FY2010 National Defense Authorization Act: Selected Military Personnel Policy Issues

Don J. Jansen, Coordinator
Analyst in Defense Health Care Policy

Lawrence Kapp
Specialist in Military Manpower Policy

David F. Burrelli
Specialist in Military Manpower Policy

Charles A. Henning
Specialist in Military Manpower Policy

July 17, 2009

Congressional Research Service
7-5700
www.crs.gov
R40711

CRS Report for Congress
Prepared for Members and Committees of Congress

Summary

Military personnel issues typically generate significant interest from many Members of Congress and their staffs. Ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, along with the emerging operational role of the Reserve Components, further heighten interest in a wide range of military personnel policies and issues.

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) selected a number of the military personnel issues considered in deliberations on the House-passed version of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2010. This report provides a brief synopsis of sections that pertain to personnel policy. It includes background information and a discussion of the issue, along with a table that contains a comparison of the bill (H.R. 2647) passed by the House on June 25, 2009, and the bill (S. 1390) introduced and reported to the full Senate on July 2, 2009. The column for S. 1390 will be updated following Senate action on the bill. A third column will be completed after action on a final version by both chambers. Where appropriate, other CRS products are identified to provide more detailed background information and analysis of the issue. For each issue, a CRS analyst is identified and contact information is provided. Note: some issues were addressed in the FY2009 National Defense Authorization Act and discussed in CRS Report RL34590, *FY2009 National Defense Authorization Act: Selected Military Personnel Policy Issues*, coordinated by Lawrence Kapp, concerning that legislation. Those issues that were previously considered in CRS Report RL34590, *FY2009 National Defense Authorization Act: Selected Military Personnel Policy Issues* are designated with a "*****" in the relevant section titles of this report.

This report focuses exclusively on the annual defense authorization process. It does not include appropriations, veterans' affairs, tax implications of policy choices or any discussion of separately introduced legislation.

Contents

Tables

Contacts

Each year, the Senate and House Armed Services Committees report their respective versions of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). These bills contain numerous provisions that affect military personnel, retirees and their family members. Provisions in one version are often not included in another; are treated differently; or, in certain cases, are identical. Following passage of these bills by the respective legislative bodies, a Conference Committee is typically convened to resolve the various differences between the House and Senate versions.

In the course of a typical authorization cycle, congressional staffs receive many constituent requests for information on provisions contained in the annual NDAA. This report highlights those personnel-related issues that seem to generate the most intense congressional and constituent interest, and tracks their status in the FY2010 House and Senate versions of the NDAA. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, H.R. 2647, was introduced on June 2, 2009, reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on June 18, 2009 (H.Rept. 111-166), and passed by the House on June 25, 2009. In the Senate, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, S. 1390, was introduced and reported (S.Rept. 111-35) to the full Senate on July 2, 2009. The entries under the headings "House-passed version (H.R. 2647)" and "Senate reported version (S. 1390)" in the following pages are based on language in these bills, unless otherwise indicated. The entries under the heading "Final version "will be completed when a final bill is enacted.

Where appropriate, other CRS products are identified to provide more detailed background information and analysis of the issue. For each issue, a CRS analyst is identified and contact information is provided. Note: some issues were addressed in the FY2009 National Defense Authorization Act and discussed in CRS Report RL34590, *FY2009 National Defense Authorization Act: Selected Military Personnel Policy Issues* concerning that legislation. Those issues that were previously considered in CRS Report RL34590, *FY2009 National Defense Authorization Act: Selected Military Personnel Policy Issues*, are designated with a "*****" in the relevant section titles of this report.

*Active Duty End Strengths

Background: The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 110-181) authorized the Army to grow by 65,000 and the Marine Corps by 27,000, to respective end strengths of 547,400 and 202,000 by FY2012. Successful recruiting efforts, aided by a downturn in the U.S. economy, enabled the Army and Marine Corps to achieve these new end strength targets three years earlier than originally projected. Even with these increases, the nation's armed forces, especially the Army and Marine Corps, continue to experience high deployment rates. With relatively stable operations in Iraq and a significant increase in the number of servicemembers deployed to Afghanistan during 2009, some members of Congress and a number of observers have recommended a further increase in end strength, especially for the Army.

