

Union Calendar No. 227

113th Congress, 1st Session - - - - - House Report 113-309

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



DECEMBER 27, 2013.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

39-006

WASHINGTON : 2014

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

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

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

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

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, December 27, 2013.

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

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

Sincerely,

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

CONTENTS

	Page
Powers and Duties	1
Committee Rules	5
Composition of the Committee on Armed Services	17
Committee Staff	21
Committee Meetings and Hearings	23
Legislative Activities	24
Oversight Activities	27
Publications	90

Union Calendar No. 227

113TH CONGRESS }
1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
113-309

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR THE 113TH CONGRESS

DECEMBER 27, 2013.—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 involv-

ing 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 Services over intelligence matters was changed.

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

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

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

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

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

CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS AND DUTIES

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

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

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

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

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

HOUSE RULES ON JURISDICTION

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

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

(2) Common defense generally.

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

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

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

(6) Merchant Marine Academy and State Maritime Academies.

(7) Military applications of nuclear energy.

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

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

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

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

(12) Selective service.

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

(14) Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

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

(16) Cemeteries administered by the Department of Defense.

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

INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY AND LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

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

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

COMMITTEE RULES

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

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

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

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

RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

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

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

RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

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

RULE 4. JURISDICTION AND MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Jurisdiction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) Membership of the Subcommittees

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

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

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

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

RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS AND TASK FORCES

(a) Committee Panels

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

(2) No panel appointed by the Chairman shall continue in existence for more than six months after the appointment. A panel so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be

reappointed by the Chairman for a period of time which is not to exceed six months.

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

(4) No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

(b) Committee and Subcommittee Task Forces

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

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

(3) No task force shall have legislative jurisdiction.

RULE 6. REFERENCE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

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

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

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

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

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

RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

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

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

RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

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

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

RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee, or any subcommittee, panel, or task force, to the extent that the respective body is authorized to conduct markups, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force in open session and with a majority being present, deter-

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

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

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

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any

hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public.

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

RULE 10. QUORUM

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

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

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

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

RULE 11. THE FIVE-MINUTE RULE

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

(b)(1) Members who are present at a hearing of the Committee or subcommittee when a hearing is originally convened shall be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently shall be recognized in order of their arrival. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member will take precedence upon their arrival. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the Majority to Minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning

in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of either party.

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

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

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

RULE 12. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

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

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

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

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

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

RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

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

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

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

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

RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

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

(b) Witnesses, when sworn, shall subscribe to the following oath:

“Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee (or subcommittee) in the matters now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?”

RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

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

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

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

RULE 16. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

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

RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

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

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

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

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

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

RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

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

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

RULE 19. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

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

RULE 20. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER INFORMATION

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

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

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

RULE 21. COMMITTEE STAFFING

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

RULE 22. COMMITTEE RECORDS

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

RULE 23. HEARING PROCEDURES

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

RULE 24. COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

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

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

FULL COMMITTEE

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

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

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

¹Mrs. Roby resigned from the committee on December 11, 2013.

SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

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

MAC THORNBERRY, Texas, *Chairman*

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL

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

JOE WILSON, South Carolina, *Chairman*

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

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

process, and energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense.

ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia, *Chairman*

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER AND PROJECTION FORCES

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

J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia, *Chairman*

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

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

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama, *Chairman*

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TACTICAL AIR AND LAND FORCES

Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4—All Army, Air Force and Marine Corps acquisition programs (except Marine Corps am-

phibious assault vehicle programs, strategic missiles, space, lift programs, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology accounts) and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs and the associated weapons systems sustainment, National Guard and Army, Air Force and Marine Corps Reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio, *Chairman*

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

¹ Mrs. Roby resigned from the committee on December 11, 2013.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

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

MARTHA ROBY,¹ Alabama, *Chairman*

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
MO BROOKS, Alabama	ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina	JACKIE SPEIER, California
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma	

¹ Mrs. Roby resigned from the committee on December 11, 2013.

COMMITTEE STAFF

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

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

Stephen Kitay, *Professional Staff Member*
James Mazol, *Staff Assistant (resigned Mar. 12, 2013)*
Katie Thompson, *Clerk*
Alexander Gallo, *Professional Staff Member*
Eric L. Smith, *Clerk*
Joe Sangiorgio, *Communications Assistant*
John Noonan, *Deputy Communications Director*
Dan Harder, *Intern (appointed Jan. 23, 2013, resigned Mar. 22, 2013)*
Daniel Westlake, *Intern (appointed Jan. 23, 2013, resigned May 17, 2013)*
Alexandra Chinchilla, *Intern (appointed Jan. 24, 2013, resigned May 16, 2013)*
Gabe Surratt, *Intern (appointed Feb. 8, 2013, resigned June 14, 2013)*
Colin Bosse, *Clerk (appointed Mar. 4, 2013)*
Julie Herbert, *Clerk (appointed Mar. 13, 2013)*
Colleen Taggart, *Intern (appointed May 20, 2013, resigned Aug. 2, 2013)*
Schuyler Miller, *Intern (appointed May 27, 2013, resigned Aug. 2, 2013)*
Daniel Swartz, *Intern (appointed June 3, 2013, resigned Aug. 2, 2013)*
Alec Sugarman, *Intern (appointed June 13, 2013, resigned Aug. 2, 2013)*
Rob Simmons, *Intern (appointed June 24, 2013, resigned Aug. 27, 2013)*
Stephen Harris, *Intern (appointed July 1, 2013, resigned July 26, 2013)*
David Giachetti, *Professional Staff Member (appointed Sept. 1, 2013)*
Kate Bock, *Intern (appointed Sept. 3, 2013, resigned Dec. 12, 2013)*
Aaron Novy, *Intern (appointed Sept. 3, 2013, resigned Dec. 12, 2013)*
Kari Bingen, *Professional Staff Member (appointed Sept. 16, 2013)*
Viktor Stoll, *Intern (appointed Sept. 16, 2013, resigned Dec. 12, 2013)*

COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

A total of 153 meetings and hearings have been held by the Committee on Armed Services and its subcommittees and panels during the 113th Congress. A breakdown of the meetings and hearings follows:

FULL COMMITTEE	46
SUBCOMMITTEES:	
Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities	20
Subcommittee on Military Personnel	14
Subcommittee on Readiness	19
Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces	15
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces	15
Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces	14
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations	10

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

LEGISLATION PASSED BY BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS

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

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

LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

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

H.R. 3304—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014

H.R. 3304 was introduced on October 22, 2013, by Mr. Theodore E. Deutch. The bill’s title, as introduced, was “To authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to Bennie G. Adkins and Donald P. Sloat of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam Conflict and to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to certain other veterans who were previously recommended for award of the Medal of Honor,” and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The committee waived con-

sideration of H.R. 3304, and on October 28, 2013, Mr. Mike Rogers (AL) moved to consider H.R. 3304 under suspension of the rules of the House, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to by voice vote. On October 29, 2013, the bill was received in the Senate, read twice and referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. On November 19, 2013, the Senate Committee on Armed Services was discharged and the bill was laid before Senate by unanimous consent. On November 19, 2013, H.R. 3304 was passed in the Senate with amendments and an amendment to the title by unanimous consent. The following day, a message on Senate action was sent to the House.

In lieu of a formal conference report for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the legislative vehicle used for the agreed upon legislative text between the House and the Senate was an amendment to H.R. 3304. The provisions granting the President the authority to award the Medal of Honor to certain individuals were retained. On December 12, 2013, Mr. McKeon moved that the House to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution H.Res. 441, which provided for the concurrence by the House in the Senate amendments to H.R. 3304, with an amendment, which contained the agreed upon legislative text between the House and the Senate. Pursuant to H. Res. 441, the House agreed to Senate amendments to H.R. 3304, with an amendment, by the yeas and nays, 350–69 (Roll no. 641). On December 13, 2013, a message on House action was received in Senate and held at the desk. H.R. 3304 is awaiting further action in the Senate.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would: (1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2014: (a) the personnel strength for each Active Duty Component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; (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 2014 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the Maritime Administration.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, is a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides jurisdiction over the Department of Defense generally, and

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

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

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

H.R. 272, “To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the “Major General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic” was introduced on January 15, 2013, by Mr. Sam Farr and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel and the full committee waived consideration of H.R. 272. On November 1, 2013, Mr. Brad Wenstrup moved to consider H.R. 272, as amended, under suspension of the rules of the House, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 388–0 (Roll no. 589). On November 19, 2013, H.R. 272 was received in the Senate. No further action has been taken.

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

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

OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

OVERVIEW

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 113th Congress, as well as additional oversight activities not explicitly enumerated by the oversight plan.

POLICY ISSUES

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

During the first session of the 113th Congress, the committee has continued its traditional interest in the broad spectrum of national security challenges facing the United States and how the Nation might best prepare itself to face such challenges in the near- and long-term. H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, and the Joint Explanatory Statement that accompanies it, is a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as enumerated in the U.S. Constitution. H.R. 3304 includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from the committee's oversight activities in the current year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

H.R. 3304 reflects the committee's steadfast support of the courageous, professional, and dedicated men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces and the committee's appreciation for the sacrifices they make to accomplish their required missions. Events of the last year, ranging from on-going operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the security situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, the renewed focus on the Asia-Pacific region, heightened tensions on the Korean peninsula, dispersed special operations in support of the global war on terrorism, and time-sensitive disaster and humanitarian responses, serve to highlight the U.S. military's flexibility and responsiveness in defending the Nation's interests and addressing security challenges, wherever and whenever they may arise. The committee understands that the capabilities of the Armed Forces are underpinned by the dedicated civilian employees of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration, as well as the defense industrial base. Each of these elements is required to enable the U.S. military to be the guarantor of peace and economic security that it has been for generations.

The committee recognizes that the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25) and defense sequestration has had, and will continue to have, a severe impact on the military. To help the Department of Defense further understand the impacts of sequestration and the resultant strategic choices and tradeoffs it must consider in such a constrained budget environment, the Secretary of Defense undertook a Strategic Choices and Management Review (SCMR). The committee convened several hearings and briefings,

building upon previous oversight activities conducted in prior sessions of Congress, to further its understanding of the impacts of sequestration on the Department of Defense and the strategic choices considered in the SCMR. Following the automatic cuts to the defense budget that began in January 2013, as required by the Budget Control Act, the committee held a hearing on the “Impacts of a Continuing Resolution and Sequestration on Defense,” on February 13, 2013, with the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On August 1, 2013, the committee convened a hearing on the “Initial Conclusions Formed by the Defense Strategic Choices and Management Review,” with the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and on September 18, 2013, held a hearing titled “Planning for Sequestration in Fiscal Year 2014 and Perspectives of the Military Services on the Strategic Choices and Management Review.”

These hearings, coupled with committee briefings and official statements from senior defense officials over the past year, further illustrate the acute impact of sequestration on military force posture, readiness, modernization, and planning and budgeting. The committee is committed to providing full authorization for the funding required for the readiness of our military; to enhance the quality of life of military service members and their families; to sustain and improve the Armed Forces; and to properly safeguard the national security of the United States. To this end, H.R. 3304 would authorize \$552.1 billion in spending for national defense and an additional \$80.7 billion for Overseas Contingency Operations, consistent with the House budget, the President’s budget request, and the Senate budget. This legislation would ensure our troops deployed in Afghanistan and around the world have the equipment, resources, authorities, training, and time needed to successfully complete their missions and return home; provide warfighters and their families with the resources and support they need, deserve, and have earned; invest in the capabilities and force structure needed to protect the United States from current and future threats; and mandate fiscal responsibility, transparency and accountability within the Department of Defense.

The committee recognizes that continued sequestration of the national defense accounts, or future national defense appropriations at sequestration funding levels, would limit the ability of the Department to implement the 2012 defense strategic guidance, and may very well impact the new National Security Strategy (NSS) and Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), both expected to be released in early 2014. The committee has maintained oversight of the QDR process through a series of staff briefings provided by the Department in 2013. It also convened an Oversight & Investigation Subcommittee hearing on February 26, 2013, with experts outside of government titled, “The Quadrennial Defense Review: Process, Policy, and Perspectives,” to examine the QDR process and broader strategic issues the QDR should consider. The committee will continue to monitor QDR developments as well as the subsequent independent review of the QDR by the associated National Defense Panel (NDP). Through the committee’s oversight, it will be postured to consider the findings and recommendations of the NSS,

QDR, and NDP, and to understand the assumptions and assessments leading to possible changes from previous national strategies and reviews.

Afghanistan and Pakistan

The committee maintained three critical areas of focus with respect to the war in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and U.S. efforts with the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, including:

- (1) The efforts to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat Al Qaeda,
- (2) The transition of security responsibilities from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)–International Security and Assistance Force (ISAF) to the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) and the retrograde of ISAF equipment, and
- (3) the progress of the Bilateral Security Agreement (BSA) between the United States and the Government of Afghanistan and the planning for any post-2014 residual presence of U.S. troops in Afghanistan.

The committee conducted numerous oversight activities, including staff and member-level briefings. Additionally, the committee convened hearings to complement the oversight of the policy, strategy, and post-2014 presence in Afghanistan, including hearings with outside experts on February 27, 2013 and September 19, 2013.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would extend a number of authorities that support congressional oversight of U.S. defense programs in Afghanistan. H.R. 3304 would re-authorize the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP), the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF), the authority for reintegration activities in Afghanistan, the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations (TFBSO), and the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF). These authorities support the NATO-ISAF commander's campaign plan in Afghanistan. Additionally, H.R. 3304 would include a description of U.S. policy and approach in Afghanistan and calls on the President to consult with Congress on any post-2014 mission prior to any public announcement on a presidential decision to have a post-2014 presence in Afghanistan. H.R. 3304 would also limit 50 percent of funds authorized to be appropriated for CERP, AIF, and ASFF until the Secretary of Defense certifies to specified congressional committees of jurisdiction that the United States has signed a Bilateral Security Agreement (BSA) with the Government of Afghanistan and that the BSA is in the national security interest of the United States. Lastly, H.R. 3304 would provide for certain improvements in the process for the authority, consistent with section 602(b) of the Afghan Allies Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–8), to provide Special Immigrant Visas (SIV) to those who worked with the U.S. military in Afghanistan.

