

**En Bloc Amendments to H.R. 1735**  
**National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016**  
Wednesday, April 29, 2015

<b>Subcommittee on Strategic Forces</b> <b>En Bloc # 3</b>
---

<b>Log #</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Description</b>
138	Gabbard	Requiring the Missile Defense Agency to submit a plan to Congress for medium range ballistic missile defense sensor alternatives for the enhanced defense of Hawaii
162r1	Sanchez	Requires an analyses of alternatives to be conducted in accordance with best practices for capital asset projects, life extension programs of the NNSA, and capital asset projects relating to defense environmental management
165r1	Sanchez	Requests a study outlining an approach, including not only left-of-launch opportunities but also other non-kinetic means of defense in terms of U.S. missile defense strategy
178r1	Heck	Directs the Administrator of Nuclear Security to submit a project data sheet for the enhanced radiography project
278r1	Gabbard	The amendment would move the deadline for reassignment of the SBX homeport to Dec 31 2020 and require the Director of MDA to certify adequate missile defense coverage prior to the SBX homeport reassignment

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1735**  
**OFFERED BY MS. GABBARD OF HAWAII**

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

1 **SEC. 16 \_\_\_\_ . PLAN FOR MEDIUM RANGE BALLISTIC MISSILE**  
2 **DEFENSE SENSOR ALTERNATIVES FOR EN-**  
3 **HANCED DEFENSE OF HAWAII.**

4 (a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Con-  
5 gress that—

6 (1) expanding persistent midcourse and ter-  
7 minal ballistic missile defense system discrimination  
8 capability is critically important to the defense of  
9 the Nation;

10 (2) such discrimination capability is needed to  
11 respond to emerging ballistic missile threats involv-  
12 ing countermeasures and decoys; and

13 (3) the Department of Defense should take all  
14 appropriate steps to ensure Hawaii has adequate  
15 missile defense coverage.

16 (b) **EVALUATION AND PLAN.**—

17 (1) **EVALUATION.**—The Director of the Missile  
18 Defense Agency shall conduct an evaluation of po-  
19 tential options for fielding medium range ballistic

1 missile defense sensor alternatives for the defense of  
2 Hawaii, including—

3 (A) the use of the Aegis Ashore Missile  
4 Defense Test Complex land-based system at the  
5 Pacific Missile Range Facility in Hawaii;

6 (B) the use of existing sensor assets in the  
7 region; and

8 (C) other options the Director determines  
9 appropriate.

10 (2) SUBMITTAL OF PLAN.—Not later than 60  
11 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the  
12 Director shall submit to the congressional defense  
13 committees a plan for the missile defense of Hawaii,  
14 which shall include—

15 (A) a summary of the findings of the eval-  
16 uation conducted under paragraph (1);

17 (B) estimated acquisition and operating  
18 costs for each sensor option; and

19 (C) a timeline for deployment of the sen-  
20 sor.



Log 162r1

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1735**  
**OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF**  
**CALIFORNIA**

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

1 **SEC. 31\_\_\_ . USE OF BEST PRACTICES FOR CAPITAL ASSET**  
2 **PROJECTS AND NUCLEAR WEAPON LIFE EX-**  
3 **TENSION PROGRAMS.**

4 (a) ANALYSES OF ALTERNATIVES.—Not later than  
5 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the  
6 Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Adminis-  
7 trator for Nuclear Security, shall ensure that analyses of  
8 alternatives are conducted (including through contractors,  
9 as appropriate) in accordance with best practices for cap-  
10 ital asset projects and life extension programs of the Na-  
11 tional Nuclear Security Administration and capital asset  
12 projects relating to defense environmental management.

13 (b) COST ESTIMATES.—Not later than 30 days after  
14 the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in  
15 coordination with the Administrator, shall develop cost es-  
16 timates in accordance with cost estimating best practices  
17 for capital asset projects and life extension programs of  
18 the National Nuclear Security Administration and capital

1 asset projects relating to defense environmental manage-  
2 ment.

3 (c) REVISIONS TO DEPARTMENTAL PROJECT MAN-  
4 AGEMENT ORDER AND NUCLEAR WEAPON LIFE EXTEN-  
5 SION REQUIREMENTS.—As soon as practicable after the  
6 date of the enactment of this Act, but not later than two  
7 years after such date of enactment, the Secretary shall  
8 revise—

9 (1) the capital asset project management order  
10 of the Department of Energy to require the use of  
11 best practices for preparing cost estimates and for  
12 conducting analyses of alternatives for National Nu-  
13 clear Security Administration and defense environ-  
14 mental management capital asset projects; and

15 (2) the nuclear weapon life extension program  
16 procedures of the Department to require the use of  
17 use of best practices for preparing cost estimates  
18 and conducting analyses of alternatives for National  
19 Nuclear Security Administration life extension pro-  
20 grams.