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 401 authorizes a total baseline FY2010 end strength of 1,410,000 including 547,400 for the Army, 328,800 for the Navy, 202,100 for the Marine Corps, and 331,700 for the Air Force.	Section 401 of the Senate bill is virtually identical to section 401 of the House bill.	
Section 403 authorizes for each of fiscal years (FYs) 2011 and 2012, an active-duty end strength for the Army at a number greater than the number otherwise authorized by law up to the fiscal-year 2010 baseline plus 30,000.	Section 402 of the Senate bill also authorizes a temporary increase for the Army in each of FYs 2011 and 2012 of 30,000 over the 2010 baseline	

Discussion: With increased concern over the "dwell time" provided to servicemembers between deployments and the projected end of the Army's Stop Loss program in January 2010, service end strengths remain a high visibility issue. Both 2010 national defense authorization bills provide the same increases to baseline end strength (please see table below) and also allow the Army temporary increases of 30,000 over the 2010 baseline in each of FYs 2011 and 2012.

Table 1. Authorized Active Duty End Strengths

	2008 (P.L. 110-181)	2009 (P.L. 110-417)	2010 (H.R. 2647 and S. 1033)
Baseline Army	525,400	532,400	547,400
Baseline Navy	329,098	326,323	328,800
Baseline Marine Corps	189,000	194,000	202,100
Baseline Air Force	329,563	317,050	331,700
Baseline Subtotal	1,373,061	1,369,773	1,410,000
Temporary Army		22,000*	22,000*
Temp. Marine Corps		13,000*	13,000*
Temporary Subtotal		35,000	35,000
Grand Total	1,408,061	1,404,773	1,445,000

* Temporary additional authority for 2009 and 2010 provided by section 403 of P.L. 110-181.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the cost to DOD of the 2010 baseline increase to be $31 billion over the 2010-2014 period. CBO further estimates that the 30,000 temporary increase in Army active-duty end strength in 2011 and 2012 authorized by sections 403 in the House bill and 402 in the Senate bill will raise costs for salaries and other expenses by roughly $2 billion in 2011, $4 billion in 2012, and $2 billion in 2013.

References: Previously discussed in CRS Report RL34590, *FY2009 National Defense Authorization Act: Selected Military Personnel Policy Issues*, coordinated by Lawrence Kapp, page 5. See also CRS Report R40121, *U.S. Military Stop Loss Program: Key Questions and Answers*, by Charles A. Henning.

CRS Point of Contact (POC): Charles Henning, x7-8866.

*Military Pay Raise

Background: Ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, highlighted by the significant increase in the number of servicemembers deployed to Afghanistan, continue to focus interest on the military pay raise. Title 37 U.S.C. 1009 provides a permanent formula for an automatic annual military pay raise that indexes the raise to the annual increase in the Employment Cost Index (ECI). The FY2010 President's Budget request for a 2.9% percent military pay raise was consistent with this formula. However, Congress, in FYs 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008, and 2009 approved the pay raise as the ECI increase plus 0.5 percent. The FY2007 pay raise was equal to the ECI.

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 601 supports a 3.4 percent (0.5 percent above the President's Budget) across-the-board pay raise that would be effective January 1, 2010.	Section 601 of the Senate bill is virtually identical to section 601 of the House bill.	

Discussion: A military pay raise larger than the permanent formula is not uncommon. In addition to "across-the-board" pay raises for all military personnel, mid-year, "targeted" pay raises (targeted at specific grades and longevity) have also been authorized over the past several years. This year's proposed legislation includes no mention of targeted pay raises. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the incremental cost of this larger raise would be about $350 million in 2010 and $2.3 billion over the 2010-2014 period.

Reference: Previously discussed in CRS Report RL34590, *FY2009 National Defense Authorization Act: Selected Military Personnel Policy Issues*, coordinated by Lawrence Kapp, page 6. See also CRS Report RL33446, *Military Pay and Benefits: Key Questions and Answers*, by Charles A. Henning.

CRS Point of Contact (POC): Charles Henning, x7-8866.

Expansion of Concurrent Receipt

Background: "Concurrent receipt" means to receive both military retirement benefits and disability compensation. This practice was forbidden by law until 2004. The first concurrent receipt legislation was enacted in FY2003, and successive legislation since then has extended concurrent receipt to additional populations and further modified the program. There are two common criteria that define eligibility for concurrent receipt: (1) all recipients must be military retirees and (2) they must also be eligible for VA disability compensation. Beyond these common criteria, there are separate and distinct components: (1) Combat-Related Special Compensation (CRSC) for those with service-verified combat disabilities and (2) Concurrent Retirement and Disability Payments (CRDP) for those with service-connected disabilities. A retiree cannot receive both CRSC and CRDP. At present, all disabled retirees with combat-related disabilities rated at 10% or greater are eligible for CRSC. However, two groups of retirees with service-connected disabilities are not currently eligible: (1) Chapter 61 retirees (a reference to the chapter of Title 10 that governs disability retirement) who were determined to be unfit for continued military service and generally due to service-connected (CRDP) disabilities prior to completing 20 years of service, and (2) longevity retirees (those with 20 or more years of service) who have service-connected (CRDP) disabilities rated at 40% or less.

