

**En Bloc Amendments to H.R. 2810****Subcommittee on Readiness  
En Bloc #1**

<b>Log #</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>001</b>	Bordallo	Requires a briefing on the Guam Micronesian Kingfisher recovery habitat Memorandum of Agreement and specific impacts of that agreement.
<b>002</b>	Bordallo	Requires the Department of Defense to develop guidance regarding the use of the organic industrial base.
<b>010</b>	Scott	Directs the Air Force to brief the committee on the status of the Advanced Adversarial Air Training Program.
<b>017</b>	Larsen	Directs the Director of the Defense Contract Management Agency to brief the committee on compliance with the Department of Defense item unique identification policy.
<b>037r1</b>	Cook	Requires the Secretary of Defense to report on mutually beneficial infrastructure projects between military bases and local municipalities.
<b>038</b>	Shuster	Clarifies that nothing in this year's NDAA can be construed as authorizing a Base Realignment and Closure round.
<b>040</b>	Bordallo	Withholds 25% of funds of the Office of Secretary of the Navy until a request for proposal for a dry dock in the Western Pacific has been issued.
<b>047r1</b>	Tsongas	Authorizes the Secretary of the Army to sell and convey three plots of land in Massachusetts and use the proceeds to fund military family housing and other supporting facilities.
<b>106</b>	Coffman	Directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on each military service's existing process for stationing, basing and laydown decisions.
<b>108</b>	Coffman	Directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing on the potential of using additional military installation ranges for Counter-Unmanned Aerial Systems testing and training.

## **Amendment to H.R. 2810 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018**

**Offered by: Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Guam**

In the appropriate place in the report to accompany H.R. 2810, insert the following new Directive Report Language:

### **Guam Micronesian Kingfisher Recovery Habitat**

The committee is aware that the Department of the Navy and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) on June 11, 2015 regarding the conservation of the Guam Micronesian kingfisher. The committee notes that this MOA was put in place to support the relocation of U.S. Marines to Guam as well as to ensure a sufficient amount of suitable survival recovery habitat is conserved and managed for the reintroduction and recovery of the Guam Micronesian kingfisher. Under the MOA, 5,234 acres of land under the control of the Department of Defense was identified and designated for enhanced management activity to ensure the continued suitability of the recovery habitat until such time as the species can be reintroduced on Guam. The committee notes that this MOA was signed by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy, as the Department of the Navy serves as the executive agent for installation management for Joint Region Marianas. However, the committee is concerned about the potential impacts this MOA may have on current and future military infrastructure development, training, and operational requirements on Guam as well as the limitations unrelated to the Department of Defense that affect the feasibility of reintroduction of the species. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 30, 2017, regarding the near- and long-term operational impacts of the MOA. At minimum, the briefing should address land use needs at Andersen Air Force Base, impacts on the operations master plan for future mission growth, any identified property deemed potentially in conflict with current land designations, and any other relevant information.

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2810**  
**OFFERED BY MS. BORDALLO OF GUAM**

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

1 **SEC. 3** . **GUIDANCE REGARDING USE OF ORGANIC IN-**  
2 **DUSTRIAL BASE.**

3       The Secretary of the Army shall maintain the arse-  
4 nals with sufficient workloads to ensure affordability and  
5 technical competence in all critical capability areas by es-  
6 tablishing, not later than 90 days after the enactment of  
7 this Act, clear, step-by-step, prescriptive guidance on the  
8 process for conducting make-or-buy analyses, including  
9 the use of the organic industrial base.



## Amendment to H.R. 2810 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018

**Offered by: Rep. Austin Scott (GA-08)**

In the appropriate place in the report to accompany H.R. 2810, insert the following new Directive Report Language:

### Advanced Adversarial Air Training Program

The committee notes that the Air Force testified it is at its lowest state of full-spectrum readiness in its history, particularly when confronting near-peer adversaries. The Air Force has publicly stated its need for contracted adversarial air support. The committee is concerned about the disparity between the significance that senior Air Force leadership assigns to increase combat pilot training and the lack of budgetary and programmatic attention to addressing it. The fiscal year 2018 Air Force budget approach delays the entrance of new combat pilot training capabilities not currently available to the Air Force. Specifically, the current adversarial air training capability flies subsonic, single engine aircraft that address a portion of lower-end training requirements; it does not address supersonic training, which U.S. pilots will face when engaging near-peer adversaries.

