

consideration of H.R. 2810, pursuant to House Resolution 431, amendment No. 88 printed in part B of House Report 115-212 may be considered out of sequence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 431 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2810.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1920

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. MITCHELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to bring before the House H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. It was reported favorably by the House Armed Services Committee at 11:59 p.m. on June 28, 2017, by a vote of 60-1. Now, that vote is an indication of the bipartisan support that exists to support our troops and to fulfill our obligations placed on us by the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is always helpful for us to remind ourselves of the authority by which we undertake our responsibilities. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution says that Congress has the power and the responsibility "to raise and support Armies. . . . To provide and maintain a Navy; To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of land and naval Forces," and, of course, "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers."

The members of our committee and our staff take those responsibilities very seriously. This year, we seek to

carry them out in a world which is as dangerous and complex as any of us have ever seen. One example from the news of the day is the alarming progress North Korea is making towards having an intercontinental ballistic missile that can carry nuclear weapons to our homeland.

Now, we have, of course, a number of tools to use, including diplomacy and sanctions, but there is no substitute for military power, and I believe we must develop and deploy more of it to be ready to deal with these growing threats.

So the bill before us today substantially increases money for missile defense so we are more capable of protecting our homeland against those ballistic missiles. It also increases funding for key munitions and for intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance so we can have better visibility on what adversary is doing.

It increases the end strength for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, just as they requested. And it funds more joint exercises with key allies in the Pacific. It boosts our shipbuilding budget to get more ships into the water faster, and also cheaper.

So, just as an example, Mr. Chairman, each of those items is important for dealing with this growing threat coming from North Korea, and we could sit here and go through a similar sort of discussion when it comes to Iran, or the provocative actions of Russia and China, or the terrorist organizations of various shades.

Of course, we cannot guarantee that the capabilities that we will vote on in this bill will be available by the time the crisis comes for, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, we are still dealing with defense budgets that were cut by more than 20 percent at a time when the threats around the world were growing. So we can't guarantee that these capabilities will be available when we need them.

But what we can guarantee is, if we don't fund these things now, they will not be available when we need them, so that is the priority given to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, exactly 1 month ago, on June 12, Secretary Mattis and Chairman Dunford testified before our committee. And I would like to read just one paragraph of the Secretary's testimony where he was comparing what the military was like when he left it and when he came back as Secretary.

Secretary Mattis testified: "Four years later, I returned to the Department and I have been shocked by what I have seen with our readiness to fight. For all the heartache caused by the loss of our troops during these wars, no enemy in the field has done more harm to the readiness of our military than sequestration. We have sustained our ability to meet America's commitments abroad because our troops have stoically shouldered a much greater burden."

Four years later, shocked, more harm by sequestration than the enemies in the field, and it is only because our folks are so incredible that they have born an increasing burden. That is what the Secretary testified.

Mr. Chairman, we have, indisputably, the finest military in the world, but it is also indisputable that it has been severely damaged by continuing resolutions, by sequestration, and by failure of the executive and legislative branches to adequately support the men and women out there on the front lines. We have an urgent need to begin to repair and rebuild our military.

And I also believe, Mr. Chairman, it is fundamentally wrong to send men and women out on dangerous missions without providing them the best equipment, in the best shape, with the best training that our country can possibly provide. This bill, if followed by matching appropriation, takes a significant step toward meeting that objective, to support those troops.

It also makes major reforms in the way the Pentagon does business. Among other reforms, it enables the military to buy commercial products through online sites such as Amazon, Staples, and Grainger. We require life cycle maintenance costs to be considered at the beginning of a program, as must intellectual property rights, to maximize competition in the maintenance and repairs. Oversight into service contracts has increased, and there is much more, of course, in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the vehicle by which we usually, for 55 years, at least, fulfill our responsibilities under the Constitution that I mentioned, to provide for the common defense. I believe that is the first job of the Federal Government.

I want to just express my appreciation to each of the members of our committee. Each of them has contributed to the product before us. Each of them takes their responsibilities under the Constitution very seriously; no one more so than the Ranking Member, Mr. SMITH of Washington. We don't always agree on the judgment calls about issues, but I have no doubt that he and all the members of the committee try to do what is right for the country and put the interests of our troops first.

That is exactly the attitude that we must follow, I think, on the floor over the next 3 days as we go through the amendments which we will consider.

I also want to express appreciation to the committee and personal staff who have worked on this bill.

It has been a challenging year for a variety of reasons, but, as I started, I will finish. I am proud of this product. I hope it will gain the support of the entire House.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I thank the chairman, first of all, for his hard work on this bill, and all the members of the committee and the staff. As the chairman has pointed out, this is a bill that we have passed for 55 straight years. It is a long and complicated bill that essentially sets the defense and national security policy for our country, and there is a lot of good work that has gone into this bill.

Again, I thank the members for doing that. They recognize the complex threat environment that the chairman correctly described, and we are attempting to address it as best we can in this very difficult environment.

I think the thing that is most difficult that I really want to emphasize is what the chairman said in the middle of his remarks: that over the past 6 years we have had one government shutdown, a number of continuing resolutions, several threatened government shutdowns, and the unpredictability that that has presented to the Defense Department.

Now, to be clear, it has also presented a fair amount—the same amount of unpredictability to the non-defense discretionary budget that also has to deal with those challenges. But that uncertainty about our budget has made it very difficult to plan, and nowhere is that more important than at the Department of Defense.

□ 1930

As they try to lay out a strategy for national security, not knowing from one month to the next how much money you are going to have or what you are going to be able to spend it on is a huge problem. I will say a little bit more about this later, because as big a problem as that is, we haven't solved it.

As we debate this bill here today, we do not have a budget resolution from either the House or the Senate. This is a problem we still need to work on. However much money we wind up spending on defense, if we had a cohesive plan and a clear idea of how much money we were going to have over the next few years, it would be a lot easier to plan for those contingencies.

Again, I do want to compliment the work that has been done on this bill. Particularly, I focus a lot on unconventional threats. I think that is the changing nature of the world. I used to chair what is now called the Emerging Threats Committee. I want to thank Congresswoman STEFANIK and Ranking Member LANGEVIN for their work and focusing on cyber, focusing on supporting our special operation forces that have borne so much of the brunt of the fight that we face in countering terrorism.

I also want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member COOPER for their work on the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, focusing on space, in particular, on the importance of em-

phasizing that. For a long time, our country dominated space. We didn't have to worry about it. But now a lot of other countries are catching up and competing with us. I think this bill reflects the importance of that.

So there are a lot of very solid things in this bill, but I want to close by emphasizing two significant problems that we still need to address.

One I mentioned already. We don't have a budget resolution. This bill has \$621 billion in it, as I understand it, in the base bill, and another, I believe, \$75 billion in the overseas contingency fund. We are spending nearly \$700 billion in this bill on defense. That is a lot of money, and the chairman mentioned a lot of the very necessary programs that it is going towards. However, that breaks the budget caps.

In order to break the budget caps, the House and the Senate have to vote to break the budget caps. It is July. We haven't done that. I will emphasize that in the Senate it actually requires 60 votes to break the budget caps.

So as much as I see the need in defense, given the complex threat environment out there, it is very possible that \$72 billion of what is in this bill is going to disappear between now and the end of this year unless we address the broader issue of sequestration and budget caps.

I will also emphasize that addressing that issue by gutting funding for the nondefense discretionary budget and plugging up defense is not going to work for a couple of reasons.

Number one, a lot of the national security needs that we have come out of some of those other items. The proposal to cut the State Department by 31 percent in a time when we face the complex threat environment that was described is ridiculous. In fact, I will quote Chairman Mattis as well, who said:

If you are going to cut the State Department by 30 percent, you better give me five more divisions because I am going to need them. We are not going to be able to resolve conflicts in a peaceful way.

And also, of course, we have domestic needs that are very important as well. We are still waiting on the infrastructure package from the administration.

There are a lot of needs that are not being met, and we are not yet voting to bust the budget caps. Here we have a bill that does that, but this House has to step up and take that vote if this defense authorizing bill is going to go forward.

The second and final point, we still don't have a national security strategy from the White House. Now, we have a very complex threat environment, as I have said more often than I meant to during the course of the last few minutes—we do. We have got Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, a variety of terrorist threats. What we have heard in our committee for the last 6 months

is a series of people from the Pentagon coming over and saying the house is on fire. We don't have enough money to do—fill in the blank. There are a whole lot of different things.

What we haven't heard is a strategy, and the most disturbing conversation I had in that regard was with someone from the Office of Net Assessment.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

He explained to me that we laid out a strategy in 2012 and said we do not have the money to fund that strategy right now. So I asked him: Well, how short are you? How much more money do you need?

He looked at me like he didn't understand what I was asking, so I sort of explained it. The short answer: he didn't know.

How could he not know? I mean, if you can sit there confidently and say, "My gosh, we don't have enough money; we are way crazy short of our 2012 strategy" and you still can't say how short, then you don't have a strategy. We need a strategy to make sure this money is spent wisely.

I will close with a compliment of the chairman for something that he has done. We should also not assume that simply spending more money at the Department of Defense is necessarily going to make us safer. We have to make sure we spend it efficiently and effectively. I think this bill has a lot of very solid efforts to try to make us do that, towards acquisition reform, towards spending the money more wisely.

It is not just a matter of spending more money. We have got to spend it smarter, and we have got to confront the lack of a strategy, and we have got to confront the fact that we still have not resolved our budget resolution problem.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the House Armed Services Committee chairman, MAC THORNBERRY, for his determined leadership to promote peace through strength. I am grateful to support H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

First of all, I would like to thank my colleague and ranking member, Congresswoman MADELEINE BORDALLO of Guam, for her tireless efforts and participation in this process, and I also thank the Readiness Subcommittee members of the House Armed Services Committee on both sides of the aisle for bipartisan input on this bill. The creation of the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act truly was bipartisan.

Mr. Chairman, over the past several months, we have heard testimony from every military service branch about their urgent need to address the alarming readiness shortfalls. Their testimonies were sobering, confirming Congress must take bold action.

Here today, we have the responsibility of reducing the risk to our servicemembers by making sure they are well trained, supported, and that the equipment they use is properly maintained and combat ready. There are numerous important readiness provisions in the authorization, including adding over \$2 billion to long-neglected facilities sustainment and restoration and modernization accounts.

It gives the Department of Defense more responsive facility construction, repair, and real estate authorities for more efficient use of DOD resources.

It extends multiple temporary hiring authorities to allow the Department of Defense to fill critical manpower gaps, in particular at our defense industrial facilities—our depots, arsenals, and shipyards.

None of the readiness provisions are arbitrary. They are specifically targeted to stop and, as much as possible, to reverse the decline of the readiness of our Armed Forces so we can continue to combat and deter the threats to national security from around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, and encourage my colleagues in the House to support it as well.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, two weeks ago, the Armed Services Committee advanced the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 to the House floor with broad bipartisan support. I would like to thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their work in developing this year's bill.

I would also like to thank Congressman TURNER, chairman of the Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking member, for his leadership and spirit of bipartisan support this year.

This year's bill includes investments to fill genuine readiness needs and funding that is critical to ensuring that our men and women in uniform have the best cutting-edge resources and best equipment possible to keep them safe when defending our Nation.

I was encouraged that the bill we have passed out of committee directs the Defense Department to provide specific updates and reports on a number of programs and platforms so that we can robustly conduct our oversight re-

sponsibility on behalf of the American people.

However, as we consider the bill on the floor today and in the coming days, I remain concerned about how we fund these needs. Substantial budget increases for the Department of Defense at the expense of other vital national programs undermines investments in our national competitiveness and the future of our country and, I believe, makes us less secure over the long term.

Providing our men and women in uniform with the resources they need to carry out their mission is one of our most solemn obligations, but we must also fund these resources responsibly in order to safeguard our economic vitality and our national security.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

I have the privilege of serving as the chairman of the Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee, and I want to particularly thank my subcommittee's ranking member, Ms. TSONGAS, for her support in completing the markup of the bill, as well as for her hard work and for the bipartisan work that we have done together on the issue of sexual assault in the military. I appreciate her leadership in that.

I strongly support this bill and can't emphasize enough Chairman THORNBERRY's steadfast leadership in raising the top line in this bill. This bill recommends \$631 billion, a significant and needed increase over the original budget request that supports both the base and unfunded requirements, which totaled over \$30 billion. Without Chairman THORNBERRY's leadership, this number would not be sufficient.

We are presenting a budget that helps rebuild the readiness of our forces. This increased base funding will begin to rebuild full-spectrum readiness from years of deferred modernization brought on by the previous administration.

Within the Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee jurisdiction, this bill authorizes over \$12 billion in additional funds to address critical unfunded modernization requirements identified by the services.

The bill recognizes the importance of land forces in current and future operations and authorizes over \$2 billion to accelerate armored brigade team modernization, to include additional Abrams tanks and Bradley fighting vehicles.

The bill addresses strike fighter capability and capacity shortfalls and authorizes another \$2 billion in additional funding to secure additional F-35

Strike Fighters and F-18 Super Hornets to address unfunded requirements for the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps.

I am also pleased that this bill supports the European Deterrence Initiative, using OCO and addressing the needs of our European allies.

This bill contains language from the BE HEARD sexual assault bill that I worked with Representative TSONGAS on, that we introduced in June, and I am very proud that we continue to advance for the cause of protecting our servicemembers from sexual assault.

I am also pleased to note that Evan's Law is included in this bill. This bill will ensure that the that Department of Defense implements military residential window safety measures to protect against unintentional falls by young children.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO), ranking member of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member SMITH, and the committee staff who have worked many long nights on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

While there are very real questions about the top line number, and I believe it would be inappropriate and reckless to have any additional funding come off the backs of nondefense spending, this is an important step forward in rebuilding our military readiness.

This bill includes additional operations and maintenance funding to support more combat training center rotations and needed investment in the facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization accounts, providing more training opportunities and better maintenance facilities to live, work, and operate in. However, readiness cannot be bought back in a year, and these targeted investments must continue.

Furthermore, the bill provides authorities to right-size civilian personnel shortfalls that have stressed maintenance backlogs at our shipyards and our depots. It also will make more effective the Department's Quarterly Readiness Report and raise the minor military construction threshold and clarify unspecified projects to provide additional flexibility to the Department.

I would especially like to thank Chairman THORNBERRY for following through on his commitment last year to work with me to include my provision that would help address critical workforce shortages affecting military construction and healthcare essential to the military buildup on Guam. I also thank our Ranking Member SMITH and

Readiness Subcommittee Chairman JOE WILSON for working with me on this issue and on this bill. I look forward to continuing to work together to protect the full intent of this legislation.

The readiness portion of this bill also includes provisions to support ship repair in the western Pacific, as well as full funding for critical military construction projects.

□ 1945

Given our posture, our strategic needs and challenges in the region, it is essential that we continue to sufficiently resource and support an active and engaged Indo-Asia-Pacific force.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as this process continues.

And lastly, Mr. Chair, I would like to commend Vickie Plunkett for her over two decades of service in the House of Representatives, and 10 years on the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the chair of our Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their leadership in bringing this year's NDAA. I would also like to thank my friend and colleague from Tennessee, Mr. JIM COOPER, the ranking member on our subcommittee, for being such a great partner as we worked on this important bill.

Now, I would like to focus on some key provisions in the bill. First, space reform. This bill takes two monumental steps to reform national security space. First, the bill provides for the creation of a space core within the Air Force to fix the fragmented space acquisition process.

Second, it provides for the establishment of a subordinate, unified command for space under U.S. Strategic Command to ensure integration of the joint command of all space operations.

I can't stress enough the urgent necessity of these reforms. Our society and our military are enormously dependent on space. Meanwhile, our adversaries continue to grow their counterspace capabilities. These adversaries have already reorganized their space forces toward the goal of neutralizing our advantage in space.

Multiple studies going back almost two decades have recommended a space force to fix our space acquisition and management problems. Regardless, the DOD and the Air Force have yet to fix the problem. Decisionmaking authorities for space acquisitions remain fragmented across over 60 organizations. This bill would consolidate acquisition authority and improve our ability to jointly operate in space.

Earlier this week, I returned from Asia where I got to meet with our

troops on the Korean Peninsula. I was in theater when North Korea conducted their intercontinental ballistic missile. We must be vigilant when it comes to our missile defenses, and this year's NDAA does that.

Noteworthy initiatives in the bill include the authorization of approximately \$2 billion in additional funds for the Missile Defense Agency. It also accelerates our efforts to develop a space-based sensor and interceptor capabilities. Lastly, the bill supports our nuclear deterrence and includes provisions to improve the oversight of our nuclear command, control, and communications.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this important legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding. And, Mr. Chair, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member SMITH, and Chairwoman STEFANIK for their collective efforts in crafting this bill that is before us this evening.

I would also like to thank the staff who worked tirelessly on this productive and forward-thinking legislation.

It is an honor and a privilege to serve as a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee on behalf of the selfless servicemen and women who protect our Nation every day, and I am proud of the very strong bipartisan effort represented by this year's NDAA.

Mr. Chair, we accomplish a number of important objectives in this bill. First of all, we enhance our deterrence capabilities in Europe and support our Nation's submarine force. I am very proud of the Virginia class submarines that we build starting right in my district, and we also provide strong support for the Columbia class program that will be the Ohio replacement program.

We also make it clear that climate security is, indeed, national security, backing the Department in its efforts to build resilience, reduce risk, and prepare for all types of threats that may come our way, even if those threats come from climate change.

But as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, I am particularly proud of the provisions we have included on cybersecurity, special operations, and research and development. We strengthen our cyber cooperation with our partners and allies through both training and collaboration with the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence.

We better leverage the U.S. Global Engagement Center to combat propaganda and information warfare oper-

ations conducted against America and her allies, and we grant permanent authority for family support programs within Special Operations Command that reflect the unique needs of these warfighters and their families.

We also reinvigorate the DOD scholarship program so that students are encouraged to pursue information security degrees and can come to work defending our Nation from the get-go. We can have all of the cyber policies in place that we want, but if we don't have the trained workforce to execute those policies, we are going to be behind the curve, and this helps to close that gap.

We advance hypersonic weapons research, development, and especially transition efforts. We prioritized the readiness of U.S. Cyber Command in our Cyber Mission Force, and we strengthen congressional oversight of sensitive cyber military operations and command cyber warfare tools and capabilities.

This approach was deliberate in nature, and it moves us closer to a military that will be able to address the variety of threats that we face in the 21st century.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member SMITH, and Chairwoman STEFANIK, and all of my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee, as well as the staff, for their hard work on this very important bill.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2810, the FY18 National Defense Authorization Act, but I continue to be surprised at some of the national security pundits who believe that a diminished force structure will improve our national security.

Some have questioned whether we should fully fund national defense. Some have even questioned whether we should continue to expand our armed services to meet the strategic challenges posed by a rising China and Russia, by an unpredictable North Korea, and a belligerent Iran.

Mr. Chairman, our time is up. The time of action is now. The focus of our Nation is upon us to provide for our national security. I am pleased that we appear to have turned the tide in properly resourcing the requirements of our armed services; and I am pleased that we are authorizing the funding to match our strategy and providing what our combatant commanders need to win any future conflicts; and I am pleased that we have acknowledged the importance of our servicemembers and the hardships that they endure so that we can enjoy our free and democratic society.

In reference to the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee, I believe that we have reversed a trend toward a diminishing Navy and are tracking toward a strengthened 355-ship fleet. The bill expands on the eight ships requested by the administration and adds an additional five ships. The bill also recommends additional advance procurement for aircraft carriers and attack submarines, while fully funding the *Columbia* class ballistic missile submarine and the B-21 raider bomber programs.

As to aircraft, the bill recommends an expansion of KC-46As, C-130Js, E-2Ds, and P-8s. Finally, the bill delivers the right authorities that will save the Department of Defense billions—yes, billions—of dollars.

Additionally, I want to recognize Ranking Member JOE COURTNEY. He has done extraordinary work and has been a true partner in this journey and continues to work in a collaborative, bipartisan basis, to deliver the best for our national security.

I continue to be impressed with the results that can be achieved when a subcommittee and the full committee focuses on a common goal and works to achieve bipartisan results.

I urge my colleagues to support the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his outstanding leadership and candor on our committee. I want to give a special shout-out to our chairman, Mr. THORNBERRY, who shaved an hour and a half off our deliberations a couple of weeks ago by bringing us into the 21st century, and laptops to look at our amendments. So it was a great improvement.

I also want to thank my chair, Chairman MIKE COFFMAN, for his leadership. We have worked well together, and I look forward to continuing that relationship, and also to a top-notch staff.

This bill includes provisions that will provide the military services flexibility to recruit and retain members of our armed services and continues our commitment to taking care of our military families.

The NDAA continues funding for DOD impact aid for schools with large numbers of military-connected families and authorizes reimbursement, up to \$500 for military spouses' expenses related to obtaining a professional license or certification when moving to a new State.

The committee continues to provide oversight of important programs in the bill requiring reviews to ensure the Morale, Welfare, and Recreation programs are properly funded to required levels and the Department of Defense's debt

collection practices are fair and do not place undue burdens on servicemembers or their families.

The bill includes the PRIVATE Act, which I cosponsored with Congresswoman MARTHA MCSALLY and other members of the committee to prohibit the wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images and ensure the military services have the tools to prosecute those who violate the law.

The bill also provides support for victims of sexual assault by mandating training for Special Victims' Counsel to recognize and address unique challenges often faced by male victims of sexual assault.

I am pleased that the bill continues the committee's efforts to assist those with post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury, as well as ensuring families are educated on suicide factors that are often associated with TBI or post-traumatic stress.

However, as Ranking Member SMITH has said, this NDAA fails to make the hard choices and trade-offs that are expected of us. The NDAA goes beyond the President's request to provide 2.4 percent pay raises for our servicemen and -women, at an additional cost of \$200 million, an expense simply added to the top line.

The NDAA also authorizes an increased end strength for the Army at a cost of \$4 billion, again, simply adding it to the top line. Certainly, our troops deserve a pay raise, but the question that must be asked is: Where is the money coming from? And on what basis are these decisions being made?

Congress has not received a strategic plan from the Pentagon that would inform us on how large the military needs to grow. By just adding funding to the NDAA, Congress is not providing the stable, predictive funding the military needs. In order to do that, we need to address the big elephant in the room, the sequestration and budget control act caps.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SPEIER. Despite all of these additions, the committee was unfortunately unable to find the required offsets to fund an extension to the Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance to ensure it does not expire in May 2018. This falls short of my strong desire, shared by other members of the committee, to permanently fix the survivor benefit compensation.

This also amounts to a shameful tax on over 60,000 surviving spouses who are already struggling emotionally and financially. While the SSIA extension would be an important temporary fix, Congress must make a permanent fix to the offset.

We cannot continue to allow surviving military spouses to suffer from our inaction.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to make two points.

Number one, President Barack Obama was inaugurated in January 2009. The first national security strategy he submitted was in May of 2010, a year-and-a-half later. So I don't think it is completely unreasonable that we haven't yet gotten the national security strategy from the new administration.

Secondly, the pay raise for the troops is based on the statutory formula which is related to the cost of living. That is where it comes from. And it seems to me to say, no, you don't really get what the formula says you deserve, is not appropriate.

Now, the administration did not request it, and the criticism from some is that we should not provide it. I think if the formula is wrong, we should change it, but if the formula says that is how much the cost of living has gone up, we should provide it.

Mr. Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), the chair of the Subcommittee on Personnel.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

The bill contains significant policy and funding initiatives that continue our commitment to maintain military personnel and family readiness and address issues important to our troops. The provisions contained in this bill provide our warfighters, retirees, and their families the necessary pay and benefits to sustain them into today's highly stressed force.

To support these efforts, this bill establishes a fully funded by-law pay raise for all of our servicemembers overriding the President's ability to reduce the pay raise. After years of lower than by-law pay raise requests, it is critical that we continue to give our troops and their families the pay increases they deserve.

□ 2000

The bill increases the end-strengths of our Active Duty, National Guard, and Reserve forces, increasing mission readiness while reducing the stress and strain on the force and their families.

The bill further focuses last year's management reform of the Military Health System to provide clear responsibility for the delivery of healthcare services at military medical treatment facilities and for military medical readiness.

The bill also stops an ill-considered, cost-saving measure that would close several U.S. military hospitals overseas. We believe our servicemembers and their families should continue to have the best medical care possible wherever they serve.

It also continues to improve sexual assault prevention and response by adding a new provision to the Uniform Code of Military Justice specifically prohibiting nonconsensual sharing of intimate images, expanding Special Victims' Counsel training to include training on the unique challenges often faced by male victims, and clarifying the process by which a designated representative can be appointed by a victim prior to a court-martial.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN. Finally, servicemembers returning to civilian life and their spouses are challenged by varying State licensure and certification requirements. Rather than imposing a single Federal standard on the States, we provide for a \$500 reimbursement to defray these costs. We ask States to work with the Secretary of Defense to develop common standards where possible.