Log 165 r1

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SANCHEZ  
HR 1735

At an appropriate place in the committee report, insert the following:

The committee notes the November 5, 2014, memo to the Secretary of Defense from the Chief of Naval Operations and Chief of Staff of the Army about the U.S. ballistic missile defense strategy and developing a long-term holistic approach that addresses homeland missile defense and regional missile defense priorities. The committee is aware that the memo stated that, “the recent Army-Navy Warfighter Talks highlighted the growing challenges associated with ballistic missile threats that are increasingly capable, continue to outpace our active defense systems, and exceed our Services' capacity to meet Combatant Commanders' demand.” The memo concluded that, “[o]ur present acquisition-based strategy is unsustainable in the current fiscal environment and favors forward deployment of assets in lieu of deterrence-based options to meet contingency demands,” and that, “[n]ow is the opportunity to develop a long-term approach... that is more sustainable and cost effective...to balance priorities, inform resourcing decisions and restore our strategic flexibility.”

The committee is aware that then-Secretary of Defense Hagel responded on February 4, 2015, that, “[d]uring last fall’s Strategic Portfolio Review (SPR), the Deputy’s Management Action Group (DMAG) reviewed the question of how to address the growing GCC demand for regional BMD forces. The DMAG concluded that our current national BMD policy is sound, but an update to the 2011 Joint Capability Mix (JCM) sufficiency study was needed to inform force requirements and related issues for the FY 2017 Program and Budget Review.”

The committee also notes that the “Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense: Vision 2020” was released by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on December 5, 2013, and stated, “the approach for [Integrated Air and Missile Defense] IAMD in 2020 will be balanced, taking into account a full range of opportunities including diplomacy, a robust approach to passive defense both left and right of enemy launch, electronic warfare, active defense, and increased cooperation with our friends and allies.”

The committee is also aware of several other ongoing reviews looking at regional ballistic missile defense and left-of-launch (including an additional review proposed in another section of this Act), but believes there is good reason to specifically focus on a number of the elements referenced in the memo by the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of Staff of the Army.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than December 1, 2015, a report outlining how the concepts outlined in the “Vision 2020” plan authored by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the memo authored by the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations in November 2014, are being implemented, including left-of-launch opportunities and non-kinetic means of defense. The report should include the Secretary and the Chairman’s evaluation of the feasibility and value of a missile defense strategy

that increasingly relies on left-of-launch and non-kinetic means of defense against ballistic missiles; an analysis of the cost-benefit for such an approach to complement current missile defense capabilities and strategy; a description of the programs involved in achieving such capability and the technology readiness levels of such programs if applicable, including projected costs to develop and deploy such capabilities; projected cost-savings; the acquisition strategy to develop and deploy such capabilities and an optimal timeline for their development and deployment; any impacts on force structure of the military departments; any impacts on the current ballistic missile defense strategy; and any related Department of Defense policy decisions in place or needed concerning the use of U.S. military options left-of-launch.

Log 178  
Revision  
Log 178r1

## Amendment Offered by Dr. Heck

### H.R. 1735—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016

In the appropriate place in the report, insert the following:

#### Advanced Radiography

The committee notes the fiscal year 2016 budget request justification materials for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) described a technology gap identified by the directors of the national security laboratories and the director of the Nevada National Security Site regarding NNSA's ability to assess the final stages of a nuclear weapon's primary implosion without nuclear explosive testing. The committee supports NNSA's initiative to fill this gap through the development of enhanced radiography for integrated subcritical plutonium experiments at NNSS and therefore reduce risks in scientific understanding necessary to design and certify future stockpile life extension programs.

However, the committee notes that NNSA has requested initial funding for this project but has not yet submitted a project data sheet for it, which would provide increased transparency on the project's multi-year cost and schedule. The committee understands that certain aspects of this project may require significant cutting-edge science and substantial research and development before implementation, but other, largely separate, portions of the project are focused on more standardized equipment and infrastructure improvements. The committee believes these latter aspects of this project, at least, should be accelerated and managed under a full or streamlined capital asset acquisition process under Department of Energy (DOE) Order 413.3B, "Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets." The committee believes that portions of the project requiring significant further technology maturation and research and development may, if the Administrator determines it appropriate, continue to be developed under other authorities.

The committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide the congressional defense committees, by September 1, 2015, a project data sheet in compliance with DOE Order 413.3B for part or all of the enhanced radiography project to enable transparency and accountability for this program. As always, the committee expects NNSA to follow a best practices acquisition approach for this project.



**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1735**  
**OFFERED BY MS. GABBARD OF HAWAII**

In section 1673—

(1) in subsection (a), strike “2019” and insert “2020”; and

(2) in subsection (b), strike “after” and insert “prior to”.