The President's FY2010 Budget request proposed concurrent receipt expansion similar to that in H.R. 2647. The House report on the FY2010 NDAA (H.Rept. 111-166) did not initially include the provision. It was introduced separately as H.R. 2990, which passed the House on June 24, 2009. H.Res. 573, the rule which provided for consideration of H.R. 2647, added the text of H.R. 2990 to the end of H.R. 2647 where it appears as Division D.

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 121 of Division D includes a phased expansion of concurrent receipt eligibility that would provide CRDP to Chapter 61 military retirees. In 2010 this would include those with disabilities rated as either 90 or 100% disabled; in 2011 to those rated at 70 or 80%; in 2012 to those rated at 50 or 60%; in 2013 to those rated at 30 or 40%; in 2014 to all Chapter 61 retirees with a disability rating	No similar provision.	

Discussion: The House version of this proposed expansion of concurrent receipt represents a temporary, one-year program that would become effective on January 1, 2010. Many supporters of expanding concurrent receipt have expressed concern with the House version due to its scope and implementation.

Reference: CRS Report R40589, *Concurrent Receipt: Background and Issues for Congress*, by Charles A. Henning.

CRS Point of Contact (POC): Charles Henning, x7-8866.

Prohibition on Recruiting or Retaining Individuals Associated with Hate Groups

Background: While the Department of Defense and the Military Services have regulations prohibiting the recruiting or retention of those who participate in extremist activities,[1] critics have argued that the military has not effectively enforced these provisions, leading to the infiltration of violent extremists—including white supremacists—into the armed forces. Defense officials have stated that racist or extremist behaviors are not tolerated in the military.

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate reported-version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 524 amends 10 USC 504 to specify that "A person associated or affiliated with a group associated with hate-related violence against groups or persons or the United States government, as determined by the Attorney General may not be recruited, enlisted, or retained in the armed forces" It prohibits recruiters from enlisting anyone associated with a hate group. It also requires the immediate discharge of military personnel found to be associated with a hate group, though it provides an exception for those who have renounced a previous association.	No similar provision.	

Discussion: The House provision would statutorily prohibit the recruitment, enlistment, or retention of individuals who are associated with a "group associated with hate-related violence" or a "hate group." These terms are defined to encompass seven meanings, the broadest of which appears to be "groups or organizations engaged in criminal gang activity including drug and weapons trafficking and smuggling." The provision specifies the evidence—such as tattoos, meeting attendance, online activity, and written material—which demonstrate hate group association. Those already in the military who have renounced a previous affiliation with a hate group are exempted from separation. There is no exemption for those seeking to join the military who have renounced a previous affiliation; this could affect recruiting in neighborhoods where some form of criminal gang affiliation by teenagers is relatively common. The language of this provision and its location at 10 USC 504—the section of the U.S. Code which covers persons not qualified for enlistment—appear to limit its effect only to enlisted personnel, not officers.[2]

Reference(s): None

CRS Point of Contact (POC): Lawrence Kapp, x7-7609 and Dave Burrelli at x7-8033.

[1] DOD Directive 1325.6, 3.5.8; Army Regulation (AR) 600-20, 4-12; AR 601-210, 4-2(e)(i)(a)(9); Navy Regulations, Ch. 11, Art. 1167; Navy Recruiting Command Instruction 1130.8H, Vol I, Ch. 1, Sec. 4, p. 4; Air Force Instruction (AFI) 51-903, 5; AFI 36-2002, Att. 2; Marine Corps Order (MCO) 5370.4B; MCO P1100.72C, 3-85, 3-146 to 148.

[2] However, current law requires all newly appointed regular officers to be of "good moral character" (10 U.S.C. 532) and provides for the separation of regular officers for misconduct or moral dereliction (10 USC 1181).