In conclusion, I want to thank Ms. SPEIER and her staff for their contributions to the mark and support in this process. Of course, we were joined by an active, informed, and dedicated group of subcommittee members. Their recommendations and priorities are clearly reflected in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. Additionally, I appreciate the dedication and hard work of the subcommittee staff.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the dedicated bipartisan work of the House Armed Services Committee in recognizing our subcommittee chairs, members, and the staff as well in bringing this critical bill to the floor.

But as it has been stated earlier, the budget numbers that we are talking about contained in the bill are, unfortunately, aspirational. We have not passed a budget resolution, and the Budget Control Act is still the law of the land.

While it is true that the BCA was a bipartisan failing—we can all take credit for that—pointing fingers does not solve the problems. We are on an uncertain and dangerous path, one where we have not been honest with ourselves on many levels and where we continue to play games with our men and women serving in the military.

We must recognize that the only path to solving these issues is bipartisan collaboration and legislation to repeal the BCA. Continuing resolutions and unrealistic, deeply partisan budgets amount to nothing more than professional malpractice.

I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that I was encouraged to see that the Senate included a proposal similar to the one I introduced during markup to continue paying the widows of servicemembers who died in defense of our Nation. Their personal compensation is not just a small gesture but our fundamental responsibility.

I am also encouraged by the promise our chairman made regarding this issue. He said that the issue “has to be fixed and will be,” but there are, as he acknowledged as well, “difficult trade-offs that have to be made.” I completely agree. We will all have to contribute to the solutions. I am prepared to do that, and I know that my colleagues are as well. We all have to hope together that we move forward and be prepared to do that.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who is the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I would like to thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for bringing this important bill to the floor.

As Members of Congress, it is our responsibility to provide support for our men and women in uniform while they selflessly serve our Nation. This bill takes significant steps to address our military's severe readiness crisis by ensuring that our troops have the resources, training, and capabilities needed to face the growing threats of today.

As chairwoman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, I am proud of the provisions included in this bill to reform the Foreign Military Sales process, provide funding to address the critical infrastructure needs of the U.S. Nuclear Security Enterprise, and protect our Nation's highly sensitive U.S. military information—information that our adversaries are actively seeking to exploit.

This bill is good news for the warfighter. It authorizes 22 additional F-18 Super Hornets to help fill the Navy's strike fighter shortfall and fully funds the B-21 Raider—a critical platform needed to deter and defeat future aggression around the world.

I am proud to represent Missouri's Fourth Congressional District, which is home to Whiteman Air Force Base and Fort Leonard Wood. This bill funds modernization programs for the B-2 Spirit and authorizes phase one of a new hospital facility at Fort Leonard Wood.

Since arriving to Congress, I have been fighting to address the infrastructure needs of our Army ammunition plants, like the one at Lake City, which is the sole source for our Army's

small caliber ammo. These plants are in dire need of modernization, and this bill authorizes much-needed funding to help improve these deteriorating facilities.

Thanks to the leadership of Chairman THORNBERRY, the Armed Services Committee increased defense spending to meet the needs of today's warfighter. I appreciate the opportunity to work with Ranking Member SETH MOULTON and all the committee members on this bill. I am proud of the bipartisan fashion in which we work, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, first, let me start by thanking Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH not only for their leadership but the bipartisan collaborative approach to the work of the committee.

Certainly as a new member of the 115th Congress, I find that very refreshing. From what I have seen, it is no surprise that 50-plus years in a row we have successfully passed the NDAA.

Mr. Chairman, the United States faces serious security threats: aggression from North Korea and Russia, long and costly campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq, and new battlefields in cyberspace and in outer space.

After years of sequestration, there is consensus certainly in the House Armed Services Committee that Congress must address readiness shortfalls and modernization challenges facing our military. So in the NDAA, we made greater investments in training and equipping the forces and prioritized projects that extend our technological and warfighting edge.

But increasing defense authorizations and appropriations, absent a clear national security strategy, will not make our country safer. We need a smart, strategic approach to national security that provides clear goals and objectives and that incorporates an all-of-government approach. That means not only increasing defense spending, but also ensuring funding for the State Department and USAID and reversing proposed cuts to nondefense programs that make the world more stable and secure.

We owe it to our servicemen and -women to provide them with both the resources to accomplish their mission abroad and to pursue the American Dream when they return home, and that is good schools, family-supporting jobs, and safe neighborhoods. We cannot do one at the expense of the other. The long-term success of our country depends on that.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), who is the distinguished

chair of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, which increases readiness and ensures that those who serve our Nation are fully equipped, trained, and supported.

As the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, I am especially proud of the oversight regarding stronger cyber warfare capabilities, safeguarding technological superiority, enabling our Special Operations Forces around the globe, providing resources and authorities to counter terrorism and unconventional warfare threats, and energizing programs and activities that counter the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

Our achievements in cybersecurity carry three broad themes: First, the bill increases congressional oversight of cyber operations by including a bill introduced by myself, Ranking Member LANGEVIN, Chairman THORBERRY, and Ranking Member SMITH that ensures Congress is kept fully informed of sensitive military cyber operations.

Second, we bolster international partnerships for cyber warfare to counter aggressive adversaries, including efforts to counter and mitigate adversarial propaganda efforts and information warfare campaigns.

Third, the bill continues to build and enhance our U.S. cyber warfare capabilities and activities.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this bill reinforces counterterrorism and unconventional warfare capabilities by fully resourcing U.S. Special Operations Command's programs and activities and increasing congressional oversight of intelligence activities.

Finally, I would like to thank Mr. ROGERS, chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, for including language that supports the decision for a future East Coast missile defense site.

I would like to thank Mr. COFFMAN, chairman of the Military Personnel Subcommittee, for including portions of my bill, the Lift the Relocation Burden From Military Spouses Act.

Before I conclude, I would like to thank Chairman MAC THORBERRY for his leadership, as well as my subcommittee ranking member, Congressman JIM LANGEVIN of Rhode Island, for his bipartisan energy and cooperation on all of these issues.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2810.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) who is a valued member of the committee and a retired Air Force general.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in staunch support of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2018.

I served in the military under the past five Presidents starting with Ronald Reagan and witnessed firsthand the erosion of our combat edge. When I joined the military, we out-trained our competitors with a 2-to-1 flying-hour advantage. Today, we are lagging behind them in training, and it is unconscionable to send our warriors to fight without every possible advantage. We don't want a close fight, but that is where we are at today.

As a General Officer, I was charged with preparing our forces to prevail over any adversary, a nearly impossible task given the damage done by a 22 percent reduction of defense spending over the last 8 years while we are at war. This act will begin to right the ship with a 10 percent top-line increase providing the means to rebuild readiness, deter aggression, and defeat adversaries. It invests in peace through strength.

The Constitution charges this body with the power to provide for the common defense. For the Armed Services Committee, this is a solemn obligation rooted in over 50 years of bipartisanship, and we meet this obligation with the 2018 NDAA.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), who is another very valuable member of our committee.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. This bill is the result of mindful deliberation and absolute dedication to our Nation's soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. I am proud to be standing here with fellow members of the Armed Services Committee and speak to the merits of this legislation.

In particular, the acquisition reforms in this bill will help get proven, advanced equipment in the hands of servicemembers faster and for a better price. This bill brings much-needed innovation to the way defense acquisition personnel spend taxpayer dollars and the way commercial businesses engage with the U.S. Government.

It prioritizes oversight of service contracts. This type of contract accounts for over 50 percent of DOD contract expenditures, which up to now was unclear and unanalyzed. It will help secure a better value for precious dollars spent through reforms in the contract auditing process.

The small-business industrial base is a critical part of DOD procurement. Our small businesses have a unique ability to strengthen our contracting process by driving innovation and competition in the marketplace. It is important that we create opportunities for these contractors and strengthen entrepreneurial development programs and help eliminate barriers of entry and diversify our industrial base.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. SMITH for yielding and compliments to him and Chairman THORBERRY for the outstanding work, again, that the two of them have collaborated on to keep this really massive undertaking on schedule. It is really a very truncated schedule this year, but they both did it. Again, it is kudos to both of them in terms of their leadership skills.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the 2018 NDAA. Front and center in our deliberations in the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee on which I serve with Chairman WITTMAN, who is in his first term and did an outstanding job, was the build-up of our Navy fleet which has been a multiyear process of strategic planning.

□ 2015

In December of last year, the prior Navy secretary, Ray Mabus, who served in the prior administration, released an updated force structure assessment that laid out the requirement for increasing the Navy's fleet from 308 ships to 355.

Then, in January, Navy officials outlined a plan to get us on a construction plan to get us on a path to a larger fleet. In early May, the chief of naval operations emphasized that "time is of the essence" in growing the Navy.

The stage was set to get started on the larger fleet. That was why so many of us were surprised on May 23 and disappointed when the White House sent over basically a 308-ship budget for a 355-ship fleet.

I am proud to say that, on a bipartisan basis, we have done much better in this bill than the budget that came over. Among other things, the bill explicitly makes it the policy of our Nation to achieve a 355-ship Navy. We add five additional ships in 2018, for a total of 12, to get us moving to the larger fleet that the prior administration and the new administration know that we need.

One area I am particularly proud of is the area of undersea forces. Reflecting the urgent testimony of our combatant commanders, our panel once again led the way in forging an aggressive but realistic plan to grow our submarine fleet.

To achieve this, our bill authorizes multiyear procurement authority for 13 *Virginia* class attack submarines for the next 5 years. Not only would this keep us at the two-a-year level we have been on for the last few years, but would go even further by reaching a three-submarine build rate in the coming years.

The seapower portion of the bill does much more to support a range of priorities on the seas and in the skies, far too many to itemize here today.

I will just say that I am proud of the bipartisan contribution of all of our subcommittee members into the product before the House today, and, again, Mr. WITTMAN for his first year as subcommittee chairman.

In particular, I want to highlight the work of our subcommittee staff in helping us craft the bill. I am joined here today by one of my staff, Stephen Clement, who has been working with us, but he is going to be moving on to better things. I want to publicly thank him for his outstanding work in terms of helping us get to the place we are here today.

In closing, I would urge my colleagues to support the Defense Authorization bill.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS), a valuable member of our committee who continues to serve our Nation in the Reserves.

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my strong support for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

As the most recently deployed veteran serving in Congress, serving in Afghanistan just 2 years ago, I know the national security challenges facing our country firsthand. While these challenges are not easily solved, this legislation represents a significant step forward.

I want to take a moment and specifically thank Chairman THORNBERRY for his leadership and assistance to myself and other freshman members of the committee.

Working together with colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the Armed Services Committee has crafted a bill focused on rebuilding and reforming the Department of Defense. By procuring what we need, fixing what we already have, and by being good stewards of the taxpayers' dollars by proposing new contract audit reforms, this bill begins the hard work of getting our Department back on the right track.

While we cannot control the existential threats facing our Nation, we must ensure those in uniform are ready to address those threats when necessary.

Moreover, as this week's tragic C-130 accident that claimed the lives of 16 servicemembers reminded all Americans, our servicemembers place their lives on the line each day.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. From giving our troops a well-deserved raise to funding our vital missile defense programs, I believe this legislation begins the process of rebuilding and reforming our military so we are ready for whatever comes next.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, what I really want to focus on is the budget problem, because that is really underlying all of this.

We have heard a lot of good speeches from Members talking about what is in this bill, how important it is, how what is in this bill is attempting both to meet our national security threats and, as importantly, to make sure that we take care of the men and women who serve our military, who fight to protect us to make sure, first of all, that they and their families are taken care of from a financial standpoint, but also to make sure they have the equipment and training they need to be ready to fight the fights that we ask them to go to. I think that is one of the great challenges.

Whatever it is we decide ought to be our national security strategy, I think the thing we all agree on is we need to make sure we provide the training, equipment, and support so that the men and women who serve in the military are ready for that fight.

The worst thing we can do is create a hollow force and set up an expectation that: You need to do all of this, but we are only going to train you for that. So if this other stuff comes up, you are not going to be ready.

We have talked about this a lot in our committee to make sure that we are ready for the fight that comes. And that is where the budget creates a very significant problem.

We have talked a lot about the Budget Control Act and sequestration. It is pretty clear why we had the Budget Control Act and sequestration. I was here for it. We were days away from not raising the debt ceiling and basically not meeting our commitments to pay our bills. There are those who figure that that can be a significant problem.

So we made an agreement. We were going to try to get the budget under control. Sequestration was put in place, with the expectation that it wouldn't be implemented because we would come to a grand bargain on revenue and spending that would get our deficit under control. Well, we didn't, and sequestration kicked in.

But as we sit here today, even if we got rid of sequestration, even if we got rid of the budget caps, we are still \$20 trillion in debt. We are going to run a \$700 billion deficit. This is projected to go nowhere but up in the years ahead. I don't believe that is sustainable.

Now, I don't think we need to balance the budget tomorrow or next year or even in the next 5 years, but we need to get ourselves on a sustainable path. And we flat refuse to do that.

You don't see a lot of campaigns promising to cut specific programs or promising to raise taxes. I love the fact that if you poll the American people, there is a very clear consensus on what they think we ought to do about this problem.

First of all, somewhere in the neighborhood of 80 percent of them support a balanced budget now, by the way. Not 5, 10 years, but right now.

You ask them: Well, here are all the places where the government spends money. What would you like to cut?

The answer to that question is: nothing. Literally nothing.

The Pew Research folks do a poll on this every year, and in every single category a majority of people would rather keep the money the same or increase it, as opposed to decrease it.

Of course, if you ask them what taxes they would like to increase, by and large, they don't want to increase taxes. It is interesting. If you can convince people that the taxes in question will not apply to them, for a brief moment they will be supportive of it. But then someone will come along and convince them that at some point it might apply to them, and then they oppose it.

So our task as Members of Congress is to balance the budget without raising taxes or cutting spending. That, of course, is impossible. So what we have chosen to do is put off that decision for as long as is humanly possible.

That is why we do not have a budget resolution. Any budget resolution this body could create would fail on probably multiple fronts of what the public expects. It wouldn't balance the budget. It would cut spending they didn't want to cut. It probably wouldn't raise taxes, coming from this majority, but if it did, it wouldn't be popular. So we have to start having an honest conversation about the budget.

We hear in the Armed Services Committee all the time about all the needs, all the shortfalls, all the critical things we need to do. We argue about it and argue about it, but in 6 years the Republican majority has not put forward a plan to control mandatory spending. They say that is the problem. No plan to do that. Certainly, they haven't even considered the possibility of increasing revenue.

If we are this serious—and we should be—about making sure that we have the funds necessary to provide an adequate national security, then we should stop cowering from the budget debate.

Personally, I am all for raising taxes because I see the needs that the chairman and everybody else has described, and I am actually prepared to pay for them. So we need to do that. That

overarching budget problem is what has put us in this mess.

As we talk about this bill, as I said, it is \$72 billion over the budget caps. Unless we get a vote to lift those budget caps—which I just mentioned is politically unpopular, which is why we haven't done it for the full 6 months we have been in session this year—then that \$72 billion goes away and the Pentagon is back in chaos.

So this may be a good bill. It may be solid. It doesn't have the backing of the budget.

Let me finally suggest that there are some things that the Department of Defense could do. This is why the strategy is so important.

Yes, the Obama administration waited until May of 2010. They didn't have 6 years of CRs and government shutdowns and threatened shutdowns and the changing threat environment that we have. They had a reasonably consistent set of problems. It was a set of problems, but they had the same Secretary of Defense from the previous administration. They had time to look at that.

We need this strategy urgently because the big question is: Are we spending the money correctly? Is the Department of Defense spending the money in the right way? Do we have a strategy to figure out how we should prioritize?

We don't. With this crushing budget environment, it is absolutely critical that we do. We need to consider the possibility, for instance, that we might be spending some money that we shouldn't be spending.

I will often ask that question of the generals who come over and tell us how short they are of everything. I say: Well, where are we spending money, in your opinion, that we shouldn't be?

They never answer the question. You cannot tell me in a \$700 billion budget in a place as large as the Pentagon that there isn't somebody over there who knows to say: Look, we shouldn't be doing this.

Just to give one suggestion, we have had the BRAC debate forever. We have had a shrinking military, yet we have maintained the same infrastructure. We have seen study after study from the Air Force and others about how much excess capacity they have and money that could be saved from doing that. But again this year, for, I submit, political reasons, BRAC is prohibited.

So we need to get a lot smarter about how we are going to spend this money and a lot smarter about our budget if this bill is actually going to become reality.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, as usual, the gentleman from Washington makes a number of good points.

We absolutely need to have national security based on a strategy and fund

that strategy. There are many of us who would argue that is not what has happened in recent years.

I would just point out it was not only President Obama, but also President Bush and President Clinton. None of them provided a national security strategy in the first year that they were in office. I have tremendous confidence in Secretary Mattis, among others on the national security team. I believe they are looking at these issues and will provide us with a strategy.

The gentleman is also absolutely correct when he points out that the Defense Authorization bill is only one step in the process. There are many more steps to come.

I think we will have a budget on this floor to vote on shortly. I also expect that we are going to have appropriations to vote on at some point in the coming weeks. I also believe that we are going to have the opportunity to vote on dealing with the sequestration caps, which, by the way, the administration and I think most of us in the House and I presume most in the other body as well are in favor of doing away with because they have not been successful in accomplishing the goal for which they were put in place.

So there are clearly many more debates to have on other days. What we have this week on the floor before us is the Defense Authorization bill. And it is our obligation to authorize the things that the military needs.

I want to go back to the point that Mr. BANKS made a few minutes ago. These are life-and-death decisions. Our hearts break, our prayers go out to the families of the 15 marines and the one sailor who lost their lives Monday of this week in the plane crash in Mississippi, just as our hearts go out and our prayers continue for the family members of the seven sailors who lost their lives off of Japan a few weeks ago.

What it reminds us is exactly what Mr. BANKS said: this is a dangerous business, even on training mission, even on routine deployments. The men and women who volunteer to serve our country to protect us and to secure our freedoms deserve the very best our country can provide them. That is the goal of this bill: support the men and women who serve us and to further the national security of the United States.

You have heard from both sides of the aisle about many good things that are in this bill. We are going to go through a lot of amendments over the next several days. But at the end of the day, the point is, even with the good, the bad, and the ugly that gets put in this bill, to support the men and women who serve by voting "yes," and I hope my colleagues will do that.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I ask that the following exchange of letters be included in the RECORD on H.R. 2810:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I write concerning H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, as amended. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H.R. 2810 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 30, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 2810 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

DAVID P. ROE, M.D.,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. DAVID P. ROE, M.D.,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of our nation's servicemembers, military families, and community colleges in support of the National Defense Authorization Act.

The 2018 NDAA supports our men and women in uniform by providing a much deserved 2.4 percent pay increase and extending special pay and bonuses for servicemembers. This bill further supports military families by prohibiting the proposed reduction in inpatient care for military medical treatment facilities located outside the United States, and will provide up to \$500 for a spouse's expense related to obtaining a license or certification in another state because of a military move.

Our nation's military is one of the major economic drivers for the State of Texas. Texas is home to several of America's largest military bases, including Fort Hood in Killeen, Fort Bliss in El Paso, and Joint Base San Antonio. Texas is also home to major defense manufacturing facilities that help our servicemembers protect America and employ thousands of hardworking Texans.

The NDAA includes a provision, Section 3507, that will authorize the U.S. Maritime Administration to designate and provide assistance to certain community colleges and workforce training centers as "centers of excellence" that provide valuable skills in the maritime sector.

This language will help community colleges, like San Jacinto College, in our district in Harris County, Texas, that provides a modern, comprehensive training program for working in our maritime industry. San Jacinto College works closely with Houston's maritime community and the Port of Houston, and recently opened a state-of-the-art maritime training center last year.

This provision is modeled after legislation I introduced with Rep. ROBERT WITTMAN earlier

this year, the Domestic Maritime Centers of Excellence Act (H.R. 2286). I hope our colleagues will support our Centers of Excellence provision and ensure its inclusion when the NDAA reaches the President's desk.

I ask all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting the National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Harper/Brady Amendment, which is included in this en block package of amendments. Our amendment while simple is critical to the security of the House of Representatives and its information technology systems. This amendment allows the Speaker, with the concurrence of the Minority Leader, to request assistance from the Executive Branch, within the confines of current law, in the event there is a successful cybersecurity attack on the House of Representatives.

Three scenarios readily come to mind in which Executive Branch assistance would be critical.

The first scenario addresses a situation in which the House of Representatives has a suspicion that a nation-state sponsored actor has successfully infiltrated the House network. The House of Representatives would need assistance from the National Security Agency, the Department of Homeland Security, or possibly even the Department of Defense's Cyber Command to help identify, eliminate and remove the nation-state sponsored actor from our network systems. The House of Representatives would also need additional assistance from the intelligence community to identify and validate the nation-state sponsored actor and their associated tactics, techniques, and procedures.

The second scenario involves assistance from the appropriate law enforcement agency in the event the House of Representatives and its network systems are victims of criminal activity conducted by a malicious actor or actors.

Finally, the House of Representatives would need assistance from the Executive Branch if a catastrophic event occurred and compromised a significant amount of the House of Representatives' enterprise system, and could not guarantee the integrity of the legislative process. The House of Representatives would seek assistance from the National Security Agency, the Department of Homeland Security, the intelligence community, or the Department of Defense's Cyber Command to identify the root cause of the compromise; protect existing House information systems; detect any collateral damage resulting from the incident; respond, resolve, and remove the incident from the House systems; and finally, restore the House of Representatives to an acceptable operational state.

The attempts to attack the House of Representatives are real. Every month, the House successfully defends against the three to four million cyber attacks against our networks. Before the July 4th recess, the House of Representatives successfully fought off a "brute force attack" in which more than 44,000 attempts to breach the networks occurred in just one day.

We are not dealing with hypotheticals. It may be just a matter of time before one of the millions of attempts is successful. The House of Representatives must be prepared.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in support of my amendment No. 41 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

My amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a definition for the term Procurement Administrative Lead Time to be applied throughout the Department of Defense (DoD). Additionally, the amendment also requires a plan for measuring and publicly reporting data on procurement administrative lead time for DoD contracts and task orders above a certain threshold.

Given the number and costs of contracts and task orders issued by the Department of Defense, it is important that the Department collect information on the amount of time between when a solicitation is issued and the initial award of the contract or task order. By establishing a uniform definition and collecting this data, DoD, the contractor community, and other stakeholders can better analyze the data and use it as a tool to reduce unnecessary delays.

I am very pleased that the managers of this legislation recognize the need to find and address inefficiencies in the procurement process.

Mr. Chair, I also rise to speak in support of my bipartisan amendment No. 43 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, which I have offered with my colleague, Mr. ISSA of California.

My amendment would extend three expiring provisions of the Federal Information Technology Acquisition and Reform Act, which is better known as FITARA or Issa-Connolly. This bipartisan legislation represented the first major reform of the laws governing federal IT management since the seminal Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996, and it was enacted as a provision of the FY2015 NDAA.

When I meet with stakeholders in federal IT from government agencies and industry, I am constantly reminded why previous major IT reform efforts have fallen short of their potential—the lack of a robust implementation plan and congressional oversight. Through countless hearings and briefings, close coordination with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Government Accountability Office (GAO), and the Oversight and Government Reform Committee's work on the FITARA Scorecard, Congress is committed to the successful implementation and oversight of FITARA.

In working with GAO and OMB on FITARA implementation, we have found that there are areas of FITARA that would benefit from an extension of their original sunset date. These areas include the provisions on federal data center consolidation, transparency and risk management of major IT systems (IT Dashboard), and IT portfolio, program, and resource reviews (PortfolioStat).

Very simply, the federal data center problem is bigger than we initially thought. In 2009, when Federal Chief Information Officer Vivek Kundra directed agencies to determine how many data centers they had and begin to consolidate those centers, the government estimated it had roughly 1,100 data centers. That estimate grew to 11,700 by 2015.

As GAO has recommended, we are potentially leaving money on the table when it comes to data center consolidation if we allow FITARA's data center reporting and planning requirements to expire in 2018. Twenty-three agencies have reported roughly \$656 million collectively in planned savings for fiscal years 2016 through 2018. This is \$3.3 billion less than the estimated \$4.0 billion in planned savings for fiscal years 2016 through 2018 that agencies reported to GAO in November 2015. As of April 2017, 23 of 24 agencies have submitted a strategic plan for data center consolidation. Of the 23 plans, only 7 included all required information. The remaining plans either partially met or did not meet the requirements.

We need to let agencies know that they are not going to be able to run out the clock on FITARA's transparency and reporting requirements. A limited extension of the data center provisions of FITARA, scheduled to sunset October 1, 2018, could help us do that.

Additionally, the IT Dashboard and PortfolioStat provisions of FITARA have allowed OMB to evaluate the efficiencies and risk of IT investments and would benefit from a permanent extension of the current December 1, 2019 sunset. These are valuable oversight tools, and we should continue to use them to reform federal IT procurement.

The federal government invests roughly \$100 billion in IT each year. I look forward to continued bipartisan collaboration on FITARA implementation to ensure these investments are efficient, effective, and in the best interest of the taxpayer.