In the absence of commercially supplied supersonic adversarial air capability, the Air Force will continue to rely on front-line aircraft and pilots to meet this need, which the committee notes is expensive, reduces the life of the fleet, and takes pilots away from practicing their intended missions.

The committee believes the Air Force should move aggressively to meet the adversarial air combat training requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2017, on the status of near-peer training utilizing advanced adversarial air capabilities.

**Amendment to H.R. 2810  
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018**

**Offered by Mr. Larsen of Washington**

In the appropriate place in the report to accompany H.R. 2810, insert the following new Directive Report Language:

**Improving Asset Tracking and In-Transit Visibility**

The Committee is supportive of the Department of Defense's ongoing efforts to improve asset tracking and in-transit visibility. The Committee supports the goal of enhancing asset visibility through item-unique identification (IUID) and automatic identification technology/automatic identification and data capture processes because this initiative can help improve readiness, reduce waste, and increase oversight. However, the Committee remains concerned with the Department's compliance with its own IUID policy as issued in 2015 in Department of Defense Instruction 8320.04 and believes that writing requirements into contracts fosters compliance with the IUID policy. The Committee is also concerned that a briefing requirement on this subject from the FY 17 NDAA has not yet been delivered, and expects to receive this briefing in a timely manner. Additionally, the Committee directs the Director of the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) to brief the Committee not later than December 1, 2017 on the DCMA's plan to foster the adoption, implementation, and verification of the revised IUID policy across the Department and the defense industrial base.

**Amendment to H.R. 2810**  
**National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018**

**Offered by: Mr. Cook of California**

In the appropriate place in the report to accompany H.R. 2810, insert the following new Directive Report Language:

Wastewater Treatment Infrastructure

The committee notes that the budget request includes a number of military construction projects to provide potable water and wastewater treatment infrastructure to support military installations. The committee notes that the military departments have leveraged existing authorities to enter into intergovernmental support agreements with local municipalities as well as utilizing the Utility Privatization authorities to provide utility services to military installations. The committee has been supportive of the use of these authorities, and notes that they provide opportunities for military installations and neighboring communities to work together to provide mutually beneficial utility services in a more efficient and cost-effective manner. The committee believes that in certain cases, it may be in the interest of the military installation to enter into mutually beneficial agreements with local municipalities to provide utility services, to include water and wastewater. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the secretaries of the military departments, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 30, 2018. At minimum, the briefing shall address the process used to identify utility infrastructure investments required to support a military installation, how the development of those requirements is coordinated with local municipalities, and how the Department makes a determination to carry out a military construction project or enter into an agreement with a local municipality or private partner to meet the installation's requirement.

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2810**

**OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER OF PENNSYLVANIA**

Add at the end of title XXVII the following new section:

1 **SEC. 2702. PROHIBITION ON CONDUCTING ADDITIONAL**  
2 **BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE (BRAC)**  
3 **ROUND.**

4 Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize  
5 an additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)  
6 round.



**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2810**  
**OFFERED BY MS. BORDALLO OF GUAM**

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

1 **SEC. 10\_\_\_ . RESTRICTION ON USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS**  
2 **PENDING SOLICITATION OF BIDS FOR WEST-**  
3 **ERN PACIFIC DRY DOCK.**

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

6 (1) Following closure of the Department of the  
7 Navy ship repair facility in Guam in 1997 following  
8 the Base Realignment and Closure round of 1995,  
9 operation of the facility was turned over to a private  
10 company.

11 (2) While streamlining operations, resulting in  
12 savings to the Navy of approximately \$38,000,000  
13 each year, the company was able to maintain the  
14 depot-level capabilities of the facility with dry-dock-  
15 ing capability that had existed in Apra Harbor since  
16 World War II.