Chiropractic Health Care for Members on Active Duty

Background: Chiropractic is a health care approach that focuses on the relationship between the body's structure—mainly the spine—and its functioning. Although practitioners may use a variety of treatment approaches, they primarily perform adjustments to the spine or other parts of the body with the goal of correcting alignment problems and supporting the body's natural ability to heal itself. Research to expand the scientific understanding of chiropractic treatment is ongoing. Section 702 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (P.L. 106-398) established the Chiropractic Care Program, replacing the former Chiropractic Health Care Demonstration Program (CHCDP) that ended in Sept. 1999. Under this program 60 military clinics and hospitals currently provide chiropractic care to active duty service members. The current Chiropractic Care Program is only available to active duty service members at designated military treatment facilities. A service member's primary care manager determines if chiropractic care is appropriate. Family members, retirees and their family members, unremarried former spouses and survivors are not eligible for chiropractic care. They may be referred to non-chiropractic health care services in the military health system (e.g., physical therapy or orthopedics) or may seek chiropractic care in the local community at their own expense.

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 702 would require the Secretary of Defense to provide chiropractic services and benefits as a permanent part of the Defense Health Program, including the Tricare program for all active duty service members. The Secretary would also be authorized to conduct one or more demonstration projects to provide chiropractic services to deployed members of the uniformed services.	No similar provision.	

Discussion: The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that about 900,000, or roughly two thirds, of the 1.4 million active-duty members are currently able to receive chiropractic services. CBO estimates that extending chiropractic care to the remainder of the active-duty population would result in 160,000 additional visits to chiropractors each year, at a net cost of about $55 per visit, or about $9 million per year. CBO also estimates such the chiropractic demonstration program for deployed troops would cost about $12 million over a five-year period, based on cost data from previous DOD chiropractic demonstration programs. In total, CBO estimates that section 702 would cost $53 million over the 2010-2014 period.

Reference(s): None.

CRS Point of Contact (POC): Don Jansen, x7-4769

Tricare Coverage for Certain Members of the Retired Reserve Who Are Not Yet Age 60

Background: Under current law, reserve component members who have completed 20 years of service but have not yet reached the age of 60 (so called "grey-area" retirees), are not eligible for Tricare benefits. This has traditionally been the policy because the individuals in this category of "working-age," were assumed to be able to obtain health insurance from their civilian employer.

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 704 would amend Chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code by inserting a new section 1076e. The new section would extend Tricare standard coverage for certain members of the retired reserve who are qualified for a non-regular retirement but are not yet age 60. Eligible members would be required to pay premiums beneficiaries would be required to pay premiums equal to the cost of coverage as determined by the Secretary of Defense on an appropriate actuarial basis.	Section 701 includes a similar provision.	

Discussion: The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the net cost to the government of this new program should be "insignificant over the long-run." DOD would incur start-up costs estimated to total about $15 million over the 2010-2011 period.

Reference(s): None.

CRS Point of Contact (POC): Don Jansen, x7-4769

Earlier TRICARE Eligibility for Certain Reservists

Background: Since September 11, 2001, the United States has activated hundreds of thousands of reservists for service in the United States, Afghanistan, Iraq and elsewhere. In response to this, both Congress and the executive branch have taken a variety of actions to smooth the transition of reservists from civilian to military status and back. In 2003, Congress provided reservists with early access to Tricare for reservists for up to 90 days prior to the projected date of activation if they had received "delayed-effective-date active-duty orders." "Delayed-effective-date active-duty orders" were defined as "an order to active duty for a period of more than 30 days in support of a contingency operation under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of [Title 10] that provides for active duty service to begin under such order on a date after the date of the issuance of the order."

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 706 amends 10 USC 1074 to extend the period of early TRICARE coverage from a maximum of 90 days to a maximum of 180 days prior to the projected date of activation if they have received "delayed-effective- date active-duty orders" or if they have received official notification from their Service Secretary that such orders are forthcoming.	No similar provision	

Discussion: The House provision extends the period of early Tricare access to as much as 180 days prior to the projected activation date and provides such access upon "official notification" that orders are forthcoming. "Official notification" is defined as "a memorandum from the Secretary concerned that notifies a unit or a member of a reserve component of the armed forces that such unit or member shall receive a delayed-effective-date active-duty order."

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates this expanded authority would cost about $92 million in 2010. In total, CBO estimates that section 706 would cost $347 million over the 2010-2014 period.

Reference(s): CRS Report RL33537, *Military Medical Care: Questions and Answers*, by Don J. Jansen

CRS Point of Contact (POC): Lawrence Kapp, x7-7609

Dental Care for Survivors

Background: Under current law (10 U.S.C. 1076a(k)(3)) a dependent enrolled in the Tricare dental program is no longer eligible for coverage after the end of the three-year period beginning on the date of the death of the member upon which the dependent's eligibility was based. Unlike other survivor eligibility standards, exceptions are not provided for children until they reach age 21 or age 23 if enrolled in college.