I want to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for working with me on this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I ask that the following exchange of letters be included in the RECORD on H.R. 2810:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, July 3, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I write to you concerning H.R. 2810, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, which contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence ("the Committee"). The Committee recognizes the need for proceeding expeditiously to Floor consideration of this important bill. Therefore, I do not intend to request a sequential referral.

This waiver is conditional on our mutual understanding that my decision to forego Committee consideration of this legislation does not diminish or otherwise affect any future claim over the matters in the bill which fall within the Committee's jurisdiction, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging the Committee's jurisdictional interest will be included in the committee report accompanying H.R. 2810 and submitted into the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor.

I also intend to seek the appointment of Committee Members to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and request your support if such a request is made. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this and

other matters between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. DEVIN NUNES, Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, July 6, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 2810, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018," which your Committee ordered reported on June 28, 2017.

H.R. 2810 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2017.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative

of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Small Business takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 2810 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. STEVE CHABOT, Chairman, Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Small Business has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Small Business is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of Amendment No. 18, and I'm proud to be a cosponsor of it.

The amendment authorizes \$15 million for an innovative program known as Hacking for Defense. I'm proud this was originally piloted at Stanford University in my Congressional District and has since expanded to six other colleges and universities around the country.

Hacking for Defense offers our country's best and brightest students the opportunity to work directly with our nation's military to identify our most urgent national security threats.

Students design innovative solutions using a lean-startup model that can quickly lead to the procurement of new technologies that solve

real-world problems facing our military and the warfighter.

Hacking for Defense integrates entrepreneurship with public service and helps the federal government become more flexible and less bureaucratic in its approach to problem solving, something Congress has long sought to foster.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Sinema-Fitzpatrick-Budd amendment to H.R. 2810, the Fiscal Year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act.

I thank Chairman Thornberry and Ranking Member Smith for their support of our amendment and for including it in the en bloc package.

The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) continues to represent a clear threat to the security of the United States and our allies, and to stability in the Middle East.

While ISIL has lost significant territory over the last six months, the terrorist organization continues to oppress and murder civilians in Syria and Iraq and spread its message of violence and hate across the globe.

ISIL's perverted orthodoxy and efforts to support and inspire attacks in the United States and elsewhere are direct threats to our security and safety.

We must do all we can to accelerate ISIL's destruction.

Our bipartisan amendment ensures that the Report on the United States Strategy in Syria required by the underlying bill includes a description of amounts and sources of ISIL financing and our efforts to disrupt this financing as part of the broader US strategy in Syria.

Financing is the lifeblood of any organization.

Denying revenue streams from oil, from stolen currency, and from extortion, has helped in the fight against ISIL.

Less money means fewer weapons, fewer fighters, and fewer resources to support those fighters, but the fight is far from over and ISIL has already demonstrated its ability to adapt and evolve.

As ISIL loses territory in Iraq and Syria, it looks abroad to inspire and support terrorist attacks in other countries around the world.

We must choke off its sources of revenue. We must deny its access to resources that fund operations in Syria, Iraq, and abroad.

Our amendment ensures we stay focused on financing, and we do it in a way that supports our broader military and counter-terrorism strategies.

As we have seen, effectively integrating smart counter threat finance enhances our overall strategy in Syria and Iraq and can prevent ISIL support for attacks in the US, in Europe and elsewhere.

Ultimately, it will accelerate the fall of ISIL and keep Americans safe.

I thank my colleagues Congressman FITZPATRICK and Congressman BUDD for offering this amendment with me.

Again, I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their support and for their continued bipartisan leadership in support of our country's national security.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking

Member SMITH for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2018, which authorizes \$2.5 million in increased funding to combat and treat Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Had it been made in order, this Jackson Lee amendment would have provided additional funding to be used toward outreach activities targeting hard to reach veterans; especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas.

Mr. Chair, along with traumatic brain injury, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) is the signature wound suffered by the brave men and women who fought or are fighting in Afghanistan, Iraq, and far off lands to defend the values and freedom we hold dear.

For those of us whose daily existence is not lived in harm's way, it is difficult to imagine the horrific images seen by American servicemen and women deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other theaters of war.

In an instant a suicide bomber, an IED, or an insurgent can obliterate your best friend and right in front of your face.

Yet, you are trained and expected to continue on with the mission, and you do, even though you may not even have reached your 20th birthday.

But there always comes a reckoning.

And it usually comes after the stress and trauma of battle is over and you are alone with your thoughts and memories.

And the horror of those desperate and dangerous encounters with the enemy and your own mortality come flooding back.

PTSD was first brought to public attention in relation to war veterans, but it can result from a variety of traumatic incidents, such as torture, being kidnapped or held captive, bombings, or natural disasters such as floods or earthquakes.

People with PTSD may startle easily, become emotionally numb (especially in relation to people with whom they used to be close), lose interest in things they used to enjoy, have trouble feeling affectionate, be irritable, become more aggressive, or even become violent.

They avoid situations that remind them of the original incident, and anniversaries of the incident are often very difficult.

Most people with PTSD repeatedly relive the trauma, called flashbacks, in their thoughts during the day and in nightmares when they sleep.

A person having a flashback may lose touch with reality and believe that the traumatic incident is happening all over again.

Mr. Chair, the fact of the matter is that most veterans with PTSD also have other psychiatric disorders, which are a consequence of PTSD.

These veterans have co-occurring disorders, which include depression, alcohol and/or drug abuse problems, panic, and/or other anxiety disorders.

The Jackson Lee Amendment recognizes that these soldiers are first and foremost, human and that they carry their experiences with them.

Ask a veteran of Vietnam, Iraq, or Afghanistan about the frequency of nightmares they experience, and one will realize that serving in the Armed Forces leaves a lasting impression, whether good or bad.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would have helped ensure that "no soldier is left behind" by addressing the urgent need for more outreach toward hard to reach veterans suffering from PTSD, especially those who are homeless or reside in underserved urban and rural areas of our country.

Mr. Chair, I also want to speak in support of the amendment to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2018, offered by Judiciary Committee Ranking Member CONYERS, and supported by Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of California, Congressman WALTER JONES of North Carolina, myself, and many other colleagues but not made in order by the Rules Committee.

The Conyers Amendment is simple and straightforward, stating:

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the use of force against North Korea."

Interviewed by Reuters in the Oval Office on April 27, 2017, the President stated:

"There is a chance that we could end up having a major, major conflict with North Korea. Absolutely."

According to media reports, military strikes against North Korea remain an option for the President and his national security team.

Earlier this year, the Trump Administration sent an aircraft carrier and a nuclear-powered submarine to the region in a show of force.

Of course, direct U.S. military action runs the risk of massive North Korean retaliation and huge casualties in Japan and South Korea and among U.S. forces in both countries.

The Conyers Amendment would make clear and explicit that nothing in the FY2018 NDAA can be construed as congressional authorization or acquiescence regarding the use of military force against North Korea.

The Framers understood that while the military does the fighting, the entire nation goes to war.

That is why the Framers lodged the power to declare war in the Congress, the branch of government closest to the people.

They knew that the decision to go to war was too important to be left to the whim of a single person, no matter how wise or well-informed he or she might be.

The President must consult with Congress and to obtain an AUMF before undertaking any military offensive against North Korea.

Over the last 16 years, we have seen 3 Presidents use the 2001 Afghanistan AUMF as a blank check to engage in serious military action.

In 2016, the Congressional Research Service issued a report detailing 37 unclassified uses of this authorization in 14 countries, including for operations at Guantanamo Bay, warrantless wiretapping, and recent military action in Libya, Syria, Somalia, and Yemen.

The overly broad 2001 AUMF represents a critical deterioration of Congressional oversight, which should be repealed, rather than repeated with respect to North Korea.

As our brave service members are deployed around the world in combat zones, Congress is missing in action.

As provided under the War Powers Resolution of 1973, absent a Congressional declaration of war or authorization for the use of military force, the President as Commander-in-Chief has constitutional power to engage the U.S. armed forces in hostilities only in the case of a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces.

As a co-equal branch of government, it is Congress's right and responsibility to be fully consulted regarding any potential plans to conduct military operations in North Korea, to assess whether such action is in the national security interest of the United States and its allies, and to withhold or grant authorization for the use of military force based on this assessment.

As we have learned from the painful and bitter experience of the past 16 years, at the initiation of hostilities, the costs in terms of blood and treasure of U.S. military interventions abroad are often underestimated and the benefits overstated.

For example, more than 6,800 American service members gave the last full measure of devotion to their country on battlefields in Afghanistan and Iraq, with hundreds of thousands more returning with physical, emotional, or psychological wounds that may never heal.

The direct economic cost of the war in Afghanistan exceeds \$1.07 trillion, including \$773 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations funds, an increase of \$243 billion to the Department of Defense base budget, and an increase of \$54.2 billion to the Veterans Administration budget to address the human costs of the military involvement in Afghanistan.

We should not repeat the mistakes of the past and my position on this issue is directly aligned with the will of the American people.

I commend my colleague, Congressman CONYERS for offering this important amendment and am disappointed that it was not made in order.

I am confident that depriving Members of the opportunity to debate and vote on the Conyers Amendment will strengthen our resolve to restore Congress's preeminent constitutional role in the decision to take the nation to war.

If it had been made in order and approved, Jackson Lee Amendment No. 179 would have directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct, and report to Congress within 180 days, the results of a study regarding whether the requirement to notify a Voting Action Officer within 10 days of registering to vote in a state where a service member resides, due to a duty reassignment, imposes a significant burden on military voters.

Members on both sides of the aisle want our men and women in the armed services to be able to vote.

Unfortunately, they often cannot, despite the option of casting an absentee ballot if they are deployed overseas.

For most of U.S. history, military personnel have been barred from voting by State laws and constitutions that specifically restricted military personnel from voting.

Following the Civil War, many of these laws began to change because so many citizens served in the military.

Today, there is a Federal Voting Assistance Program that assists military voters and their families living in the United States and abroad to vote in public elections.

Work has been done and is continuing to be done to make the absentee voting experience for military voters as easy as possible, but there are still issues with receiving a ballot and being able to return it by the deadline.

The military population is extremely mobile. Since voting materials are postal materials that cannot be forwarded, it is important for them to provide their election office their current address annually, as well as after every move, because information provided is the only way of election agencies can contact them.

Military personnel are often relocated because of reassignments, which are outside of their control.

The process for voting is difficult for persons serving in the military and adding a requirement that military voters who decide to register where they may have been reassigned may need more than 10 days to meet the requirement of notice to their Voting Action Officer.

This Jackson Lee Amendment directs the Department of Defense to study and report to Congress the impact the 10 day requirement and whether it imposes an undue burden on military voters who seek to cast their ballots in person.

Military voters should have the option of casting an in-person ballot, while they serve our nation at a station or on assignment in the United States.

This Jackson Lee Amendment would have ensured that our men and women of the armed services have equal access to the ballot and the opportunity to cast a vote, without fear of violating a 10 day deadline.

I am disappointed that this Jackson Lee Amendment was not made in order, but I will continue working with my colleagues to find ways to ensure our armed services men and women have equal and just access to voice their opinion by casting a voting ballot.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2018, which would have required the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on programs and procedures employed to ensure students studying abroad through Department of Defense National Security Education Programs are trained to recognize, resist, and report against recruitment efforts by agents of foreign governments.

This training would have been helpful for students such as Glenn Shriver, an outstanding college student-majoring in international relations at a college in Michigan and interested in seeing the world.

Seeking new experiences, Glenn traveled to China during the 2002–2003 academic year to Study Abroad in one of Shanghai's universities and practice his Mandarin.

During his study abroad program in China, Glenn developed an interest in Chinese culture and considerably improved his fluency in Mandarin, so after graduating from college in 2004, he returned to the China to continue his language studies and to look for work.

After seeing potential in Glenn, a Chinese official going by the name of Amanda ap-

proached him and asked him to write papers and paid him \$120.

In the following months, Glenn took some \$70,000 from the woman and her associates, and eventually sought a U.S. government job with the aim of accessing classified information with the purpose of providing it to Chinese officials until his scheme was uncovered and he was arrested by the FBI in 2010.

To a recent college graduate, \$70,000 seems like a lot of money if they are graduating with high student loan debt, and the promise of even more can be too tempting to pass up.

There are other means and methods for foreign agents to attempt to of course, trick or in some other way deceive a college student into becoming a tool of that government.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would have laid the foundation for protected students attending domestic institutions of higher education by providing them with the training necessary to recognize, resist, and report recruitment efforts by agents of foreign governments when they occur in the United States.

Congress should not assume that foreign governments seeking to recruit students attending institutions of higher learning will limit their efforts to students studying abroad.

Had it been made in order and adopted, the Jackson Lee Amendment simply would require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on whether U.S. students attending institutions in the United States would benefit from similar or some aspects of the training described in the bill.

We have seen and learned so much regarding Russia's efforts to influence our nation's elections in large part by leveraging relationships between Russian agents and key individuals in President Trump's Campaign.

Although the work to investigate what took place continues, we should take steps today to make sure that young people attending institutions of higher learning are equipped with the knowledge and training needed to resist influence of a foreign government.

Although I am disappointed this important amendment was not made to order, I will continue to work with my colleagues to find ways to train our young people studying abroad on ways to detect, resist, and report attempts to recruit them by hostile foreign nations and actors.

Had it been made in order and approved, Jackson Lee Amendment No. 182 would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop plans for early detection, mitigation, and defense against state sponsored cyberattacks targeting federal public election assets, election administrators, election workers, or voter engagement efforts.

The aim of this amendment is to ensure that elections, and the peaceful transfer of power, which are pillars of our democracy, remain secure and are not undermined by external factors.

Last year, during one of the most contentious elections we have seen, a foreign state commenced a series of spearfishing attacks with the goal of penetrating the networks of a variety of Republican and Democratic Party organizations.

This foreign adversary was Russia, whose intelligence agencies worked under the directive of Vladimir Putin with the goal of making

Donald Trump the 45th President of the United States.

Russian interference may have begun as early as 2015, and lasted through the winter of 2016. While at first, the hacking may have been done with the aim of foreign intelligence collection, by July 2016, Russian intelligence weaponized their information and worked to damage Hillary Clinton's campaign.

While the exact extent of Russia's influence on our elections may never be known, the fact is that Russia successfully intervened in our democracy and American intelligence agencies have determined that they have the capability and motivation to do so once more.

The Jackson Lee amendment would have helped to ensure that this never happens again.

Neither Russia, nor any other country, will ever have a say in our democratic processes.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would protect our election administrators, our election workers, and our voter engagement efforts.

I am disappointed that this amendment was not made in order, but I will continue to work with my colleagues to ensure that the United States has the proper technology, capability, and methods to defend our elections against malicious foreign state-sponsored cyberattacks.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I ask that the following exchange of letters be included in the RECORD on H.R. 2810:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, June 30, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in your committee report on this bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 2810 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on the Judiciary has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not

to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by forgoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Judiciary is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2017.
Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. That bill, as ordered reported, contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Natural Resources Committee, including those affecting public lands, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Corps, and matters regarding the Freely Associated States and insular areas of the United States.

In the interest of permitting you to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this very important bill, I waive this committee's right to a sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that the Natural Resources Committee does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in the bill that fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you urge the Speaker to name members of the Natural Resources committee to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 2810 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you and your staff have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees, and congratulations on this significant achievement.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.
Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee reports on the bill.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOV-
ERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, June 29, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in matters being considered in H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 2810 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. TREY GOWDY,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Govern-
ment Reform, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak on House consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH and the Armed Services Committee for their work on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and Judiciary, I take our role in Congress as stewards of our nation's security seriously.

I offer my thanks and appreciation to the men and women of the armed services who place themselves in harm's way each day for the safety and security of our nation's people.

The National Defense Authorization Act's purpose is to address the threats our nation faces not just today, but into the future. This makes our work vital to our national interest and it should reflect our strong commitment to ensure that the men and women of our Armed Services receive the benefits and support that they deserve for their faithful service.

This bill encompasses a number of initiatives designed to confront the military challenges posed by violent extremism, terrorists engaging in ground wars, making more efficient the work of protecting America, addresses defense of our nation's computing networks and infrastructure, the medical health needs of men and women in the armed services, and extends economic and education opportunity to small minority and women owned businesses.

We live in a dangerous world, where threats are not always easily identified, and our enemies are not bound by borders.

Russia's aggression towards the United States has long been understood, but in 2016 the stakes were raised in terms of how far they would go to harm our nation and Democratic institutions when they interfered in our national election.

Since September 11, 2001, we have kept a steadfast commitment to ending the threat of global terror.

Boko Haram, ISIL, and Al Shabaab remind us of how fragile our nation's security could be without a well trained and equipped military.

The introduction of cyber offensive actions against the United States and our interest has altered the definition of war and with it our understanding about what is needed to combat a unique type of enemy that fights under no flag, for any nation, and can cause harm to computing networks.

I appreciate the House Armed Services Committee's continued support of our national defense and support a number of provisions in H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, such as authorities that support ongoing operations.

The amendments offered to this bill offered opportunities to address these and other Administration concerns that will improve the bill.

Let me discuss briefly the amendments I offered that were adopted by the House and included in the final version of the bill.

1. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 56 calls for increased collaboration with NIH to combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer and provides \$10 million in appropriations.

2. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 76 directs the Department of Defense to prepare contingency plans to assist relief organizations in delivering humanitarian aid in South Sudan and to deescalate conflict.

3. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 83 directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare against deployment of North Korean nuclear ICBMs to prevent damage or destruction of satellites critical to U.S. national defense and global communications.

These Jackson Lee Amendments are straightforward, and make improvements to the bill.

There were 14 additional Jackson Lee Amendments that were not included in the Rule for consideration of the Fiscal Year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act.

The Jackson Lee Amendments to H.R. 2810 are in four categories:

1. National Security Amendments that protect and promote national security, national defense and U.S. foreign policy interests;

2. Counterespionage and Deterrence Amendments that uphold the interests of American citizens at home and abroad.

3. Healthcare, technology and know-how, and Opportunities for Women Amendments that promote advances in PTSD and Triple-Negative Breast Cancer Research and Professional Development and Business opportunities for women.

4. Cybersecurity Amendments that support the work of the DOD to ensure defense of our nation against cyberattacks.

I have submitted six amendments that protect and promote national security, national defense or U.S. foreign policy interests:

1. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 175 authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide technical assistance by U.S. military women to military women abroad combating terrorism, human and narcotics trafficking and their impact on women and girls.

2. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 166 condemns the actions of Boko Haram and directs the Secretary of Defense to provide technical assistance to Nigeria in establishing a central missing persons' database and a Victims Relief Fund.

3. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 187 expresses Sense of Congress that the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program is an important U.S. foreign policy and national defense instrument of value and asks Secretary of Defense to make maximum use of it.

4. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 184 directs Secretary of State to inform Congress of the feasibility of providing training, equipment and logistics to improve air traffic control systems in African countries where U.S. military operations require it.

5. The Jackson Lee Amendments No. 76 and No. 83 that were accepted by the Rules Committee and are under consideration by the House addressed the humanitarian crisis in South Sudan, and North Korea's Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Program.

These six Jackson Lee amendments would have enhanced the effectiveness of the NDAA by protecting and promoting U.S. foreign policy and national security interests.

I have submitted three amendments to defend against espionage and provide deterrence against threats to the United States:

1. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 177 authorized the Secretary of Defense to work with local partners in providing security at civilian nuclear research centers to assure nuclear weapons do not fall into the possession of terrorists or rogue nations.

2. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 181 required the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress the programs employed to ensure Department of Defense National Security Education Program students studying abroad are trained to recognize, resist, and report against foreign governmental recruitment efforts.

3. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 179 directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct and report to Congress the results of a study on whether requirement to notify Voting Action

Officer within 10 days of registration in service member duty reassignment state imposes significant burden on military voters.

Two of these amendments sought to address known threats to our national interest and one would have assured that changes in voter registration rules for persons serving in the military would not impose an undue burden to their right to vote at a polling location instead of by absentee ballot.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 177 (Secure Nuclear Material in developing nations)

There is a wide array of peaceful uses for nuclear material such as nuclear power plant power generation; radiation treatment for cancer and other medical conditions; as well as research at academic and research institutions.

China and India are both pursuing nuclear power as an option to dependence on fossil fuels, while oil-rich Gulf nations are considering nuclear power with the hope of exporting more oil.

There are 65 reactors being built around the world, and 69 percent of them are in Brazil, Russia, India and China.

India has no fossil fuel resources and is expanding its use of nuclear power to address shortfalls in electric generation capacity that is out stripped by economic growth.

India goal is to have nuclear power be the source for 50 percent of its electricity needs by 2050.

I have submitted six amendments to protect women and health:

4. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 224 provides \$2.5 million increase in funding to combat Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

5. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 180 enforces the title and section "Minority and Business Ownership" to include HUZ and disadvantaged businesses.

6. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 226 directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to Congress on the ability to apply desalination technologies for drought relief for both military and civilian purposes.

7. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 431 directs that the Office of Women's Business Ownership shall include a focus on outreach and engagement of minority women owned businesses.

All six of these amendments enhance the NDAA.

I have submitted two amendments to ensure greater cybersecurity capacity and resource allocation for the purpose of protecting America's Cyber Defense interest:

1. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 182 directs the Secretary of Defense to develop plans for early detection, mitigation, and defense against state-sponsored cyberattacks regarding elections and voter engagement efforts.

2. Jackson Lee Amendment No. 183 directs the Secretary of Defense to develop effective countermeasures to defend networks against attacks by cyber weapons.

Both of these Jackson Lee amendments offered improvements to the NDAA's protection of America's cyber security.

In addition to these Amendments, I am in support of the AUMF Amendment offered by Representatives WALTER JONES and JOHN CONYERS that was not made in order by the Rules Committee.

Congress has an obligation to the American people to debate the issue of war.

Our military is now in theaters of war without Congressional approval which is in contravention to the Constitution because it states that only Congress has the power to declare war.

We must continue to direct our efforts as a body to ensure that our troops remain the best equipped and prepared military force in the world. They are not just soldiers they are sons and daughters, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters—they are some of the people we represent as Members of Congress. Support for them is a sacred obligation of Congress, both to those who are at risk on battlefields and serving as the guard against threats around the world, but they are also those who have returned home from war.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I will vote against H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2018 (Roll no. 378). I commend the House Armed Services Committee for tackling some difficult issues, but I remain concerned about several components of the bill, including its lack of fiscal discipline and use of budget gimmicks.

There are provisions of this legislation that I support. I am pleased this bill includes a provision expressing the sense of Congress that climate change is a direct threat to the national security of the United States. The bill would also support a 2.4 percent military pay raise and would require the Pentagon to report to Congress any attempts by Russian actors to hack the Defense Department's system.

However, by authorizing a total of \$621.5 billion in base budget authority, exceeding the \$549 billion cap set in the 2011 Budget Control Act, and using \$10 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding for base defense requirements, Congress and the administration are misusing budget mechanisms to pad their accounts in an era of fiscal uncertainty. The bill puts off making tough decisions about our defense spending.

The legislation also keeps intact funding for several unnecessary weapons programs and undermines key international nuclear non-proliferation efforts. The bill authorizes full funding for the Air Force's next generation air-launched cruise missile, known as the Long-Range Standoff weapon (LRSO), even though Secretary of Defense Mattis has stated numerous times that he is skeptical we actually need it. I offered an amendment to keep funding for the LRSO at FY17 levels until the administration submits a Nuclear Posture Review to Congress, but it was unfortunately not accepted.

The bill also requires the Department of Defense to develop a missile system that, if tested or deployed, would violate U.S. obligations under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. I offered an amendment to prohibit this system's development until military experts, diplomats and our NATO allies certify that they agree with this approach, but this amendment too was rejected.

Additionally, the legislation caps funding for nuclear weapon dismantlement at \$56 million for FY19 through FY21, making us less safe.

Beyond nuclear weapons and treaties, the legislation maintains a prohibition on transferring detainees in Guantanamo Bay detention

facility to the United States and bars the construction or modification of facilities within the U.S. to house detainees for another year. It's past time that we closed this military prison. We can safely and securely imprison anyone we need to without the extraordinary expense of this recruiting tool for ISIS.

The bill also prohibits a new round of base realignment and closure (BRAC), rejecting the Department of Defense's request for flexibility to implement BRAC for the sixth year in a row.

The best way to support our troops is to fight for common-sense budgeting and spending these sums out properly.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chair, I am a strong supporter of our troops and voted to move the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) out of Committee in early July. As I pointed out in my Additional Views expressed in House Report 115–200, however, I remain very concerned with the size of the defense spending increases proposed by the legislation and the required cuts that would likely be necessitated in non-defense discretionary spending. The measure would provide \$621.5 billion for regular national defense activities, which would exceed the \$549 billion cap set in the 2011 Budget Control Act (Public Law 112–25) by \$72 billion. If you include war funds for the Pentagon, nuclear programs at the Energy Department, and mandatory spending, the measure would authorize a total of \$696 billion for FY18.