17 (3) From 1997 to 2012, the private operator  
18 successfully performed 28 major overhauls with dry-  
19 dockings of Navy, Military Sealift Command, and



1 Coast Guard vessels, 27 mid-term availabilities, as  
2 well as the emergency dry-docking of USS San  
3 Francisco (SSN-711) after the nuclear powered sub-  
4 marine collided with a seamount off the coast of  
5 Guam in 2005.

6 (4) While the privately owned dry-dock, Ma-  
7 chinist, was undergoing upgrades and refurbishment  
8 in 2013, the Navy announced that it would split the  
9 long-standing depot-level capability in Guam into  
10 two pieces, awarding an initial contract for pier-side  
11 ship repair, to be followed by a contract for dry-dock  
12 ship repair.

13 (5) At this time, the Committee on Armed  
14 Services of the House of Representatives, including  
15 the Delegate from Guam, as well as the Governor of  
16 Guam, objected to this plan, and a conditional  
17 agreement was made wherein the Navy committed to  
18 restoring dry-docking capabilities expeditiously fol-  
19 lowing issuance of the pier-side contract.

20 (6) Despite repeated requests from the Com-  
21 mittee on Armed Services of the House of Rep-  
22 resentatives, the Delegate from Guam, and the Gov-  
23 ernor of Guam over the past four years, the Sec-  
24 retary of the Navy has failed to issue the dry-dock  
25 contract.

1           (7) The Navy conducted a business case anal-  
2           ysis to assess options for a dry-docking capability in  
3           Guam in 2014 and agreed to provide a copy of the  
4           report to Congress upon completion. The draft busi-  
5           ness case analysis was provided to the Committee on  
6           Armed Services of the House of Representatives on  
7           March 3, 2016, but a final document was not pro-  
8           duced.

9           (8) The draft business case analysis evaluated  
10          200 potential options for restoring a dry-docking ca-  
11          pability in Guam, recommending seven potential  
12          courses of action, with estimated costs ranging from  
13          \$324,000,000 to \$398,000,000 over a 50-year life  
14          cycle. The business case analysis concluded that any  
15          of these options are significant savings when com-  
16          pared with the cost of not having a dry-docking ca-  
17          pability in Guam, which exceeds \$700,000,000 over  
18          a 50-year period.

19          (9) The Navy has removed machinery and  
20          equipment needed to perform major overhauls from  
21          the former ship repair facility, and shifted ship re-  
22          pair work previously performed in Guam to various  
23          foreign locations in the Western Pacific. The total  
24          cost of Navy ship repair contracts in Guam have

1       gone from \$45,00,000 in 2010 to \$16,000,000 in  
2       2016.

3           (10) As a result of Navy actions over the past  
4       five years, the number of skilled workers engaged in  
5       ship repair in Guam has been reduced from a com-  
6       bined total of approximately 550 at three ship-repair  
7       companies in Guam to the current level of 150. Due  
8       to this degraded workforce and equipment capabili-  
9       ties, the Navy is now forced to rely almost exclu-  
10      sively on foreign ship repair instead at a time when  
11      the Committee believes tensions and threats of crisis  
12      in the Western Pacific can put access to foreign  
13      shipyards at risk.

14           (11) Navy leadership has long acknowledged  
15      the importance of a depot-level, dry-docking capa-  
16      bility in Guam, as evidenced by the following:

17           (A) “Robust depot-level ship repair capa-  
18      bility in Guam is a matter of strategic impor-  
19      tance and remains an operational necessity be-  
20      cause ships of the 7th Fleet have high oper-  
21      ational tempo and experience vast distances be-  
22      tween repair facilities.” (Letter from the Com-  
23      mander of the Pacific Fleet to the Governor of  
24      Guam, dated February 15, 2013).