The committee remains concerned about the control of the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan and the ability of the groups that exploit the difficulty in securing this border to attack ISAF and ANSF forces in order to affect the strategic landscape in Afghanistan. To support oversight of this issue, H.R. 3304 would require the Secretary of Defense to furnish a report on the plan to disrupt and degrade the Haqqani Network, which will provide the

committee with an understanding of the interagency effort against the Haqqani Network in Afghanistan and the region.

Finally, the committee continues to maintain a focus on the United States' efforts with the Government of Pakistan. To that end, H.R. 3304 would re-authorize the Coalition Support Fund (CSF), which reimburses certain countries, including Pakistan, for their direct support to Operation Enduring Freedom; however, this section also would require the Secretary of Defense to certify key aspects of the partnership with Pakistan before providing reimbursements through the CSF.

Force Protection

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

During the 113th Congress, through formal activity to include hearings, classified briefings, and interaction with Government Accountability Office (GAO) auditors, the committee continued to maintain rigorous oversight of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO), the Department of Defense's focal point for the battle against improvised explosive devices (IEDs). The committee continued to examine and provide oversight on JIEDDO's current roles and missions, operational functions, organizational and force structure requirements, as well as current metrics for measuring success against countering the global IED threat. Further, the committee continued to receive monthly updates on JIEDDO's financial management and funding rates of obligation and execution, as well as monitor the use of recent expanded authority to transfer limited funds to the Department of State for the purposes of monitoring, disrupting, and interdicting the movement of explosive precursors from the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to locations within Afghanistan.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would authorize \$955.0 million for JIEDDO; would direct the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide a report to Congress on the long-term strategy for JIEDDO; and would extend existing authorities to December 31, 2014, to include JIEDDO's ability to transfer limited funding to the Department of State for the purposes of mitigating the movement of explosive precursors for improvised explosive devices from Pakistan to Afghanistan.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a classified briefing on August 1, 2013 to receive a global IED assessment, with particular emphasis on Afghanistan.

Global War on Terrorism

Since the 9/11 attacks, the United States has dealt Al Qaeda repeated and significant blows during the global war on terrorism. Despite many notable successes, however, Al Qaeda remains potent

in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, with its organization's affiliates continuing to expand in locations such as Somalia, Yemen, Syria, Iraq, and North Africa. The committee continued to conduct extensive oversight, often in classified form, on terrorism issues and emerging threats, giving particular attention to special operations capabilities, the changing nature of Al Qaeda's organization and operations, as well as efforts to build partner nation counterterrorism capabilities. The committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities held several related hearings and briefings in this area including a hearing on February 13, 2013, "The Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for U.S. Special Operations Command and U.S. Special Operations Forces"; a hearing on March 3, 2013, "The Posture of the U.S. Central Command, U.S. Special Operations Command, and U.S. Transportation Command"; a briefing on March 19, 2013, "Counterterrorism Operations Update"; a briefing on April 24, 2013, "Weapons of Mass Destruction and Counterproliferation Programs"; a hearing on June 28, 2013, "Past, Present, and Future Irregular Warfare Challenges"; a briefing on July 11, 2013, "Exploitation of Materials Recovered during the Osama bin Laden Raid"; a briefing on July 31, 2013, "Counterterrorism Policy and Operations Update"; a briefing on September 12, 2013, "Counterterrorism Operations Update"; a hearing on October 10, 2013, "Biodefense, Worldwide Threats and Countermeasures for the Department of Defense"; a briefing on October 16, 2013, "Counterterrorism Operations Update"; and a briefing on October 23, 2013, on the state of Al Qaeda.

As the United States strengthens and builds partnership capacity with key allies around the world, the committee has remain focused on the Department of Defense's (DOD) efforts to aggressively fight the global war on terror and counter radicalism in the greater Middle East and across the globe. Ensuring security and stability in volatile regions that cannot adequately govern themselves or secure their own territory remains a top priority for the committee.

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

needs, requirements, and priorities. Additionally the subcommittee assisted the committee with several provisions within H.R. 3304 related to Weapons of Mass Destruction, Building Partnership Capacity, Security Force Assistance, Counterinsurgency, Sensitive Military Operations, Intelligence, and the regional conflicts of Afghanistan, Syria, Libya, and East Africa addressed elsewhere in this report.

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

Asia

The defense strategic guidance, released in January 2012, stated that the United States military would rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region in recognition of the economic and security interests of the United States in the region. The region is home to more than 50 percent of the world's population; 3,000 different languages; several of the world's largest militaries; five countries allied with the United States through mutual defense treaties (the Commonwealth of Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of the Philippines, and the Kingdom of Thailand); two of the world's four largest economies (Japan and the People's Republic of China); and 10 of its 14 smallest economies. Given the size and importance of the region, the committee continued to monitor the Department of Defense's strategy, force posture, and readiness, to ensure that U.S. forces are properly resourced and postured to protect U.S. national security interests.

The People's Republic of China continued efforts to assert regional influence, while the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) remained a threat to stability on the Korean peninsula. As part of its oversight, the committee held several classified briefings examining regional developments ranging from the People's Liberation Army (PLA) military modernization trends to the North Korean threat to test launch a missile, as well as classified briefings on the 2013 annual reports on military and security developments related to the People's Republic of China and North Korea. The committee also held a hearing on November 20, 2013, on the 2013 Annual Report to Congress by the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, focusing on several PLA modernization developments over the last year and China's engagement in cyber espionage against the United States.

As part of the committee's oversight of this critical region, the Chairman and Ranking Member have committed to a dedicated Asia-Pacific hearing series, led by Rep. J. Randy Forbes and Rep. Colleen W. Hanabusa. In addition to the hearings held by the committee and its subcommittees as part of this series, on November 13, 2013, the committee held a closed-door roundtable with regional Ambassadors from Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Phil-

ippines, Singapore and South Korea to discuss issues of mutual interest and concern.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would add an additional reporting requirement to the Department of Defense Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the DPRK. The Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3304 would also contain a provision that would add an additional reporting requirement on China's fifth generation fighter program to the Department of Defense annual report on military and security developments involving the People's Republic of China.

The committee remained focused on the Asia-Pacific region and its evolving security environment, particularly regarding engagement with allies and partners. The committee continued to monitor key operational control transition initiatives between U.S. Forces Korea and the Republic of Korea, as well as the Yongsan Relocation Plan and the Land Partnership Plan. With respect to Japan, the committee continued to focus on the continued realignment of U.S. forces that are based in Japan. Committee staff traveled to South Korea and Japan to conduct congressional oversight of the force posture of U.S. forces in South Korea and Japan. The committee also continued to evaluate U.S. military engagement with other regional allies and partners, including Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, and several other countries.

Central and South America

The committee continued to examine the issues affecting the United States military in Central and South America, as many nations in this region increasingly face the dangers of illicit trafficking, political turmoil, and instability that pose a potential threat to the homeland. The committee maintained strong oversight of the U.S. role in the Republic of Colombia, as Colombia continues to improve its national security and continues peace talks with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). In addition, the committee continually monitored the political and economic changes in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, instability in parts of Central America including the Republic of Honduras, and the security situation in the United Mexican States. The committee examined potential threats from global terrorist organizations such as Al Qaeda, Hezbollah, and the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps, who have increasing influence in the region.

The Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, includes several provisions that would reauthorize Department of Defense counternarcotics authorities for the Republic of Colombia and other nations in the region. In addition, the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3304 would require a number of briefings and reports from the Department of Defense, including a counternarcotics strategy in Central America and the status of operations as it relates to Operation Martillo. The committee recognizes the importance of the United States' relationship with its Central and South American neighbors and the assurance of safety and security in the region.

Europe

While the stability and security of Europe remain core U.S. national interests, the U.S. military force presence in Europe has declined dramatically since the end of the cold war. The planned withdrawal of two of four Army Brigade Combat Teams will further reduce U.S. military presence. Nevertheless, there are significant advantages that come from European-based U.S. troops, including the opportunity to train regularly with allied and partner forces at U.S. training centers in Europe, and the ability to plan and launch operations elsewhere in the region, as was demonstrated recently by Operation Odyssey Dawn and Operation Unified Protector in Libya. The committee continued to examine all overseas basing, including Europe, to inform its views on a cost effective force posture to meet U.S. national security needs.

European allies are strong partners of the U.S. military, contributing to a range of regional and global missions, including approximately 30 percent of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) training teams in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. However, the continuing constrained fiscal environment has created pressures on the region's militaries, defense budgets, and investments in future capabilities. To deal with the financial impact on the region's militaries, the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) agreed to a "Smart Defense" initiative, a series of projects designed to pool and share resources in order to better set priorities and encourage members to specialize. In addition to the full committee hearing on the posture of the U.S. European Command listed elsewhere in this report, the committee held a number of staff briefings to consider developments in Europe. The committee will continue to focus on the U.S. military's engagement in NATO's activities.

While the cold war has been over for more than 20 years, the U.S. military's relationship with the Russian Federation is focused on building and maintaining cooperative military-to-military relations while also reassuring U.S. allies wary of Russia's intentions. Russia remains focused on reforming and modernizing their forces, with specific emphasis on improving the recruitment, training, and retention of its troops. The committee paid particular attention to U.S.-Russia discussions on missile defense, conducting several staff briefings and member engagements with senior Department of Defense and Department of State officials.

The committee also closely followed U.S.-Russia nonproliferation activities, and held several staff-level briefings on the umbrella agreement governing the nonproliferation activities of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy. Russia announced it wanted changes to this agreement, which was set to expire in June 2013. The old agreement helped the U.S. Government, particularly Department of Defense personnel, secure and dismantle Soviet-era nuclear weapons and contained key liabilities for U.S. personnel. The new agreement, signed in June 2013, enables continued engagement only between the National Nuclear Security Administration and Russia's State Nuclear Energy Cooperation (Rosatom).

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, expressed the sense of Congress on the importance of stationing U.S. forces in Europe. The Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would require the Department of Defense to submit a report on military and security developments involving the Russian Federation.

Addressing Emerging Threats

The committee continued to focus attention on how the Department of Defense addresses the threats of terrorism, insurgency, and weapons of mass destruction proliferation, including how the Department addresses these threats in its strategic planning processes, how resources are arrayed to meet these threats, and how existing authorities are consistent with operational requirements. The committee also continued its oversight of numerous cross-cutting Department activities central to addressing these emerging and unforeseen threats, including counterinsurgency, counterterrorism, security force assistance, and building partnership capacity (BPC), all of which received renewed emphasis in the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review.

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

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

The committee held a hearing on February 14, 2013, “Framework for Building Partnership Capacity Authorities to Meet 21st Century Challenges” and received testimony from witnesses representing the Department of Defense and the Government Accountability Office.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, and the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying it, includes several provisions that would reauthorize authorities and requiring reports dealing with Department of Defense counter-narcotics programs, including programs in the Republic of Colombia and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. H.R. 3304 would also modify and extend the “1206” authority to include authorizing train and equip activities with those security forces of foreign nations that conduct counterterrorism operations, extending the authority through 2017, and requiring two new reports. H.R. 3304

would also make technical modifications to the Global Security Contingency Fund authority, section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), and codify the National Guard State Partnership Program.

Detainee Policy, Military Commissions, and Related Matters

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

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

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

The committee also focused on issues relating to detainee interrogations, intelligence collection, detainee reviews, conditions of confinement, and the Department of Defense’s role in the High Value Interrogation Group.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, contains numerous provisions relating to detention policy, including a 1-year prohibition on the transfer of GTMO detainees to the United States, a 1-year prohibition on the construction or modification of facilities in the United States to house GTMO detainees, and authorities, under certain circumstances and subject to certain requirements, relating to foreign transfers of GTMO detainees. H.R. 3304 also contains several reporting requirements relating to detainees at GTMO and in Afghanistan.

Intelligence

The committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats, and Capabilities conducted extensive oversight of defense intelligence activities, including one hearing, seven member briefings, and numerous staff briefings. The committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats, and Capabilities placed particular attention on: resource allocation for intelligence-related programs both for effectiveness and affordability; defense intelligence strategies and policies in consideration of current and anticipated future threats; organization and management of the elements of the Department of Defense that are part of the intelligence community; and the consideration and prioritization of defense intelligence requirements across the intelligence community. Additionally, the committee monitored the Department’s security practices, audit capabilities, and information-sharing policies following recent extensive unauthorized disclosures of classified information.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, includes several intelligence-related provisions, including: a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to develop a policy for internal coordination and prioritization of Department of Defense intelligence priorities; a limitation on the use of funds for the Defense Clandestine Service; a prohibition on separation or consolidation of the portions of the Department of Defense budget that are identified as part of the National Intelligence Program; and a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan regarding future use of defense intelligence assets as a result of the U.S. military drawdown in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

National Guard and Reserves

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

The Continent of Africa

The committee conducted regular oversight of the continent of Africa, including numerous staff level briefings and a member-level briefing in closed session.

Additionally, H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would re-authorize the efforts of the Department of Defense and U.S. Africa Command, consistent with the Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-172), to assist the Ugandan People's Defense Force as they combat the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) and attempt to remove or apprehend Joseph Kony. This re-authorization allows for the provision of logistic support, supplies, and services, and intelligence support to foreign forces participating in operations to mitigate and eliminate the threat posed by the Lord's Resistance Army. Additionally, H.R. 3304 provided \$50.0 million for additional intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capability to aid this effort. Finally, H.R. 3304 required reports on counterterrorism assistance and cooperation in the Sahel and Maghreb regions, a strategy to support security and governance gains in Somalia, and an intelligence assessment of al-Shabaab, an Al Qaeda-affiliated terrorist group in Somalia to complement and reinforce the committee's oversight of defense policy related to the African continent. Finally, H.R. 3304 would authorize a report on the posture and readiness of the U.S. armed forces to respond to future terrorist attacks in Africa and the Middle East against U.S. embassies and facilities.

Syria

The committee conducted regular oversight of the evolving security situation in Syrian Arab Republic and the region, including staff level briefings and two member-level briefings in closed session. Additionally, the committee convened a hearing on the security situation in Syria on July 17, 2013, and a hearing on the Administration's proposed authorization for the use of force against the Government of Syria on September 9, 2013.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to the military and civilian first responder organizations of countries that share a border with Syria in order to enhance the capability of such countries to respond effectively to potential incidents involving weapons of mass destruction in Syria and the surrounding region. In addition, H.R. 3304 would authorize assistance on a reimbursable basis to the Government of Jordan for their efforts to secure the Jordan-Syria border.