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 703 would amend 10 U.S.C 1076a(k) to extend Tricare dental benefits to the survivors of members who die on active duty until they reach the age of 21, or, if they are still enrolled in college, age 23.	Section 702 also would amend 10 U.S.C 1076a(k) to extend Tricare dental benefits to the survivors of members who die on active duty until they reach the age of 21, or, if they are still enrolled in college, age 23.	

Discussion: This provision is intended to expand survivor eligibility under the Tricare dental program so that it matches other Tricare survivor eligibility standards. CBO estimates this section would allow about 7,000 additional survivors to receive dental benefits through the Tricare program each year, at an annual cost of about $300 per person for an overall cost to DOD of $2 million per year.

Reference(s): None

CRS Point of Contact (POC): Don Jansen, x7-4769

Prohibition on Conversions of Military Medical Positions to Civilian and Dental Positions

Background: In previous years the Defense Health Program appropriations request budgeted for savings to be achieved by converting military medical positions to civilian positions. H.Rept. 111-166 states without explanation that such conversions have had an adverse impact on the military health system. Section 721 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 110-181) prohibited such conversions and required that any unfilled positions slotted for conversion be restored to a military position. The Department of Defense budgeted for these restorations in its 2010 appropriations request.

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 701 provides that the Secretary of a military department may not convert any military medical or dental position to a civilian medical or dental position. In the case of any military medical or dental position that was converted to a civilian medical or dental position during the period beginning on October 1, 2004, and ending on September 30, 2008, if the position was not filled by a civilian by September 30, 2008, the Secretary of the military department concerned must restore the position to a military position that may be filled only by a member of the Armed Forces who is a health professional.	No similar provision.	

Discussion: This section would indefinitely extend a prohibition on conversions of military medical and dental positions to civilian positions. The provision reenacts section 721 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 110-181) but without an end date. The Bush Administration had opposed prohibitions on conversions saying that they would eliminate the flexibility of the Secretary of Defense to use converted positions to enhance the strength of operating units and would have an adverse impact on all the services, especially the Army. Previous DOD budgets had recognized annual savings in excess of $200 million from conversions.

Reference(s): None.

CRS Point of Contact (POC): Don Jansen, x7-4769

Cooperative Health Care Agreements Between Military Installations and Non-Military Health Care Systems

Background: Congress has enacted several provisions over the years to allow for the establishment of cooperative health care arrangements between military installations and local and regional non-military health care systems. Section 721 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (P.L. 108-375) required the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program at two or more installations for the purpose of testing initiatives that build cooperative health care arrangements and agreements between military installations, and local and regional non-military health care systems.

Section 707 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 110-181) extended the pilot program through 2010 and pushed back the due date for a required final report describing the results of the program with recommendations for a model health care delivery system for other military installations until July 1, 2010.

DOD submitted an interim report on the two pilot programs it established under this authority to Congress on July 30, 2007.[3] This report provided an overview of a pilot project at Fort Drum, NY, and at Yuma, AZ, where there is a Marine Corps facility and an Army proving ground.

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 705 would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish cooperative health care arrangements and agreements between military installations and local and regional non-military health care systems.	No similar provision.	

Discussion: Cooperative arrangements between DOD and non-military health care systems may offer opportunities to increase access to care for Tricare beneficiaries and to leverage Federal health care resources in medically underserved areas by allowing support for hospitals and other facilities in areas that might not feasibly support both a military health care facility and other facilities. Unlike previous provisions, section 705 is not-time limited.

Reference(s): None

CRS Point of Contact (POC): Don Jansen, x7-4769

[3] Available at: http://www.tricare.mil/planning/congress/downloads/20070830/2007%20Reports%20to%20Congress/131553-Update_to_Congress_on_the_Pilot_Program_for_Health_Care_Delivery_-_Coordinations_-_SIGNED.pdf.

*Sexual Assault

Background: DOD affords the victims of sexual assault the option of confidential reporting of assaults to specified individuals and services including medical care, counseling and victim advocacy, without initiating an investigation.