The BCA was enacted in August 2011 in response to increased deficits in the wake of the Great Recession. The primary method of direct deficit reduction imposed by the BCA was the installation of caps on discretionary spending from FY12 through FY21. There have been three major revisions to the deficit reduction measures imposed by the BCA and each one included parity where the effects on total defense and nondefense budget authority were identical. As a member of the House Budget Committee, I know the discretionary caps are already scheduled to decline by a combined \$5 billion in FY18 relative to FY17 levels. House Republicans have yet to release their Budget Resolution mark which would quantify the exact spending cuts they propose to pay for the large increase in defense spending.

With the uncertainty of the size and scope of potentially massive cuts to our non-defense discretionary spending such as to diplomacy, foreign aid, education, housing, basic research, job training, and infrastructure, I cannot in good conscience vote for the additional billions of dollars in defense spending. I support our troops and a strong military to keep the peace, but this bill's spending levels would weaken our country's efforts at home and abroad. Our diplomatic and foreign aid budgets are an integral part in keeping the peace abroad. An increase to defense in conjunction with a cut in diplomacy and aid is a choice I cannot support. This should not be an either-or issue. However, because of the BCA and the decisions made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this is the choice I had to make on behalf of my constituents in Silicon Valley and what is right and in the best interests of our troops and national security interests and objectives.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I would like to address Section 131

of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

Last week, I filed amendment No. 247 on this matter; however I have since withdrawn the amendment given that the USAF has moved swiftly to replace the UH–1N fleet through an open and competitive process with the recent launch of the RFP.

The UH–1N replacement program is a priority for the Air Force and for many members of this Congress, House and Senate. This is for good reason. The UH–1N accomplishes two vital national security missions—nuclear missile security and continuity of government. Over a decade has passed since our Air Force identified the need to replace the aging Vietnam-era UH–1N Huey fleet.

Following collaborative efforts between the Air Force and industry, including meetings and additional requests for information, the Air Force has now released its final Request for Proposal which begins the process of replacing the UH–1N fleet and ensuring a fair and open competition. Unfortunately, language contained in the H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2018, threatens to upend this fair, competitive and open process by pushing a sole-source contract at the taxpayer's expense. Section 131 would allow the Air Force to sole-source the replacement of the UH–1N helicopter.

Frankly, I find this language appalling. The Department of Defense's Better Buy Power 3.0 directive states, "Real competition is the single most powerful tool available to the Department to drive productivity." The Federal Acquisition Regulations clearly articulate the importance of competition to satisfy cost, quality and timeliness aims. Competition is essential to maintaining a healthy industrial base. In Congress, we should be encouraging the Department of Defense to remain committed to competition.

Congress has repeatedly supported and directed a fair and open competition for the replacement of the UH–1N; yet, the language in Section 131 goes against congressional and Air Force efforts to ensure an open and fair competition. Given the fact that responses to the RFP will be due prior to the FY18 NDAA's completion, changing course from a fair and open competition to a sole-source procurement at this time would limit options, create more delays, increase costs for taxpayers, and potentially impact mission requirements. There is also no justification for a sole-source contract of helicopters when multiple candidate aircraft, including commercial aircraft built cost effectively here in the United States on existing, hot production lines, can be leveraged in support of this mission.

In 2016, twelve Members of Congress signed on to a letter in support of a UH–1N replacement competition, which was instrumental in moving the Air Force towards its current strategy. We must allow the Air Force to continue their competition to replace their UH–1N aircraft and accelerate their ability to field new aircraft without further delay in the interest of national security. We should applaud and support the Air Force for moving forward with replacing the fleet of UH–1N not force them to stop and change course. Changing course from a fair and open competition to a sole-source procurement would create more

delays, increase costs, and potentially impact mission requirements.

We cannot let this happen to the Airmen of our nation.

I applaud the Air Force in moving forward with replacing its fleet of UH-1N aircraft that help ensure the security of our land-based nuclear forces. Taking any other path would further jeopardize this critical program.

While I have withdrawn my amendment, I will be working to ensure this language is removed from the final bill during conference. Mr. Chair, replacing these assets is long overdue and I look forward to working with the Chairman and Ranking Member on this and other Air Force priorities.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following exchange of letters be included in the RECORD on H.R. 2810:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2017.
Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this committee's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill the Committee on House Administration does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 2810 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

GREGG HARPER,
Chairman, Committee on House
Administration.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.
Hon. GREGG HARPER,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on House Administration has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on House Administration is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, June 30, 2017.
Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I am writing concerning H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

This legislation contains provisions within the Committee on Agriculture's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Agriculture will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.
Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Agriculture has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Agriculture is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.
Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I am writing regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, which the Committee on Armed Services ordered reported on June 28, 2017.

The bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. In order to expedite House consideration of H.R. 2810, the Committee on the Budget will forego action on the bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in H.R. 2810 or similar legislation and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that the Committee may address any remaining issues that fall within its jurisdiction. The Committee on the Budget also reserves the right to seek appointment of an

appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and requests your support of any such request.

I also request that you include this letter and your response as part of your committee's report on H.R. 2810 and in the Congressional Record during its consideration on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to working with you as this bill moves through the Congress.

Sincerely,

DIANE BLACK,
CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. DIANE BLACK,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on the Budget has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Budget is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following exchange of letters be included in the RECORD on H.R. 2810:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE
WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.
Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 2810 on those matters within the Committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 2810, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forego further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 2810 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chairwoman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chairwoman, Committee on Education and the
Workforce, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRWOMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.
Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 2810, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018." While the legislation does contain provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee will not request a sequential referral so that it can proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Committee takes this action with the understanding that its jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as such legislation moves forward. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on such legislation and requests your support when such a request is made.

Finally, I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 2810 on the House floor.

Sincerely,
GREG WALDEN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.
Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 30, 2017.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I am writing to you regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this committee's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill the Committee on Financial Services does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 2810 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,
JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.
Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Financial Services has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Financial Services is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 30, 2017.
Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, which contains substantial matter that falls within the Rule X legislative jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I appreciate the cooperation that allowed us to work out mutually agreeable text on numerous matters prior to your markup.

Based on that cooperation and our associated understandings, the Foreign Affairs Committee will not seek a sequential referral or object to floor consideration of the bill text approved at your Committee markup. This decision in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdictional interests of the Foreign

Affairs Committee in this bill, any subsequent amendments, or similar legislation. I request your support for the appointment of House Foreign Affairs conferees during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

Finally, I respectfully request that you include this letter and your response in your committee report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 2810 on the House floor.

Sincerely,
EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2017.
Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. I agree that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-23, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 115-212, is adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is a follows:

H.R. 2810

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018".

SEC. 2. ORGANIZATION OF ACT INTO DIVISIONS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) DIVISIONS.—This Act is organized into four divisions as follows:

(1) Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations.

(2) Division B—Military Construction Authorizations.

(3) Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations.

(4) Division D—Funding Tables.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Organization of Act into divisions; table of contents.

Sec. 3. Congressional defense committees.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization Of Appropriations

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—Army Programs

Sec. 111. Report on acceleration of Increment 2 of the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Sec. 121. Aircraft carriers.

Sec. 122. Procurement authority for icebreaker vessels.

Sec. 123. Limitation on availability of funds for procurement of icebreaker vessels.

Sec. 124. Multiyear procurement authority for Virginia class submarine program.

Sec. 125. Multiyear procurement authority for Arleigh Burke class destroyers and associated systems.

Sec. 126. Limitation on availability of funds for Arleigh Burke class destroyer.

Sec. 127. Extensions of authorities relating to construction of certain vessels.

Sec. 128. Multiyear procurement authority for V-22 Osprey aircraft.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

Sec. 131. Streamlining acquisition of intercontinental ballistic missile security capability.

Sec. 132. Limitation on selection of single contractor for C-130H avionics modernization program increment 2.

Sec. 133. Limitation on availability of funds for EC-130H Compass Call recapitalization program.

Sec. 134. Cost-benefit analysis of upgrades to MQ-9 Reaper aircraft.

Subtitle E—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters

Sec. 141. Authority for procurement of economic order quantities for the F-35 aircraft program.

Sec. 142. Limitation on demilitarization of certain cluster munitions.

Sec. 143. Reinstatement of requirement to preserve certain C-5 aircraft.

Sec. 144. Requirement that certain aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicles use specified standard data link.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization Of Appropriations

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, And Limitations

Sec. 211. Cost controls for presidential aircraft recapitalization program.

Sec. 212. Capital investment authority.

Sec. 213. Modification of authority to award prizes for advanced technology achievements.

Sec. 214. Critical technologies for Columbia class submarine.

Sec. 215. Joint Hypersonics Transition Office.

Sec. 216. Hypersonic airbreathing weapons capabilities.

Sec. 217. Limitation on availability of funds for MQ-25 unmanned air system.

Sec. 218. Limitation on availability of funds for contract writing systems.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—Energy and Environment

Sec. 311. Codification of and improvements to Department of Defense clearinghouse to coordinate Department review of applications for certain projects that may have adverse impact on military operations and readiness.

Sec. 312. Energy performance goals and master plan.

Sec. 313. Payment to Environmental Protection Agency of stipulated penalty in connection with Umatilla Chemical Depot, Oregon.

Sec. 314. Payment to Environmental Protection Agency of stipulated penalty in connection with Longhorn Army Ammunition Plant, Texas.

Sec. 315. Department of Defense cleanup and removal of petroleum, oil, and lubricant associated with the Prinz Eugen.

Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment

Sec. 321. Reauthorization of multi-trades demonstration project.

Sec. 322. Guidance regarding use of organic industrial base.

Subtitle D—Reports

Sec. 331. Quarterly reports on personnel and unit readiness.

Sec. 332. Biennial report on core depot-level maintenance and repair capability.

Sec. 333. Annual report on personnel, training, and equipment needs of non-federalized National Guard.

Sec. 334. Annual report on military working dogs used by the Department of Defense.

Sec. 335. Annual briefings on Army explosive ordnance disposal.

Sec. 336. Report on effects of climate change on Department of Defense.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Sec. 341. Explosive safety board.

Sec. 342. Department of Defense support for military service memorials and museums that highlight the role of women in the Armed Forces.

Sec. 343. Limitation on availability of funds for advanced skills management software system of the Navy.

Sec. 344. Cost-benefit analysis of uniform specifications for Afghan military or security forces.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

Sec. 401. End strengths for active forces.

Sec. 402. Revisions in permanent active duty end strength minimum levels.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

Sec. 411. End strengths for Selected Reserve.

Sec. 412. End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves.

Sec. 413. End strengths for military technicians (dual status).

Sec. 414. Fiscal year 2018 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians.

Sec. 415. Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support.

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 421. Military personnel.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Regular and Reserve Component Management

Sec. 501. Modification of requirements relating to conversion of certain military technician (dual status) positions to civilian positions.

Sec. 502. Pilot program on use of retired senior enlisted members of the Army National Guard as Army National Guard recruiters.

Sec. 503. Equal treatment of orders to serve on active duty under section 12304a and 12304b of title 10, United States Code.

Sec. 504. Direct employment pilot program for members of the National Guard and Reserve.

Subtitle B—General Service Authorities and Correction of Military Records

Sec. 511. Consideration of additional medical evidence by Boards for the Correction of Military Records and liberal consideration of evidence relating to post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury.

Sec. 512. Public availability of information related to disposition of claims regarding discharge or release of members of the Armed Forces when the claims involve sexual assault.

Sec. 513. Pilot program on use of video teleconferencing technology by boards for the correction of military records and discharge review boards.

Sec. 514. Inclusion of specific email address block on Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214).

Sec. 515. Provision of information on naturalization through military service.

Subtitle C—Military Justice and Other Legal Issues

Sec. 521. Clarifying amendments related to the Uniform Code of Military Justice reform by the Military Justice Act of 2016.

Sec. 522. Minimum confinement period required for conviction of certain sex-related offenses committed by members of the Armed Forces.

Sec. 523. Prohibition on wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images.

Sec. 524. Information for the Special Victims' Counsel or Victims' Legal Counsel.

Sec. 525. Special Victims' Counsel training regarding the unique challenges often faced by male victims of sexual assault.

Sec. 526. Garnishment to satisfy judgment rendered for physically, sexually, or emotionally abusing a child.

Sec. 527. Inclusion of information in annual SAPRO reports regarding military sexual harassment and incidents involving nonconsensual distribution of private sexual images.

Sec. 528. Inclusion of information in annual SAPRO reports regarding sexual assaults committed by a member of the Armed Forces against the member's spouse or other family member.

Sec. 529. Notification of members of the Armed Forces undergoing certain administrative separations of potential eligibility for veterans benefits.

Sec. 530. Consistent access to Special Victims' Counsel for former dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

Subtitle D—Member Education, Training, Resilience, and Transition

Sec. 541. Prohibition on release of military service academy graduates to participate in professional athletics.

- Sec. 542. ROTC Cyber Institutes at the senior military colleges.
- Sec. 543. Lieutenant Henry Ossian Flipper Leadership Scholarship Program.
- Subtitle E—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters
- Sec. 551. Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees.
- Sec. 552. Education for dependents of certain retired members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 553. Codification of authority to conduct family support programs for immediate family members of members of the Armed Forces assigned to special operations forces.
- Sec. 554. Reimbursement for State licensure and certification costs of a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces arising from relocation to another State.
- Subtitle F—Decorations and Awards
- Sec. 561. Replacement of military decorations at the request of relatives of deceased members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 562. Congressional Defense Service Medal.
- Sec. 563. Limitations on authority to revoke certain military decorations awarded to members of the Armed Forces.
- Subtitle G—Miscellaneous Reports and Other Matters
- Sec. 571. Expansion of United States Air Force Institute of Technology enrollment authority to include civilian employees of the homeland security industry.
- Sec. 572. Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance.
- Sec. 573. Voter registration.
- Sec. 574. Sense of Congress regarding section 504 of title 10, United States Code, on existing authority of the Department of Defense to enlist individuals, not otherwise eligible for enlistment, whose enlistment is vital to the national interest.
- TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS
- Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances
- Sec. 601. Annual adjustment of basic monthly pay.
- Sec. 602. Limitation on basic allowance for housing modification authority for members of the uniformed services residing in Military Housing Privatization Initiative housing.
- Sec. 603. Housing treatment for certain members of the Armed Forces, and their spouses and other dependents, undergoing a permanent change of station within the United States.
- Sec. 604. Per diem allowance policies.
- Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays
- Sec. 611. One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces.
- Sec. 612. One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals.
- Sec. 613. One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers.
- Sec. 614. One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities.
- Sec. 615. One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays.
- Sec. 616. Reimbursement for State licensure and certification costs of a member of the Armed Forces arising from separation from the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 617. Increase in maximum amount of aviation bonus for 12-month period of obligated service.
- Sec. 618. Technical and clerical amendments relating to 2008 consolidation of certain special pay authorities.
- Subtitle C—Disability Pay, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits
- Sec. 621. Findings and sense of Congress regarding the Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance.
- Subtitle D—Other Matters
- Sec. 631. Land conveyance authority, Army and Air Force Exchange Service property, Dallas, Texas.
- Sec. 632. Advisory boards regarding military commissaries and exchanges.
- TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS
- Subtitle A—TRICARE and Other Health Care Benefits
- Sec. 701. Physical examinations for members of a reserve component who are separating from the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 702. Mental health examinations before members separate from the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 703. Provision of hyperbaric oxygen therapy for certain members of the Armed Forces.
- Subtitle B—Health Care Administration
- Sec. 711. Clarification of roles of commanders of military medical treatment facilities and Surgeons General.
- Sec. 712. Maintenance of inpatient capabilities of military medical treatment facilities located outside the United States.
- Sec. 713. Regular update of prescription drug pricing standard under TRICARE retail pharmacy program.
- Sec. 714. Residency requirements for podiatrists.
- Subtitle C—Other Matters
- Sec. 721. One year extension of pilot program for prescription drug acquisition cost parity in the TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program.
- Sec. 722. Pilot program on health care assistance system.
- Sec. 723. Research of chronic traumatic encephalopathy.
- Sec. 724. Sense of Congress on eligibility of victims of acts of terror for evaluation and treatment at military treatment facilities.
- TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS
- Subtitle A—Defense Acquisition Streamlining and Transparency
- PART I—ACQUISITION SYSTEM STREAMLINING
- Sec. 801. Procurement through online marketplaces.
- Sec. 802. Performance of incurred cost audits.
- Sec. 803. Modifications to cost or pricing data and reporting requirements.
- PART II—EARLY INVESTMENTS IN ACQUISITION PROGRAMS
- Sec. 811. Requirement to emphasize reliability and maintainability in weapon system design.
- Sec. 812. Licensing of appropriate intellectual property to support major weapon systems.
- Sec. 813. Management of intellectual property matters within the Department of Defense.
- Sec. 814. Improvement of planning for acquisition of services.
- Sec. 815. Improvements to test and evaluation processes and tools.
- PART III—ACQUISITION WORKFORCE IMPROVEMENTS
- Sec. 821. Enhancements to the civilian program management workforce.
- Sec. 822. Improvements to the hiring and training of the acquisition workforce.
- Sec. 823. Extension and modifications to acquisition demonstration project.
- Sec. 824. Acquisition positions in the Offices of the Secretaries of the Military Departments.
- PART IV—TRANSPARENCY IMPROVEMENTS
- Sec. 831. Transparency of defense business system data.
- Sec. 832. Major defense acquisition programs: display of budget information.
- Sec. 833. Enhancements to transparency in test and evaluation processes and data.
- Subtitle B—Streamlining of Defense Acquisition Statutes and Regulations
- Sec. 841. Modifications to the advisory panel on streamlining and codifying acquisition regulations.
- Sec. 842. Extension of maximum duration of fuel storage contracts.
- Sec. 843. Exception for business operations from requirement to accept \$1 coins.
- Sec. 844. Repeal of expired pilot program.
- Subtitle C—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations
- Sec. 851. Limitation on unilateral definitization.
- Sec. 852. Codification of requirements pertaining to assessment, management, and control of operating and support costs for major weapon systems.
- Sec. 853. Use of program income by eligible entities that carry out procurement technical assistance programs.
- Sec. 854. Amendment to sustainment reviews.
- Sec. 855. Clarification to other transaction authority.
- Sec. 856. Clarifying the use of lowest price technically acceptable source selection process.
- Sec. 857. Amendment to nontraditional and small contractor innovation prototyping program.
- Sec. 858. Modification to annual meeting requirement of Configuration Steering Boards.
- Sec. 859. Change to definition of subcontract in certain circumstances.
- Sec. 860. Amendment relating to applicability of inflation adjustments.
- Subtitle D—Other Matters
- Sec. 861. Exemption from design-build selection procedures.
- Sec. 862. Requirement that certain ship components be manufactured in the national technology and industrial base.
- Sec. 863. Procurement of aviation critical safety items.
- Sec. 864. Milestones and timelines for contracts for foreign military sales.
- Sec. 865. Notification requirement for certain contracts for audit services.
- Sec. 866. Training in acquisition of commercial items.
- Sec. 867. Notice of cost-free Federal procurement technical assistance in connection with registration of small business concerns on procurement websites of the Department of Defense.

- Sec. 868. Comptroller General report on contractor business system requirements.
- Sec. 869. Standard guidelines for evaluation of requirements for services contracts.
- Sec. 870. Temporary limitation on aggregate annual amount available for contract services.
- TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT**
- Subtitle A—Organization and Management of the Department of Defense Generally*
- Sec. 901. Responsibility of the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense for risk management activities regarding supply chain for information technology systems.
- Sec. 902. Repeal of Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight.
- Sec. 903. Designation of corrosion control and prevention executives for the military departments.
- Sec. 904. Maintaining civilian workforce capabilities to sustain readiness, the all volunteer force, and operational effectiveness.
- Subtitle B—Designation of the Navy and Marine Corps*
- Sec. 911. Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.
- Sec. 912. Conforming amendments to title 10, United States Code.
- Sec. 913. Other provisions of law and other references.
- Sec. 914. Effective date.
- Subtitle C—Other Matters*
- Sec. 921. Transition of the Office of the Secretary of Defense to reflect establishment of positions of Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment, and Chief Management Officer.
- Sec. 922. Extension of deadlines for reporting and briefing requirements for Commission on the National Defense Strategy for the United States.
- Sec. 923. Briefing on force management level policy.
- TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS**
- Subtitle A—Financial Matters*
- Sec. 1001. General transfer authority.
- Sec. 1002. Preparation of consolidated corrective action plan and implementation of centralized reporting system.
- Sec. 1003. Additional requirements relating to Department of Defense audits.
- Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards*
- Sec. 1011. National Defense Sealift Fund.
- Sec. 1012. National Defense Sealift Fund: construction of national icebreaker vessels.
- Sec. 1013. Use of National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund for multiyear procurement of certain critical components.
- Sec. 1014. Restrictions on the overhaul and repair of vessels in foreign shipyards.
- Sec. 1015. Availability of funds for retirement or inactivation of Ticonderoga-class cruisers or dock landing ships.
- Sec. 1016. Policy of the United States on minimum number of battle force ships.
- Subtitle C—Counterterrorism*
- Sec. 1021. Termination of requirement to submit annual budget justification display for Department of Defense combating terrorism program.
- Sec. 1022. Prohibition on use of funds for transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba to the United States.
- Sec. 1023. Prohibition on use of funds to construct or modify facilities in the United States to house detainees transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.
- Sec. 1024. Prohibition on use of funds for transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to certain countries.
- Sec. 1025. Biannual report on support of special operations to combat terrorism.
- Subtitle D—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations*
- Sec. 1031. Limitation on expenditure of funds for emergency and extraordinary expenses for intelligence and counter-intelligence activities and representation allowances.
- Sec. 1032. Modifications to humanitarian demining assistance authorities.
- Sec. 1033. Prohibition on charge of certain tariffs on aircraft traveling through channel routes.
- Sec. 1034. Limitation on divestment of U-2 or RQ-4 aircraft.
- Sec. 1035. Prohibition on use of funds for retirement of legacy maritime mine countermeasures platforms.
- Sec. 1036. Restriction on use of certain funds pending solicitation of bids for Western Pacific dry dock.
- Sec. 1037. National Guard flyovers of public events.
- Sec. 1038. Transfer of funds to World War I Centennial Commission.
- Sec. 1039. Rule of construction regarding use of Department of Defense funding of a border wall.
- Subtitle E—Studies and Reports*
- Sec. 1051. Elimination of reporting requirements terminated after November 25, 2017, pursuant to section 1080 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.
- Sec. 1052. Report on Department of Defense arctic capability and resource gaps.
- Sec. 1053. Review and assessment of Department of Defense personnel recovery and nonconventional assisted recovery mechanisms.
- Sec. 1054. Mine warfare readiness inspection plan and report.
- Sec. 1055. Report on civilian casualties from Department of Defense strikes.
- Sec. 1056. Reports on infrastructure and capabilities of Lajes Field, Portugal.
- Sec. 1057. Report on Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex modernization.
- Subtitle F—Other Matters*
- Sec. 1061. Technical, conforming, and clerical amendments.
- Sec. 1062. Workforce issues for relocation of Marines to Guam.
- Sec. 1063. Protection of Second Amendment Rights of Military Families.
- Sec. 1064. Transfer of surplus firearms to corporation for the promotion of rifle practice and firearms safety.
- Sec. 1065. National Guard accessibility to Department of Defense issued unmanned aircraft.
- Sec. 1066. Sense of Congress regarding aircraft carriers.
- Sec. 1067. Notice to Congress of terms of Department of Defense settlement agreements.
- Sec. 1068. Sense of Congress recognizing the United States Navy Seabees.
- Sec. 1069. Recognition of the United States Special Operations Command.
- Sec. 1070. Sense of Congress regarding World War I.
- Sec. 1071. Findings and sense of Congress regarding the National Guard Youth Challenge Program.
- Sec. 1072. Sense of Congress regarding National Purple Heart Recognition Day.
- TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS**
- Sec. 1101. Extension of direct hire authority for domestic Defense Industrial Base Facilities and Major Range and Test Facilities Base.
- Sec. 1102. Extension of authority to provide voluntary separation incentive pay for civilian employees of the Department of Defense.
- Sec. 1103. Additional Department of Defense science and technology reinvention laboratories.
- Sec. 1104. One year extension of authority to waive annual limitation on premium pay and aggregate limitation on pay for Federal civilian employees working overseas.
- Sec. 1105. Appointment of retired members of the armed forces to positions in or under the Department of Defense.
- Sec. 1106. Direct hire authority for financial management experts in the Department of Defense workforce.
- Sec. 1107. Extension of authority for temporary personnel flexibilities for domestic defense industrial base facilities and Major Range and Test Facilities Base civilian personnel.
- Sec. 1108. One-year extension of temporary authority to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities to civilian personnel on official duty in a combat zone.
- TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS**
- Subtitle A—Assistance and Training*
- Sec. 1201. One-year extension of logistical support for coalition forces supporting certain United States military operations.
- Sec. 1202. Modification to Special Defense Acquisition Fund.
- Sec. 1203. Modification to ministry of defense advisor authority.
- Sec. 1204. Modification of authority to build capacity of foreign security forces.
- Sec. 1205. Extension and modification of authority on training for Eastern European national military forces in the course of multilateral exercises.
- Sec. 1206. Extension of participation in and support of the Inter-American Defense College.
- Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan and Pakistan*
- Sec. 1211. Extension of authority to transfer defense articles and provide defense services to the military and security forces of Afghanistan.
- Sec. 1212. Report on United States strategy in Afghanistan.
- Sec. 1213. Extension and modification of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations.

- Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Syria, Iraq, and Iran*
- Sec. 1221. Report on United States strategy in Syria.
- Sec. 1222. Extension and modification of authority to provide assistance to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.
- Sec. 1223. Extension and modification of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq.
- Sec. 1224. Sense of Congress on threats posed by the Government of Iran.
- Subtitle D—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation*
- Sec. 1231. Extension of limitation on military cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation.
- Sec. 1232. Prohibition on availability of funds relating to sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea.
- Sec. 1233. Statement of policy on the Russian Federation.
- Sec. 1234. Modification and extension of Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative.
- Sec. 1235. Limitation on availability of funds relating to implementation of the Open Skies Treaty.
- Sec. 1236. Sense of Congress on importance of nuclear capabilities of NATO.
- Sec. 1237. Sense of Congress on support for Georgia.
- Sec. 1238. Sense of Congress on support for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.
- Subtitle E—Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty Preservation Act of 2017*
- Sec. 1241. Short title.
- Sec. 1242. Findings.
- Sec. 1243. Compliance enforcement regarding Russian violations of the INF Treaty.
- Sec. 1244. Development of INF range ground-launched missile system.
- Sec. 1245. Notification requirement related to Russian Federation development of noncompliant systems and United States actions regarding material breach of INF Treaty by the Russian Federation.
- Sec. 1246. Limitation on availability of funds to extend the implementation of the New START Treaty.
- Sec. 1247. Review of RS-26 ballistic missile.
- Sec. 1248. Definitions.
- Subtitle F—Fostering Unity Against Russian Aggression Act of 2017*
- Sec. 1251. Short title.
- Sec. 1252. Findings and sense of Congress.
- Sec. 1253. Strategy to counter threats by the Russian Federation.
- Sec. 1254. Strategy to increase conventional precision strike weapon stockpiles in the United States European Command's areas of responsibility.
- Sec. 1255. Plan to counter the military capabilities of the Russian Federation.
- Sec. 1256. Plan to increase cyber and information operations, deterrence, and defense.
- Sec. 1257. Sense of Congress on enhancing maritime capabilities.
- Sec. 1258. Plan to reduce the risks of miscalculation and unintended consequences that could precipitate a nuclear war.
- Sec. 1259. Definitions.
- Subtitle G—Matters Relating to the Indo-Asia-Pacific Region*
- Sec. 1261. Sense of Congress on the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.
- Sec. 1262. Report on strategy to prioritize United States defense interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.
- Sec. 1263. Assessment of United States force posture and basing needs in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.
- Sec. 1264. Extended deterrence commitment to the Asia-Pacific region.
- Sec. 1265. Authorization of appropriations to meet United States financial obligations under Compact of Free Association with Palau.
- Sec. 1266. Sense of Congress reaffirming security commitments to the Governments of Japan and South Korea and trilateral cooperation between the United States, Japan, and South Korea.
- Sec. 1267. Sense of Congress on freedom of navigation operations in the South China Sea.
- Sec. 1268. Sense of Congress on strengthening the defense of Taiwan.
- Sec. 1269. Sense of Congress on the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.
- Sec. 1270. Sense of Congress on reaffirming the importance of the United States-Australia defense alliance.
- Subtitle H—Other Matters*
- Sec. 1271. NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence.
- Sec. 1272. NATO Strategic Communications Center of Excellence.
- Sec. 1273. Security and stability strategy for Somalia.
- Sec. 1274. Assessment of Global Theater Security Cooperation Management Information System.
- Sec. 1275. Future years plan for the European Deterrence Initiative.
- Sec. 1276. Extension of authority to enter into agreements with participating countries in the American, British, Canadian, and Australian Armies' Program.
- Sec. 1277. Security strategy for Yemen.
- Sec. 1278. Limitation on transfer of excess defense articles that are high mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicles.
- Sec. 1279. Department of Defense program to protect United States students against foreign agents.
- Sec. 1280. Extension of United States-Israel anti-tunnel cooperation authority.
- Sec. 1281. Anticorruption strategy.
- TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION**
- Sec. 1301. Specification of cooperative threat reduction funds.
- Sec. 1302. Funding allocations.
- TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**
- Subtitle A—Military Programs*
- Sec. 1401. Working capital funds.
- Sec. 1402. Chemical agents and munitions destruction, defense.
- Sec. 1403. Drug interdiction and counter-drug activities defense-wide.
- Sec. 1404. Defense Inspector General.
- Sec. 1405. Defense Health Program.
- Sec. 1406. National Defense Sealift Fund.
- Subtitle B—Other Matters*
- Sec. 1411. Authority for transfer of funds to joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois.
- Sec. 1412. Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home.
- TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**
- Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations*
- Sec. 1501. Purpose and treatment of certain authorizations of appropriations.
- Sec. 1502. Procurement.
- Sec. 1503. Research, development, test, and evaluation.
- Sec. 1504. Operation and maintenance.
- Sec. 1505. Military personnel.
- Sec. 1506. Working capital funds.
- Sec. 1507. Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide.
- Sec. 1508. Defense Inspector General.
- Sec. 1509. Defense Health program.
- Subtitle B—Financial Matters*
- Sec. 1511. Treatment as additional authorizations.
- Sec. 1512. Special transfer authority.
- Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters*
- Sec. 1521. Afghanistan Security Forces Fund.
- Sec. 1522. Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund.
- TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS**
- Subtitle A—Management and Organization of Space Programs*
- Sec. 1601. Establishment of Space Corps in the Department of the Air Force.
- Sec. 1602. Establishment of subordinate unified command of the United States Strategic Command.
- Subtitle B—Space Activities*
- Sec. 1611. Codification, extension, and modification of limitation on construction on United States territory of satellite positioning ground monitoring stations of foreign governments.
- Sec. 1612. Foreign commercial satellite services: cybersecurity threats and launches.
- Sec. 1613. Extension of pilot program on commercial weather data.
- Sec. 1614. Conditional transfer of acquisition and funding authority of certain weather missions to National Reconnaissance Office.
- Sec. 1615. Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle modernization and sustainment of assured access to space.
- Sec. 1616. Commercial satellite communications pathfinder program.
- Sec. 1617. Demonstration of backup and complementary positioning, navigation, and timing capabilities of Global Positioning System.
- Sec. 1618. Enhancement of positioning, navigation, and timing capacity.
- Sec. 1619. Establishment of Space Flag training event.
- Sec. 1620. Report on operational and contingency plans for loss or degradation of space capabilities.
- Sec. 1621. Limitation on availability of funding for Joint Space Operations Center mission system.
- Sec. 1622. Limitation on availability of funds relating to advanced extremely high frequency program.
- Subtitle C—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Activities*
- Sec. 1631. Security clearances for facilities of certain contractors.
- Sec. 1632. Extension of authority to engage in certain commercial activities.
- Sec. 1633. Submission of audits of commercial activity funds.
- Sec. 1634. Clarification of annual briefing on the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements of the combatant commands.

- Sec. 1635. Review of support provided by Defense intelligence elements to acquisition activities of the Department.
- Sec. 1636. Limitation on availability of funds for certain offensive counterintelligence activities.
- Sec. 1637. Prohibition on availability of funds for certain relocation activities for NATO intelligence fusion center.
- Sec. 1638. Establishment of chairman's controlled activity within Joint Staff for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.
- Sec. 1639. Sense of Congress and report on geospatial commercial activities for basic and applied research and development.
- Sec. 1640. Department of Defense Counterintelligence polygraph program.
- Sec. 1641. Security clearance for dual-nationals.
- Sec. 1642. Suspension or revocation of security clearances based on unlawful or inappropriate contacts with representatives of a foreign government.
- Subtitle D—Cyberspace-Related Matters
- Sec. 1651. Notification requirements for sensitive military cyber operations and cyber weapons.
- Sec. 1652. Modification to quarterly cyber operations briefings.
- Sec. 1653. Cyber Scholarship Program.
- Sec. 1654. Plan to increase cyber and information operations, deterrence, and defense.
- Sec. 1655. Report on termination of dual-hat arrangement for Commander of the United States Cyber Command.
- Subtitle E—Nuclear Forces
- Sec. 1661. Notifications regarding dual-capable F-35A aircraft.
- Sec. 1662. Oversight of delayed acquisition programs by Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System.
- Sec. 1663. Establishment of Nuclear Command and Control Intelligence Fusion Center.
- Sec. 1664. Security of nuclear command, control, and communications system from commercial dependencies.
- Sec. 1665. Oversight of aerial-layer programs by Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System.
- Sec. 1666. Security classification guide for programs relating to nuclear command, control, and communications and nuclear deterrence.
- Sec. 1667. Evaluation and enhanced security of supply chain for nuclear command, control, and communications and continuity of government programs.
- Sec. 1668. Limitation on pursuit of certain command and control concept.
- Sec. 1669. Procurement authority for certain parts of intercontinental ballistic missile fuzes.
- Sec. 1670. Sense of Congress on importance of independent nuclear deterrent of United Kingdom.
- Sec. 1671. Prohibition on availability of funds for mobile variant of ground-based strategic deterrent missile.
- Sec. 1672. Report on impacts of nuclear proliferation.
- Subtitle F—Missile Defense Programs
- Sec. 1681. Administration of missile defense and defeat programs.
- Sec. 1682. Preservation of the ballistic missile defense capacity of the Army.
- Sec. 1683. Modernization of Army lower tier air and missile defense sensor.
- Sec. 1684. Enhancement of operational test and evaluation of ballistic missile defense system.
- Sec. 1685. Defense of Hawaii from North Korean ballistic missile attack.
- Sec. 1686. Aegis Ashore anti-air warfare capability.
- Sec. 1687. Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system, Israeli cooperative missile defense program codevelopment and coproduction, and Arrow 3 testing.
- Sec. 1688. Review of proposed ground-based midcourse defense system contract.
- Sec. 1689. Sense of Congress and plan for development of space-based sensor layer for ballistic missile defense.
- Sec. 1690. Sense of Congress and plan for development of space-based ballistic missile intercept layer.
- Sec. 1691. Limitation on availability of funds for ground-based midcourse defense element of the ballistic missile defense system.
- Sec. 1692. Conventional prompt global strike weapons system.
- Sec. 1693. Determination of location of continental United States interceptor site.
- Subtitle G—Other Matters
- Sec. 1695. Protection of certain facilities and assets from unmanned aircraft.
- Sec. 1696. Use of commercial items in Distributed Common Ground Systems.
- Sec. 1697. Independent assessment of costs relating to ammonium perchlorate.
- Sec. 1698. Limitation and business case analysis regarding ammonium perchlorate.
- Sec. 1699. Industrial base for large solid rocket motors and related technologies.
- Sec. 1699A. Pilot program on enhancing information sharing for security of supply chain.
- Sec. 1699B. Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States From Electromagnetic Pulse Attacks and Events.
- Sec. 1699C. Pilot program on electromagnetic spectrum mapping.
- TITLE XVII—MATTERS RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT
- Subtitle A—Improving Transparency and Clarity for Small Businesses
- Sec. 1701. Improving reporting on small business goals.
- Sec. 1702. Uniformity in procurement terminology.
- Sec. 1703. Responsibilities of commercial market representatives.
- Sec. 1704. Responsibilities of Business Opportunity Specialists.
- Subtitle B—Women's Business Programs
- Sec. 1711. Office of Women's Business Ownership.
- Sec. 1712. Women's Business Center Program.
- Sec. 1713. Matching requirements under Women's Business Center Program.
- Subtitle C—SCORE Program
- Sec. 1721. SCORE reauthorization.
- Sec. 1722. SCORE program.
- Sec. 1723. Online component.
- Sec. 1724. Study and report on the future role of the SCORE program.
- Sec. 1725. Technical and conforming amendments.
- Subtitle D—Small Business Development Centers Improvements
- Sec. 1731. Use of authorized entrepreneurial development programs.
- Sec. 1732. Marketing of services.
- Sec. 1733. Data collection.
- Sec. 1734. Fees from private partnerships and cosponsorships.
- Sec. 1735. Equity for small business development centers.
- Sec. 1736. Confidentiality requirements.
- Sec. 1737. Limitation on award of grants to small business development centers.
- Subtitle E—Miscellaneous
- Sec. 1741. Modification of past performance pilot program to include consideration of past performance with allies of the United States.
- DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS
- Sec. 2001. Short title.
- Sec. 2002. Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law.
- Sec. 2003. Effective date.
- TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
- Sec. 2101. Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2102. Family housing.
- Sec. 2103. Improvements to military family housing units.
- Sec. 2104. Authorization of appropriations, Army.
- Sec. 2105. Modification of authority to carry out certain Fiscal Year 2014 project.
- Sec. 2106. Modification of authority to carry out certain Fiscal Year 2015 project.
- Sec. 2107. Extension of authorization of certain Fiscal Year 2014 project.
- Sec. 2108. Extension of authorizations of certain Fiscal Year 2015 projects.
- Sec. 2109. Additional authority to carry out certain Fiscal Year 2000, 2005, 2006, and 2007 projects.
- TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
- Sec. 2201. Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2202. Family housing.
- Sec. 2203. Improvements to military family housing units.
- Sec. 2204. Authorization of appropriations, Navy.
- Sec. 2205. Extension of authorizations for certain Fiscal Year 2014 projects.
- Sec. 2206. Extension of authorizations of certain Fiscal Year 2015 projects.
- TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
- Sec. 2301. Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2302. Family housing.
- Sec. 2303. Improvements to military family housing units.
- Sec. 2304. Authorization of appropriations, Air Force.
- Sec. 2305. Modification of authority to carry out certain Fiscal Year 2017 projects.
- Sec. 2306. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2015 projects.
- TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
- Sec. 2401. Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2402. Authorized energy resiliency and conservation projects.
- Sec. 2403. Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies.
- Sec. 2404. Modification of authority to carry out certain Fiscal Year 2017 project.

Sec. 2405. Extension of authorizations of certain Fiscal Year 2014 projects.

Sec. 2406. Extension of authorizations of certain Fiscal Year 2015 projects.

TITLE XXV—INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program

Sec. 2501. Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2502. Authorization of appropriations, NATO.

Subtitle B—Host Country In-Kind Contributions

Sec. 2511. Republic of Korea funded construction projects.

Sec. 2512. Modification of authority to carry out certain Fiscal Year 2017 projects.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Appropriations

Sec. 2601. Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2602. Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2603. Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2604. Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2605. Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2606. Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Sec. 2611. Modification of authority to carry out certain Fiscal Year 2015 project.

Sec. 2612. Extension of authorizations of certain Fiscal Year 2014 projects.

Sec. 2613. Extension of authorizations of certain Fiscal Year 2015 projects.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 2701. Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account.

Sec. 2702. Prohibition on conducting additional base realignment and closure (BRAC) round.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing

Sec. 2801. Elimination of written notice requirement for military construction activities and reliance on electronic submission of notifications and reports.

Sec. 2802. Modification of thresholds applicable to unspecified minor construction projects.

Sec. 2803. Extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects outside the United States.

Sec. 2804. Use of operation and maintenance funds for military construction projects to replace facilities damaged or destroyed by natural disasters or terrorism incidents.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

Sec. 2811. Elimination of written notice requirement for military real property transactions and reliance on electronic submission of notifications and reports.

Sec. 2812. Clarification of applicability of fair market value consideration in grants of easements on military lands for rights-of-way.

Sec. 2813. Criteria for exchanges of property at military installations.

Sec. 2814. Prohibiting use of updated assessment of public schools on Department of Defense installations to supersede funding of certain projects.

Sec. 2815. Requirements for window fall prevention devices in military family housing.

Sec. 2816. Authorizing reimbursement of States for costs of suppressing wildfires caused by Department of Defense activities on State lands; restoration of lands of other Federal agencies for damage caused by Department of Defense vehicle mishaps.

Sec. 2817. Prohibiting collection of additional amounts from members living in units under Military Housing Privatization Initiative.

Subtitle C—Land Conveyances

Sec. 2821. Land exchange, Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant, Sunnyvale, California.

Sec. 2822. Land conveyance, Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam.

Sec. 2823. Lease of real property to the United States Naval Academy Alumni Association and Naval Academy Foundation at United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland.

Sec. 2824. Land conveyance, Natick Soldier Systems Center, Massachusetts.

Sec. 2825. Imposition of additional conditions on land conveyance, Castner Range, Fort Bliss, Texas.

Sec. 2826. Land conveyance, Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Rich County, Utah.

Sec. 2827. Land conveyance, former missile alert facility known as Quebec-01, Laramie County, Wyoming.

Subtitle D—Military Land Withdrawals

Sec. 2831. Indefinite duration of certain military land withdrawals and reservations and improved management of withdrawn and reserved lands.

Sec. 2832. Temporary segregation from public land laws of property subject to proposed military land withdrawal; temporary use permits and transfers of small parcels of land between Departments of Interior and military departments; more efficient surveying of lands.

Subtitle E—Military Memorials, Monuments, and Museums

Sec. 2841. Modification of prohibition on transfer of veterans memorial objects to foreign governments without specific authorization in law.

Sec. 2842. Recognition of the National Museum of World War II Aviation.

Sec. 2843. Principal office of Aviation Hall of Fame.

Subtitle F—Shiloh National Military Park

Sec. 2851. Short title.

Sec. 2852. Definitions.

Sec. 2853. Areas to be added to Shiloh National Military Park.

Sec. 2854. Establishment of affiliated area.

Sec. 2855. Private Property Protection.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

Sec. 2861. Modification of Department of Defense guidance on use of airfield pavement markings.

Sec. 2862. Authority of Chief Operating Officer of Armed Forces Retirement Home to acquire and lease property.

TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 2901. Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2902. Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition project.

Sec. 2903. Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2904. Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition project.

Sec. 2905. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 2906. Extension of authorization of certain Fiscal Year 2015 projects.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

Sec. 3101. National Nuclear Security Administration.

Sec. 3102. Defense environmental cleanup.

Sec. 3103. Other defense activities.

Sec. 3104. Nuclear energy.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

Sec. 3111. Nuclear security enterprise infrastructure recapitalization and repair.

Sec. 3112. Incorporation of integrated surety architecture in transportation.

Sec. 3113. Cost estimates for life extension program and major alteration projects.

Sec. 3114. Budget requests and certification regarding nuclear weapons dismantlement.

Sec. 3115. Improved information relating to defense nuclear nonproliferation research and development program.

Sec. 3116. Research and development of advanced naval reactor fuel based on low-enriched uranium.

Sec. 3117. Prohibition on availability of funds for programs in Russian Federation.

Sec. 3118. National Nuclear Security Administration pay and performance system.

Sec. 3119. Disposition of weapons-usable plutonium.

Sec. 3120. Modification of minor construction threshold for plant projects.

Sec. 3121. Design competition.

Sec. 3122. Department of Energy Counterintelligence polygraph program.

Sec. 3123. Security clearance for dual-nationals employed by National Nuclear Security Agency.

Subtitle C—Plans and Reports

Sec. 3131. Modification of certain reporting requirements.

Sec. 3132. Assessment of management and operating contracts of national security laboratories.

Sec. 3133. Evaluation of classification of certain defense nuclear waste.

- Sec. 3134. Report on Critical Decision-1 on Material Staging Facility project.
- Sec. 3135. Modification to stockpile stewardship, management, and responsiveness plan.
- Sec. 3136. Improved reporting for anti-smuggling radiation detection systems.
- Sec. 3137. Annual selected acquisition reports on certain hardware relating to defense nuclear nonproliferation.
- Sec. 3138. Assessment of design trade options of W80-4 warhead.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

- Sec. 3201. Authorization.
- TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES**
- Sec. 3401. Authorization of appropriations.
- TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION**
- Sec. 3501. Authorization of the Maritime Administration.
- Sec. 3502. Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946.
- Sec. 3503. Maritime Security Fleet Program; restriction on operation for new entrants.
- Sec. 3504. Codification of sections relating to acquisition, charter, and requisition of vessels.
- Sec. 3505. Assistance for small shipyards.
- Sec. 3506. Report on sexual assault victim recovery in the Coast Guard.
- Sec. 3507. Centers of excellence.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

- Sec. 4001. Authorization of amounts in funding tables.

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

- Sec. 4101. Procurement.
- Sec. 4102. Procurement for overseas contingency operations.
- Sec. 4103. Procurement for overseas contingency operations for base requirements.

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

- Sec. 4201. Research, development, test, and evaluation.
- Sec. 4202. Research, development, test, and evaluation for overseas contingency operations.
- Sec. 4203. Research, development, test, and evaluation for overseas contingency operations for base requirements.

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

- Sec. 4301. Operation and maintenance.
- Sec. 4302. Operation and maintenance for overseas contingency operations.
- Sec. 4303. Operation and maintenance for overseas contingency operations for base requirements.

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

- Sec. 4401. Military personnel.
- Sec. 4402. Military personnel for overseas contingency operations.
- Sec. 4403. Military personnel for overseas contingency operations for base requirements.

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

- Sec. 4501. Other authorizations.
- Sec. 4502. Other authorizations for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

- Sec. 4601. Military construction.
- Sec. 4602. Military construction for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

- Sec. 4701. Department of Energy national security programs.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.

In this Act, the term “congressional defense committees” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization Of Appropriations

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for procurement for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and Defense-wide activities, as specified in the funding table in section 4101.

Subtitle B—Army Programs

SEC. 111. REPORT ON ACCELERATION OF INCREMENT 2 OF THE WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than January 30, 2018, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on options for the acceleration of the procurement and fielding of Increment 2 of the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical program of the Army (referred to in this section as “WIN-T Increment 2”).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An estimate of the level of funding required to procure a sufficient quantity of WIN-T Increment 2 components to field thirty Brigade Combat Teams or equivalent units in the period beginning with fiscal year 2018 and ending with fiscal year 2022.

(2) A plan for fielding WIN-T Increment 2 to all Armored Brigade Combat Teams of the Army and associated combat vehicles, including the Armored Multipurpose Vehicle.

(3) A plan for integrating WIN-T Increment 2 on the Stryker combat vehicles fielded to Stryker Brigade Combat Teams of the Army.

(4) A list of potential upgrades to WIN-T Increment 2 that may improve program capabilities, including size, weight, and complexity, and the impact of these improvements on the cost of the program.

(5) Options for fielding an Expeditionary Command Post capability that effectively integrates WIN-T Increment 2 and command post infrastructure.

(6) A detailed plan for upgrading the existing WIN-T Increment 1 system to the latest WIN-T Increment 2 configuration that includes—

(A) an estimate of the level of funding required to implement the plan; and

(B) the effect of the plan on the fielding of mobile mission command to the reserve components of the Army.

(7) Any other matters the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

SEC. 121. AIRCRAFT CARRIERS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INCREASE IN NUMBER OF OPERATIONAL AIRCRAFT CARRIERS.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) Aircraft carriers are an essential element of the Navy’s core missions of forward presence, sea control, ensuring safe sea lanes, and power projection, and provide the flexibility and versatility necessary for the execution of a wide range of additional missions.

(B) Forward airpower is integral to the security and joint forces operations of the United States. Carriers play a central role in delivering forward airpower from sovereign territory of the United States in both permissive and nonpermissive environments.

(C) Aircraft carriers provide the Nation the ability to rapidly and decisively respond to national threats, to conduct worldwide, on-station diplomacy, and to deter threats to allies, partners, and friends of the United States.

(D) Since the end of the cold war, aircraft carrier deployments have increased while the aircraft carrier force structure has declined.

(E) Due to the increased array of complex threats across the globe, the Navy’s aircraft carriers are operating at maximum capacity, increasing deployment lengths and decreasing maintenance periods in order to meet operational requirements.

(F) To meet global peacetime and wartime requirements, the Navy has indicated a requirement to maintain two aircraft carriers deployed overseas and to have three additional aircraft carriers capable of deploying within 90 days. However, the Navy has indicated that the existing aircraft carrier force structure cannot support these military requirements.

(G) Despite the requirement to maintain an aircraft carrier strike group in both the United States Central Command and the United States Pacific Command, the Navy has been unable to generate sufficient capacity to support combatant commanders and has developed significant carrier gaps in these critical areas.

(H) The continued use of a diminished aircraft carrier force structure has resulted in extensive maintenance availabilities which typically exceed program costs and increase time in shipyards. These expansive maintenance availabilities exacerbate existing carrier gaps.

(I) Because of maintenance overhaul extensions, the Navy is truncating basic aircraft carrier training to expedite the deployment of available aircraft carriers. Limiting aircraft carrier training decreases operational capabilities and increases risks to sailors.