H.R. 3304 would also provide enhanced authority through the Cooperative Threat Reduction program to facilitate destruction of Syria's chemical weapons. The committee continues oversight of these activities, as well as U.S. nonproliferation programs at the National Nuclear Security Administration.

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

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

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

The Benghazi attacks were the subject of two full committee events this year: one briefing and one hearing. The briefing, entitled "Intelligence and Operations in North and East Africa" was held on February 6, 2013. The witnesses were Ms. Amanda Dory, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for African Affairs; Mr. William Wechsler, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Combating Terrorism; Major General Michael

Nagata, USA, Deputy Director for Special Operations, Joint Staff; and Mr. George Kuk, Intelligence Analyst, Defense Intelligence Agency. The hearing, entitled “The Posture of the U.S. European Command and U.S. Africa Command” was held on March 15, 2013. The witnesses were General Carter F. Ham, USA, Commander, U.S. Africa Command, and Admiral James G. Stavridis, USN, Commander, U.S. European Command.

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

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

The sole subcommittee hearing on Benghazi was held on September 19, 2013. Mr. Garry Reid, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict and Major General Darryl Roberson, USAF, Vice Director, Operations, on the Joint Staff appeared before the committee to testify on “The Defense Department’s Posture for September 11, 2013: What are the Lessons of Benghazi?”

While the committee’s inquiries continue, the committee has found that:

(1) No Department of Defense personnel signed (or were asked to sign) non-disclosure agreements.

(2) No Armed Forces, units, weapons, or specific personnel that could have been readily deployed in the course of the attack were unduly held back, told to “stand down,” or refused permission to enter the fight.

(3) The posture the Department of Defense mandated for its forces worldwide on September 11, 2012 requires further oversight.

Furthermore, as a result of the committee’s activities, H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would direct the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of State, to convey a report to the committee on lessons learned from the Benghazi attack. The report would assess the military’s posture and readiness,

describe the ability of the U.S. military to respond to requests from the Department of State for supplemental embassy security forces, and identify possible related intelligence enhancements.

Iran

The committee continued to conduct oversight of the threat posed by the Islamic Republic of Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon to the U.S. interests, U.S. allies, and countries in the region of Iran. The committee received numerous staff-level briefings and a member-level briefing in closed session on Middle East intelligence and operations, which included analysis on Iran.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would authorize a report on U.S. military partnership with the countries of the Gulf Coordination Council (GCC), which would provide information on U.S. posture, agreements, and sustainability of funding of such efforts. Additionally, H.R. 3304 would authorize the United States to conduct integrated air and missile defense training programs with GCC allies. These legislative efforts support the committee's oversight of U.S. military posture in the region of Iran.

Iraq

Although U.S. forces deployed to the Republic of Iraq are limited to those associated with the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC-I), the committee continues to conduct robust oversight of the security environment in Iraq and the activities of OSC-I. The committee has received a number of staff-level briefings on OSC-I and the security situation in Iraq. Additionally, the committee received a member-level briefing in closed session on Middle East intelligence and operations, which included analysis on the situation in Iraq.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would re-authorize OSC-I and its ability to provide training in a institutional, non-operational environment to the Iraqi Ministry of Defense, including the Iraqi Counterterrorism Service (CTS). This section would limit the total funding authorized for OSC-I to \$209.0 million for fiscal year 2014. Additionally, the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3304 would direct the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Attorney General, to submit a report on the current security situation at Camp Liberty in Iraq and efforts to relocate the camp residents to other countries. H.R. 3304 would also extend the Special Immigrant Visa (SIV) program for Iraq, consistent with the Refugee Crisis in Iraq Act of 2007, and would authorize up to 2,500 additional visas for potential Iraqi immigrants that worked with the U.S. military in Iraq between March 2003 and September 2013. Finally, this section required certain improvements in processing SIV applications for eligible Iraqis.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND EFFICIENCY

Overview

The committee scrutinized the Department of Defense's budget and identified inefficiencies to capture and reinvest savings into higher national security priorities. The Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, reflects the fact that the Nation must examine every aspect of the defense enterprise to find ways to accomplish the mission of providing for the common defense more effectively.

During the first session of the 113th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of efforts by the Department of Defense to improve its fiscal responsibility, transparency, and accountability, and to further identify opportunities to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse. The committee continued to monitor the Department's efforts to implement the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan, and has given particular attention to efforts announced by the Secretary of Defense in July 2013, within the context of the Strategic Choices and Management Review undertaken by the Department of Defense, to identify cost savings through management efficiencies and overhead reductions within the Department's major headquarters. While such cost savings and efficiency efforts are good government measures to undertake under any budget conditions, they have taken on increased importance as the Department works to absorb the cuts to defense resulting from the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25).

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

Organization and Management of the Department of Defense

The committee continued to review the organization and management of the Department of Defense in order to ensure that it is properly postured to meet the complex and evolving security threats of the 21st century. Declining resources resulting from the Budget Control Act are driving the Department of Defense to re-evaluate its organization and management structure to identify cost savings. Most significant in the past year was the announcement by the Secretary of Defense in July 2013, within the context of the Strategic Choices and Management Review undertaken by the Department of Defense, to identify cost savings through management efficiencies and overhead reductions within the Department's major headquarters. According to the Department, these management reforms, consolidations, personnel cuts, and spending reductions are planned to reduce the Department's overhead and operating costs by some \$10 billion over the next 5 years and almost \$40 billion over the next 10 years. In holding the Department to these objectives and ensuring these reductions are done smartly and strategically, H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan for streamlining Department of Defense management headquarters.

As a first step, in December 2013, the Secretary of Defense announced specific changes to the organization and management of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, including a restructure of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; realignment of the Office of Net Assessment under the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; elimination of several deputy under secretary, assistant secretary, and deputy assistance secretary positions; realignments within the Office of the Deputy Chief Management Officer and Office of the DOD Chief Information Officer; and rebalance of internal resources within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.

The committee received a staff-level briefing on these proposed organizations reforms, and it will continue to solicit further information and analyses from the Department to ensure that such decisions were supported by thorough business case analyses and risk assessments. The committee has expressed some concern about these organizational changes, specifically the realignment of the Office of Net Assessment under the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, which is captured in the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3304. The committee will also continue to ensure that any reductions to military or civilian end strength are made only following a thorough, holistic review of the Department's manpower requirements and the total force.

Financial Management

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

The Comptroller General of the United States has consistently identified the Department of Defense's financial management as a high-risk area since 1995. The Department's inability to track and account for billions of dollars in funding and tangible assets continues to undermine its management approach. It also creates a lack of transparency that significantly limits congressional oversight. The Department's inability to produce auditable financial statements undermines its efforts to reform defense acquisition processes and to realize efficiencies. Without these objective tools, neither the Department nor Congress can verify that greater value is being created. As a result, the committee continues to monitor the Department's efforts to implement the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan to correct the weaknesses in its financial statements, including its efforts to meet the Secretary of Defense's goal of achieving audit readiness on the Statement of Budgetary Resources by 2014, and monitor closely the interdependencies between FIAR and the hundreds of millions of dollars being spent on business systems modernization programs that the Department has proposed to address its financial management problems.

The committee received the statutorily mandated semi-annual updates on the FIAR plan in May and in November. Supporting the Department's goal of achieving audit readiness by the end of 2017, H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, included a provision that would clarify the intent of the Department to have a full and complete audit on all fiscal year 2018 financial materials, with the results of the audit submitted to Congress by March 31, 2019.

The committee looks forward to receiving notification that the Statement of Budgetary Resources will be audit ready during the 113th Congress, as the current projected date for that certification is September 30, 2014.

Acquisition Issues

The Acquisition System and Acquisition Policy

The committee continued to provide oversight of the defense acquisition system and to address standing concerns about cost growth in major defense acquisition programs and the responsiveness of the system to compelling military needs. The committee examined potential areas for improving defense acquisition activities to include reforming the process for reviewing and certifying requirements for major defense acquisition programs; reforming operational contract support; improving the education, skills and experience of the acquisition workforce; protecting supply availability of strategic materials; and establishing greater transparency and accountability in services contracting activities.

As part of its oversight, the committee examined the military requirements process, which is the foundation for procurement of not only weapon systems, but also contracts for services. The committee also examined the process for developing the cost estimates for weapon systems and included section 814 in H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, that would strengthen acquisition planning by requiring the original baseline cost estimate to be reported in selected acquisition reports required by section 2432 of title 10, United States Code. The provision would also require identification and reporting of the primary risk parameters associated with each current reported cost estimate.

Service contracting represents an increasingly important and large proportion of the acquisition expenditures of the Department of Defense. The committee continued to work to reform the acquisition process to reflect this reality by reviewing the management structure for these contracts; increasing the visibility and transparency of these contracts by reviewing service contract inventories; and monitoring efforts to prevent personal and organizational conflicts of interest.

The committee also worked aggressively to improve the Department's ability to contract in a contingency environment. The committee worked directly with the Joint Staff and others to improve requirements development and planning for operational contract support. However, more emphasis is needed in this area and the committee will continue to address this matter through visits to the individual combatant commands and other engagements. The committee notes that the Department has scheduled a joint exercise in

January 2014, to specifically focus on planning, training, execution, and management of operational contract support. The committee applauds these efforts and looks forward to this and other events focused on developing the Department's ability to effectively and efficiently contract in support of contingency operations. Furthermore, the committee included section 821 in H.R. 3304, which would expand prohibitions on contracting with the enemy. This section would expand the authorities provided in section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) to other geographic combatant commands and would also make the authorities permanent.

The committee recognizes that a fundamental component in addressing most of the problems in the acquisition process is improving the composition and quality of the acquisition workforce. Therefore, the committee continues to closely monitor the development of the acquisition workforce, the execution and management of the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, and other efforts by the Department to expand and improve the acquisition workforce.

The committee also continued efforts to protect supply availability of strategic materials and directed a Comptroller General review of supply activities related to specialty metals and expects the review to examine how Department program officials determine their needs for specialty metal components for major weapon systems throughout the acquisition life cycle; how information about these needs are communicated within Department programs, policies, and oversight offices and with prime contractors; and the extent to which the Department has issued waivers for specialty metals procurements in the last 5 years and the basis for these waivers. The committee looks forward to the findings of this review.

Despite the committee's efforts in these areas, it remains concerned about significant shortcomings in the current acquisition system. Therefore, in October 2013, the committee initiated an effort to examine acquisition reform efforts of the previous decades in order to understand why these well-intentioned reform efforts have not yet produced an improved acquisition system. The committee also continues to work with the Department of Defense to review the application of regulatory frameworks so as to begin eliminating unnecessary overhead, red tape, and bureaucracy. The committee held a hearing on October 29, 2013, "Twenty-five years of acquisition reform: Where do we go from here?" and received testimony from a panel of outside experts.

Defense Industrial Base and Technology Transfers

The committee continued to closely monitor the health, security and innovative capacity of the defense industrial base, especially in light of changes to the defense strategy, the needs for recapitalization and modernization after 12 years of war, and budget pressures. The industrial base for complex major weapons systems has shrunk dramatically in the past decade, limiting the ability of the Department of Defense to control costs and encourage innovation through the use of competition. Industry has also struggled in many cases to make the long-term investments that are vital to the

health of the defense industrial base, notably so in the shipbuilding industry.

The committee also monitored implementation of recent changes to the U.S. export control regime in order to determine its effectiveness in preventing the transfer of sensitive military-related technologies to potential adversaries. The consolidation of the defense industry and its increasingly global nature will continue to challenge the capabilities of current systems for industrial security. The committee monitored the Department's plans and statutory authorities for industrial security. In addition to overseeing the effectiveness of the Defense Security Service to carry out this mission, the committee continues to examine traditional mechanisms for industrial security, such as the personnel security clearance process and the National Industrial Security Program, as well as other areas where adversaries could exploit vulnerabilities or loop holes in the acquisition process to undermine the U.S. defense industrial base.

Information Technology and Business Systems

Information technology (IT) systems are critical enablers for the Department of Defense. As the IT budget represents nearly \$33 billion of the Department of Defense's total budget, it also represents a major investment area requiring the same rigorous planning and oversight as any other complex major weapon system. The Department recognized this area as a source of greater efficiencies and has managed to reduce spending in IT by several billion dollars across the Future Years Defense Program. The committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats, and Capabilities continued reviewing the Department's IT investment planning and acquisitions to reduce unwarranted duplication and eliminate programs of little value to the warfighter. The committee has paid particular attention to the various IT business systems of the Department where egregious programmatic failures, such as the Air Force's Expeditionary Combat Support System, have occurred, and which are also critical components in the Department's strategy to achieve auditability.

The committee held a related hearing on March 13, 2013, on "Information Technology and Cyber Operations: Modernization and Policy Issues to Support the Future Force." In addition to hearings, the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats, and Capabilities held briefings on Department of Defense Electromagnetic Pulse as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239). Additionally, the subcommittee conducted detailed oversight of specific programmatic issues related to IT.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 passed by the House, the committee included a directive related to information technology, requiring a briefing on the progress of implementing an IT-specific acquisition process for the Department of Defense.

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

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

READINESS

Strategic Military Readiness

The Subcommittee on Readiness provided oversight of Department of Defense military readiness, training, logistics, maintenance, military construction, installations, family housing, and the base closure and realignment process. The subcommittee also provided oversight on civilian personnel, energy security, and environmental issues that affect the Department of Defense. The committee visited numerous overseas bases to assess the skills of assigned forces, the material condition of equipment, the readiness challenges associated with the forces, along with the appropriate application of military construction in the overseas and contingency operations environments. Specifically, the committee has conducted numerous oversight visits to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and examined U.S. Central Command's plans to sustain operations while simultaneously withdrawing forces and equipment. The committee continues to assess the logistics and readiness challenges facing the Department of Defense as it implements these plans.

The Department's implementation of the Defense Strategic Guidance focused on the rebalance to the Asia Pacific region remained a key area of oversight. The committee continues to assess Department of Defense force-generation capabilities, its ability to return to full-spectrum operations in a peacetime environment, and the alignment of military forces to fulfill two primary strategic demands: rotational presence and contingency availability. Under sequestration-level funding, however, the military cannot continue to operate at current levels and provide a fully ready, globally responsive force in the manner that ensures the morale, welfare, and safety of U.S. Armed Forces. The committee will continue to monitor the impact of sequestration as required under the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25) into the foreseeable future.

