

**En Bloc Amendments to H.R. 1960**  
**National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014**  
Wednesday, June 5, 2013

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces

En Bloc 1

<b>Log #</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Description</b>
043	Forbes	Raises the cost-cap for the Ford-Class Carrier (CVN)
045	Forbes	Express concern with the LCS program, specifically the concurrency issue between sea frames and mission modules, and directs the GAO to report to Congress by March 30, 2014 regarding a series of questions
084	Courtney	Amends DRL on shipbuilding plan to reflect importance of the recapitalization of our SSBN fleet, and adds a requirement that the report include a discussion of strategies to address shipbuilding shortfalls in the updated long range shipbuilding report
101	Palazzo	Sense of congress with findings regarding the future balance of the Navy's fleet
118	Forbes	Directs the SecNav to submit a report by September 30, 2013 on the most recent Offensive Anti-Surface Warfare Weapon analysis of alternatives and a report addressing a series of questions regarding the program's development.
154	Maffei	Requires a briefing to assess the current situation pertaining to overhauls and RMA kits and efforts to address the backlog of overhauls of Close-in Weapon Systems
166r1	Brooks	Requests a report from the SECNAV on the Joint High Speed Vessel and expanding its mission
212	Langevin	Strike the following DRL in the report: Integration of High-Energy Laser Weapons on Surface Combatants"

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1960**  
**OFFERED BY MR. FORBES OF VIRGINIA**

Strike section 112 and insert the following:

1 **SEC. 112. COST LIMITATION FOR CVN-78 AIRCRAFT CAR-**  
2 **RIERS.**

3 (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 122 of the John Warner  
4 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007  
5 (Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2104) is amended to read  
6 as follows:

7 **“SEC. 122. ADHERENCE TO NAVY COST ESTIMATES FOR**  
8 **CVN-78 CLASS OF AIRCRAFT CARRIERS.**

9 “(a) LIMITATION.—

10 “(1) LEAD SHIP.—The total amount obligated  
11 from funds appropriated or otherwise made available  
12 for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, or for any  
13 other procurement account, for the aircraft carrier  
14 designated as CVN–78 may not exceed  
15 \$12,887,000,000 (as adjusted pursuant to sub-  
16 section (b)).

17 “(2) FOLLOW-ON SHIPS.—The total amount ob-  
18 ligated from funds appropriated or otherwise made  
19 available for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, or  
20 for any other procurement account, for the construc-

1       tion of any ship that is constructed in the CVN-78  
2       class of aircraft carriers after the lead ship of that  
3       class may not exceed \$11,411,000,000 (as adjusted  
4       pursuant to subsection (b)).

5       “(b) ADJUSTMENT OF LIMITATION AMOUNT.—The  
6       Secretary of the Navy may adjust the amount set forth  
7       in subsection (a) for any ship constructed in the CVN-  
8       78 class of aircraft carriers by the following:

9           “(1) The amounts of increases or decreases in  
10          costs attributable to economic inflation after Sep-  
11          tember 30, 2013.

12          “(2) The amounts of increases or decreases in  
13          costs attributable to compliance with changes in  
14          Federal, State, or local laws.

15          “(3) The amounts of outfitting costs and post-  
16          delivery costs incurred for that ship.

17          “(4) The amounts of increases or decreases in  
18          costs of that ship that are attributable to insertion  
19          of new technology into that ship, as compared to the  
20          technology baseline as it was defined in the approved  
21          acquisition program baseline estimate of December  
22          2005.

23          “(5) The amounts of increases or decreases to  
24          nonrecurring design and engineering cost attrib-

1       utable to achieving compliance with the cost limita-  
2       tion.

3           “(6) The amounts of increases or decreases to  
4       cost required to correct deficiencies that may affect  
5       the safety of the ship and personnel or otherwise  
6       preclude the ship from safe operations and crew cer-  
7       tification.

8           “(7) With respect to the aircraft carrier des-  
9       ignated as CVN-78, the amounts of increases or de-  
10      creases in costs of that ship that are attributable to  
11      the shipboard test program.

12      “(c) LIMITATION ON TECHNOLOGY INSERTION COST  
13      ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary of the Navy may use the  
14      authority under paragraph (4) of subsection (b) to adjust  
15      the amount set forth in subsection (a) for a ship referred  
16      to in that subsection with respect to insertion of new tech-  
17      nology into that ship only if—

18           “(1) the Secretary determines, and certifies to  
19      the congressional defense committees, that insertion  
20      of the new technology would lower the life-cycle cost  
21      of the ship; or

22           “(2) the Secretary determines, and certifies to  
23      the congressional defense committees, that insertion  
24      of the new technology is required to meet an emerg-  
25      ing threat and the Secretary of Defense certifies to

1 those committees that such threat poses grave harm  
2 to national security.