(J) Despite the objections of the Navy, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics directed the Navy on August 7, 2015, to perform shock trials on the U.S.S. Gerald R. Ford (CVN-78). The Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Operations, Plans and Strategy indicated that this action could delay the introduction of the U.S.S. Gerald R. Ford (CVN-78) to the fleet by up to two years, exacerbating existing carrier gaps.

(K) The Navy has adopted a two-phase acquisition strategy for the U.S.S. John F. Kennedy (CVN-79), an action that will delay the introduction of this aircraft carrier by up to two years, exacerbating existing carrier gaps.

(L) Developing an alternative design to the Ford class aircraft carrier is not cost beneficial. A smaller design is projected to incur significant design and engineering cost while significantly reducing magazine size, carrier air wing size, sortie rate, and on-station effectiveness among other vital factors as compared to the Ford class. Furthermore, a new design will delay the introduction of future aircraft carriers, exacerbating existing carrier gaps and threatening the national security of the United States.

(M) The 2016 Navy Force Structure Assessment states “A minimum of 12 aircraft carriers are required to meet the increased warfighting response requirements of the Defense Planning Guidance Defeat/Deny force sizing direction.” Furthermore, a new National Defense Strategy is being prepared that will assess the defeat/deny force sizing direction and may increase the force structure associated with aircraft carriers.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) the United States should expedite delivery of 12 aircraft carriers;

(B) an aircraft carrier should be authorized every three years;

(C) shock trials should be conducted on the U.S.S. John F. Kennedy (CVN-79), as initially proposed by the Navy;

(D) construction for the U.S.S. John F. Kennedy (CVN-79) should be accomplished in a single phase; and

(E) the United States should continue the Ford class design for the aircraft carrier designated CVN-81.

(b) INCREASE IN NUMBER OF OPERATIONAL AIRCRAFT CARRIERS.—

(1) INCREASE.—Section 5062(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “11 operational aircraft carriers” and inserting “12 operational aircraft carriers”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on September 30, 2023.

(c) SHOCK TRIALS FOR CVN-78.—Section 128 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 751) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b); and
(2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (a) and (b), respectively.

(d) PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR AIRCRAFT CARRIER PROGRAMS.—

(1) PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF CONSTRUCTION OF FORD CLASS AIRCRAFT CARRIERS.—

(A) AUTHORITY FOR ECONOMIC ORDER QUANTITY.—The Secretary of the Navy may procure material and equipment in support of the construction of the Ford class aircraft carriers designated CVN-81 and CVN-82 in economic order quantities when cost savings are achievable.

(B) LIABILITY.—Any contract entered into under subparagraph (A) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose, and that total liability to the Government for termination of any contract entered into shall be limited to the total amount of funding obligated at time of termination.

(2) REFUELING AND COMPLEX OVERHAUL OF NIMITZ CLASS AIRCRAFT CARRIERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Navy may carry out the nuclear refueling and complex overhaul of each of the following Nimitz class aircraft carriers:

- (i) U.S.S. John C. Stennis (CVN-74).
- (ii) U.S.S. Harry S. Truman (CVN-75).
- (iii) U.S.S. Ronald Reagan (CVN-76).
- (iv) U.S.S. George H.W. Bush (CVN-77).

(B) USE OF INCREMENTAL FUNDING.—With respect to any contract entered into under subparagraph (A) for the nuclear refueling and complex overhaul of a Nimitz class aircraft carrier, the Secretary may use incremental funding for a period not to exceed six years after advance procurement funds for such nuclear refueling and complex overhaul effort are first obligated.

(C) CONDITION FOR OUT-YEAR CONTRACT PAYMENTS.—Any contract entered into under subparagraph (A) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2018 is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose for that later fiscal year.

SEC. 122. PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR ICEBREAKER VESSELS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may enter into a contract or other agreement with the Secretary of the Navy under which the Navy shall act as general agent for the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating for the purpose of entering into a contract on behalf of such Department, beginning with the fiscal year 2018 program year, for the procurement of the following:

(1) Not more than three heavy icebreaker vessels.

(2) Not more than three medium icebreaker vessels.

(b) CONDITION FOR OUT-YEAR CONTRACT PAYMENTS.—A contract entered into under subsection (a) shall provide that any obligation of

the United States to make a payment under the contract for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2018 is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose for such later fiscal year.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HEAVY ICEBREAKER VESSEL.—The term “heavy icebreaker vessel” means a vessel that is able—

(A) to break through nonridged ice that is not less than six feet thick at a speed of three knots;

(B) to break through ridged ice that is not less than 21 feet thick; and

(C) to operate continuously for 80 days without replenishment.

(2) MEDIUM ICEBREAKER VESSEL.—The term “medium icebreaker vessel” means a vessel that is able—

(A) to break through nonridged ice that is not less than four and one-half feet thick at a speed of three knots; and

(B) to operate continuously for 80 days without replenishment.

SEC. 123. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR PROCUREMENT OF ICEBREAKER VESSELS.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 may be obligated or expended for the procurement of an icebreaker vessel.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding the limitation in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Navy may use funds described in such subsection to act as general agent for the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating pursuant to a contract or other agreement entered into under section 122.

SEC. 124. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT.—Subject to section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may enter into one or more multiyear contracts, beginning with the fiscal year 2019 program year, for the procurement of up to 13 Virginia class submarines at a rate of not more than 3 submarines per year during the covered period.

(b) BASELINE ESTIMATE.—Before entering into any contract for the procurement of a Virginia class submarine under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Navy shall determine a baseline estimate for the submarine in accordance with section 2435 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Navy may not enter into a contract for the procurement of a Virginia class submarine under subsection (a) if the contract would increase the cost of the submarine by more than 10 percent above the baseline estimate for the submarine determined under subsection (b).

(d) AUTHORITY FOR ADVANCE PROCUREMENT.—The Secretary may enter into one or more contracts, beginning in fiscal year 2018, for advance procurement—

(1) associated with the vessels for which authorization to enter into a multiyear procurement contract is provided under subsection (a); and

(2) for other equipment and subsystems associated with the Virginia class submarine program.

(e) CONDITION FOR OUT-YEAR CONTRACT PAYMENTS.—A contract entered into under subsection (a) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2018 is subject to the availability of appropriations or funds for that purpose for such later fiscal year.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED PERIOD.—The term “covered period” means the 5-year period beginning with the fiscal year 2019 program year and ending with the fiscal year 2023 program year.

(2) VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE.—The term “Virginia class submarine” means a block V configured Virginia class submarine.

SEC. 125. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR ARLEIGH BURKE CLASS DESTROYERS AND ASSOCIATED SYSTEMS.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT.—Subject to section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may enter into one or more multiyear contracts, beginning with the fiscal year 2018 program year, for the procurement of—

(1) up to 15 Arleigh Burke class Flight III guided missile destroyers at a rate of not more than three such destroyers per year during the covered period; and

(2) the Aegis weapon systems, AN/SPY-6(v) air and missile defense radar systems, MK 41 vertical launching systems, and commercial broadband satellite systems associated with such vessels.

(b) BASELINE ESTIMATE.—Before entering into any contract for the procurement of an Arleigh Burke class destroyer under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Navy shall determine a baseline estimate for the destroyer in accordance with section 2435 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Navy may not enter into a contract for the procurement of a Arleigh Burke class destroyer or any major subprogram under subsection (a) if the contract would increase the cost of the destroyer by more than 10 percent above the baseline estimate for the destroyer determined under subsection (b).

(d) AUTHORITY FOR ADVANCE PROCUREMENT.—The Secretary may enter into one or more contracts, beginning in fiscal year 2018, for advance procurement associated with the vessels and systems for which authorization to enter into a multiyear procurement contract is provided under subsection (a).

(e) CONDITION FOR OUT-YEAR CONTRACT PAYMENTS.—A contract entered into under subsection (a) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2018 is subject to the availability of appropriations or funds for that purpose for such later fiscal year.

(f) COVERED PERIOD DEFINED.—The term “covered period” means the 5-year period beginning with the fiscal year 2018 program year and ending with the fiscal year 2022 program year.

SEC. 126. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR ARLEIGH BURKE CLASS DESTROYER.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 for procurement, that are unobligated as of the date of the enactment of this Act, may be obligated or expended to procure an Arleigh Burke class destroyer (DDG-51) unless not fewer than two covered destroyers include an AN/SPY-6(V) air and missile defense radar system.

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary of the Navy may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that the cost or schedule risk associated with the integration of the AN/SPY-6(V) air and missile defense radar is unacceptable or incongruous with a business case that relies on stable design, technology maturity, and realistic cost and schedule estimates.

(c) COVERED DESTROYER DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered destroyer” means an Arleigh Burke class destroyer (DDG-51) for which funds were authorized to be appropriated by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) or the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328).

SEC. 127. EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN VESSELS.

(a) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO USE INCREMENTAL FUNDING FOR LHA REPLACEMENT.**—Section 122(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017 (114–328; 130 Stat. 2030) is amended by striking “for fiscal years 2017 and 2018” and inserting “for fiscal years 2017, 2018, and 2019”.

(b) **EXTENSION OF FORD CLASS AIRCRAFT CARRIER CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY.**—Section 121(a) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2104), as most recently amended by section 121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1654), is amended by striking “five fiscal years” and inserting “seven fiscal years”.

SEC. 128. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR V–22 OSPREY AIRCRAFT.

(a) **AUTHORITY FOR MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT.**—Subject to section 2306b of title 10, United States Code (except as provided in subsection (b)), the Secretary of the Navy may enter into one or more multiyear contracts, beginning with the 2018 program year, for the procurement of the following:

(1) V–22 Osprey aircraft.

(2) Common configuration-readiness and modernization upgrades for V–22 Osprey aircraft.

(b) **CONTRACT PERIOD.**—Notwithstanding section 2306b(k) of title 10, United States Code, the period covered by a contract entered into on a multiyear basis under the authority of subsection (a) may exceed five years, but may not exceed seven years.

(c) **CONDITION FOR OUT-YEAR CONTRACT PAYMENTS.**—A contract entered into under subsection (a) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2018 is subject to the availability of appropriations or funds for that purpose for such later fiscal year.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

SEC. 131. STREAMLINING ACQUISITION OF INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE SECURITY CAPABILITY.

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

(1) On September 25, 2014, then Secretary of the Air Force, Deborah Lee James, submitted a report to Congress on the replacement strategy of the Air Force for the UH–1N helicopter, which included the following information:

(A) On the age of the airframe: “The UH–1N is a versatile utility helicopter that was accepted into service from 1968–1969.”

(B) On the ability to meet requirements: “The entire fleet supports five general homeland security missions . . . The ability of the UH–1N to accomplish these missions was evaluated in 2006, and the aircraft was found to be ‘not effective.’ The shortcomings of the UH–1N were derived from specific mission requirements for carrying capacity, airspeed, unrefueled endurance, mission range, force protection for the floor, specific protection for all aircrew and passengers, survivability, and materiel availability.”

(C) Regarding previous efforts to acquire a replacement aircraft, the report identified efforts that date back to 2006, including—

(i) an initial analysis of alternatives by Air Force Space Command in 2006;

(ii) the common vertical lift support platform program, which was cancelled in 2013;

(iii) two RAND corporation studies funded in 2013; and

(iv) the then-current proposal of the Air Force to procure modified Army UH–60 helicopters.

(2) On February 24, 2016, at a hearing before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, in response to concerns related to lift, capacity, and hover time of the

UH–1N, then Commander of the United States Strategic Command, Admiral Cecil Haney stated: “Congressman, absolutely, in terms of thinking very crisply associated with what we need to do to improve security of our missile fields . . . the attributes you listed are the attributes that concern me in terms of the capability, not just now, but into the future.”

(3) On March 2, 2016, at a hearing before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the Commander of Air Force Global Strike Command, General Robin Rand stated: “We will not meet the emergency security response with the present helicopter.”

(4) On April 4, 2017, at a hearing before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, General John E. Hyten stated: “Of all the things in my portfolio, I can’t even describe how upset I get about the helicopter replacement program. It’s a helicopter, for gosh sakes. We ought to be able to go out and buy a helicopter and put it in the hands of the people that need it. And we should be able to do that quickly. We’ve been building combat helicopters for a long time in this country. I don’t understand why the heck it is so hard to buy a helicopter.”

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that, based on the findings under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense should have the authority to expedite the procurement of a replacement aircraft for the UH–1N helicopter.

(c) **WAIVER AND CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—Subject to subsection (d), in procuring a replacement aircraft for the UH–1N helicopter, the Secretary of Defense may—

(1) waive any provision of law requiring the use of competitive procedures for the procurement; and

(2) enter into a contract for the procurement on a sole-source basis.

(d) **NOTICE AND CERTIFICATION.**—Not later than 15 days before exercising the authority under subsection (c), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees, in writing—

(1) notice of the intent of the Secretary to exercise such authority; and

(2) a certification that—

(A) the Secretary has reviewed—

(i) the threshold requirements for the UH–1N replacement aircraft program; and

(ii) any delays that may have occurred while the Air Force pursued strategies for the procurement of such aircraft on an other than sole-source basis; and

(B) after conducting such review, the Secretary has determined that entering into a contract on a sole-source basis under subsection (c)—

(i) is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(ii) is necessary to ensure that a UH–1N replacement aircraft enters service by not later than September 30, 2020.

SEC. 132. LIMITATION ON SELECTION OF SINGLE CONTRACTOR FOR C–130H AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM INCREMENT 2.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may not select only a single prime contractor to carry out increment 2 of the C–130H avionics modernization program until the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a written certification that, in selecting such a single prime contractor—

(1) the Secretary will ensure, to the extent practicable, that commercially available off-the-shelf items are used under the program, including technology solutions and nondevelopmental items; and

(2) excessively restrictive military specification standards will not be used to restrict or eliminate full and open competition in the selection process.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “commercially available off-the-shelf item”, “full and open competition”, and “nondevelopmental item” have the meanings given the terms in chapter 1 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 133. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR EC–130H COMPASS CALL RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any fiscal year for the EC–130H Compass Call recapitalization program of the Air Force may be obligated or expended until a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date on which the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics submits to the congressional defense committees the certification described in subsection (b).

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—The certification described in this subsection is a written statement certifying that—

(1) an independent review of the acquisition process for the EC–130H Compass Call recapitalization program of the Air Force has been conducted; and

(2) as a result of such review, it has been determined that the acquisition process for such program complies with all applicable laws, guidelines, and best practices.

SEC. 134. COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF UPGRADES TO MQ–9 REAPER AIRCRAFT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Air Force, shall conduct an analysis that compares the costs and benefits of the following:

(1) Upgrading fielded MQ–9 Reaper aircraft to a Block 5 configuration.

(2) Proceeding with the procurement of MQ–9B aircraft instead of upgrading fielded MQ–9 Reaper aircraft to a Block 5 configuration.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the results of the cost-benefit analysis conducted under subsection (a).

(2) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

Subtitle E—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters

SEC. 141. AUTHORITY FOR PROCUREMENT OF ECONOMIC ORDER QUANTITIES FOR THE F–35 AIRCRAFT PROGRAM.

(a) **AUTHORITY FOR PROCUREMENT OF ECONOMIC ORDER QUANTITIES.**—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense may enter into one or more contracts, beginning with the fiscal year 2018 program year, for the procurement of economic order quantities of the material and equipment described in subsection (b).

(b) **MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT DESCRIBED.**—The material and equipment described in this subsection is material and equipment—

(1) that has completed formal hardware qualification testing for the F–35 aircraft program; and

(2) is to be used in procurement contracts to be awarded under the F–35 aircraft program in fiscal years 2019 and 2020.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **MAXIMUM AMOUNT.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 or any fiscal year thereafter for the F–35 aircraft program, not more than \$661,000,000 may be obligated or expended to enter into contracts under subsection (a).

(2) **CERTIFICATION.**—The Secretary of Defense may not enter into a contract under subsection (a) until a period of 15 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a written certification that the contract to be entered

into under such subsection meets the following conditions:

(A) The contract will result in significant cost savings as compared to the total anticipated costs of procuring the property through contracts that are not for economic order quantities.

(B) The estimates of the cost of the contract and the anticipated cost savings resulting from the contract are realistic.

(C) The minimum need for the property that is to be procured under the contract is expected to remain substantially unchanged during the contract period.

(D) There is a reasonable expectation that, throughout the contract period, the head of the relevant military department or defense agency will request funding for the contract at the level required to avoid contract cancellation.

(E) The design of the property that is to be procured under the contract is expected to remain substantially unchanged and the technical risks associated with such design are not excessive.

(F) Entering into the contract will promote the national security interests of the United States.

(G) The contract satisfies the conditions described in subparagraphs (C) through (F) of section 2306b(i)(3) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 142. LIMITATION ON DEMILITARIZATION OF CERTAIN CLUSTER MUNITIONS.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense may not demilitarize any cluster munitions until the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees the certification described in subsection (b).

(b) **CERTIFICATION.**—The certification described in this subsection is a written certification that the Department of Defense has an inventory of covered munitions that meets not less than 75 percent of the operational requirements of the Department with respect to cluster munitions across the full range of military operational environments.

(c) **EXCEPTION FOR SAFETY.**—The limitation under subsection (a) shall not apply to the demilitarization of cluster munitions that the Secretary determines—

(1) are unserviceable as a result of an inspection, test, field incident, or other significant failure to meet performance or logistics requirements; or

(2) are unsafe or could pose a safety risk if not demilitarized or destroyed.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CLUSTER MUNITION.**—The term “cluster munition” means a munition that is composed of a nonreusable canister or delivery body that contains multiple, conventional submunitions, without regard to the mode by which the munition is delivered. The term does not include—

(A) nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons;

(B) obscurants;

(C) pyrotechnics;

(D) non-lethal systems;

(E) non-explosive kinetic effect submunitions;

(F) electronic effects; or

(G) landmines.

(2) **COVERED MUNITIONS.**—The term “covered munitions” means cluster munitions containing submunitions that, after arming, do not result in more than 1 percent unexploded ordnance (as that term is defined in section 101(e)(5) of title 10, United States Code) across the range of intended operational environments.

(3) **DEMILITARIZE.**—The term “demilitarize”, when used with respect to a cluster munition or components of a cluster munition—

(A) means to destroy the military offensive or defensive advantages inherent in the munition or its components; and

(B) includes any mutilation, scrapping, melting, burning, or alteration that prevents the use

of the munition or its components for the military purposes for which the munition or its components was designed or for a lethal purpose.

SEC. 143. REINSTATEMENT OF REQUIREMENT TO PRESERVE CERTAIN C-5 AIRCRAFT.

Section 141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1659), as amended by section 132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328), is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) **PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN RETIRED C-5 AIRCRAFT.**—The Secretary of the Air Force shall preserve each C-5 aircraft that is retired by the Secretary during a period in which the total inventory of strategic airlift aircraft of the Secretary is less than 301, such that the retired aircraft—

“(1) is stored in flyable condition;

“(2) can be returned to service; and

“(3) is not used to supply parts to other aircraft unless specifically authorized by the Secretary of Defense upon a request by the Secretary of the Air Force.”.

SEC. 144. REQUIREMENT THAT CERTAIN AIRCRAFT AND UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES USE SPECIFIED STANDARD DATA LINK.

Section 157 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1667) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) **SOLICITATIONS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall—

“(1) ensure that any solicitation issued for a Common Data Link described in subsection (a), regardless of whether the solicitation is issued by a military department or a contractor with respect to a subcontract—

“(A) conforms to a Department of Defense specification standard, including interfaces and waveforms, existing as of the date of the solicitation; and

“(B) does not include any proprietary or undocumented waveforms or control interfaces or data interfaces as a requirement or criterion for evaluation; and

“(2) notify the congressional defense committees not later than 15 days after issuing a solicitation for a Common Data Link to be sunset (CDL-TBS) waveform.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics” and inserting “Deputy Secretary of Defense”; and

(B) by striking “Under Secretary” and inserting “Deputy Secretary of Defense”; and

(C) by inserting “before October 1, 2023” after “committees”.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization Of Appropriations

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the use of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the funding table in section 4201.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, And Limitations

SEC. 211. COST CONTROLS FOR PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM.

(a) **FIXED CAPABILITY REQUIREMENTS.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the capability requirements for aircraft procured under the presidential aircraft recapitalization program of the Air Force (referred to in this section as the “PAR Program”) shall be the capability requirements identified in version 7.0 of the system re-

quirement document for the PAR Program dated December 14, 2016.

(b) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may adjust the capability requirements described in subsection (a) only if the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a written determination that such adjustment is necessary—

(1) to resolve an ambiguity relating to the capability requirement;

(2) to address a problem with the administration of the capability requirement;

(3) to lower the development cost or life-cycle cost of the PAR program;

(4) to comply with a change in international, Federal, State, or local law or regulation that takes effect after September 30, 2017;

(5) to address a safety issue; or

(6) subject to subsection (c), to address an emerging threat or vulnerability.

(c) **LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT FOR EMERGING THREAT OR VULNERABILITY.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may use the authority under paragraph (6) of subsection (b) to adjust the requirements described in subsection (a) only if the Secretary and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, on a nondelegable basis—

(1) jointly determine that such adjustment is necessary and in the interests of the national security of the United States; and

(2) submit to the congressional defense committees notice of such joint determination.

(d) **FORM OF CONTRACTS.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT FOR FIXED-PRICE TYPE CONTRACTS.**—Of the total amount of funds obligated or expended for contracts for engineering and manufacturing development under the PAR program, not less than 50 percent shall be for fixed-price type contracts.

(2) **OTHER CONTRACT TYPES.**—Except as provided in paragraph (1), a contract other than a fixed-price type contract may be entered into under the PAR Program only if the service acquisition executive of the Air Force, on a nondelegable basis, approves the contract.

(e) **QUARTERLY BRIEFINGS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning not later than October 1, 2017, and on a quarterly basis thereafter through October 1, 2022, the Secretary of the Air Force shall provide to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a briefing on the efforts of the Secretary to control costs under the PAR Program.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—Each briefing under paragraph (1) shall include, with respect to the PAR Program, the following:

(A) An overview of the program schedule.

(B) A description of each contract awarded under the program, including a description of the type of contract and the status of the contract.

(C) An assessment of the status of the program with respect to—

(i) modification;

(ii) testing;

(iii) delivery; and

(iv) sustainment.

(f) **SERVICE ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “service acquisition executive” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(10) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 212. CAPITAL INVESTMENT AUTHORITY.

Section 2208(k)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

SEC. 213. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO AWARD PRIZES FOR ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY ACHIEVEMENTS.

Section 2374a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “to award cash prizes” and inserting “to award prizes, which may be cash prizes or nonmonetary prizes.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “cash prizes” and inserting “prizes”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “cash prize off” and inserting “prize valued at”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) No prize competition may result in the award of a nonmonetary prize valued at more than \$10,000 without the approval of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.”;

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by inserting “or nonmonetary items” after “accept funds”; and

(B) by striking “and from State and local governments,” and inserting “from State and local governments, and from other nongovernmental sources.”; and

(5) by striking subsection (f).

SEC. 214. CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES FOR COLUMBIA CLASS SUBMARINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of sections 2366b and 2448b(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, the components identified in subsection (b) are deemed to be critical technologies for the Columbia class ballistic missile submarine construction program.

(b) CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES.—The components identified in this subsection are—

(1) the coordinated stern for the Columbia class ballistic missile submarine;

(2) the electric drive system for the submarine; and

(3) the nuclear reactor for the submarine.

SEC. 215. JOINT HYPERSONICS TRANSITION OFFICE.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The joint technology office on hypersonics in the Office of the Secretary of Defense is redesignated as the “Joint Hypersonics Transition Office”. Any reference in a law (other than this section), map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the joint technology office on hypersonics shall be deemed to be a reference to the Joint Hypersonics Transition Office.

(b) HYPERSONICS DEVELOPMENT.—Section 218 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note), as amended by section 1079(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-192; 129 Stat. 999), is amended—

(1) in the heading of subsection (a), by striking “JOINT TECHNOLOGY OFFICE ON HYPERSONICS” and inserting “JOINT HYPERSONICS TRANSITION OFFICE”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “joint technology office on hypersonics” and inserting “Joint Hypersonics Transition Office (in this section referred to as the ‘Office’)”; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “office” and inserting “Office”;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “joint technology office established under subsection (a)” and inserting “Office”; and

(4) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—In carrying out the program required by subsection (b), the Office shall do the following:

“(1) Coordinate and integrate current and future research, development, test, and evaluation programs and system demonstration programs of the Department of Defense on hypersonics.

“(2) Undertake appropriate actions to ensure—

“(A) close and continuous integration of the programs on hypersonics of the military departments and the Defense Agencies with the programs on hypersonics across the Federal Government; and

“(B) that both foundational research and developmental testing resources are adequate and

well funded, and that facilities are made available in a timely manner to support hypersonics research, demonstration programs, and system development.