Force Readiness

The declining state of force readiness remains the committee's highest priority. The committee will continue to examine the readiness of deployed personnel supporting ongoing operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, in addition to the ability of the services to conduct full-spectrum combat missions should the need arise and to maintain capabilities to posture the force in the decades to come. The committee will also closely monitor the impacts of sequestration on operational tempo and current readiness shortfalls

in equipment, personnel, and training to include flying hours, steaming days, and full-spectrum training miles. In support of this effort, the committee held hearings on the potential financial implications of another round of base closure and realignment actions, the Navy's readiness posture, Army and Marine Corps reset, Air Force reductions in force structure, the civilian workforce, and U.S. force posture in the Pacific Area of Responsibility. The committee also examined the impact of budget cuts to the Department of Defense and held a series of classified briefings for both members of the committee and non-committee members on the resulting challenges in maintaining readiness.

The committee noted that during the first quarter of the previous fiscal year, overall readiness trends improved for non-deployed units across the force, including equipment availability and condition, personnel, and training in fiscal year 2013. However, the impacts of sequestration and top-line budget reductions challenged readiness in the latter portion of the year across almost all readiness areas. The committee found that these shortfalls present a concerning increase in national security risk which poses challenges to planning and executing emergent contingencies. Specifically, the committee notes the cancellation of 6 Navy deployments, and 2 additional deferred, the grounding of 17 Air Force fighter squadrons, the cancellation of 7 Army combat training center rotations, the cancellation and de-scoping of multiple multilateral and joint exercises, and the acute impact of civilian personnel furloughs. The committee will continue to monitor these trends during the remaining congressional session.

To better understand the unique challenges sequestration presents to the readiness of the total force, in the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee directs the Government Accountability Office to review readiness trends and risks within the military departments, the Department as a whole, and the geographic combatant commands. The committee also proposed several changes to the Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress, requiring the Department to provide greater clarity and visibility on changes to military readiness both within geographic combatant commands and the Defense combat support agencies. Additionally, the committee conducted hearings, site visits, and briefings focused on how these trends impact planned force structure and resource allocations as well as possible future force structure reductions mandated by the Strategic Choices and Management Review completed by the Department in July 2013.

With the ongoing drawdown of operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the committee anticipates a continuing realignment of funds from the Department's Overseas Contingency Operations budget to the operation and maintenance base budgets to better represent normalized budget requirements, to accommodate training across the full spectrum of conflict, and to reset war-torn equipment. However, the committee remains deeply concerned about the viability of fully resetting the force if sequestration runs the full 10-year course. To address these issues, H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would require the Department of Defense to examine closely its Afghan retrograde lo-

logistics chain, encourage smarter use of resources by examining the logistics roles and missions of the military departments and the Defense Logistics Agency, and provide additional resources for reset and reconstitution. The committee will continue to monitor the Services' compliance with this requirement as it monitors the reset strategies to repair, recapitalize, and replace equipment used in ongoing operations and progress toward complete reconstitution of prepositioned stocks. The committee believes that full reset remains at risk in a constrained budget environment. Subsequently, the committee will provide rigorous oversight of ongoing property accountability and retrograde efforts aimed at returning equipment with remaining military value to home station. Further, the committee will continue to monitor the disposition of non-standard equipment returning from the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to ensure that important items are incorporated into units' tables of equipment, are budgeted for and sustained properly, and that items no longer of military utility are disposed of in the most cost-effective manner possible.

The committee found that while readiness has largely remained steady for deployed or next-to-deploy forces, specifically within the Army, this readiness has continued to be at the expense of non-deployed ground-force 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 on how additional force structure changes or budget cuts would further exacerbate force readiness levels. While the Army's overseas contingency budget request decreased in fiscal year 2014, the base budget saw a slight increase to support the reset of equipment that has been damaged or worn out through 10 years of high demand, and also to support increased home-station training for full-spectrum operations as the Army commits fewer units to combat operations. However, sequestration has challenged this effort and delayed expected improvements in readiness across the Army.

Restoring equipment readiness is a key element of the Army reset process. However, the committee remains concerned about the Army's ability to absorb another round of sequestration-driven reductions without impacting reset needed for current operations and those likely to be undertaken in the future and intends to hold hearings on the issue. The committee also found through several briefings and hearings that readiness shortfalls are especially prevalent within the National Guard and Reserve Components. While these shortfalls are expected to stabilize if sequestration is avoided in fiscal year 2014, further cuts in funding could seriously challenge the ability of the Reserve Component to remain operationally ready. To address this trend in both the Active and Reserve Components, H.R. 3304 provides additional resources for additional flying hours, training miles, training center rotations, and depot maintenance.

The committee found that the Air Force continues to experience a high operational tempo, which has resulted in detrimental effects on equipment such as engine and structural fatigue, deterioration, corrosion, and increased rates of component failures. The increased

tempo also delays 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. The committee also has found that challenges are expected to persist as operational tempo is anticipated to remain at high levels during the drawdown of U.S. forces supporting Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, such as what occurred during Operation Northern Watch following Operation Desert Storm, or even more recently with simultaneous operations in Libya. This will be particularly problematic for the Air Guard and Reserve as they also continue to provide support for U.S. domestic operations, which was highlighted during the Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on the Army and Air Reserve Components.

Despite the drawdown in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Navy operational tempo is expected to remain high, as demand for naval assets continues to increase as a result of the rebalance to the Pacific and other regional commands. The committee remains concerned about the size of the fleet based on current downward demands, particularly in light of years of degraded maintenance on the Navy's non-nuclear surface fleet, sustained high operational tempo, and a reset cost associated with restoring those assets. The committee remains concerned about the Navy's readiness to meet combatant commander demands, particularly in light of sequestration, which is expected to degrade the Navy's ability to provide surge capacity. The committee requested the Government Accountability Office review the Navy's initiatives to improve amphibious and surface combatant ship material readiness. Additionally, H.R. 3304 includes additional funds for ship and aircraft depot maintenance to address the backlog of requirements and to prevent further degradation to the fleet as well as funds to address the combat forces equipment shortfall.

The committee has also monitored the impacts of higher operational tempo and sequestration on the Marine Corps and its missions. The committee has closely monitored the Marine Corps' reset operation to replace and refurbish equipment and vehicles damaged in wartime operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, specifically combat vehicles, the Armored Amphibious Vehicle, rotary-wing aircraft, and the repair and refurbishment of communications equipment and crew-served weapons as well as its collective training activities and the resumption of the Unit Deployment Program which remains challenged as a result of sequestration. Through hearings and site visits, the committee expressed concern about the Marine Corps' ability to reset its force in a budget-constrained environment as well as its ability to meet the current one major contingency operation construct with an end strength below the 186,800 Marines recommended by the Force Posture Review and the proposed retirement of two additional amphibious ships in the President's budget request. To ensure that the Marine Corps remains ready for current operations, H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, contained additional resources for the growth of the Marine Security Guard Program in response to

events in Benghazi, Libya, the Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Force constitution in Rota, Spain, and for training days and exercises.

Depot and Arsenal Capability

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

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

Civilian Personnel

The Department of Defense has long relied on the Federal civilian workforce to support its missions around the world, often requiring civilians to serve in active combat zones, and it is clear that the Department's civilian workforce plays a critical role in the readiness of U.S. military forces. H.R. 3304, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, included provisions that would extend authorities for premium pay and allowances, benefits and gratuities for deployed civilians. The committee has also continued to closely monitor the implementation of the each military depart-

ment's efficiencies initiatives, including the Department's Strategic Choices and Management Review, which focuses on the civilian workforce. These initiatives have led to a civilian hiring freeze for all military departments as well as significant personnel reductions which started in 2010 and remain in effect.

The committee focused significant oversight efforts on the civilian furlough decision announced by the Secretary of Defense on May 14, 2013, imposing an 11-day furlough (later decreased to 6 days) on the civilian workforce. The committee remains concerned about the effects of the furlough and Federal Government shut-down on the morale of the force which has already suffered from the civilian hiring freeze, layoffs of temporary workers, cuts in facilities maintenance and other disruptive factors on the working environment. Such oversight efforts will continue for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

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 installation energy and operational energy to reduce consumption and dependence on foreign oil while promoting good stewardship of taxpayer money with demonstrated returns on investment. The committee believes that Department of Defense installations provide significant opportunities for reducing energy demand through appropriate use of renewable energy technologies combined with energy security. In the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the final Quadrennial Defense Review assessment include details regarding the importance of, and funding necessary to achieve, energy security. Likewise, the committee report directed the the committee subsequently received briefings from the Department of Defense regarding power and energy research at University Affiliated Research Centers, alternative power applications on military installations, direct solar and other energy efficient technologies on military installations, decentralized steam generation, and energy collaboration and technology transition. H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2014, also includes several provisions focused on alternative fuel and installation energy specifically.

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. H.R. 3304, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, addressed modifications to the Sikes Act to include a 5-year reauthorization and permitting the ability to use funds to match for cost-sharing requirements. The committee also continued its oversight and provided clarification re-

garding the prohibition of burn pits. Additionally, in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2014, the committee continues oversight regarding the Department of Defense’s ability to operate in the Arctic, directing a roadmap for 2020–30, as well as concerns regarding the Military Ocean Terminal Concord, California, and finally directs an audit of the impacts of encroachment on national security and the Department of Defense’s ability to train and operate on its defense installations.

As further directed by the committee report, the committee received a briefing from the Department of Defense regarding environmental exposures and the Department of Defense’s processes to minimize exposure and seek technological solutions.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Basing

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

The committee has been specifically interested in ensuring the Department of Defense has the requisite tools and capabilities to support the rebalance effort in the Pacific. H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, includes a provision that would restrict certain construction funds to support the realignment of military forces from Okinawa to Guam or Hawaii until specific conditions are completed including: submission of a report required by section 1068(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239); mater plans for the Marine Corps distributed laydown on Guam and Hawaii; and, a coordinated Federal agencies plan to provide public infrastructure on Guam. H.R. 3304 would provide several exceptions to the restrictions authorizing the expenditure of funds to support a certain military construction project, funds to support planning and design activities on Guam, and funds to continue environmental analyses associated with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 for support of the realignment of Marine Corps assets to Guam. H.R. 3304 also includes specific authority to initiate certain Air Force military construction projects that would harden certain hangars and fuel points to ensure the survivability of these critical nodes.

The committee also assessed the Department of Defense’s request for an additional round of Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC). After contemplating information provided by the Department of Defense in support of its request for an additional round of BRAC, H.R. 3304 included language stating that nothing in the Act shall be construed to authorize a future BRAC round. In addition, H.R. 3304 reduced the budget request for Defense-Wide Oper-

ation and Maintenance by \$8.0 million, the funding requested by the Department to develop recommendations and manage a new BRAC round.

The committee was also concerned about the use of host nation funding sources on military construction projects and potential abuses to this program that have occurred over the last several years. H.R. 3304 included a requirement to obtain a specific congressional authorization to use host nation funding in support of projects in excess of the military construction authority provided in section 2805 of title 10, United States Code.

Military Construction Programming

The committee continued its efforts focused on construction programming to provide combatant commanders limited authority to rapidly implement contingency construction to address emerging construction requirements. H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, contains a provision that would authorize the use of operations and maintenance funds for contingency construction.

The committee continues to support initiatives to streamline existing military construction programming authorities and H.R. 3304 would expand the authority for military laboratories to implement construction projects and require local installation security assessments to determine the appropriate level of anti-terrorism/force protection criteria to insert in future construction projects. Finally, H.R. 3304 would delete certain outdated reporting requirement previously provided to Congress.

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. To ensure proper oversight of this real property inventory, the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 expressed concern about the extensive use of existing leasing authorities and requested the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the magnitude of Department of Defense leasing efforts. The committee report also included a requirement for the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report on the Department of Defense's efforts to improve the accuracy of its real property inventory database and the impact on consolidations activities to this database. Additionally, H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, required a report to assess the current use utilization rates of the Department of Defense real property inventory.

The committee also reviewed the Department of Defense facility sustainment accounts and found that significant shortfalls need to be addressed to manage basic services. H.R. 3304 increased funding to these accounts to address critical shortfalls in the facility sustainment accounts to partially support systemic facility sustainment deficits.

Military Infrastructure Privatization

The Department of Defense has made extensive use of privatization of military assets including family housing, bachelor quarters, and utility-related infrastructure. The Department has leveraged available capital in Department of Defense infrastructure and entered into long-term contracts with private property managers. H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would provide additional oversight and accountability in the pursuit of military family housing privatization projects to include an assessment of litigation costs that are being pursued by the privatization partners.

TOTAL FORCE, PERSONNEL, AND HEALTH CARE ISSUES

Manpower Sufficient in Quantity and Quality To Meet Global Commitments

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

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

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

The new, most optimistic end-state based on the SCMR recommendations would shrink the Army to 420,000 from 450,000; and the Marine Corps to between 170,000 and 175,000. The committee remains concerned that unfettered reductions in end

strength will have a detrimental impact on force structure and ultimately, operational mission capability and capacity among the services, and harm the morale of the force.

Military Benefits

The committee continued to closely monitor compensation programs during the first session of the 113th Congress to ensure an adequate quality of life for service members and their families and to ensure that pay and benefits meet the needs of the wartime military and keep pace with private sector standards. The committee's active oversight of these issues led the committee as part of H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House on June 7, 2013, to recommend no change to current law, which would allow a 1.8 percent raise in basic pay during fiscal year 2014 based on section 1009 of title 37, United States Code. It is the intent of the underlying law to ensure military pay raises match the rate of compensation increases in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index. Following passage of H.R. 1960, the President used his authority and notified Congress that he was setting the 2014 military basic pay raise at 1.0 percent, well below the Employment Cost Index. Consistent with the position of the House, H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, neither affirms or rejects the President's decision. However, in the committee report (H. Rept. 113-103) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee expressed concern that future pay raise proposals that are below the Employment Cost Index may have long term adverse consequences on the recruiting and retention of a high-quality All-Volunteer Force.