3 “(d) NOTICE.—

4 “(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the  
5 Navy shall submit to the congressional defense com-  
6 mittees each year, at the same time that the budget  
7 is submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31,  
8 United States Code, for the next fiscal year, written  
9 notice of—

10 “(A) any change in the amount set forth  
11 in subsection (a) during the preceding fiscal  
12 year that the Secretary has determined to be  
13 associated with a cost referred to in subsection  
14 (b); and

15 “(B) the most accurate estimate possible  
16 of the Secretary with respect to the total cost  
17 compared to the amount set forth in subsection  
18 (a), as adjusted by subsection (b), and the steps  
19 the Secretary is taking to reduce the costs  
20 below such amount.

21 “(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirement in  
22 paragraph (1) shall become effective with the budget  
23 request for the year of procurement of the first ship  
24 referred to in subsection (a).”

1 (b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of con-  
2 tents at the beginning of such Act is amended by striking  
3 the item relating to section 122 and inserting the fol-  
4 lowing:

“Sec. 122. Adherence to Navy cost estimates for CVN-78 class of aircraft car-  
riers.”.



Amendment Offered by Mr. Forbes of Virginia

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

To be inserted in the appropriate place the report:

*Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Oversight*

The committee notes the Navy plans to acquire 52 Littoral Combat Ship seaframes and 64 mission packages at a cost of approximately \$40.0 billion through 2035. Littoral Combat Ships 1-16 are under contract, and Littoral Combat Ships 17-24 are pending authorization. The committee further notes that the Navy's acquisition strategy for the Littoral Combat Ship seaframes has changed several times and continues to evolve as the Navy approaches its next major planned contract award in fiscal year 2016. The Navy has indicated that 10 of the 64 planned mission modules will be procured before the seaframe Milestone B and that this milestone continues to be delayed due to lack of an approved test plan and acquisition program baseline. The Navy expects to procure more than half of the Surface Warfare and Mine Counter Measure modules before it demonstrates they meet minimum requirements. The committee has significant concerns regarding the levels of concurrency associated with the mission modules and the expected delivery of the Littoral Combat Ship seaframes. This dichotomy in capability development appears excessive and the committee believes it should be better aligned to ensure future success of this program.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to prepare a report to the congressional defense committees by the March 30, 2014 on the current status of the Littoral Combat Ship program. This report should assess the following:

1. Seaframe production and testing, including:
  - a. Seaframe developmental test activities and changes made to correct deficiencies identified during testing to date;
  - b. Weight management for both seaframe variants;
  - c. Planned Navy surrogate damage and survivability tests using aluminum structures;
  - d. Progress made in implementing commonality across both variants;
2. Mission module development and testing, including:
  - a. Developmental test activities and changes made to correct deficiencies identified during testing to date;
3. Lessons learned and knowledge gained to date from the Singapore deployment;

4. Results of Navy technical and requirements studies and any recommendations for changes to the design and/or capabilities of either current or future LCS;
5. Navy studies, assessments, or potential plans to acquire the Joint High Speed Vessel to operate in conjunction with LCS or perform similar missions; and
6. Role of LCS Council in acquisition oversight and decision-making.



## Amendment Offered by Mr. Courtney

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

In the matter titled *Long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels*, strike the paragraph starting with “The committee believes” and insert the following:

The committee supports a robust shipbuilding plan that invests in the near and long term needs of our Navy, and considers the recapitalization of the SSBN fleet a challenging but necessary strategic priority. However, the committee is concerned that the Navy’s ship construction accounts will face significant pressure in supporting long term ship requirements while also resourcing the Ohio-class replacement ballistic missile submarine program. The committee also believes that a significant increase to the ship construction accounts is unsustainable in times of budget challenges. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the average ship construction investment over the last 30 years, in current dollars, is \$16.0 billion. Therefore, to better understand the significance associated with even sustaining the current ship construction investment throughout the long-range plan, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committee by March 1, 2014, that provides an update to the long plan for the construction of naval vessels based on \$16.0 billion across the entirety of the long-range plan and to assess the corresponding reductions in the shipbuilding plan. The Secretary of the Navy should also provide an assessment of this investment in terms of the health associated with the industrial base, as well as a discussion of alternative strategies for the Navy and Congress to consider in alleviating any shortfalls between this assessment and the May 10 report.

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1960**  
**OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO OF MISSISSIPPI**

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

1 **SEC. 10 \_\_\_\_ . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING A BALANCED**  
2 **FUTURE NAVAL FORCE.**

3 (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following find-  
4 ings:

5 (1) The battle force of the Navy must be suffi-  
6 ciently sized and balanced in capability to meet cur-  
7 rent and anticipated future national security objec-  
8 tives.

9 (2) A robust and balanced naval force is re-  
10 quired for the Department of Defense to fully exe-  
11 cute the President's National Security Strategy.

12 (3) To develop and sustain required capabilities  
13 the Navy must balance investment and maintenance  
14 costs across various ship types, including—

15 (A) aircraft carriers;

16 (B) surface combatants;

17 (C) submarines;

18 (D) amphibious assault ships; and

1 (E) other auxiliary vessels, including sup-  
2 port vessels operated by the Military Sealift  
3 Command.