1 (B) “We must maintain a viable ship  
2 maintenance capability in Guam to include dry-  
3 docking in support of operations and contin-  
4 gency plans (OPLANs and CONPLANs) and  
5 the U.S. Navy rebalance to the Pacific. Guam  
6 is a strategic in-theater location for depot-level  
7 ship maintenance on sovereign U.S. territory.  
8 This is a significant factor given that commer-  
9 cial dry docks available in foreign countries con-  
10 sidered friendly to the United States may be-  
11 come unavailable to SEVENTH Fleet ships in  
12 time of crisis or war. Availability of CPF ships  
13 would be stressed if assets are required to dry  
14 dock in CONUS due to the non-availability of  
15 a secure dry docking capability in the Western  
16 Pacific. Dry-docking in Guam is a critical com-  
17 ponent of depot-level ship repair. The capability  
18 must be maintained and regularly exercised so  
19 that a capability and expertise are available to  
20 support ships of the SEVENTH Fleet in peace  
21 and war.” (Letter from the Commander of the  
22 Pacific Fleet to the Chief of Naval Operations,  
23 dated February 7, 2014).

24 (C) On February 24, 2016, in testimony  
25 before the Committee on Armed Services of the

1 House of Representatives, Admiral Harry Har-  
2 ris, Commander of the United States Pacific  
3 Command, affirmed that he continues to view  
4 robust ship repair capabilities as a matter of  
5 strategic importance and an operational priority  
6 for United States Pacific Fleet.

7 (12) The Navy currently has four fast-attack  
8 nuclear submarines homeported in Guam.

9 (13) The Navy homeports submarine squadrons  
10 at seven locations in the United States, each of  
11 which has a dry-docking capability, with the excep-  
12 tion of Guam.

13 (14) The Committee on Armed Services of the  
14 House of Representatives believes that dry-docking  
15 capability in Guam is a strategic requirement and a  
16 cost-effective means of ensuring the Forward De-  
17 ployed Fleet has depot-level repair capabilities at a  
18 United States port in the Western Pacific.

19 (15) Amounts were authorized to be appro-  
20 priated in the National Defense Authorization Act  
21 for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) and ap-  
22 propriated in the Consolidated Appropriations Act,  
23 2017 (Public Law 115-31) for funds be applied to  
24 chartering a dry dock to meet fleet maintenance re-  
25 quirements in the Western Pacific.

1           (b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Not more than  
2 75 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated or  
3 otherwise made available for the Office of the Secretary  
4 of the Navy may be obligated or expended until the Sec-  
5 retary submits to Congress notice that a request for pro-  
6 posals has been issued to solicit bids for the chartering  
7 of a dry dock in the Western Pacific that satisfies the min-  
8 imum requirements for heavy ship depot-level repair.



**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2810****OFFERED BY Ms. TSONGAS OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Insert at the appropriate place in title XXVIII the following new section:

1 **SEC. 28** \_\_\_\_ . **LAND CONVEYANCE, NATICK SOLDIER SYS-**  
2 **TEMS CENTER, MASSACHUSETTS.**

3 (a) **CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of  
4 the Army may sell and convey all right, title, and interest  
5 of the United States in and to parcels of real property,  
6 consisting of approximately 98 acres and improvements  
7 thereon, located in the vicinity of Hudson, Wayland, and  
8 Needham, Massachusetts, that are the sites of military  
9 family housing supporting military personnel assigned to  
10 the United States (U.S.) Army Natick Soldier Systems  
11 Center.

12 (b) **COMPETITIVE SALE REQUIREMENT.**—The Sec-  
13 retary shall use competitive procedures for the sale author-  
14 ized by subsection (a).

15 (c) **CONSIDERATION.**—

16 (1) **CONSIDERATION REQUIRED.**—The Sec-  
17 retary shall require as consideration for conveyance  
18 under subsection (a), tendered by cash payment, an  
19 amount equal to no less than the fair market value,

1 as determined by the Secretary, of the real property  
2 and any improvements thereon.

3 (2) CASH PAYMENTS.—

4 (A) CASH PAYMENTS DEPOSITED IN A SPE-  
5 CIAL ACCOUNT.—Cash payments provided as  
6 consideration under this subsection shall be de-  
7 posited in a special account in the Treasury es-  
8 tablished for the Secretary.