The committee extended the authorities to pay bonuses and special pays during fiscal year 2014 and monitored the value of those bonuses and special pays to ensure they were sufficient to achieve the recruiting and retention objectives for which they were developed. The committee also included legislation that reforms and prevents a retired pay inversion for members whose retired pay is computed under the high-three average. The committee continues to closely monitor the progress of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239), as they continue their work to develop recommendations for the modernization of the military compensation and retirement system. On September 12, 2013, pursuant to section 674(c) of Public Law 112-239, the President transmitted his principles for modernizing the military compensation and retirement systems.

Military Family Readiness

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

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

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

Mental Health Services for Members of the Armed Forces

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

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

On March 21, 2013, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel conducted a hearing to receive testimony from the military services on the current status of suicide prevention programs in the military. The hearing provided Members with the opportunity to examine the implementation of suicide prevention programs in each of the military services.

On April 10, 2013, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel conducted a hearing to receive testimony from the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services on how DOD funded re-

search on mental health related matters, specifically PTSD and TBI, has improved the treatment of mental health conditions for members of the military and their family members.

On September 17, 2013, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel received a briefing from the Defense Center of Excellence on Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury.

On November 15, 2013, the committee received a briefing on the research findings conducted under the Mindfulness-Based Mind Fitness Training Pilot Research in cooperation with the Army and Marine Corps.

Military Health Care System

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

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

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

Morale, Welfare and Recreation Programs and Military Resale Programs

Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) and military resale programs (commonly known as commissary and exchange stores) are a valuable benefit to the all-volunteer force. Critics have continued to target these programs as being unnecessary and wasteful, and have proposed to reduce or eliminate appropriated funding. The committee rejects such assertions and believes cost efficient sustainment of MWR and military resale programs (commissaries and exchanges) is required to protect quality of life for military families and their communities and help ensure the readiness of

the force. In its oversight efforts, the committee held several meetings with the Department of Defense to discuss initiatives to gain efficiencies in the management and delivery of MWR programs at every level, to include installation level. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel met in an open hearing on November 20, 2013, titled “Military Resale Programs Overview” in order to discuss how the military resale community will continue to provide benefits to service members, families and retirees in a fiscally constrained environment. The committee will continue to provide oversight of these vitally important programs in the second session of the 113th Congress.

Prisoner of War and Missing in Action

Over the past several years, the committee has maintained active oversight of the Department of Defense’s Prisoner of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA) activities, as the committee of jurisdiction. That oversight led to the requirement that the Department of Defense reform the POW/MIA accounting effort and achieve significantly higher levels of identification by 2015. The committee continued its oversight role by receiving updates from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for POW/Missing Personnel Affairs and the Commander of Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command (JPAC) on their plans to achieve the legislative mandate to increase the number of identifications to a rate of 200 per year by 2015. The committee also received the Comptroller General of the United States review as directed by committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 to conduct a review of the Secretary of Defense’s efforts to significantly increase the capability and capacity of the Department of Defense to account for missing persons in accordance with section 1509 of title 10, United States.

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

Sexual Assault in the Military

The committee continued to hold the Department of Defense and the military services accountable to address sexual assaults in the military and ensure victims are provided the appropriate care and support. As a result of this aggressive oversight, H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act, as passed by the House, con-

tained substantial, bipartisan reforms, especially to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Reforms to the Uniform Code of Military Justice would:

(1) Strip commanders of their authority to dismiss a finding by a court martial, a power they have held since the earliest days of our military;

(2) Prohibit commanders from overturning or reducing guilty findings to guilty of a lesser offense;

(3) Limit commander's authority to modify adjudged sentences;

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

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

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

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

(8) Articulate the rights of a crime victim;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Wounded Warrior Care

The committee devoted substantial attention on the adequacy of the Department of Defense policies and programs for wounded and disabled service members and their families. In this regard, the committee oversight activities included several staff visits to the military service's units responsible for the care, recovery and transition of wounded, ill and injured service members. Committee staff also visited several defense centers of excellence to assess the progress towards providing wounded, ill and injured service members new and innovative treatment and technology to improve recovery and quality of life.

The committee continued to monitor, through quarterly briefings with DOD and the military services, progress toward reducing the time a service member remains in the Integrated Disability Evaluation System and the backlog of cases awaiting completion.

On September 17, 2013, the committee received a briefing from the DOD-VA Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury, Hearing and Vision on research regarding visual dysfunction related to Traumatic Brain Injury and implementation of the Comptroller General's recommendations to prevent hearing loss.

MODERNIZATION AND INVESTMENT ISSUES

Overview

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

prematurely with development with immature technology; poor cost estimating; inadequate funding profiles; over-estimation of potential production rates; and program instability.

In particular, the committee examined whether the military services have the appropriate authorities, capabilities, and force structure to defend against any potential challenges posed by the advanced anti-access capabilities of countries such as China and Iran, consistent with the report of the 2010 Department of Defense Quadrennial Defense Review which found that, "Anti-access strategies seek to deny outside countries the ability to project power into a region, thereby allowing aggression or other destabilizing actions to be conducted by the anti-access power. Without dominant capabilities to project power, the integrity of U.S. alliances and security partnerships could be called into question, reducing U.S. security and influence and increasing the possibility of conflict."

Army and Marine Corps Armored Vehicle Modernization

The committee focused on oversight of the Army and Marine Corps' ambitious and evolving plans to recapitalize their entire fleets of heavy and medium-weight armored combat vehicles, including the M1 Abrams tank, M2 Bradley Fighting Vehicles, Stryker Combat Vehicles, the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle, the Marine Personnel Carrier program, upgrades for Light Armored Vehicles, upgrades to Paladin artillery systems, and replacement of Army M113 series vehicles.

In particular, the committee focused on ensuring that the existing fleet of armored vehicles is properly upgraded and reset after very heavy use in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and that the Army continues to field vehicles that stay ahead of the evolving anti-vehicle threat posed by improvised explosive devices and advances in anti-tank guided missiles. In addition to ensuring modernization of existing armored vehicles, the committee continued aggressive efforts to oversee and shape the evolving Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV) program and the follow-on effort to the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV), the Amphibious Combat Vehicle (ACV) through formal activities to include hearings, briefings, official correspondence, and senior level meetings.

The committee, in particular the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, and the Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces has focused on understanding the basis of these requirements for the GCV and ACV as they pertain to their respective Analysis of Alternatives, containing program costs, and ensuring appropriate and thorough testing is complete for both systems before moving forward in development and procurement. The committee has also worked closely with the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office to conduct continuous oversight and evaluation of major development programs as necessary. These oversight efforts also included official hearings, site visits, close coordination with Army and Marine Corps leadership, and careful scrutiny of reprogramming requests.

The committee remained concerned about the Army's proposal to let the Armored Brigade Combat Team (ABCT) vehicle production lines go "cold" for 3-to-4 years and the associated impact this decision would have on the industrial base at both the prime contractor

and vendor level. The committee also believes that Foreign Military Sales (FMS) may help to mitigate some of the risk to the industrial base, but believes FMS alone will not be enough to ensure that the ABCT industrial base is maintained at viable levels in the near term.

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, authorized full funding for the GCV program. The bill would also restrict the Army from obligating technology development funds until the Secretary of the Army submits a report to the defense committees that provides Congress with more detailed information regarding the current program requirements and acquisition strategy. H.R. 1960 also mandates an annual reporting requirement on the ACV program by the Government Accountability Office (GAO). Finally, H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, authorized \$243.0 million in additional funding to allow for the continued sustainment of America's heavy armored vehicle production base by maintaining at least minimum sustained production for Abrams tank upgrades and heavy improved recovery vehicles.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would direct an additional \$165.0 million for ABCT industrial base sustainment, and supported the provisions contained in H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, with minor technical and clarifying amendments.

Army and Marine Corps Tactical Wheeled Vehicles

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

The committee also continued to closely monitor the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) program. The JLTV program represents a significant investment by the Army and Marine Corps in developing a new light tactical vehicle that would address current capability gaps in performance, protection, and payload. JLTV is the only new major defense acquisition program for TWVs across the future years defense program and is critical for the sustainment of the industrial base. The committee remains concerned over potential impacts of sequestration on the JLTV program.

H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, authorized \$134.6 million, the full amount requested for the JLTV program. H.R. 3304, the

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would direct \$134.6 million, the full amount requested for JLTV program.

Army Aviation Programs

During the 113th Congress, the committee provided oversight on legacy rotorcraft platforms, including the CH-47, UH-60, AH-64, and OH-58, continued to note the importance of these platforms, as well as indicated that they will likely continue to be operated at high operational tempos, in very challenging environments. The committee has highlighted the need to continue to upgrade and reset this critical equipment platforms for both the Active and Reserve Components through formal activities that included a field hearing. In addition to its oversight of aviation requirements for, and performance in, combat operations, the committee has closely monitored the Army's future force program for aviation. In particular, the committee has focused on the Army's restructured acquisition plan resulting from the cancellation of the Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter, the initiation of modernization programs such as the Joint Future Theater Lift (JFTL) program, and the critical need for aircraft survivability equipment upgrades to provide warning and protection against evolving surface-to-air missile threats.

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

H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, fully supported the budget request for Army Aviation. H.R. 1960 also provided an additional \$135.0 million for the Light Utility Helicopter (LUH).

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would direct an additional \$75.0 million for the LUH program.

Army Communications Programs

During the 113th Congress, the committee, in particular the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, continued to place emphasis on the growing importance of battlefield communications networks in global combat operations. The committee has aggressively monitored the Army's plans for its future battlefield network and the supporting research programs now being resourced by the Army and Marine Corps. In particular, the committee has focused oversight efforts on the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-T) and the follow-on efforts resulting from the restructured Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) programs. The committee continued to work with the Army to ensure that the future battlefield capabilities it creates results in a network-enabled, rather than a network-dependent, Army.

Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment

During the 113th Congress, the committee, in particular the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, continued to devote

substantial attention to the oversight of individual body armor, personnel protection equipment, and other complementary individual equipment programs through: legislation; informal and formal discussions with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Army and Marine Corps senior leadership; briefings and hearings; coordination with the Government Accountability Office (GAO) audit teams; and other formal and informal activities. Focus areas included but were not limited to: advances in weight reduction (“lightening the load”) clothing and equipment; development of specific body armor systems for military servicewomen; small arms and small caliber ammunition modernization with particular emphasis on the Army’s individual carbine program and handgun program; improved combat helmets; improved uniforms; and management of these associated niche industrial bases. The committee engaged with the Joint Staff and the military services to coordinate requirements for these individual equipment programs and has encouraged joint programs wherever possible.

H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, and the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, addressed the critical need to reduce the weight of individual warfighter equipment, improve acquisition practices used for this gear, and requires the Secretary of Defense to assess options for providing personnel protection equipment specifically fitted for the female warfighter.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, supports the legislation contained in H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, supports weight reduction initiatives, fully funds body armor and personal protection equipment (PPE) programs, as well as notes the importance of treating PPE as a weapon system rather than an expendable commodity. H.R. 3304 would also require more detailed budget exhibits for PPE programs.

Tactical Aircraft Force Structure

During the 113th Congress, the committee continued to investigate the adequacy of fighter force structure in both the Navy and the Air Force. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on these issues on April 17, 2013. 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 18 aircraft in 2023. The Air Force witness also testified to an Air Force requirement for 1,900 fighter aircraft, which does not now reveal a strike fighter shortfall in projected force structure through 2030. To maintain this force structure, Air Force officials informed the subcommittee that any shortfall mitigation will include executing funded sustainment and fleet management actions for older F–16 Block 25, 30 and 32 aircraft, newer block 40 and 50 service life extension, and targeted modernization and examination of the overall force structure to ensure viable warfighting capabilities are maintained.

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, authorized the budget request of 21 EA–18G aircraft for the Navy and the requested procurement

to extend the life of the legacy F/A-18 and AV-8B fleets, and included an increase of \$75.0 million for advance procurement of additional F/A-18E/F aircraft in fiscal year 2015. H.R. 1960 also authorized the entire Air Force request for modifications to its A-10, F-15, F-16, F-22A, and F-35 fleets. Additionally, H.R. 1960 authorized the budget request of \$5.5 billion for 29 F-35 aircraft and \$1.9 billion for F-35 development.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would authorize 21 EA-18G aircraft for the Navy and the requested funding to extend the life of the legacy F/A-18 and AV-8B fleets, and include an increase of \$75.0 million for advance procurement of additional F/A-18E/F aircraft in fiscal year 2015. H.R. 3304 would also authorize the Air Force request for modifications to its A-10, F-15, F-16, F-22A, and F-35 fleets. Additionally, H.R. 3304 would authorize \$5.5 billion for 29 F-35 aircraft and \$2.7 billion for F-35 development.

F-35/Joint Strike Fighter

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

Before the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on April 17, 2013 the Government Accountability Office (GAO) Director of Acquisition and Sourcing testified that the new F-35 acquisition baseline reflects positive restructuring actions taken by the Department of Defense (DOD) since 2010, including more time and funding for development and deferred procurement of more than 400 aircraft to future years. The GAO witness noted that overall the program progressed on several fronts during 2012 to further improve the current outlook. As examples of this progress, the GAO witness reported that the program achieved seven of 10 key management objectives and made substantial progress on one other, but two objectives on aircraft deliveries and a corrective management plan were not met. Additionally, he testified that the F-35 development test program substantially met expectations with some revisions to flight test plans and made considerable progress addressing key technical risks. Software management practices and some output measures improved, although deliveries to test continued to lag behind plans. The GAO witness also noted that manufacturing and supply processes also improved indicators such as factory throughput, labor efficiency, and quality measures were positive, and aircraft deliveries are accelerating. However, the GAO witness also testified that development of the F-35's block 3.0 software, which provides full warfighting capability, is one of the program's highest risk areas.

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House on June 14, 2013, would authorize the budget request of \$5.5 billion for procurement of 29 F-35s, and \$1.9 billion for F-35 research, development, test and evaluation. H.R. 1960 also included a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an independent team of subject matter experts to review the F-35's software development program and assess whether the software development program will be completed according to schedule and to provide recommendations for improving the software development program.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would authorize \$7.8 billion for F-35 development and procurement and included the House provision directing an F-35 software development review.

