

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

STRATEGIC FORCES

En Bloc # 2

Log #	Sponsor	Description
047r1	Lamborn	Report on two stage GBIs
052r1	Sanchez	Report by NNSA on nuclear weapons component reuse studies
059	Sanchez	Seeks additional information on cost estimates of nuclear forces.
078r1	Franks	Reports on Russian tactical nuclear weapons developments
081r1	Franks	Report on MYP for SM-3 IB missiles
107r1	Lamborn	Directing the President to seek NATO funding for the EPAA
210r2	Langevin	Stating the Sense of the Congress on the CE-2 EKV
214r2	Langevin	Additional reporting in the MDA BMDS Accountability Report
249r1	Lamborn	Stating the Sense of the Congress on the 30th Anniversary of Missile Defense
254r1	Coffman	Reporting language on HALT/HASS testing of the BMDS
255	Rogers	Perfecting amendment to section 3114

Amendment Offered by Mr. Lamborn

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

To be inserted in the appropriate place the report:

Two-stage Interceptor for Ground-based Midcourse Defense

In the Administration's 2009 Ballistic Missile Defense Review, the continued development of the two-stage GBI was considered a hedge against the advancing threat. The committee notes that a two-stage variant of the Ground-based interceptor provides significant additional Homeland Defense performance and robustness against emerging threat capabilities by improving the battle space capability through shorter engagement times. The committee also understands the value of deploying a mixture of two-stage and three-stage GBIs to the existing GBI missile fields for enhanced Homeland Defense. The committee is concerned that the planned two-stage intercept flight test in 2014, FTG-08, will test a two-stage missile that cannot be operationally deployed. The committee directs the Missile Defense Agency to provide a briefing to the committee prior to FTG-08 detailing the improvements necessary, cost and feasibility, to test a two-stage missile that can be operationally deployed.

LOG 052 r1
(REVISION)

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1960
OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF
CALIFORNIA

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

1 **SEC. 31___. STUDY OF POTENTIAL REUSE OF NUCLEAR**
2 **WEAPON SECONDARIES.**

3 (a) STUDY.—Not later than 60 days after the date
4 of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Nu-
5 clear Security shall conduct a study of the potential reuse
6 of nuclear weapon secondaries that includes an assessment
7 of the potential for reusing secondaries in future life ex-
8 tension programs, including—

9 (1) a description of which secondaries could be
10 reused;

11 (2) the number of such secondaries available in
12 the stockpile as of the date of the study; and

13 (3) the number of such secondaries that are
14 planned to be available after such date as a result
15 of the dismantlement of nuclear weapons.

16 (b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study under sub-
17 section (a) shall include the following:

Lag 052r1

- 1 (1) The feasibility and practicability of potential
- 2 full or partial reuse options with respect to nuclear
- 3 weapon secondaries.
- 4 (2) The benefits and risks of reusing such
- 5 secondaries.
- 6 (3) A list of technical challenges that must be
- 7 resolved to certify aged materials under dynamic
- 8 loading conditions and the full stockpile-to-target se-
- 9 quence of weapons, including a program plan and
- 10 timeline for resolving such technical challenges and
- 11 an assessment of the importance of resolving out-
- 12 standing materials issues on certifying aged
- 13 secondaries.
- 14 (4) The potential costs and cost savings of such
- 15 reuse.
- 16 (5) The effects of such reuse on the require-
- 17 ments for secondaries manufacturing.
- 18 (6) An assessment of how such reuse affects
- 19 plans to build a responsive nuclear weapons infra-
- 20 structure.
- 21 (c) SUBMISSION.—Not later than March 1, 2014, the
- 22 Administrator shall submit to the congressional defense
- 23 committees the study under subsection (a).



AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1960
OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF
CALIFORNIA

At the appropriate place in subtitle F of title X, insert the following:

1 **SEC. 10__ . COST ESTIMATES FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS.**

2 Section 1043(a) of the National Defense Authoriza-
3 tion Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125
4 Stat. 1576), as amended by section 1041 of the National
5 Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public
6 Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1931), is amended—

7 (1) in paragraph (2)(F), by inserting “per-
8 sonnel,” after “maintenance,”; and

9 (2) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the pe-
10 riod at the end the following: “, including how and
11 which locations were counted”.