“(3) Approve demonstration programs on hypersonic systems to speed the maturation and deployment of the systems to the warfighter.”

“(4) Ensure that any demonstration program on hypersonic systems that is carried out in any year after its approval under paragraph (3) is carried out only if certified under subsection (e) as being consistent with the roadmap under subsection (d).

“(5) Develop a well-defined path for hypersonic technologies to transition to operational capabilities for the warfighter.”;

(5) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “joint technology office established under subsection (a)” and inserting “Office”; and

(6) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “joint technology office established under subsection (a)” and inserting “Office”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “joint technology office” and inserting “Office”.

SEC. 216. HYPERSONIC AIRBREATHING WEAPONS CAPABILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may transfer oversight and management of the Hypersonic Airbreathing Weapons Concept from the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to a responsible entity of the Air Force. The Secretary of the Air Force, acting through the head of the Air Force Research Laboratory, shall continue—

(1) to develop a reusable hypersonics test bed to further probe the high speed flight corridor and to facilitate the testing and development of hypersonic airbreathing weapon systems;

(2) to explore emerging concepts and technologies for reusable hypersonics weapons systems beyond current hypersonics programs, focused on experimental flight test capabilities; and

(3) to develop defensive technologies and countermeasures against potential and identified hypersonic threats.

(b) HYPERSONIC AIRBREATHING WEAPON SYSTEM DEFINED.—In this section, the term “hypersonic airbreathing weapon system” means a missile or platform with military utility that operates at speeds near or beyond approximately five times the speed of sound, and that is propelled through the atmosphere with an engine that burns fuel with oxygen from the atmosphere that is collected in an inlet.

SEC. 217. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR MQ-25 UNMANNED AIR SYSTEM.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy, for the MQ-25 unmanned air system, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until a period of 60 days has elapsed following the date on which the certification and report under subsection (b) have been submitted to the congressional defense committees.

(b) CERTIFICATION AND REPORT.—

(1) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written certification that—

(A) the MQ-25 unmanned air system is required to fill a validated capability gap of the Department of the Navy;

(B) the Chief of Naval Operations has reviewed and approved the initial capability document and the capability development document relating to such system; and

(C) the initial capability document and the capability development document have been provided to the congressional defense committees.

(2) REPORT.—The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisi-

tion shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes—

(A) an identification of threshold and objective key performance parameters for the MQ-25 unmanned air system;

(B) a certification that the threshold and objective key performance parameters for such system have been established and are achievable; and

(C) a description of the requirements of such system with respect to—

(i) fuel transfer;

(ii) equipment for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance;

(iii) equipment for electronic attack and electronic protection;

(iv) communications equipment;

(v) weapons payload;

(vi) range;

(vii) mission endurance for unrefueled and aerial refueled operations;

(viii) affordability;

(ix) survivability; and

(x) interoperability with other Navy and joint-service unmanned aerial systems and mission control stations.

SEC. 218. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEMS.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds specified in subsection (c), not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees the assessment required under subsection (b).

(b) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written assessment of the requirements for each contract writing information technology system of the Department of Defense and the military departments. Such assessment shall include the following:

(1) Analysis of the requirements for each such contract writing system, including identification of common requirements and any requirements unique to each military department.

(2) Identification of legacy systems that provide data to, or receive data from, such contract writing systems.

(3) Projected timelines showing when each contract writing system is expected to become fully operationally capable and when each legacy system is expected to terminate, based on budget projections included in the most recent future-years defense program submitted to Congress under section 221 of title 10, United States Code.

(4) Assessment of how a shared services model might be applied to replace specific contract writing systems, including analysis of the business process reengineering necessary to move to a shared services model and how shared services can be integrated into the business enterprise architecture of the Department.

(5) Identification of available shared services for contract writing systems, such as those offered by the General Services Administration or by other sources, that might provide viable alternatives to current contract writing systems.

(6) Identification of any gaps in the capabilities of available shared services for contract writing systems, and recommendations for addressing such gaps.

(7) Identification of any policy, legal, or statutory constraints that would have to be addressed in order to move to a shared services model for contract writing systems.

(c) FUNDS SPECIFIED.—The funds specified in this subsection are the following—

(1) Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for research, development, test, and

evaluation for each system described in subsection (d).

(2) Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for procurement for each system described in subsection (d).

(d) SYSTEMS DESCRIBED.—The systems described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The Contract Writing System of the Army.

(2) The Electronic Procurement System of the Navy.

(3) The Automated Contract Preparation System of the Air Force.

(4) The Contract Writing and Administration System of the Defense Contract Management Agency.

(5) The Standard Procurement System of the Defense Logistics Agency.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are here by authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, as specified in the funding table in section 4301.

Subtitle B—Energy and Environment

SEC. 311. CODIFICATION OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CLEARINGHOUSE TO COORDINATE DEPARTMENT REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS THAT MAY HAVE ADVERSE IMPACT ON MILITARY OPERATIONS AND READINESS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF MILITARY AVIATION, RANGE, AND INSTALLATION ASSURANCE PROGRAM OFFICE.—

(1) CODIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING LAW.—Chapter 7 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 183 the following new section:

“§ 183a. Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office for review of mission obstructions

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office.

“(2) The Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office shall be—

“(A) organized under the authority, direction, and control of an Assistant Secretary of Defense designated by the Secretary; and

“(B) assigned such personnel and resources as the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out this section.

“(b) FUNCTIONS.—(1)(A) The Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office shall serve as a clearinghouse to coordinate Department of Defense review of applications for energy projects filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49 and received by the Department of Defense from the Secretary of Transportation.

“(B) To facilitate the review of an application for an energy project submitted pursuant to such section, the Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office shall accelerate the development, in coordination with other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, of—

“(i) an integrated review process to ensure timely notification and consideration of any application that may have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness; and

“(ii) planning tools necessary to determine the acceptability to the Department of Defense of the energy project proposal included in the application.

“(2) The Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office shall establish procedures for the Department of Defense for the coordinated consideration of and response to a request for a review received from another Federal agency, a State government, an Indian tribal government, a local government, a landowner, or the developer of an energy project, including guidance to personnel at each military installation in the United States on how to initiate such procedures and ensure a coordinated Department response.

“(3) The Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office shall consult with affected military installations for the review and consideration of proposed energy projects.

“(4) The Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office shall develop procedures for conducting early outreach to parties carrying out energy projects that could have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness and to clearly communicate to such parties actions being taken by the Department under this section.

“(5) The Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office shall perform such other functions as the Secretary of Defense assigns.

“(c) REVIEW OF PROPOSED ACTIONS.—(1) Not later than 30 days after receiving from the Secretary of Transportation a proper application for an energy project under section 44718 of title 49 that may have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness, the Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office shall conduct a preliminary review of such application. Such review shall—

“(A) assess the likely scope, duration, and level of risk of any adverse impact of such energy project on military operations and readiness; and

“(B) identify any feasible and affordable actions that could be taken by the Department, the developer of such energy project, or others to mitigate such adverse impact and to minimize risks to national security while allowing such energy project to proceed with development.

“(2) If the Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office determines under paragraph (1) that an energy project will have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness, the Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, shall issue to the applicant a notice of presumed risk that describes the concerns identified by the Department in the preliminary review and requests a discussion of possible mitigation actions.

“(d) COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing the military impacts of projects filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49.

“(2) In developing the strategy required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall—

“(A) assess the magnitude of interference posed by projects filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49;

“(B) identify geographic areas in which projects filed, or which may be filed in the future, with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49, could have an adverse impact on military operations and readiness, including military training routes, and categorize the risk of adverse impact in each geographic area for the purpose of informing preliminary reviews under subsection (c)(1), early outreach efforts under subsection (b)(4), and online dissemination efforts under paragraph (3);

“(C) develop procedures to periodically review and modify geographic areas identified under

subparagraph (B) and to solicit and identify additional geographic areas as appropriate; and

“(D) specifically identify feasible and affordable long-term actions that may be taken to mitigate adverse impacts of projects filed, or which may be filed in the future, with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49, on military operations and readiness, including—

“(i) investment priorities of the Department of Defense with respect to research and development;

“(ii) modifications to military operations to accommodate applications for such projects;

“(iii) recommended upgrades or modifications to existing systems or procedures by the Department of Defense;

“(iv) acquisition of new systems by the Department and other departments and agencies of the Federal Government and timelines for fielding such new systems; and

“(v) modifications to the projects for which such applications are filed, including changes in size, location, or technology.

“(3) The Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office shall make available online access to data reflecting geographic areas identified under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) and reviewed and modified under subparagraph (C) of such paragraph.

“(e) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DETERMINATION OF UNACCEPTABLE RISK.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not object to an energy project filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49 unless the Secretary of Defense determines, after giving full consideration to mitigation actions identified pursuant to this section, that the project would result in an unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States. Such a determination shall constitute a finding pursuant to section 44718(f) of title 49.

“(2) Not later than 30 days after making a determination under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on such determination and the basis for such determination. Such report shall include an explanation of the basis of the determination, a discussion of the mitigation options considered, and an explanation of why, in the case of a determination of unacceptable risk, the mitigation options were not feasible or did not resolve the conflict. The Secretary of Defense may provide public notice through the Federal Register of the determination.

“(3) The Secretary of Defense may only delegate the responsibility for making a determination under paragraph (1) to the Deputy Secretary of Defense, an Under Secretary of Defense, or a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

“(f) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to request and accept a voluntary contribution of funds from an applicant for a project filed with the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 44718 of title 49. Amounts so accepted shall remain available until expended for the purpose of offsetting the cost of measures undertaken by the Secretary of Defense to mitigate adverse impacts of such a project on military operations and readiness or to conduct studies of potential measures to mitigate such impacts.

“(g) EFFECT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HAZARD ASSESSMENT.—An action taken pursuant to this section shall not be considered to be a substitute for any assessment or determination required of the Secretary of Transportation under section 44718 of title 49.

“(h) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect or limit the application of, or any obligation to comply with, any

environmental law, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘adverse impact on military operations and readiness’ means any adverse impact upon military operations and readiness, including flight operations, research, development, testing, and evaluation, and training, that is demonstrable and is likely to impair or degrade the ability of the armed forces to perform their warfighting missions.

“(2) The term ‘energy project’ means a project that provides for the generation or transmission of electrical energy.

“(3) The term ‘landowner’ means a person that owns a fee interest in real property on which a proposed energy project is planned to be located.

“(4) The term ‘military installation’ has the meaning given that term in section 2801(c)(4) of this title.

“(5) The term ‘military readiness’ includes any training or operation that could be related to combat readiness, including testing and evaluation activities.

“(6) The term ‘military training route’ means a training route developed as part of the Military Training Route Program, carried out jointly by the Federal Aviation Administration and the Secretary of Defense, for use by the armed forces for the purpose of conducting low-altitude, high-speed military training.

“(7) The term ‘unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States’ means the construction, alteration, establishment, or expansion, or the proposed construction, alteration, establishment, or expansion, of a structure or sanitary landfill that would—

“(A) endanger safety in air commerce, related to the activities of the Department of Defense;

“(B) interfere with the efficient use and preservation of the navigable airspace and of airport traffic capacity at public-use airports, related to the activities of the Department of Defense; or

“(C) impair or degrade the capability of the Department of Defense to conduct training, research, development, testing, evaluation, and operations or to maintain military readiness.”.

(2) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(A) REPEAL OF EXISTING PROVISION.—Section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 49 U.S.C. 44718 note) is repealed.

(B) REFERENCE TO DEFINITIONS.—Section 44718(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “211.3 of title 32, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 6, 2014” both places it appears and inserting “183a(i) of title 10”.

(C) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 183 the following new item:

“183a. Military Aviation, Range, and Installation Assurance Program Office for review of mission obstructions.”.

(3) DEADLINE FOR INITIAL IDENTIFICATION OF GEOGRAPHIC AREAS.—The initial identification of geographic areas under subsection (d)(2)(B) of section 183a of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall be completed not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) APPLICABILITY OF EXISTING RULES AND REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding the amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2), any rule or regulation promulgated to carry out section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 49 U.S.C. 44718 note) that is in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this

Act shall continue in effect and apply to the extent such rule or regulation is consistent with the authority under section 183a of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), until such rule or regulation is otherwise amended or repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT REGARDING CRITICAL MILITARY-USE AIRSPACE AREAS.—Section 44718 of title 49, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(2)(B), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) SPECIAL RULE FOR IDENTIFIED GEOGRAPHIC AREAS.—In the case of a proposed structure to be located within a geographic area identified under subsection (d)(2)(B) of section 183a of title 10, the Secretary of Transportation may not issue a determination until the Secretary of Defense issues a determination under subsection (e) of such section as to whether or not the proposed structure represents an unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States (as defined in subsection (i)(7) of such section).”.

SEC. 312. ENERGY PERFORMANCE GOALS AND MASTER PLAN.

Section 2911(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, the future demand for energy, and the requirements for the use of energy”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “reduce the future demand and the requirements for the use of energy” and inserting “enhance energy resilience to ensure the Department of Defense has the ability to prepare for and recover from energy disruptions that affect mission assurance on military installations”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(13) Opportunities to leverage financing provided by a non-Department entity to address installation energy needs.”.

SEC. 313. PAYMENT TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY OF STIPULATED PENALTY IN CONNECTION WITH UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT, OREGON.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER FUNDS.—

(1) TRANSFER AMOUNT.—The Secretary of the Army may transfer an amount of not more than \$125,000 to the Hazardous Substance Superfund established under subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Any such transfer shall be made without regard to section 2215 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Any transfer under subsection (a) shall be made using funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for Base Realignment and Closure, Army.

(b) PURPOSE OF TRANSFER.—A transfer under subsection (a) shall be for the purpose of satisfying a stipulated penalty assessed by the Environmental Protection Agency in the settlement agreement approved by the Army on July 14, 2016, against the Umatilla Chemical Depot, Oregon under the Federal Facility Agreement between the Army and the Environmental Protection Agency dated September 19, 1989.

(c) ACCEPTANCE OF PAYMENT.—If the Secretary of the Army makes a transfer under subsection (a), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall accept the amount transferred as payment in full of the penalty referred to in subsection (b).

SEC. 314. PAYMENT TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY OF STIPULATED PENALTY IN CONNECTION WITH LONGHORN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, TEXAS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER FUNDS.—

(1) TRANSFER AMOUNT.—The Secretary of the Army may transfer an amount of not more than \$1,185,000 to the Hazardous Substance Superfund established under subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Any such transfer shall be made without regard to section 2215 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Any transfer under subsection (a) shall be made using funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for Environmental Restoration, Army.

(b) PURPOSE OF TRANSFER.—A transfer under subsection (a) shall be for the purpose of satisfying a stipulated penalty assessed by the Environmental Protection Agency on April 5, 2013, against Longhorn Army Ammunition Plant, Texas, under the Federal Facility Agreement for Longhorn Army Ammunition Plant, which was entered into between the Army and the Environmental Protection Agency in 1991.

(c) ACCEPTANCE OF PAYMENT.—If the Secretary of the Army makes a transfer under subsection (a), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall accept the amount transferred as payment in full of the penalty referred to in subsection (b).

SEC. 315. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CLEANUP AND REMOVAL OF PETROLEUM, OIL, AND LUBRICANT ASSOCIATED WITH THE PRINZ EUGEN.

Amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense may be used for all necessary expenses for the removal and cleanup of petroleum, oil, and lubricants associated with the heavy cruiser Prinz Eugen, which was transferred from the United States to the Republic of the Marshall Islands in 1986.

Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment

SEC. 321. REAUTHORIZATION OF MULTI-TRADES DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

Section 338 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 10 U.S.C. 5013 note), as most recently amended by section 321 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1694) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking “2019” and inserting “2024”.

SEC. 322. GUIDANCE REGARDING USE OF ORGANIC INDUSTRIAL BASE.

The Secretary of the Army shall maintain the arsenals with sufficient workloads to ensure affordability and technical competence in all critical capability areas by establishing, not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, clear, step-by-step, prescriptive guidance on the process for conducting make-or-buy analyses, including the use of the organic industrial base.

Subtitle D—Reports

SEC. 331. QUARTERLY REPORTS ON PERSONNEL AND UNIT READINESS.

(a) MODIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT.—Section 482 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “Each report” and inserting “The reports for the first and third quarters of a calendar year”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The reports for the second and fourth quarters of a calendar year shall contain the information required by subsection (j).”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “AND REMEDIAL ACTIONS”;

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Each report” and inserting “A report for the second or fourth quarter of a calendar year”;

(C) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and” after the semicolon;

(D) by striking paragraph (2); and
(E) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(3) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “Each report” and inserting “A report for the second or fourth quarter of a calendar year”;

(4) in subsection (e), by striking “Each report” and inserting “A report for the second or fourth quarter of a calendar year”;

(5) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “Each report” and inserting “A report for the second or fourth quarter of a calendar year”;

(6) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “Each report” and inserting “A report for the second or fourth quarter of a calendar year”; and

(7) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) **REMEDIAL ACTIONS.**—A report for the first or third quarter of a calendar year shall include—

“(1) a description of the mitigation plans of the Secretary to address readiness shortfalls and operational deficiencies identified in the report submitted for the preceding calendar quarter; and

“(2) for each such shortfall or deficiency, a timeline for resolution, the cost necessary for such resolution, the mitigation strategy the Department will employ until the resolution is in place, and any legislative remedies required.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 117 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “QUARTERLY” and inserting “SEMI-ANNUAL”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “quarterly” and inserting “semi-annual”; and
(2) in subsection (e), by striking “each quarter” and inserting “semi-annually”.

SEC. 332. BIENNIAL REPORT ON CORE DEPARTMENT-LEVEL MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR CAPABILITY.

Section 2464(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) Any workload shortfalls at any work breakdown structure category designated as a lower-level category pursuant to Department of Defense Instruction 4151.20, or any successor instruction.

“(5) A description of any workload executed at a category designated as a first-level category pursuant to such Instruction, or any successor instruction, that could be used to mitigate shortfalls in similar categories.

“(6) A description of any progress made on implementing mitigation plans developed pursuant to paragraph (3).

“(7) A description of core capability requirements and corresponding workloads at the first level category.

“(8) In the case of any shortfall that is identified, a description of the shortfall and an identification of the subcategory of the work breakdown structure in which the shortfall occurred.

“(9) In the case of any work breakdown structure category designated as a special interest item or other pursuant to such Instruction, or any successor instruction, an explanation for such designation.

“(10) Whether the core depot-level maintenance and repair capability requirements described in the report submitted under this subsection for the preceding fiscal year have been executed.”.

SEC. 333. ANNUAL REPORT ON PERSONNEL, TRAINING, AND EQUIPMENT NEEDS OF NON-FEDERALIZED NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.**—Section 10504 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 1051, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “REPORT.—” and inserting “REPORT ON STATE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.—(1)”; and

(B) by striking “The report” and inserting the following:

“(2) The annual report required by paragraph (1)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) **ANNUAL REPORT ON NON-FEDERALIZED SERVICE NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, TRAINING, AND EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS.**—(1) Not later than January 31 of each of calendar years 2018 through 2022, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall submit to the recipients described in paragraph (3) a report that identifies the personnel, training, and equipment required by the non-federalized National Guard—

“(A) to support civilian authorities in connection with natural and man-made disasters during the covered period; and

“(B) to carry out prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery activities relating to such disasters during the covered period.

“(2) In preparing each report under paragraph (1), the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall—

“(A) consult with the chief executive of each State, the Council of Governors, and other appropriate civilian authorities;

“(B) collect and validate information from each State relating to the personnel, training, and equipment requirements described in paragraph (1);

“(C) set forth separately the personnel, training, and equipment requirements for—

“(i) each of the emergency support functions of the National Response Framework; and

“(ii) each of the Federal Emergency Management Agency regions;

“(D) assess core civilian capability gaps relating to natural and man-made disasters, as identified by States in submissions to the Department of Homeland Security; and

“(E) take into account threat and hazard identifications and risk assessments of the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, and the States.

“(3) The annual report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the following officials:

“(A) The congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

“(B) The Secretary of Defense.

“(C) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(D) The Council of Governors.

“(E) The Secretary of the Army.

“(F) The Secretary of the Air Force.

“(G) The Commander of the United States Northern Command.

“(H) The Commander of the United States Pacific Command.

“(I) The Commander of the United States Cyber Command.

“(4) In this subsection, the term ‘covered period’ means the fiscal year beginning after the date on which a report is submitted under paragraph (1).”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **SECTION HEADING.**—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“**§ 10504. Chief of National Guard Bureau: annual reports**”.

(2) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1011 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 10504 and inserting the following:

“10504. Chief of National Guard Bureau: annual reports.”.

SEC. 334. ANNUAL REPORT ON MILITARY WORKING DOGS USED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **CAPACITY.**—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Executive Agent for Military

Working Dogs (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “Executive Agent”), shall—

(1) identify the number of military working dogs required to fulfill the various missions of the Department of Defense for which such dogs are used, including force protection, facility and check point security, and explosives and drug detection;

(2) take such steps as are practicable to ensure an adequate number of military working dog teams are available to meet and sustain the mission requirements identified in paragraph (1);

(3) ensure that the Department’s needs and performance standards with respect to military working dogs are readily available to dog breeders and trainers; and

(4) coordinate with other Federal, State, and local agencies, nonprofit organizations, universities, and private sector entities, as appropriate, to increase the training capacity for military working dog teams.

(b) **MILITARY WORKING DOG PROCUREMENT.**—The Secretary, acting through the Executive Agent, shall work to ensure that military working dogs are procured as efficiently as possible and at the best value to the Government, while maintaining the necessary level of quality and encouraging increased domestic breeding.

(c) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, and annually thereafter until September 30, 2021, the Secretary, acting through the Executive Agent, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the procurement and retirement of military working dogs for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year during which the report is submitted. Each report under this subsection shall include the following for the fiscal year covered by the report:

(1) The number of military working dogs procured, by source, by each military department or Defense Agency.

(2) The cost of procuring military working dogs incurred by each military department or Defense Agency.

(3) The number of domestically bred and sourced military working dogs procured by each military department or Defense Agency, including a list of vendors, their location, cost, and the quantity of dogs procured from each vendor.

(4) The number of non-domestically bred military working dogs procured from non-domestic sources by each military department or Defense Agency, including a list of vendors, their location, cost, and the quantity of dogs procured from each vendor.

(5) The cost of procuring pre-trained and green dogs for force protection, facility and checkpoint security, and improvised explosive device, other explosives, and drug detection.

(6) An analysis of the procurement practices of each military department or Defense Agency that limit market access for domestic canine vendors and breeders.

(7) The total cost of procuring domestically bred military working dogs versus the total cost of procuring dogs from non-domestic sources.

(8) The total number of domestically bred dogs and the number of dogs from foreign sources procured by each military department or Defense Agency and the number and percentage of those dogs that are ultimately deployed for their intended use.

(9) An explanation for any significant difference in the cost of procuring military working dogs from different sources.

(10) An estimate of the number of military working dogs expected to retire annually and an identification of the primary cause of the retirement of such dogs.

(11) An identification of the final disposition of military working dogs no longer in service.

(d) **MILITARY WORKING DOG DEFINED.**—For purposes of this section, the term “military

working dog” means a dog used in any official military capacity, as defined by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 335. ANNUAL BRIEFINGS ON ARMY EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL.

Not later than 60 days after the last day of each of fiscal years 2018 through 2021, the Secretary of the Army shall provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives briefings on the actions the Army has taken to address the following:

(1) Programmed funding and manpower to establish and implement the explosive ordnance disposal (hereinafter referred to as “EOD”) assistant commandant position in the Army Ordnance School.

(2) EOD personnel talent management, including command opportunities and promotion within the Army logistics cohort, and career broadening opportunities, including participation in joint, interagency, and multinational EOD commissioned officer and non-commissioned officer positions.

(3) How the EOD career path ensures and maintains technical proficiency for EOD-qualified personnel.

(4) Efforts to improve EOD proponentcy and advocacy across the Army, including activities of the EOD Board of Advisors.

(5) Efforts to enhance synchronization of EOD with other Army missions and functions and retain critical interdependencies.

(6) Annual funding programmed through the future-years defense program and executed during the preceding fiscal year for EOD requirements including personnel, training, and equipment.

SEC. 336. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Secretary of Defense James Mattis has stated: “It is appropriate for the Combatant Commands to incorporate drivers of instability that impact the security environment in their areas into their planning.”

(2) Secretary of Defense James Mattis has stated: “I agree that the effects of a changing climate — such as increased maritime access to the Arctic, rising sea levels, desertification, among others — impact our security situation.”

(3) Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Joseph Dunford has stated: “It’s a question, once again, of being forward deployed, forward engaged, and be in a position to respond to the kinds of natural disasters that I think we see as a second or third order effect of climate change.”

(4) Former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates has stated: “Over the next 20 years and more, certain pressures—population, energy, climate, economic, environmental—could combine with rapid cultural, social, and technological change to produce new sources of deprivation, rage, and instability.”