Aviation Programs

Through its oversight activities, the committee noted that the B-52 strategic radar replacement program replaces the current B-52 radar fielded in the 1960s and then upgraded in the 1970s and 1980s. Although sustainable through the current service life of the B-52, the legacy radar system mean-time-between-failure continues to degrade and sustainment costs are expected to significantly increase after 2017. The SRR program is a radar replacement program that may take advantage of the advanced capabilities of modern non-developmental radars, maximizing commonality with other platforms. However, the SRR program was terminated in the budget request for fiscal year 2013 due to Air Force budget constraints and the need to fund other, higher priorities. Although the committee understands that affordability concerns were the primary driver for the SRR program termination, it is unclear to the committee how the Secretary of the Air Force intends to afford the legacy radar system knowing that sustainment costs are predicted to significantly increase after 2017. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to develop and implement an affordability strategy for maintaining radar capability on the B-52 aircraft through its predicted service-life of 2040 and to communicate that strategy to the congressional defense committees soon after the affordability strategy is developed.

Through its oversight activities, regarding the previously terminated B-52 CONECT program in the budget request for fiscal year 2013, the committee supported the Secretary's decision reinstating the program in the fiscal year 2014 budget request. However, the committee is concerned with the current plan to only fund and modernize 28 of 76 total aircraft with CONECT capability. The committee reminds the Secretary that section 137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) requires the Secretary to maintain all B-52 aircraft in a common capability configuration. Realizing that the committee in the future may have to address not retaining the nuclear capability for a certain number of B-52s in order to comply with New START requirements, the committee intends to provide no flexibility for not maintaining B-52 aircraft in a common conventional capability configuration. A dissimilar capability configuration adds complexity to supply chain management, aircrew certification, training and employment, and would inherently complicate combatant commander operational planning and execution by having to account for dissimilar aircraft capabilities. The Joint Explanatory Statement associated with H.R. 3304 provides flexibility for the Air Force to demodify nuclear capability from B-52 aircraft, but requires the Secretary of the Air Force to maintain a common conventional capability configuration for the B-52 fleet of aircraft.

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

Through its oversight activities, the committee notes that the Secretary of the Air Force invested nearly \$1.5 billion of taxpayer dollars for engineering, manufacturing, development, and testing of the C-130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) and has entered Low Rate Initial Production, but has no plans to continue procurement and installation of C-130 AMP onto legacy C-130H aircraft. The Secretary had no plans to modernize or upgrade the C-130H propulsion system in order to increase reliability, capability, fuel efficiency and on-wing time of the engine, as well as to decrease the overall cost and maintenance burden of the current propulsion system. The Secretary has also not articulated to the committee a coherent plan for fleet-wide recapitalization of the C-130H fleet or how the Department of the Air Force plans to maintain medium-sized intra-theater airlift capacity and capability within both the Active and Reserve Components. Knowing that the majority of the C-130H fleet resides within the Reserve Components of the Air Force and that the C-130H should remain reliable, capable, and relevant to meeting current and future warfighter needs, the committee is concerned with the lack of initiative that the Secretary has taken with regard to the modernization and upgrade of C-130H aircraft. The committee also notes that through cost reduction initiatives and efficiencies gained in the C-130 AMP over the past year, the cost data that the Secretary used as justification for canceling the C-130 AMP in the budget request was no longer relevant. In H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 as passed by the House, the committee recommended funding increases for C-130H propulsion system propeller upgrades, propulsion system engine upgrades, and for continued procurement C-130 AMP kits and installation onto C-130H aircraft. The Joint Explanatory Statement for H.R. 3304 supports all of the committee's initiatives for the legacy C-130H fleet of aircraft.

The committee supports multi-year procurement authority for the C-130J and E-2D aircraft in both H.R. 1960 and the associated conference joint explanatory statement, which will save the Department of Defense over \$1.0 billion dollars in procurement costs.

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

Through its oversight activities, the committee recognizes the challenges associated with the development of a new U.S. Navy threat target system, Multi-Stage Supersonic Target (MSST), given the assessed complexity and capabilities of the actual threat mis-

sile. However the committee also remains concerned that the Navy still does not have a threat representative target fielded in order to assess vulnerabilities and susceptibilities of naval air defense systems, as well as to assess the effectiveness of potential countermeasures that could be developed to defend against an MSST threat. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary to maintain a robust and fully resourced MSST development strategy and encouraged the Secretary to provide the committee frequent updates as the MSST program progresses toward its May 2016, IOC milestone.

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

Through its oversight activities, the committee notes that the Secretary of the Navy has not fully leveraged technology development activities in the Unmanned Combat Air System (UCAS) program that would reduce Unmanned Carrier-Launched Aircraft Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) system program risk. The committee notes that the Secretary of the Navy again reduced the planned scope of technology development activities in fiscal year 2014 for the UCAS program by deleting the requirement for the X-47B aircraft to demonstrate unmanned autonomous aerial refueling from an airborne tanker, thereby increasing the development risk in the UCLASS program. The committee disagreed with the Secretary's approach to the UCAS program and disagreed with increasing the concurrency and developmental risk being sewn into the acquisition strategy of the UCLASS program. H.R. 1960 included a provision that would require the Secretary of the Navy to demonstrate unmanned autonomous aerial refueling with the X-47B UCAS aircraft, and another provision that would prohibit the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics from approving a milestone A technology development contract award for the UCLASS program until 30 days after the Under Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the software and system engineering designs for the control system and connectivity segment and the aircraft carrier segment of the UCLASS system can achieve, at a low level of integration risk, successful compatibility and operability with the air vehicle segment planned for selection at milestone A contract award. H.R. 3304 did not include the UCAS provision, but did include a provision for UCLASS that would: limit the acquisition to no more than six prototype aircraft prior to a Milestone B award; require the Navy to provide quarterly cost, schedule and execution reports to the congressional defense committees; and, require the Comptroller General to provide the congressional defense committees annual reports on the acquisition strategy and execution of the UCLASS program.

Shipbuilding Programs

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

Through its oversight activities, the committee faces the challenge of balancing current demands on an aging fleet within current economic constraints. The Navy's budget request was for eight new-construction battle-force ships, an increase of one ship from the fiscal year 2013 Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP). When combined with the proposed early decommissioning of seven cruisers and two amphibious ships, the Navy is projecting a 2020 force of 255 ships. This available force structure contrasts the Navy required projection in 2013 of 308 ships and the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review Independent Panel requirement of 346 ships. Despite these shortfalls, the committee seeks to obtain the required capability and provide stability to the shipbuilding industrial base.

CVN-78 is the lead ship of the Ford class of aircraft carriers. Technologies inserted into this ship, have challenged the Navy to maintain cost controls on the lead ship. To address these cost issues, H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, includes a provision that would amend section 122 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) by: (1) adjusting the cost cap for CVN-78 from \$10,500.0 million to \$12,887.0 million; (2) adjusting the cost cap for subsequent ships in the class from \$8,100.0 million to \$11,498.0 million; (3) adding a new factor for adjustment, allowing increases or decreases in the cost of CVN-78 that are attributable to the shipboard test program, but only when the changes result for urgent and unforeseen testing problems that would delay delivery or initial operating capability of the ship; (4) requiring quarterly updates on the cost of CVN-79; and (5) directing the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that each prime contract for CVN-79 includes an incentive fee structure that will, throughout the entire period of performance of the contract, provide incentives for each contractor to meet the portion of the cost of the ship for which the contractor is responsible.

The subcommittee also continues its oversight of the Littoral Combat Ship program. H.R. 3304 includes a provision that would fence funding for LCS-25 and LCS-26 until: (1) the Navy provides certain reports about the LCS program; and (2) the Joint Requirements Oversight Council makes certain certifications about the LCS program.

Military Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Programs

Manned and unmanned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) system programs have come to constitute a significant component of the overall Department of Defense force structure. The capability provided by these assets is critical to sustaining de-

terrence and warfighting capability of U.S. forces. The committee focused on the budget, cost, schedule, and performance outcomes of major manned and unmanned aerial systems programs and examine the ISR enterprise for balance in collection and analysis capabilities. Also, close scrutiny of Office of the Secretary of Defense ISR policy formulation and oversight have been and will continued to be of interest to the committee. Long-standing concerns of the committee remain: lack of an adequate long-term ISR architecture and acquisition strategy; lack of supporting analysis for programmatic decisions; failure to balance collection programs data output with adequate resources to process, exploit, and disseminate data and analysis; and unnecessary proliferation of manned and unmanned vehicles and sensors. As a result of committee oversight activities, the committee expects the Joint Staff and Joint Requirements Oversight Council to take a more active role in coordinating ISR system acquisition and coordinating employment with the combatant commanders.

In the first session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on April 23, 2013, on unmanned aerial systems. Witnesses for this hearing included the Director of Unmanned Warfare & Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance in the Office of the Secretary of Defense; the United States Air Force Director of Bases, Ranges, and Airspace; and the Director of Army Aviation. Among other issues, this hearing reviewed the Department of Defense budget requests for unmanned aerial systems for fiscal year 2014 including the requests for the RQ-4 Global Hawk and MQ-9 Reaper unmanned aerial systems.

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, extended Global Hawk Block 30 operations for 2 additional years, until December 2016, and also increased the Air Force budget request by \$80.0 million for six additional MQ-9 Reaper unmanned aerial systems.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would extend the operation of the Air Force Global Hawk Block 30 until December 2014, and would maintain critical high altitude ISR capabilities, including manning for the Global Hawk Block 30. H.R. 3304 would also increase the MQ-9 Reaper budget request by \$80.0 million.

Directed Energy Programs

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

Emerging Threats, and Capabilities conducted detailed oversight of specific Directed Energy programs and activities within Defense-wide and Service science and technology programs and activities.

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

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

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

Nuclear Deterrence and the Nuclear Security Enterprise

In the 113th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy (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. Particular emphasis has been placed on DOE and DOD nuclear modernization plans and associated funding requirements, proposed changes to nuclear weapons policy and posture, and the effectiveness of institutional structures that support the nuclear security enterprise and interagency decision-making related to nuclear weapons.

In the first session of the 113th Congress, on February 28, 2013, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing “Nuclear Security: Actions, Accountability, and Reform”. This hearing continued the subcommittee’s oversight of the DOE and National Nuclear Security Administration’s (NNSA) efforts to address the problems highlighted by the July 2012 security intrusion at the Y–12 National Security Complex. On March 19, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing on “The U.S. Nuclear Deterrent: What Are the Requirements for A Strong Deterrent In an Era of Defense Sequester?” This hearing featured non-governmental expert witnesses and discussed future plans for the U.S. nuclear deterrent in an age of increasingly scarce resources.

On May 9, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing on the “Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense Activities and Nuclear Forces Programs”. At this annual budget request hearing, members inquired about DOE and DOD nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization plans, implementation of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), defense envi-

ronmental cleanup, and the proposed resources for these and other nuclear programs. On October 29, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing on “Nuclear Weapons Modernization Programs: Military, Technical, and Political Requirements for the B61 Life Extension Program (LEP) and Future Stockpile Strategy” that focused on a key subset of such programs. The witness panel, comprised of the key government and national laboratory leaders with responsibility for the B61 LEP, discussed the requirements driving the ongoing LEP, the policies and decisions that led to the LEP, the current status of the LEP, and the funding required to successfully execute the program.

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

The committee included several legislative provisions related to nuclear deterrence and the nuclear security enterprise in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House. Among others, this includes provisions that would provide congressional input regarding nuclear force structure decisions, strengthen interagency coordination on nuclear weapons decision-making, provide momentum and increase congressional oversight to efforts to reform security practices at DOE and NNSA, require a long-term plan for cleanup of the Nation’s largest defense nuclear waste site, and continue reforms to create a more effective and efficient nuclear security enterprise.

Missile Defense

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

The committee continued to monitor foreign ballistic missile threats and identified opportunities to strengthen international missile defense cooperation with allies and partners such as the State of Israel, Japan, and North Atlantic Treaty Organization

member states. Department of Defense oversight and management of missile defense activities, including the roles, responsibilities, and acquisition policies and procedures of the Missile Defense Agency and military services was also reviewed. The committee provided oversight of the Administration's missile defense policy and posture, including close examination of any Administration efforts that may limit missile defenses as part of a treaty or agreement, and implications for United States, regional, and global security.

In the first session of the 113th Congress, on May 8, 2013, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing regarding the "Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense Programs".

In addition to the hearing, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces also held a classified briefing on February 13, 2013, regarding the long range missile threat to the United States. On April 26, 2013, the subcommittee met to receive a missile defense briefing from Admiral Syring, Director, Missile Defense Agency, including the agency's classified programs.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would direct important oversight on homeland and regional missile defense programs, Israeli cooperative missile defense programs, as well as the Israeli Iron Dome program. H.R. 3304 would increase funding for the development of a new kill vehicle for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense program as well as provide funding for continued planning activities related to an additional homeland missile defense site, and the deployment of an additional homeland missile defense radar site to defend against threats including from the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea.

National Security Space

In the 113th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the Department's national security space programs, which includes the military services, combat support agencies, and elements of the Department of Defense that are part of the Intelligence Community. On March 5, 2013, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces received a briefing from the Commander of the Air Force Space Command, the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, and the National Intelligence Officer for Science and Technology regarding national security space programs and foreign threats to U.S. space systems.

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

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

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, contained several national security space-related legislative provisions, funding recommendations, and reporting requirements to include: a requirement that the Secretary of the Air Force develop and implement a plan to ensure the fair evaluation of competing contractors in the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program; a requirement that the Secretary of Defense notify Congress regarding each attempt by a foreign actor to disrupt, deny, or destroy a U.S. national security space capability; direction that Department officials develop a strategy to enable the multi-year procurement of commercial satellite services; and a prohibition on the Department from entering into a contracts for satellite services with certain foreign entities under a set of defined circumstances.

EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Investment in Future Capabilities Science and Technology

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

The committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats, and Capabilities conducted several hearings and briefing within this area, including: a briefing on "Perspectives on the Future National Security Environment: Technological, Geopolitical and Economic Trends Affecting the Defense Strategic Guidance" on February 13, 2013; and a hearing on "Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Department of Defense (DOD) Science and Technology Programs" on April 16, 2013.

The committee included several additional legislative provisions related to science and technology in H.R. 1960, as passed by the

House, to include: extension of authority to award prizes for advanced technology achievements; extension of pilot program on technology protection features; establishment of a new authority for enhanced technology transfer of software developed at Department of Defense laboratories; clarification on eligibility for the defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research; extension and expansion of section 219 authority for defense laboratories; establishment of a pilot program on proof of concept commercialization; and establishment of a defense science initiative for personnel.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee included several directives related to science and technology, including a briefing on sustainment of sociocultural capabilities of the Department of Defense.