Amendment Offered by *Mr. Franks*

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

To be inserted in the appropriate place in the report:

Quarterly Reporting on Russian Non-Strategic Nuclear Weapon Deployments

The committee is aware that the Russian Federation is investing considerable resources to develop a new generation of long-range, sea-launched, land-attack cruise missiles capable of deploying nuclear or conventional warheads. Press reports indicate certain systems have ranges of as much as 2,500 kilometers. Press reports further indicate these systems may have already been deployed on attack and ballistic missile submarines of the Russian Federation. The committee is concerned that such cruise missiles may pose a threat to the United States, but are not limited under any arms control treaty. The committee believes there is little practical difference between so-called “strategic” and “non-strategic” nuclear weapons if used against the United States or its allies, yet one class is limited by treaty and the other class is completely unregulated.

The committee directs the Director, Defense Intelligence Agency to provide unclassified Semi-annual reports, with a classified annex if necessary, detailing the status of the development and deployment by the Russian Federation of nuclear weapons and associated delivery systems not subject to strategic arms control treaties. Such reports shall include status of deployment, numbers of deployed systems, expected employment doctrine, and status of training in the employment of such systems by the military forces of the Russian Federation. The committee directs the first such report to be provided not later than September 15, 2013 and not later than every 90 days thereafter until September 2016.

Log 08/r1

Amendment Offered by *Mr. Franks*

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

To be inserted in the appropriate place in the report:

Request for multi-year procurement authority for SM-3 Block IB beginning in FY15.

The Committee notes the successful FTM-19 flight test on May 16, 2013, which again demonstrated the robust design and performance of the SM-3 Block IB missile. With over \$4 billion programmed for this missile across the FYDP, the Committee strongly encourages the Department to request multi-year procurement authority for SM-3 Block IB beginning in FY15.

The Committee notes there could be saving in a multi-year procurement, such a contractual arrangement for SM-3 Block IB could yield savings equivalent to an entire additional year of production at current planned rates. The Department is directed to report to the Congressional Defense Committees by December 31, 2013 with a recommendation on whether SM-3 Block IB could use multi-year or advanced procurement authority beginning in Fiscal Year 2015. If such authorities are requested, an estimate of what cost savings would accrue shall be required.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1960
OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

At the appropriate place in subtitle C of title II, insert the following:

1 **SEC. 2** ____ . **NATO AND THE PHASED, ADAPTIVE APPROACH**
2 **TO MISSILE DEFENSE IN EUROPE.**

3 (a) **NATO FUNDING.**—

4 (1) **PHASE I OF EPAA.**—Not later than 60 days
5 after the date of the enactment of this Act, the
6 President shall consult with the North Atlantic
7 Council and the Secretary General of the North At-
8 lantic Treaty Organization (in this section referred
9 to as “NATO”) on—

10 (A) the funding of the phased, adaptive ap-
11 proach to missile defense in Europe; and

12 (B) establishing a plan for NATO to pro-
13 vide at least 50 percent of the infrastructure
14 and operations and maintenance costs of phase
15 I of the phased, adaptive approach to missile
16 defense in Europe.

17 (2) **PHASES II AND III OF EPAA.**—The Presi-
18 dent shall use the NATO Military Common-Funded
19 Resources process to seek to fund at least 50 per-

1 cent of the costs for phases II and III of the phased,
2 adaptive approach to missile defense in Europe.

3 (3) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after
4 the date of the enactment of this Act, and each 180-
5 day period thereafter, the President shall submit to
6 the congressional defense committees, the Committee
7 on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives,
8 and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Sen-
9 ate a report on the funding provided by NATO pur-
10 suant to paragraphs (1) and (2).

11 (b) INTERCEPTORS.—If the Secretary of Defense de-
12 termines that it is useful to the interests of the United
13 States, the Secretary shall seek to engage with members
14 of NATO to establish a NATO common pool of Aegis
15 standard missile–3 block IA, standard missile–3 block IB,
16 and standard missile–3 block IIA interceptors to defend
17 NATO members through the phased, adaptive approach
18 to missile defense in Europe.



LOG210 Revised 2
Log210r2

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1960

OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND

At the appropriate place in subtitle C of title II, add the following new section:

1. **SEC. 2 ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROCUREMENT OF CA-**
2 **PABILITY ENHANCEMENT II**
3 **EXOATMOSPHERIC KILL VEHICLE.**

4 It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of De-
5 fense should not procure a Capability Enhancement II
6 exoatmospheric kill vehicle for deployment until after the
7 date on which a successful operational flight test of the
8 Capability Enhancement II ground-based interceptor has
9 occurred unless such procurement is for test assets or to
10 maintain a warm line for the industrial base.



AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1960**OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN OF RHODE ISLAND**

At the appropriate place in subtitle C of title II, insert the following:

1 **SEC. 2** ____. **IMPROVEMENTS TO ACQUISITION ACCOUNT-**
2 **ABILITY REPORTS ON BALLISTIC MISSILE DE-**
3 **FENSE SYSTEM.**

4 (a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 225 of title 10, United
5 States Code, is amended—

6 (1) in subsection (b)(3)(A), by inserting “com-
7 prehensive” before “life-cycle”; and

8 (2) by adding at the end the following:

9 “(e) **QUALITY OF COST ESTIMATES.**—(1) The Direc-
10 tor shall ensure that each cost estimate included in an ac-
11 quisition baseline pursuant to subsection (b)(3) includes
12 all operation and support costs, regardless of funding
13 source, for which the Director is responsible.

14 “(2) In each such baseline submitted to the congres-
15 sional defense committees, the Director shall state wheth-
16 er the underlying cost estimates in such baseline meet the
17 criteria of the Comptroller General of the United States
18 to be considered a high-quality estimate. If the Director
19 states that such estimates do not meet such criteria, the

1 Director shall include in such baseline the actions, includ-
2 ing a schedule, that the Director plans to carry out for
3 the estimates to meet such criteria.”.

4 (b) REPORT.—Not later than February 15, 2014, the
5 Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to the
6 congressional defense committees a report of the plans and
7 schedule of the Director with respect to when the Director
8 will meet the quality and criteria of cost estimates re-
9 quired by section 225(e) of title 10, United States Code,
10 as added by subsection (a)(2).



AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1960
OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN OF COLORADO

At the appropriate place in subtitle C of title II, insert the following:

1 **SEC. 2 ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF**
2 **THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE.**

3 (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

4 (1) President Ronald Reagan in March 1983, in
5 a speech from the oval office, laid the corner stone
6 for a long-term research and development program
7 to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of eliminating
8 the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles.

9 (2) President Reagan stated, “I’ve become more
10 and more deeply convinced that the human spirit
11 must be capable of rising above dealing with other
12 nations and human beings by threatening their ex-
13 istence. . . What if free people could live secure in
14 the knowledge that their security did not rest upon
15 the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a So-
16 viet attack, that we could intercept and destroy stra-
17 tegic ballistic missiles before they reached our own
18 soil or that of our allies?”.

1 (3) The Strategic Defense Initiative, also
2 known as “Star Wars”, challenged the nation to ac-
3 complish the impossible by moving beyond the obvi-
4 ous possibilities of the day to set the United States
5 and our allies up for success.

6 (4) In 1999, the Ballistic Missile Defense Orga-
7 nization (BMDO), National Missile Defense (NMD)
8 prototype interceptor successfully demonstrated “hit-
9 to-kill” technology intercepting a modified Minute-
10 man intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM).

11 (5) Congress passed the National Missile De-
12 fense Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–38) (signed by
13 President Clinton), which stated, “It is the policy of
14 the United States to deploy, as soon as is techno-
15 logically possible, an effective National Missile De-
16 fense system capable of defending the territory of
17 the United States against limited ballistic missile at-
18 tack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or delib-
19 erate)”.

20 (6) On December 13, 2001, President George
21 W. Bush announced “I have concluded the ABM
22 treaty hinders our government’s ability to develop
23 ways to protect our people from future terrorist or
24 rogue state missile attacks”.

1 (7) Russian President Vladimir Putin said the
2 move was “not a threat to the security of the Rus-
3 sian Federation”.

4 (8) Since 2001, the United States has deployed
5 considerable Missile Defense capability: 30 ground-
6 based interceptors defending the continental U.S.
7 today; 32 Aegis BMD ships; 113 SM-3 IA intercep-
8 tors; 25 SM-3 IB interceptors; 3 THAAD batteries
9 and 89 interceptors; and 8 AN/TPY-2 forward-based
10 sensors.

11 (9) The United States has partnerships with 22
12 nations, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization
13 (NATO), for missile defense cooperation. Likewise,
14 India and South Korea are developing missile de-
15 fenses and the Russian Federation and People’s Re-
16 public of China are also developing and improving
17 missile defenses.