4 (4) Despite a Marine Corps requirement for 38  
5 amphibious assault ships, the Navy possesses only  
6 30 amphibious assault ships with an average of 22  
7 ships available for surge deployment.

8 (5) The inadequate level of investment in Navy  
9 shipbuilding over the last 20 years has resulted in—

10 (A) a fragile shipbuilding industrial base,  
11 both in the construction yards and secondary  
12 suppliers of materiel and equipment; and

13 (B) increased costs per vessel stemming  
14 from low production volume.

15 (6) The Department of Defense, Military Con-  
16 struction and Veterans Affairs, and Full-Year Con-  
17 tinuing Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2013  
18 provided \$263,000,000 towards the advance procure-  
19 ment of materiel and equipment required to continue  
20 the San Antonio LPD 17 amphibious transport dock  
21 class to a total of 12 ships, a key first step in rebal-  
22 ancing the amphibious assault ship force structure.

23 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Con-  
24 gress that—

1           (1) the Department of Defense and the Depart-  
2           ment of the Navy must prioritize funding towards  
3           increased shipbuilding rates to enable the Navy to  
4           meet the full-range of combatant commander re-  
5           quests;

6           (2) the Department of the Navy's future budget  
7           requests and the Long Range Plan for the Construc-  
8           tion of Naval Forces must realistically anticipate  
9           and reflect the true investment necessary to meet  
10          stated force structure goals;

11          (3) without modification to Long Range Plan  
12          for the Construction of Naval Forces shipbuilding  
13          plan, the future of the industrial base that enables  
14          construction of large, combat-survivable amphibious  
15          assault ships is at significant risk; and

16          (4) the Department of Defense and Congress  
17          should act expeditiously to restore the force struc-  
18          ture and capability balance of the Navy fleet as  
19          quickly as possible.



## Amendment Offered by Rep Forbes

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

To be inserted in the appropriate place in Title II of the report:

### *Offensive Anti-Surface Warfare (OASuW) Weapons Development*

“The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to submit to the defense committees by September 30, 2013, the most recent OASuW Analysis of Alternatives completed by the Department of Defense.

The committee also directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide to the defense committees by September 30, 2013, a report that: (1) outlines the Secretary's near-, mid-, and long-term capability and acquisition roadmaps for maintaining air-launched and surface-launched offensive anti-surface warfare weapon capabilities within the Department of Defense; (2) describes capability gaps and shortfalls of the Navy regarding current and future OASuW capabilities; (3) any supporting analysis that have informed the Secretary's roadmap; (4) any on-going technology experimentation, engineering, product development, or modification efforts within the Department of Defense that would enhance the Secretary's ability to develop and field future OASuW capabilities, and an assessment of the maturity and associated risks of those technologies and efforts; and, (5) updated budget estimates and life-cycle funding estimates of the Department of Defense required to develop, engineer, manufacture, test, field and sustain new or modified air-launched and surface-launched OASuW missile capabilities in the planned roadmaps. The report may contain a classified annex.”

## Amendment Offered by Rep. Dan Maffei

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

To be inserted in the appropriate place the report:

### Navy Close-in Weapon System (CIWS) Modernization

The committee is aware of a backlog of overhauls and reliability, maintainability, and availability, (RMA) kits for ship self-defense systems including the Navy's Close-in Weapon System (CIWS). The committee is aware that CIWS is a last line of defense against missiles, rockets and mortars for the preponderance of naval vessels including cruisers, destroyers, and aircraft carriers. The committee also remains concerned about credible threats posed to sailors and marines that rely on these systems for protection in a time of heightened operational tempo. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to deliver a briefing no later than December 31, 2013 to the House Armed Services Committee which details the current situation pertaining to overhauls and RMA kits and efforts address the backlog of these systems.

log 166r1

## **Amendment Offered by Mo Brooks**

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

To be inserted in the appropriate place the report:

### **Joint High Speed Vessel Report**

According to the Navy's fiscal year 2014 budget documentation, the Joint High Speed Vessel is being procured as an intra-theater sealift asset. However, the committee has observed growing indications from Department of the Navy leadership that the Joint High Speed Vessel will serve as much more than a troop transport vessel. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2014, on the following items:

- 1) A complete list of existing required operational capabilities for the JHSV approved by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC);
- 2) The number of vessels to be allocated to each combatant commander area of responsibility under that plan;
- 3) The overseas basing plan to fulfill combatant commander requirements and how dispersal of the vessels will affect each of the JROC-approved operational capability requirements; and
- 4) An assessment of the future options for additional missions to be fulfilled by the Joint High Speed Vessel and their operational benefits to include the following missions: mine countermeasure operations; joint task force command and control; intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance; counter-piracy operations; counter-drug operations; and counter-smuggling operations.

## **Amendment Offered by Mr. Langevin of Rhode Island**

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

To be struck in the appropriate place the report:

### **Integration of High-Energy Laser Weapons on Surface Combatants**

Strike the following Directive Report Language in the report: “Integration of High-Energy Laser Weapons on Surface Combatants”.