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

Cyber Operations Capabilities

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

The committee held a related hearing on March 13, 2013 on "Information Technology and Cyber Operations: Modernization and Policy Issues to Support the Future Force." In addition to formal hearings, the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and

Capabilities held cyber operations briefings on March 20, 2013, and December 4, 2013.

The committee included several legislative provisions related to cyber operations capabilities in H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, to include: limitation on availability of funds for defensive cyberspace operations of the Air Force; establishment of a cryptographic modernization oversight and advisory board; an assessment of United States Cyber Command by the Defense Science Board; a mission analysis for cyber operations of Department of Defense; creation of a small business cybersecurity solutions office; and establishment of a small business cyber education program.

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

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

Information Operations

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

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

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

would require a strategy for future information operations capabilities.

H.R. 3304 included several legislative provisions related to information operations, including: a strategy for future information operations capabilities and limitation on funding for the Trans-Regional Web Initiative.

ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE FULL COMMITTEE

Full Committee Hearings

During the first session of the 113th Congress, the committee held a series of budget and posture hearings in preparation for the fiscal year 2014 budget. These hearings, combined with the committee's responsibility for assembling the annual defense authorization bill, are a central element in the discharge of the committee's oversight responsibilities. In upholding its responsibilities to mitigate waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Federal Government programs, and pursuant to House rule XI, clauses 2(n), (o), and (p), the committee met several times to conduct oversight of Department of Defense activities, as noted elsewhere in this report.

On April 11, 2013, the committee received testimony from The Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense; and General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to review the budget request for funding and authorities during fiscal year 2014.

In addition to these hearings, the committee held posture hearings in which it sought and received testimony from each of the military departments. On April 12, 2013, The Honorable Michael B. Donley, Secretary of the Air Force; and General Mark A. Welsh III, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, appeared before the committee to discuss the United States Air Force's portion of the fiscal year 2014 budget request. On April 16, 2013, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony from The Honorable Ray Mabus, Secretary of the Navy; and Admiral Jonathan Greenert, Chief of Naval Operations, on the United States Navy's portion of the fiscal year 2014 budget request. On April 25, 2013, The Honorable John McHugh, Secretary of the Army; and General Raymond T. Odierno, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, testified on the budget as it related to the United States Army.

In addition to the uniformed services, which are primarily responsible for training and equipping their respective forces, commanders of the unified combatant commands appeared before the committee to discuss the security situation in their respective areas of responsibility. These hearings began with testimony from General C. Robert Kehler, Commander of U.S. Strategic Command; and Admiral Samuel J. Locklear, Commander of U.S. Pacific Command, on March 5, 2013. This hearing was followed on March 6, 2013 by General James N. Mattis, Commander of U.S. Central Command; Admiral William H. McRaven, Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command; and General William M. Fraser III, Commander of U.S. Transportation Command, who testified on their commands' budget requests for fiscal year 2014. On March 15, 2013, the committee received testimony from Admiral James G. Stavridis, Com-

mander of U.S. European Command; and General Carter F. Ham, Commander of U.S. Africa Command, who testified on their combatant commands' fiscal year 2014 budget requests. On March 20, 2013, the committee heard testimony from General Charles H. Jacoby, Jr., Commander of U.S. Northern Command; and General John F. Kelly, Commander of U.S. Southern Command, who testified on their combatant commands' budget requests.

This year the committee also convened a hearing to receive testimony from Members of Congress on their national defense priorities for the fiscal year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act, which took place on May 8, 2013.

This year the committee met several times to receive testimony on the effects of budget sequestration on Department of Defense. On February 13, 2013, the committee received testimony from Ashton Carter, Deputy Secretary of Defense; General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; General Raymond T. Odierno, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army; Admiral Jonathan Greenert, Chief of Naval Operations; General Mark A. Welsh III, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force; General James F. Amos, Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps; and General Frank J. Grass, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, to review the impacts of a Continuing Resolution and sequestration on defense. On August 1, 2013, the committee received testimony from Ashton Carter, Deputy Secretary of Defense; and Admiral James A. Winnefeld, Jr., Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the initial conclusions formed by the Defense Strategic Choices and Management Review. On September 18, 2013, the committee received testimony from General Mark A. Welsh III, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force; General James F. Amos, Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps; General Raymond T. Odierno, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army; and Admiral Jonathan Greenert, Chief of Naval Operations, on the services' plans for sequestration in fiscal year 2014 and their perspectives on the Strategic Choices and Management Review.

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 February 27, 2013, to receive testimony from outside experts on the transition in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan pertaining to drawdown of U.S. operations. Dr. Catherine Dale, Congressional Research Service; General (retired) Jack Keane, former Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army; Mr. Anthony Cordesman, Center for Strategic and International Studies; and Lieutenant General (retired) David Barno, Center for a New American Security, appeared before the committee to testify on this important matter. On April 17, 2013, the committee met to receive testimony from General Joseph Dunford, Commander of the International Security and Assistance Force and U.S. Forces-Afghanistan, on recent developments in Afghanistan. On July 17, 2013, the committee received testimony from Mr. Elliot Abrams, Council for Foreign Relations; Ambassador Frederic C. Hof, Atlantic Council; and Mona Yacoubian, Pathways to Progress, on the Security Situation in the Syrian Arab Republic and implications for U.S. National Security and policy options. On September 10, 2013,

the committee received testimony from Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense; General Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and John Kerry, Secretary of State, on the proposed Authorization to Use Military Force in Syria. On September 19, 2013, the committee received testimony from The Honorable Michèle Flournoy, Center for a New American Security; General (retired) Jack Keane, Former Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Ambassador Ronald E. Neumann, American Academy of Diplomacy; and Ms. Clare Lockhart, Institute for State Effectiveness, on the U.S. presence in Afghanistan after 2014.

The committee also met on January 23, 2013, to convene a hearing on the review of sexual misconduct at Lackland Air Force Base. The committee received testimony from Dr. David Lisak, Forensic Consultant; Chief Master Sergeant (retired) Cindy McNally, Service Women's Action Network; Ms. Jennifer Norris, Protect Our Defenders; General Edward A. Rice, Jr., Commander of Air Education and Training Command; and General Mark A. Welsh III, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force. On February 14, 2013, the committee received testimony from Mr. Michael Sheehan, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict; Lieutenant General Terry Wolff, Director for Strategic Plans & Policy (J5); and Ms. Janet St. Laurent, Managing Director for Defense Capabilities and Management Team at U.S. Government Accountability Office, on the framework for Building Partnership Capacity Programs and Authorities. On July 10, 2013, the committee held a joint hearing with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to receive testimony on the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs collaboration to assist service members returning to civilian life. Witnesses were The Honorable Frank Kendall, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics; The Honorable Jessica L. Wright, Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness; The Honorable Jonathan Woodson, MD, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs and Director, TRICARE Management Activity; Mr. Stephen W. Warren, Acting Assistant Secretary for Information and Technology for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs; Mr. Robert A. Petzel, Under Secretary for Health for the Department of Veterans Affairs; and Mr. Danny Pummill, Deputy Undersecretary for Benefits, Department of Veterans Affairs. On October 29, 2013, the committee received testimony from Mr. Dov Zakheim, Center for Strategic and International Studies; Mr. Pierre Chao, Center for International and Strategic Studies; Mr. Paul Francis, Managing Director of the Acquisition and Sourcing Management for the U.S. Government Accountability Office; and Mr. Moshe Schwartz, Congressional Research Service, on 25 years of acquisition reform.

In 2013, the committee began a series of hearings on the U.S. rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region. On July 24, 2013, the committee received testimony from Dr. Michael Auslin, American Enterprise Institute; Dr. Patrick Cronin, Center for a New American Security; Admiral (ret.) Gary Roughead, Hoover Institution; and Dr. James Shinn, Princeton University, on the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific Region and implications for U.S. National Security. On November 20, 2013, the committee received testimony from The Honorable William A. Reinsch, Chairman of the U.S.-China Economic and Se-

curity Review Commission; The Honorable Dennis C. Shea, Vice Chairman of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission; Ms. Carolyn Bartholomew, Commissioner of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission; and Dr. Larry M. Wortzel, Commissioner of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, on the 2013 Report to Congress of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

Budget Oversight

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

Under the Budget Control Act (BCA), the fiscal year 2014 funding level for discretionary spending under budget function 050 is capped at \$552.0 billion. While the committee maintained reservations about the adequacy of the "BCA Cap," the Administration stated that this level of funding was sufficient to support the new defense strategy, which was released in January 2012. The new defense strategy was developed over the course of 8 months and reflected both the President's guidance, as well as the \$487.0 billion in cuts to the military under the BCA. The efforts of the Department to implement this change in strategy and these funding cuts had just begun. The Deputy Secretary of Defense testified to the committee on February 13, 2013, ". . . we are just beginning to make that big move represented by the \$487.0 [billion] and the Gates cuts before that, the huge strategic adjustment from the era of Iraq and Afghanistan to the era that is going to define our security future. So we have laid in those plans, but we have to actually carry them out. They are challenging managerially, they are challenging budgetarily. They are challenging for everybody at this table actually to carry out, and we are just embarking on them". Based on the needs brought forward by both civilian and military leaders of the Department, the committee requested the current BCA levels be maintained as the minimum required to support our national defense needs.

The committee discussed that over the last three years, the level of funding requested for defense has seen significant decline. In fiscal year 2013, defense spending would decrease by 17 percent under sequestration when compared with the level projected for fiscal year 2013 in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) that was submitted in February 2010. Even prior to sequestration, de-

fense spending had already been reduced by 9 percent from the plan submitted just two years earlier.

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

The committee's ranking member did not join the chairman in his views and estimates. Instead, the ranking member was joined by twelve other members of the committee in submitting alternative views and estimates that encouraged the elimination of sequestration to: dispel economic uncertainty, empower economic recovery, enable the passage of appropriations legislation in regular order within a clear discretionary spending budget, and grant the legislative and executive branches of government the flexibility needed to identify and to implement savings in a responsible and deliberate manner. The ranking member's views and estimates letter also encouraged congressional passage of a comprehensive, long-term, deficit-reduction plan to solve the country's fiscal challenges and to promote national security, economic stability, and the continued growth and prosperity of the United States. The ranking member asserted that deficit-reduction goals cannot be effectuated through cuts alone. Rather, the solution must include increased revenues and changes in mandatory spending. The ranking member noted, however, that, due to the likely need for additional cuts to discretionary spending, Congress must establish a manageable, long-term, discretionary spending plan that advances national interests. In the absence of an agreed comprehensive, long-term, deficit-reduction solution or a long-term, discretionary spending plan that could be incorporated into such a solution, the ranking member could not advocate maintaining top-line allocations for the national defense budget function at, or above, the funding levels established by the BCA, as amended. In that case, further reductions to national defense spending might still be necessary.

ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEES

Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities

The Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities continued its oversight of several critical areas of the Department of Defense, including Defense-wide and joint enabling activities and programs to include: Special Operations Forces; counter-proliferation and counterterrorism programs and initiatives; science and technology policy and programs; information

technology programs; homeland defense and Department of Defense related consequence management programs; related intelligence support; and other enabling activities and programs such as cyber operations, strategic communications, and information operations. In addition, the subcommittee conducted oversight of intelligence policy, coordination of military and national intelligence programs, and Department of Defense elements that are part of the intelligence community.

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

The subcommittee considered and reported several legislative provisions in H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, and H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. The legislative provisions covered a range of issues within the subcommittee's jurisdiction including: counter-terrorism and counter-proliferation programs and activities; U.S. Special Operations Forces; science and technology policy and programs, including the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency; information technology and programs; homeland defense and consequence management programs; as well as intelligence policy, national intelligence programs, and DOD elements part of the intelligence community. Details of the germane provisions are reported elsewhere in this report in the following sections: Global War on Terrorism; Addressing Emerging Threats; Intelligence; Information Technology and Business Systems; Directed Energy Programs; Investments in Future Capabilities in Science and Technology; Cyber Operations Capabilities; and Information Operations. In addition, H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, and H.R. 3304 also included: a provision that directed additional reporting requirements for humanitarian mine action to include Counter-Improvised Explosive Device technology; a provision to extend the authority to award prizes for advanced technology achievements; a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to create a policy that governs defense intelligence priorities; a provision that provides new authorities to strengthen the ability of DOD laboratories to support the continued development and expansion of its workforce and facilities; a provision to limit funding on the establishment of Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers; a technical correction relating to funding for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Headquarters; and a provision to limit funding for United States Special Operations Command National Capital Region.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel

Transition Assistance

The committee provided extensive oversight on the Department of Defense's Transition Assistance Program (TAP) to ensure implementation of the Veterans' Opportunity to Work (VOW) Act was proceeding expeditiously. The committee held several meetings with the DOD and the services to monitor their implementation plans. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel met in an open hearing on April 24, 2013 entitled "Status of Implementation of the Requirements of the Veterans Opportunity to Work (VOW) Act and the recommendations of the Presidential Veteran Employment Initiative Task Force for the DOD Transition Assistance Program: Goals, Plans, and Success (GPS)" to discuss the implementation. The hearing also provided the opportunity to determine whether additional legislative changes were needed to further improve the quality of the program provided to service members and their families. The committee addressed several aspects of transition, including expanding opportunities to gain civilian credentials in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, as well as in the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, and in H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. Finally, the committee received a briefing on the preliminary Comptroller General's report on the implementation of the VOW Act, which indicated the program was progressing according to plan with some minor adjustments required over the next fiscal year.

Disability Evaluation System and "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"

The committee continued to provide oversight and expressed concern about the backlog of cases in the Integrated Disability Evaluation System. H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for 2014, as passed by the House, contained legislation that required the Department of Defense to consider improvements to the system and to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services in the House and Senate containing their recommendations.

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

Religious Freedom

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, contained a provision that would strengthen and clarify the extent of the protections for the sincerely held conscience, moral principles or religious beliefs of service member and a members individual expression of those beliefs. The provision amended section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239). The provision would expand the accommodation and prohibition against adverse personnel action

based on a members individual expression of those beliefs. Furthermore, it would enforce the standard that would trigger disciplinary action from expressions of those beliefs that could have an impact on military readiness, unit cohesion or good order and discipline.