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
The House Armed Services Committee Report (H.Rept. 111-116) notes that the committee is concerned that when a sexual assault report is made to certain individuals (e.g. commanders, law enforcement) by someone other than the victim, the report may trigger an investigation regardless of the victim's desire for confidentiality. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a procedure to provide the victim with confidentiality in cases where the assault is reported by someone other than the victim or other individuals covered under confidential reporting. The Committee also directs the Secretary to report on the availability and adequacy of proper care for victims of sexual assault.	No similar provision	

Discussion: The new procedure described in the House Report would allow alleged victims of sexual assault to seek assistance while protecting the desire for confidentiality in instances where the alleged assault is reported by a non-covered individual. The Senate bill does not contain a similar provision. However, section 571 of the Senate bill would amend section 576(e)(1) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (P.L. 108-375) to change the due date of a required report regarding sexual assaults due by December 1, 2009.

Reference(s): None.

CRS Point of Contact (POC): David F. Burrelli, x7-8033

*Government Accountability Office Report on the Progress Made in Implementing Recommendations to Reduce Domestic Violence in Military Families

Background: On May 24, 2006, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report entitled, "Progress Made in Implementing Recommendations to Reduce Domestic Violence, but Further Management Action Needed (GAO-06-540)."

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 582 would require the Comptroller General to review and assess the progress of the Department of Defense in implementing the recommendations contained in GAO report GAO-06-540, and to submit a report containing the results of the review and assessment to the congressional defense committees.	No similar provision.	

Discussion: Issues affecting military families have been of particular interest to Congress. The review and assessment of recommendations concerning domestic violence affords both Congress and the DOD an opportunity to stay up to date on this issue.

Reference(s): CRS Report RL34590, *FY2009 National Defense Authorization Act: Selected Military Personnel Policy Issues*, coordinated by Lawrence Kapp, page 21.

CRS Point of Contact (POC): David F. Burrelli, x7-8033

*Internship Pilot Program for Military Spouses

Background: Many military spouses desire and seek employment. Obtaining such employment, much less a career, is often hampered by frequent moves. It has been suggest that some employers discriminate against military spouses in the hiring process because of their relatively high turnover.

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 581 establishes an internship pilot program and reporting requirement for certain military spouses to obtain federal employment that could lead to career portability and enhancement	No similar provision.	

Discussion: This provision authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into agreements with the heads of other federal agencies that have established internship programs to reimburse the agency costs associated with the first year of employment of an eligible military spouse who is selected to participate in the agency's internship program. All spouses would be eligible except for those that are legally separated, already on active duty, or retired from the military.

Reference(s): CRS Report RL34590, *FY2009 National Defense Authorization Act: Selected Military Personnel Policy Issues*, coordinated by Lawrence Kapp, page 10.

CRS Point of Contact (POC): David F. Burrelli, x7-8033

Language Training Centers

Background: In recent years, both Congress and the Department of Defense have shown significant interest in increasing the ability of military personnel to operate in foreign countries by enhancing their cultural knowledge and foreign language proficiency. However, building these language and cultural skills has proven challenging due to the intensive study required for mastery and the competing demands of other training and operational requirements for currently serving personnel.

House-passed version (H.R. 2647)	Senate-reported version (S. 1390)	Final Version
Section 534 requires the Secretary of Defense to establish "at least three Language Training Centers at accredited universities, senior military colleges, or similar institutions of higher education to create the foundational critical and strategic language and regional area expertise...." Members of the armed forces, including reservists and ROTC candidates, and DOD civilian employees are authorized to participate. Language Training Centers must be established by October 1, 2010; program authority expires on September 30, 2015.	No similar provision	

Discussion: The House provision would require the establishment of at least three Language Training Centers, who purpose would be: 1) to graduate military and DOD civilian personnel with critical and strategic language skills; 2) to develop language proficiency training programs in critical and strategic languages to meet operational needs; 3) to develop alternative language training delivery systems; 4) to develop critical and strategic language programs for use in ROTC units; 5) to develop programs to increase the number of language instructors in the military; and 6) to develop program to encourage native speakers of critical and strategic languages to serve in the Department of Defense or the Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps. The Language Training Centers are also authorized to "partner with elementary and secondary educational institutions to help develop critical and strategic language skills in student who may pursue a military career."

Reference(s): None.

CRS Point of Contact (POC): Lawrence Kapp, x7-7609

Author Contact Information

Don J. Jansen, Coordinator
Analyst in Defense Health Care Policy
djansen@crs.loc.gov, 7-4769

Lawrence Kapp
Specialist in Military Manpower Policy
lkapp@crs.loc.gov, 7-7609

David F. Burrelli
Specialist in Military Manpower Policy
dburrelli@crs.loc.gov, 7-8033

Charles A. Henning
Specialist in Military Manpower Policy
chenning@crs.loc.gov, 7-8866