18 (10) Since 2001 when they began development,
19 United States missile defenses have had a test
20 record of 58 of 73 hit-to-kill intercept attempts and
21 have been successful across all programs of the inte-
22 grated system, including Aegis Ballistic Missile De-
23 fense (BMD), Ground-based Midcourse Defense
24 (GMD), Terminal High Altitude Area Defense
25 (THAAD), and PATRIOT Advanced Capability-3.

1 (11) In July of 2004, the United States missile
2 defense system was declared operational with limited
3 capability. Since that time, it has offered defense
4 against limited threats to the continental United
5 States.

6 (12) The United States has cooperatively devel-
7 oped with our Israeli allies a number of missile de-
8 fense systems including Arrow, Arrow 3 and David's
9 Sling, systems which will protector our Israeli allies
10 and contribute technology and expertise to U.S. sys-
11 tems.

12 (13) The United States in support of NATO
13 deployed a Patriot missile battery to defend the pop-
14 ulation and territory of Turkey and provide material
15 support for Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty
16 in the event of spillover from the Syrian civil war
17 and has deployed Phase I of the European Phased
18 Adaptive Approach, which includes a transportable
19 x-band radar array and an on-station AEGIS bal-
20 listic missile defense ship armed with Standard Mis-
21 sile 3 block IA missile interceptors.

22 (14) When United States territory, deployed
23 forces and allies were threatened by North Korean
24 ballistic missiles the United States had the oper-
25 ational capability and national will to deploy

1 THAAD units to Guam to provide a defensive
2 shield.

3 (15) The United States continues to work joint-
4 ly with Japan to improve the Navy Aegis Ballistic
5 Missile Defense (BMD) which in addition to pro-
6 viding missile defense in the Pacific is also a key-
7 stone in the Phased Adaptive Approach for Euro-
8 pean missile defense.

9 (16) On-going research and development under
10 the auspices of the Missile Defense Agency will con-
11 tinue to expand the technology envelope to deploy a
12 layered missile defense system capable of defending
13 the homeland, our military forces deployed overseas,
14 friendly nations and our allies against all ballistic
15 missiles from launch and orbit to reentry.

16 (17) A credible ballistic missile defense system
17 is critical to the national defense of the United
18 States.

19 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

20 (1) recognizes the inspiring leadership of Presi-
21 dent Ronald Reagan to “maintain the peace through
22 strength”;

23 (2) recognizes the enduring obligation President
24 as Commander in Chief to “ preserve, protect, and
25 defend the Constitution”;

1 (3) commemorates the vision of President
2 Reagan on the 30th anniversary of the Strategic De-
3 fense Initiative;

4 (4) believes that it is imperative that the United
5 States continue fielding a robust missile defense sys-
6 tem, including additional ground based interceptors;
7 and

8 (5) commits to supporting continued invest-
9 ments in future missile defense capabilities and
10 emerging technologies such as directed energy and
11 railguns.



Amendment Offered by Rep. Coffman

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

To be inserted in the appropriate place the report:

Report on HALT/HASS Testing of Ballistic Missile Defense Systems and Components

The Committee continues to be concerned by issues of reliability in the design and development of critical ballistic missile defense (BMD) system components and subcomponents as well as the potential for counterfeit parts to enter into the missile defense supply chain.

Effective utilization of modern methods and equipment for highly accelerated life testing and highly accelerated stress screening (HALT/HASS) during early design stages has been demonstrated to yield significant improvements in reliability and more effective product designs, as well as cost savings. Through modern HALT/HASS testing, key components and subcomponents are subjected to overstresses, revealing latent design flaws (including those based on the use of faulty or counterfeit parts) that can go undetected with legacy testing approaches.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency, to conduct an assessment of the value, feasibility, and cost of greater utilization of modern HALT/HASS testing equipment and processes to shorten design and development timelines, reduce system and component testing and lifecycle costs, and enhance reliability of critical missile defense systems and components. In addition, the assessment should consider whether and to what extent greater utilization of modern HALT/HASS testing equipment and processes could help address the growing problem of detecting and preventing the introduction of counterfeit parts into critical missile defense systems, components and subcomponents. Additionally, based on the findings of this assessment, the Director should provide the committees his recommendations regarding use of HALT/HAS. The committee directs that the results of this assessment be briefed to the defense authorization committees by not later than January 15, 2014.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1960
OFFERED BY Mr. Rogers

In section 4806(c) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act, as proposed to be inserted by section 3114(a) of the bill, strike paragraph (1) (and redesignate and conform the subsequent paragraph accordingly).