Subcommittee on Readiness

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

On February 28, 2013, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Assuring the Viability of the Sustainment Industrial Base,” in order to understand the immediate impacts of a continuing resolution and sequestration on workload trends for depots and arsenals, forward-deployed logistics, new weapon system maintenance, and the Army’s new Organic Industrial Base Strategy. On March 14, 2013, the Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled “Is Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) appropriate at this time?” The purpose of the hearing was to determine whether or not the Department of Defense completed an overseas basing assessment and to understand the rationale behind a possible future BRAC round.

The committee met on April 14, 2013, to receive testimony on the Readiness of the U.S. Army. The committee then met in a follow-on session to receive testimony on the Readiness of the U.S. Air Force on April 24, 2013. On April 26, the subcommittee also met to receive testimony on the Readiness of the U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps in the context of the President’s Fiscal Year 2014 budget request. These three hearings examined the impacts of sequestration, including Department of Defense civilian employee furloughs on the overall readiness of the services. On August 1, 2013, the Subcommittee on Readiness held a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces on “Ensuring Navy Surface Force Effectiveness with Limited Maintenance Resources,” specifically considering how operational demands and sequestration impact the Navy’s ability to conduct needed maintenance for surface ships to achieve their expected service life in support of achieving the Navy’s 30-year shipbuilding plan. On October 2, 2013, the subcommittee received testimony on “Resetting the Force for the Future: Risks of Sequestration,” with regards to the materiel reset and reconstitution efforts of the U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps in light of the drawdown of U.S. Armed Forces in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee met on October 10, 2013, to receive testimony on “The interpretation of H.R. 3210: Pay Our Military Act,” which provided that members of the Armed Forces, the Reserve Components (full-time National Guard), and civilian employees and contractors supporting the Armed Forces receive pay and allowances in spite of the United States Government shutdown of 2013.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces

The Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces conducted a series of hearings to review programs included in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2014.

In addition, the subcommittee conducted oversight hearings on the following topics: February 26, 2013, The Future of Seapower; April 24, 2013, Oversight of U.S. Naval and U.S. Air Force Acquisition Programs in the Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request; July 25, 2013, Acquisition and Development Challenges Associated with the Littoral Combat Ship; September 12, 2013, Undersea Warfare Capabilities and Challenges; October 10, 2013, Department of Defense Development and Integration of Air/Sea Battle Strategy, Governance and Policy into the Services' Annual Program, Planning, Budgeting and Execution Process; October 23, 2013, An Independent assessment of the Navy's 30-year Shipbuilding Plan; December 11, 2013, U.S. Asia-Pacific Strategic Considerations Related to PLA Naval Forces Modernization. The subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces also held a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Readiness on August 1st, 2013, Ensuring Navy Surface Force Effectiveness with Limited Maintenance Resources.

In addition to formal hearings, the subcommittee conducted numerous briefings on the following topics: February 14, 2013, Underpinning of the 30-year Shipbuilding Plan; April 10, 2013, Seapower and Projection Forces Strategy, Tactics and Challenges Associated with Conducting Full-Spectrum Maritime and Aerospace Operations in an Anti-Access/Area Denial Threat Environment; April 17, 2013, Requirements, Cost, Schedule, Acquisition Strategy and Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request regarding the new Long-Range Strike Bomber; October 2, 2013, Undersea Conventional Strike; October 29, 2013, Unmanned Carrier-based Aircraft Development Activities of the U.S. Navy.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

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

In addition to budget request hearings, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held additional oversight hearings. On February 28, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing on Nuclear Security: Actions, Accountability, and Reform. On March 19, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing on "The U.S. Nuclear Deterrent: What Are the Requirements for A Strong Deterrent In an Era of Defense Sequester?" On October 29, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing on Nuclear Weapons Modernization Programs: Military, Technical, and Political Requirements for the B61 Life Extension Program and Future Stockpile Strategy.

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

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 National Guard and Reserve equipment programs. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces also provided oversight on policy, such as threats and force structure requirements, as appropriate within the subcommittee's jurisdiction. This would include current or future acquisition programs that relate to gaps in acquisition strategies; or gaps in current or future capabilities that relate to acquisition programs; or the allocation of acquisition resources. This would also include Service specific acquisition policies as long as there is a nexus to the subcommittee's jurisdiction. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces also raised concerns over the impact of sequestration on acquisition programs, in particular the industrial base.

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

In addition to its traditional oversight responsibilities regarding the budget request, the subcommittee conducted oversight hearings

on the following topics: October 23, 2013: Impacts of a Continuing Resolution and Sequestration on Acquisition and Modernization, and December 17, 2013: The State of Army Aviation and the Effects of Sequester on Aviation Force Structure and Modernization.

In addition to hearings, the subcommittee held various briefings and events to conduct oversight including four classified briefings: July 23, 2013: Emerging Threats to Air Superiority and Contribution of 5th Generation Capability; August 1, 2013: Global IED Threat Assessment with Emphasis on the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; September 18, 2013: Current and Future Threats to Ground Forces and the Critical Need to Sustain Modernization Efforts; and October 9, 2013: Program Updates on Army and Marine Corps Body Armor, Combat Helmets, and Small Arms Programs. The subcommittee also held one unclassified briefing on February 14, 2013: Joint Strike Fighter 101. The subcommittee also met informally to gather information on the following topics: February 13, 2013: Adversary Fifth Generation Threats and the Value of Stealth; and on March 12, 2013: Acquisition 101 by the Government Accountability Office.

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

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 23, 2013, that was included in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House. 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 Army, Navy, Air Force, and Reserve Components.

Of note, the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces recommended in H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, an additional \$400.0 million for critically needed National Guard and Reserve Component equipment. H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would support the legislation included in H.R. 1960, and also would direct an additional \$400.0 million to adequately resource under-funded critical dual-use equipment requirements for the National Guard and Reserve Component.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations was reestablished by the 113th Congress to conduct studies and investigations as directed by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services after coordination with the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. The subcommittee undertakes comprehensive, in-depth oversight activities of major issues and makes recommendations to the committee for consideration and potential legislative action.

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

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

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

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

Afghanistan Oversight

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

To focus attention on the risks Afghan women face as U.S. troops withdraw, the subcommittee held two hearings on the challenges for securing the gains Afghan women have made in education, security, rights and opportunities during the last decade. On April 25, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Transitioning to Afghan Security Lead: Protecting Afghan Women?” Witnesses were: Mr. David Sedney, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Afghan, Pakistan, and Central Asia; Major General Michael Shields, USA, Director of the Pakistan-Afghanistan Coordination Cell, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Ms. Stephanie Sanok, Deputy Director and Senior Fellow, International Security Program, Center for Strategic and International Studies; and Ms. Clare Lockhart, Co-Founder and Director, Institute for State Effectiveness. On October 29, 2013, the subcommittee held a second hearing entitled “Report

from SIGAR: Challenges to Securing Afghan Women's Gains in a Post-2014 Environment." Witnesses were: Mr. John Sopko, Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction; Dr. Kenneth Katzman, Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, Congressional Research Services; and Ms. Michelle Barsa, Senior Manager for Policy, Inclusive Security Action.

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

Quadrennial Defense Review

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

PUBLICATIONS

HOUSE REPORTS

Report Number	Date Filed	Bill Number	Title
113-102	June 7, 2013	H.R. 1960	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014
113-102 Part 2	June 11, 2013	H.R. 1960	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014

COMMITTEE PRINTS

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

PUBLISHED PROCEEDINGS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

H.A.S.C. 113–35—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Oversight of U.S. Naval and U.S. Air Force Acquisition Programs in the Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request. Apr. 24, 2013.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PRESS RELEASES

FIRST SESSION

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

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

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

January 22, 2013—McKeon Announces Roby As Chair of O&I Subcommittee

January 29, 2013—McKeon Announces National Defense Panel Selections for Quadrennial Defense Review

January 29, 2013—McKeon, Smith Announce Subcommittee Membership for 113th Congress

January 30, 2013—McKeon Awaits Answers from Hagel During Nomination Hearing

January 31, 2013—McKeon Opposes Hagel As Secretary of Defense

February 5, 2013—McKeon and Inhofe on President's Expected Proposal to Replace Sequester

February 6, 2013—McKeon and HASC Republicans To Propose “Down Payment” to Protect National Security

February 8, 2013—McKeon Responds To White House Fact Sheet On Sequester

February 12, 2013—McKeon Statement on White House Plan to Withdraw Forces from Afghanistan

February 12, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on President Obama’s 2013 State of the Union Address

February 12, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on North Korean Detonation

February 13, 2013—Chairman McKeon: President’s Plan for More Defense Cuts at Odds with Testimony

February 20, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Civilian Furloughs

February 28, 2013—McKeon and Subcommittee Chairs Will Host Morning Press Conference on March 1st

March 6, 2013—Remaining Hearings POSTPONED

March 12, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on House Republican Budget

March 15, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Deployment of New Missile Defense Interceptors

April 3, 2013—HASC Leadership Appoints Members to National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force

April 3, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Secretary Hagel’s Speech at National Defense University

April 8, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on the Passing of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher

April 10, 2013—Statement by the Chairman on the President’s Budget Submission

April 22, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Disposition of Suspected Terrorist Dzhokhar Tsarnaev

April 25, 2013—McKeon Releases the FY14 NDAA Markup Schedule

April 25, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Situation in Syria

April 25, 2013—McKeon Letter to Secretary Hagel on Benghazi

April 26, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Secretary Donley

April 30, 2013—Chairman McKeon Responds to President Obama’s Guantanamo Claim

May 7, 2013—Chairman McKeon Announces Nomination to Military Sexual Assault Review Panel

May 8, 2013—McKeon Statement on DoD Denial of Vital Benghazi Oversight Information

May 9, 2013—McKeon: HASC Will Act to Combat Sexual Assault

May 14, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Allegations of Further Sexual Misconduct in the Military

May 15, 2013—McKeon Continues Benghazi Oversight

May 15, 2013—McKeon, Smith Begin FY 2014 Defense Authorization Process

May 21, 2013—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee Mark Released

May 21, 2013—Strategic Forces Subcommittee Mark Released

May 21, 2013—Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee Mark Released
 May 21, 2013—Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee Mark Released
 May 22, 2013—Readiness Subcommittee Mark Released
 May 22, 2013—Military Personnel Subcommittee Mark Released
 May 23, 2013—Background Material on Guantanamo Bay
 May 24, 2013—Myth vs Fact: Obama’s Strained View Of National Security
 June 3, 2013—Chairman McKeon Releases Full Committee Mark
 June 5, 2013—Opening Statement of Chairman McKeon for Full Committee Markup
 June 6, 2013—House Armed Services Committee Passes Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act
 June 7, 2013—Chairman McKeon writing in Washington Post: Budget cuts chip away at military readiness
 June 13, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Latest Developments in Syria
 June 14, 2013—McKeon Statement On House Passage Of National Defense Authorization Act For 2014
 June 19, 2013—Chairman McKeon on the President’s Berlin Remarks
 June 26, 2013—Readout of House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Classified Briefing on Benghazi
 June 27, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Unanimous House Action to Combat Sexual Assault in the Military
 July 8, 2013—McKeon Statement on Pentagon Furloughs
 July 9, 2013—McKeon on “Zero Option”
 July 12, 2013—Chairman McKeon Sends Letter to President Regarding “Zero Option”
 July 19, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Second Circuit Ruling Regarding NDAA
 July 30, 2013—McKeon Comments on Manning Verdict
 July 31, 2013—McKeon Statement on Strategic Choices and Management Review
 July 31, 2013—Readout of House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Classified Briefing on Benghazi
 August 6, 2013—McKeon Statement on DoD Furlough Update
 August 15, 2013—McKeon Statement on New DoD Sexual Assault Policies
 August 21, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Bradley Manning Sentence
 August 23, 2013—McKeon Statement on Hasan Verdict
 August 26, 2013—McKeon Statement on Developments in Syria
 September 11, 2013—McKeon Statement on 9/11 Anniversary
 September 16, 2013—McKeon, Smith Joint Statement on Navy Yard Shootings
 September 17, 2013—McKeon Statement on Defense Department Inspector General Report on Contractor Access to Naval Installations
 September 30, 2013—McKeon Statement on Military Pay and Potential Government Shutdown

October 4, 2013—Rep. Wilson Urges Secretary of Defense to Follow Pay Our Military Act

October 4, 2013—McKeon Announces Changes to Armed Services Committee Staff

October 5, 2013—Chairman McKeon on the Reinstatement of Furloughed DOD Civilians

October 6, 2013—McKeon Statement on the Capture of Abu Anas al-Libi

October 8, 2013—McKeon Statement on Death Gratuity

October 8, 2013—McKeon Statement on the Departure of Paul M. Lewis

October 9, 2013—HASC Vice Chairman Thornberry: Pentagon playing political games with death benefits

October 9, 2013—McKeon Statement on Rep. Bill Young’s Retirement Announcement

October 11, 2013—Roby Comments On Benghazi Briefing With General Dempsey

October 19, 2013—McKeon Comments On The Passing Of Congressman Bill Young

October 24, 2013—HASC Republicans Stress Need to Maintain National Defense in Budget Conference

October 28, 2013—McKeon Statement On The Passing Of Chairman Ike Skelton

October 29, 2013—Forbes, Hanabusa Lead Asia Pacific Oversight Series

October 29, 2013—McKeon Taps Thornberry to Lead Reform Effort

November 1, 2013—McKeon Urges President to Adopt Comprehensive Policy in Iraq

November 6, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Rep. Runyan

November 9, 2013—McKeon Statement On Reported Iran Nuke Deal

November 13, 2013—HASC Leaders Statement on Asia Pacific Ambassadors Roundtable

November 21, 2013—HASC Leaders Comment On NDAA Progress

November 22, 2013—McKeon Reacts to Iran Nuclear Deal

December 5, 2013—McKeon Statement on Rep. Martha Roby

December 6, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Pearl Harbor Anniversary

December 9, 2013—McKeon Releases FY14 NDAA Summary Fact Sheet

December 10, 2013—McKeon, Smith Release FY14 Defense Bill

December 12, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Passage of the 52nd National Defense Authorization Act

December 12, 2013—McKeon Statement on Passage of Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013