9 (B) USE OF FUNDS IN SPECIAL AC-  
10 COUNT.—The Secretary is authorized to use  
11 funds deposited in the special account estab-  
12 lished under subparagraph (A) for—

13 (i) demolition of existing military fam-  
14 ily housing on the U.S. Army Natick Sol-  
15 dier Systems Center (other than housing  
16 on property conveyed under subsection (a))  
17 that the Secretary determines necessary to  
18 accommodate construction of military fam-  
19 ily housing or unaccompanied soldier hous-  
20 ing to support military personnel assigned  
21 to the U.S. Army Natick Soldier Systems  
22 Center;

23 (ii) construction or rehabilitation of  
24 military family housing or unaccompanied  
25 soldier housing to support military per-



1                   sonnel assigned to the U.S. Army Natick  
2                   Soldier Systems Center; or

3                   (iii) construction of ancillary sup-  
4                   porting facilities (as that term is defined in  
5                   section 2871(1) of title 10, United States  
6                   Code) to support military personnel as-  
7                   signed to the U.S. Army Natick Soldier  
8                   Systems Center.

9                   (C) CASH CONSIDERATION NOT USED  
10                  PRIOR TO OCTOBER 1, 2025.—Cash payments  
11                  provided as consideration under this subsection  
12                  that are received by the Secretary and not used  
13                  by the Secretary for purposes authorized by  
14                  subparagraph (B) prior to October 1, 2025,  
15                  shall be transferred to an account in the Treas-  
16                  ury established pursuant to section 2883 of title  
17                  10, United States Code.

18                  (d) DESCRIPTION OF PARCELS.—The exact acreage  
19                  and legal description of the parcels to be conveyed under  
20                  subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey that is sat-  
21                  isfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be  
22                  borne by the recipient of the parcels.

23                  (e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The  
24                  Secretary may require such additional terms and condi-  
25                  tions in connection with the conveyance under subsection

1 (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the  
2 interests of the United States.

3 (f) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF  
4 LAW.—The conveyance of property under this section  
5 shall not be subject to section 2696 of title 10, United  
6 States Code.

7 (g) DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.—In this section the  
8 term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Army.



**Amendment to H.R. 2810  
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018**

**Offered by: Representative Mike Coffman**

In the appropriate place in the report to accompany H.R. 2810, insert the following new Directive Report Language:

**Aircraft Stationing, Basing, and Laydown Process**

The committee believes that the military departments' selection process for stationing, basing, and laydown decisions for units and missions should be transparent, repeatable, and defensible in nature. This includes transparency during the initial evaluation of basing criteria at the installation level. While the military departments each have their own unique requirements that may require variations in their stationing, basing, and laydown decisions, the committee notes that the capacity of a military installation, its associated training areas, and their ability to support mission requirements remain the primary drivers in the process. The committee believes this emphasis on mission requirements and capacity is appropriate and believes that continued engagement with the congressional defense committees at multiple points throughout each of the military services' stationing, basing, and laydown processes is critical.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2018, on each military service's existing process for stationing, basing, and laydown decisions for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter. Specifically, the report should detail how the current selection criteria take into consideration elements such as capacity, availability, and access to training areas and whether military requirements may drive changes to the criteria for future stationing, basing, or laydown decisions. The report shall address how each military service assesses the importance of having immediate access to training areas and how each service accounts for the impact of weather at the training areas. Finally, the report shall also address how current basing criteria consider the capacity, availability, and access to training areas in support of the other services or to host joint exercises to fully utilize the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter's capabilities when making their basing decision.

## Amendment to H.R. 2810 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018

**Offered by: Representative Mike Coffman**

In the appropriate place in the report to accompany H.R. 2810, insert the following new Directive Report Language:

### Counter-UAS Briefing

The committee believes that the importance of counter-unmanned aerial systems (C-UAS) will continue to increase due to the proliferating threat of commercially available and homemade hostile unmanned aerial systems used for reconnaissance and as flying IEDs.

The committee is concerned that there is a shortage of C-UAS range space in the United States. Currently, there is only one site where test and training activities can take place, which is at the Army's Yuma Proving Ground in Arizona. The committee notes it is important that training locations have sufficient contiguous and unimpeded ground and air space so that radio frequency jamming, directed energy, and kinetic capabilities can be utilized without concern for impact outside of the range.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services no later than December 1, 2017, on the potential of using additional military installation ranges for C-UAS testing and training. To address this critical need, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to consider a number of additional sites that could be used for the testing and training of C-UAS capabilities.