(5) Former Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army Gordon Sullivan has stated: “Climate change is a national security issue. We found that climate instability will lead to instability in geopolitics and impact American military operations around the world.”

(6) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) has stated: “Many countries will encounter climate-induced disruptions—such as weather-related disasters, drought, famine, or damage to infrastructure—that stress their capacity to respond, cope with, or adapt. Climate-related impacts will also contribute to increased migration, which can be particularly disruptive if, for example, demand for food and shelter outstrips the resources available to assist those in need.”

(7) The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has stated: “DOD links changes in pre-

cipitation patterns with potential climate change impacts such as changes in the number of consecutive days of high or low precipitation as well as increases in the extent and duration of droughts, with an associated increase in the risk of wildfire . . . this may result in mission vulnerabilities such as reduced live-fire training due to drought and increased wildfire risk.”

(8) A three-foot rise in sea levels will threaten the operations of more than 128 United States military sites, and it is possible that many of these at-risk bases could be submerged in the coming years.

(9) As global temperatures rise, droughts and famines can lead to more failed states, which are breeding grounds of extremist and terrorist organizations.

(10) In the Marshall Islands, an Air Force radar installation built on an atoll at a cost of \$1,000,000,000 is projected to be underwater within two decades.

(11) In the western United States, drought has amplified the threat of wildfires, and floods have damaged roads, runways, and buildings on military bases.

(12) In the Arctic, the combination of melting sea ice, thawing permafrost, and sea-level rise is eroding shorelines, which is damaging radar and communication installations, runways, seawalls, and training areas.

(13) In the Yukon Training Area, units conducting artillery training accidentally started a wildfire despite observing the necessary practices during red flag warning conditions.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) climate change is a direct threat to the national security of the United States and is impacting stability in areas of the world both where the United States Armed Forces are operating today, and where strategic implications for future conflict exist;

(2) there are complexities in quantifying the cost of climate change on mission resiliency, but the Department of Defense must ensure that it is prepared to conduct operations both today and in the future and that it is prepared to address the effects of a changing climate on threat assessments, resources, and readiness; and

(3) military installations must be able to effectively prepare to mitigate climate damage in their master planning and infrastructure planning and design, so that they might best consider the weather and natural resources most pertinent to them.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on vulnerabilities to military installations and combatant commander requirements resulting from climate change over the next 20 years.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report on vulnerabilities to military installations and combatant commander requirements required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A list of the ten most vulnerable military installations within each service based on the effects of rising sea tides, increased flooding, drought, desertification, wildfires, thawing permafrost, and any other categories the Secretary determines necessary.

(B) An overview of mitigations that may be necessary to ensure the continued operational viability and to increase the resiliency of the identified vulnerable military installations and the cost of such mitigations.

(C) A discussion of the climate-change related effects on the Department, including the increase in the frequency of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief missions and the theater campaign plans, contingency plans, and global posture of the combatant commanders.

(D) An overview of mitigations that may be necessary to ensure mission resiliency and the cost of such mitigations.

(3) FORM.—The report required subparagraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 341. EXPLOSIVE SAFETY BOARD.

(a) MODIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF AMMUNITION STORAGE BOARD.—Section 172 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “Secretaries of the military departments” and inserting “Secretary of Defense”;

(2) by inserting “that includes members” after “joint board”;

(3) by striking “selected by them” and inserting “selected by the Secretaries of the military departments,”;

(4) by inserting “military” before “officers”;

(5) by inserting “designated as the chair and voting members of the board for each military department” after “officers”;

(6) by inserting “and other” before “civilian officers”;

(7) by striking “or both” and inserting “as necessary”; and

(8) by striking “keep informed on stored” and inserting “provide oversight on storage and transportation of”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of section 172 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “Ammunition storage” and inserting “Explosive safety”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 172 and inserting the following new item:

“172. Explosive safety board.”

SEC. 342. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPORT FOR MILITARY SERVICE MEMORIALS AND MUSEUMS THAT HIGHLIGHT THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES.

The Secretary of Defense may provide financial support for the acquisition, installation, and maintenance of exhibits, facilities, historical displays, and programs at military service memorials and museums that highlight the role of women in the Armed Forces. The Secretary may enter into a contract with a nonprofit organization for the purpose of performing such acquisition, installation, and maintenance.

SEC. 343. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR ADVANCED SKILLS MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE SYSTEM OF THE NAVY.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the enhancement of the advanced skills management software system of the Navy until a period of 60 days has elapsed following the date on which Secretary of the Navy makes the submission required under subsection (b)(3).

(b) BRIEFING AND CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary of the Navy shall—

(1) provide to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a briefing on any enhancements that are needed for the advanced skills management software system of the Navy;

(2) after providing the briefing under paragraph (1), issue a request for information for such enhancements in accordance with part 15.2 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation; and

(3) submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives—

(A) the results of the request for information issued under paragraph (2); and

(B) a written certification that—

(i) as part of the request for information, the Secretary solicited information on commercially

available off-the-shelf software solutions that may be used to enhance the advanced skills management software system of the Navy; and

(ii) the Secretary has considered using such solutions.

(c) **ADVANCED SKILLS MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE SYSTEM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “advanced skills management software system” means a software application designed to—

(1) identify job task requirements for Navy personnel;

(2) assist in determining the proficiencies of such personnel;

(3) document qualifications and certifications of such personnel; and

(4) track the technical training completed by Navy aviation maintenance personnel.

SEC. 344. COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF UNIFORM SPECIFICATIONS FOR AFGHAN MILITARY OR SECURITY FORCES.

Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, whenever the Secretary of Defense enters into a contract for the provision of uniforms for Afghan military or security forces, the Secretary shall require, as a condition of the contract, that the contract include a requirement that the contractor conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the uniform specification for the Afghan military or security forces uniform. Such analysis shall determine—

(1) whether there is a more effective alternative uniform specification, considering both operational environment and cost, available to the Afghan military or security forces;

(2) the efficacy of the existing pattern compared to other alternatives (both proprietary and non-proprietary patterns); and

(3) the costs and feasibility of transitioning the uniforms of the Afghan military or security forces to a pattern owned by the United States, using existing excess inventory where available, and acquiring the rights to the SpecAce Forest pattern.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

SEC. 401. END STRENGTHS FOR ACTIVE FORCES.

The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 2018, as follows:

(1) The Army, 486,000.

(2) The Navy, 327,900.

(3) The Marine Corps, 185,000.

(4) The Air Force, 325,100.

SEC. 402. REVISIONS IN PERMANENT ACTIVE DUTY END STRENGTH MINIMUM LEVELS.

Section 691(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (4) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(1) For the Army, 486,000.

“(2) For the Navy, 327,900.

“(3) For the Marine Corps, 185,000.

“(4) For the Air Force, 325,100.”

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

SEC. 411. END STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for Selected Reserve personnel of the reserve components as of September 30, 2018, as follows:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 347,000.

(2) The Army Reserve, 202,000.

(3) The Navy Reserve, 59,000.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 38,500.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 106,600.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 69,800.

(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 7,000.

(b) **END STRENGTH REDUCTIONS.**—The end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by—

(1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at the end of the fiscal year; and

(2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at the end of the fiscal year.

(c) **END STRENGTH INCREASES.**—Whenever units or individual members of the Selected Reserve for any reserve component are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the end strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such reserve component shall be increased proportionately by the total authorized strengths of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

SEC. 412. END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES.

Within the end strengths prescribed in section 411(a), the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 2018, the following number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 30,155.

(2) The Army Reserve, 16,261.

(3) The Navy Reserve, 10,101.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,261.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 16,260.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 3,588.

SEC. 413. END STRENGTHS FOR MILITARY TECHNICIANS (DUAL STATUS).

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The authorized number of military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 2018, for the reserve components of the Army and the Air Force (notwithstanding section 129 of title 10, United States Code) shall be the following:

(1) For the Army National Guard of the United States, 25,507.

(2) For the Army Reserve, 7,427.

(3) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 21,893.

(4) For the Air Force Reserve, 10,160.

(b) **VARIANCE.**—Notwithstanding section 115 of title 10, United States Code, the end strength prescribed by subsection (a) for a reserve component specified in that subsection may be increased—

(1) by 3 percent, upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is in the national interest; and

(2) by 2 percent, upon determination by the Secretary of the military department concerned that such action would enhance manning and readiness in essential units or in critical specialties or ratings.

SEC. 414. FISCAL YEAR 2018 LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS.

(a) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **NATIONAL GUARD.**—Within the limitation provided in section 10217(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, the number of non-dual status technicians employed by the National Guard as of September 30, 2018, may not exceed the following:

(A) For the Army National Guard of the United States, 1,600.

(B) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 350.

(2) **ARMY RESERVE.**—The number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Army Reserve as of September 30, 2018, may not exceed 420.

(3) **AIR FORCE RESERVE.**—The number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Air Force Reserve as of September 30, 2018, may not exceed 90.

(b) **NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “non-dual status technician” has the meaning given that term in section 10217(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 415. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF RESERVE PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED TO BE ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR OPERATIONAL SUPPORT.

During fiscal year 2018, the maximum number of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who may be serving at any time on full-time operational support duty under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, is the following:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 17,000.

(2) The Army Reserve, 13,000.

(3) The Navy Reserve, 6,200.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 3,000.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 16,000.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 14,000.

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 421. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for military personnel, as specified in the funding table in section 4401.

(b) **CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORIZATION.**—The authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) supersedes any other authorization of appropriations (definite or indefinite) for such purpose for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Regular and Reserve Component Management

SEC. 501. MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CONVERSION OF CERTAIN MILITARY TECHNICIAN (DUAL STATUS) POSITIONS TO CIVILIAN POSITIONS.

(a) **REVISED REDUCTION AND DEADLINE.**—Section 1053(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 10 U.S.C. 10216 note), as amended by section 1084(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2421), is further amended—

(1) by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “October 1, 2018”; and

(2) by striking “20 percent” and inserting “10 percent”.

(b) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate for revising section 709 of title 32, United States Code, regarding the employment, use, and status of military technicians in the National Guard. The Secretary shall prepare the recommendations in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

SEC. 502. PILOT PROGRAM ON USE OF RETIRED SENIOR ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AS ARMY NATIONAL GUARD RECRUITERS.

(a) **PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of the Army may carry out a pilot program for the Army National Guard under which retired senior enlisted members of the Army National Guard would serve as contract recruiters for the Army National Guard.

(b) **OBJECTIVES OF PILOT PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of the Army shall design any pilot program conducted under this section to determine the following:

(1) The feasibility and effectiveness of hiring retired senior enlisted members of the Army National Guard who have retired within the previous two years to serve as recruiters.

(2) The merits of hiring such retired senior enlisted members as contractors or as employees of the Department of Defense.

(3) The best method of providing a competitive compensation package for such retired senior enlisted members.

(4) The merits of requiring such retired senior enlisted members to wear a military uniform while performing recruiting duties under the pilot program.

(c) **CONSULTATION.**—In developing a pilot program under this section, the Secretary of the Army shall consult with the operators of a previous pilot program carried out by the Army involving the use of contract recruiters.

(d) **COMMENCEMENT AND DURATION.**—The Secretary of the Army may commence a pilot program under this section on or after January 1, 2018, and all activities under such a pilot program shall terminate no later than December 31, 2022.

(e) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—If a pilot program is conducted under this section, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report containing an evaluation of the success of the pilot program, including the determinations described in subsection (b). The report shall be submitted not later than January 1, 2020.

SEC. 503. EQUAL TREATMENT OF ORDERS TO SERVE ON ACTIVE DUTY UNDER SECTION 12304A AND 12304B OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) **ELIGIBILITY OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS FOR PRE-MOBILIZATION HEALTH CARE.**—Section 1074(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “in support of a contingency operation under” and inserting “under section 12304b of this title or”.

(b) **ELIGIBILITY OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS FOR TRANSITIONAL HEALTH CARE.**—Section 1145(a)(2)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “in support of a contingency operation” and inserting “under section 12304b of this title or a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of this title”.

SEC. 504. DIRECT EMPLOYMENT PILOT PROGRAM FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE.

(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program to enhance the efforts of the Department of Defense to provide job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members in the National Guard and Reserves.

(b) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The pilot program shall be offered to, and administered by, the adjutants general appointed under section 314 of title 32, United States Code.

(c) **COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.**—As a condition on the provision of funds under this section to a State to support the operation of the pilot program in the State, the State must agree to contribute an amount, derived from non-Federal sources, equal to at least 30 percent of the funds provided by the Secretary of Defense under this section.

(d) **DIRECT EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM MODEL.**—The pilot program should follow a job placement program model that focuses on working one-on-one with a member of a reserve component to cost-effectively provide job placement services, including services such as identifying unemployed and under employed members, job matching services, resume editing, interview preparation, and post-employment follow up. Develop-

ment of the pilot program should be informed by State direct employment programs for members of the reserve components, such as the programs conducted in California and South Carolina.

(e) **EVALUATION.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop outcome measurements to evaluate the success of the pilot program.

(f) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than January 31, 2022, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report describing the results of the pilot program. The Secretary shall prepare the report in coordination with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

(2) **ELEMENTS OF REPORT.**—A report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description and assessment of the effectiveness and achievements of the pilot program, including the number of members of the reserve components hired and the cost-per-placement of participating members.

(B) An assessment of the impact of the pilot program and increased reserve component employment levels on the readiness of members of the reserve components.

(C) Any other matters considered appropriate by the Secretary.

(g) **DURATION OF AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The authority to carry out the pilot program expires September 30, 2020.

(2) **EXTENSION.**—Upon the expiration of the authority under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense may extend the pilot program for not more than two additional fiscal years.

Subtitle B—General Service Authorities and Correction of Military Records

SEC. 511. CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL MEDICAL EVIDENCE BY BOARDS FOR THE CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS AND LIBERAL CONSIDERATION OF EVIDENCE RELATING TO POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER OR TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1552 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections (i) and (j), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection (h):

“(h)(1) This subsection applies to a former member of the armed forces whose claim under this section for review of a discharge or dismissal is based in whole or in part on matters relating to post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury as supporting rationale, or as justification for priority consideration, and whose post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury is related to combat or military sexual trauma, as determined by the Secretary concerned.

“(2) In the case of a claimant described in paragraph (1), a board established under subsection (a)(1) shall—

“(A) review medical evidence of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or a civilian health care provider that is presented by the claimant; and

“(B) review the claim with liberal consideration to the claimant that post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury potentially contributed to the circumstances resulting in the discharge or dismissal or to the original characterization of the claimant’s discharge or dismissal.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1553(d)(3)(A)(ii) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “discharge of a lesser characterization” and inserting “discharge or dismissal or to the original characterization of the member’s discharge or dismissal”.

SEC. 512. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION RELATED TO DISPOSITION OF CLAIMS REGARDING DISCHARGE OR RELEASE OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHEN THE CLAIMS INVOLVE SEXUAL ASSAULT.

(a) **BOARDS FOR THE CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS.**—Subsection (i) of section 1552, United States Code, as redesignated by section 511, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The number and disposition of claims decided during the calendar quarter preceding the calendar quarter in which such information is made available in which sexual assault is alleged to have contributed, whether in whole or in part, to the original characterization of the discharge or release of the claimant.”.

(b) **DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARDS.**—Section 1553(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The number and disposition of claims decided during the calendar quarter preceding the calendar quarter in which such information is made available in which sexual assault is alleged to have contributed, whether in whole or in part, to the original characterization of the discharge or release of the claimant.”.

SEC. 513. PILOT PROGRAM ON USE OF VIDEO TELECONFERENCING TECHNOLOGY BY BOARDS FOR THE CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS AND DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARDS.

(a) **PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program under which boards for the correction of military records established under section 1552 of title 10, United States Code, and discharge review boards established under section 1553 of such title are authorized to utilize video teleconferencing technology in the performance of their duties.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the pilot program is to evaluate the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of utilizing video teleconferencing technology to allow persons who raise a claim before a board for the correction of military records, persons who request a review by a discharge review board, and witnesses who present evidence to such a board to appear before such a board without being physically present.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—As part of the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense shall make funds available to develop the capabilities of boards for the correction of military records and discharge review boards to effectively use video teleconferencing technology.

(d) **NO EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY.**—Nothing in the pilot program is intended to alter the eligibility criteria of persons who may raise a claim before a board for the correction of military records, request a review by a discharge review board, or present evidence to such a board.

(e) **TERMINATION.**—The authority of the Secretary of Defense to carry out the pilot program shall terminate on December 31, 2020.

SEC. 514. INCLUSION OF SPECIFIC EMAIL ADDRESS BLOCK ON CERTIFICATE OF RELEASE OR DISCHARGE FROM ACTIVE DUTY (DD FORM 214).

(a) **MODIFICATION REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall modify the Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214) to include a specific block explicitly identified as the location in which a member of the Armed Forces may provide one or more email addresses by which the member may be contacted after discharge or release from active duty in the Armed Forces.

(b) **DEADLINE FOR MODIFICATION.**—The Secretary of Defense shall release a revised Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214), modified as required by subsection (a), not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 515. PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON NATURALIZATION THROUGH MILITARY SERVICE.

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps who are aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence are informed of the availability of naturalization through service in the Armed Forces under section 328 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1439) and the process by which to pursue naturalization. The Secretary shall ensure that resources are available to assist qualified members of the Armed Forces to navigate the application and naturalization process.

Subtitle C—Military Justice and Other Legal Issues

SEC. 521. CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS RELATED TO THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE REFORM BY THE MILITARY JUSTICE ACT OF 2016.

(a) ENFORCEMENT OF RIGHTS OF VICTIMS OF OFFENSES UNDER UCMJ.—Section 806b(e)(3) of title 10, United States Code (article 6b(e)(3) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” after “(3)”;

(2) by striking “President, and, to the extent practicable, shall have priority over all other proceedings before the court.” and inserting the following: “President, subject to section 830a of this title (article 30a).”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(B) To the extent practicable, a petition for a writ of mandamus described in this subsection shall have priority over all other proceedings before the Court of Criminal Appeals.

“(C) Review of any decision by the Court of Criminal Appeals on a petition for a writ of mandamus described in this subsection shall have priority in the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, as determined under the rules of the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.”.

(b) REVIEW OF CERTAIN MATTERS BEFORE REFERRAL OF CHARGES AND SPECIFICATIONS.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 830a of title 10, United States Code (article 30a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by section 5202 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2904), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) Pre-referral matters under subsection (c) or (e) of section 806b of this title (article 6b).”.

(c) DEFENSE COUNSEL ASSISTANCE IN POST-TRIAL MATTERS FOR ACCUSED CONVICTED BY COURT-MARTIAL.—Section 838(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code (article 38(c)(2) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by striking “section 860 of this title (article 60)” and inserting “section 860, 860a, or 860b of this title (article 60, 60a, or 60b)”.

(d) LIMITATION ON ACCEPTANCE OF PLEA AGREEMENTS.—Subsection (b) of section 853a of title 10, United States Code (article 53a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by section 5237 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2917), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) is prohibited by law; or

“(5) is contrary to, or is inconsistent with, a regulation prescribed by the President with respect to terms, conditions, or other aspects of plea agreements.”.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES TO SENTENCE APPEAL BY THE UNITED STATES.—Subsection (d)(1) of section 856 of title 10, United States Code (article 56 of the Uniform

Code of Military Justice), as added by section 5301 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2919), is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting after “concerned,” the following: “and consistent with standards and procedures set forth in regulations prescribed by the President.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, as determined in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the President”.

(f) SENTENCE OF REDUCTION IN ENLISTED GRADE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 858a of title 10, United States Code (article 58a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 5303(1) of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2923), is further amended in the matter after paragraph (3) by striking “, effective on the date” and inserting the following: “, if such a reduction is authorized by regulation prescribed by the President. The reduction in pay grade shall take effect on the date”.

(2) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of section 858a of title 10, United States Code (article 58a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended to read as follows:

“**§858a. Art 58a. Sentences: reduction in enlisted grade**”.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter VIII of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice) is amended by striking the item relating to section 858a (article 58a) and inserting the following new item:

“858a. 58a. Sentences: reduction in enlisted grade.”.

(g) CONVENING AUTHORITY AUTHORITIES.—Section 858b(b) of title 10, United States Code (article 58b(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended in the first sentence by striking “section 860 of this title (article 60)” and inserting “section 860a or 860b of this title (article 60a or 60b)”.

(h) APPEAL BY THE UNITED STATE.—Section 862(b) of title 10, United States Code (article 62(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by striking “, notwithstanding section 866(c) of this title (article 66(c))”.

(i) REHEARING AND SENTENCING.—Subsection (b) of section 863 of title 10, United States Code (article 63 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by section 5327 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2929), is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe by regulation”.

(j) COURTS OF CRIMINAL APPEALS.—Section 866 of title 10, United States Code (article 66 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 5330 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2932), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(2)(C), by inserting after “required” the following: “by regulation prescribed by the President or”; and

(2) in subsection (f)(3), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “If the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces determines that additional proceedings are warranted, the Court of Criminal Appeals shall order a hearing or other proceeding in accordance with the direction of the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.”.

(k) MILITARY JUSTICE REVIEW PANEL.—Subsection (f) of section 946 of title 10, United States Code (article 146 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by section 5521 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2962), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “fiscal year 2020” in the first sentence and inserting “fiscal year 2021”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the sentence beginning “Not later than” and inserting the following new sentence: “The analysis under this paragraph shall be included in the assessment required by paragraph (1).”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraph (5):

“(5) REPORTS.—With respect to each review and assessment under this subsection, the Panel shall submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Each report—

“(A) shall set forth the results of the review and assessment concerned, including the findings and recommendations of the Panel; and

“(B) shall be submitted not later than December 31 of the calendar year in which the review and assessment is concluded.”.

(l) TRANSITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS SEPARATED FOR DEPENDENT ABUSE.—Section 1059(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)(ii), by striking “the approval of” and all that follows through “as approved,” and inserting “entry of judgment under section 860c of this title (article 60c of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) if the sentence”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “by a court-martial” the second place it appears and all that follows through “include any such punishment,” and inserting “for a dependent-abuse offense and the conviction is disapproved or is otherwise not part of the judgment under section 860c of this title (article 60c of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) or the punishment is disapproved or is otherwise not part of the judgment under such section (article).”.

(m) BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS WHO ARE VICTIMS OF ABUSE BY MEMBERS LOSING RIGHT TO RETIRED PAY.—Section 1408(h)(10)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “the approval” and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting “entry of judgment under section 860c of this title (article 60c of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).”.

(n) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN OFFENSES PENDING EXECUTION OF MILITARY JUSTICE ACT OF 2016 AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CHILD ABUSE OFFENSES.—With respect to offenses committed before the date designated by the President under section 5542(a) of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2967), subsection (b)(2)(B) of section 843 of title 10, United States Code (article 43 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), shall be applied as in effect on December 22, 2016.

(2) FRAUDULENT ENLISTMENT OR APPOINTMENT OFFENSES.—With respect to the period beginning on December 23, 2016, and ending on the day before the date designated by the President under section 5542(a) of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2967), in the application of subsection (h) of section 843 of title 10, United States Code (article 43 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by section 5225(b) of that Act (130 Stat. 2909), the reference in such subsection (h) to section 904a(1) of title 10, United States Code (article 104a(1) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), shall be deemed to be a reference to section 883(1) of title 10, United States Code (article 83(1) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(o) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect immediately after the amendments made by the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328) take effect as provided for in section 5542 of that Act (130 Stat. 2967).

SEC. 522. MINIMUM CONFINEMENT PERIOD REQUIRED FOR CONVICTION OF CERTAIN SEX-RELATED OFFENSES COMMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **MANDATORY PUNISHMENTS.**—Section 856(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code (article 56(b)(1) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 5301 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2919), is further amended by striking “shall include dismissal or dishonorable discharge, as applicable.” and inserting the following: “shall include, at a minimum—

“(A) dismissal or dishonorable discharge, as applicable; and

“(B) confinement for two years.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect immediately after the amendments made by the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328) take effect as provided for in section 5542 of that Act (130 Stat. 2967).

SEC. 523. PROHIBITION ON WRONGFUL BROADCAST OR DISTRIBUTION OF INTIMATE VISUAL IMAGES.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Subchapter X of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 917 (article 117 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) the following new section (article):

“§917a. Art. 117a. Wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images

“(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Any person subject to this chapter who—

“(1) knowingly and wrongfully broadcasts or distributes an intimate visual image of a private area of another person who—

“(A) is at least 18 years of age at the time the intimate visual image was created;

“(B) is identifiable from the image itself or from information displayed in connection with the image; and

“(C) does not explicitly consent to the broadcast or distribution of the intimate visual image;

“(2) knows or reasonably should have known that the intimate visual image was made under circumstances in which the person depicted in the intimate visual image retained a reasonable expectation of privacy regarding any broadcast or distribution of the intimate visual image; and

“(3) knows or reasonably should have known that the broadcast or distribution of the intimate visual image is likely—

“(A) to cause harm, harassment, intimidation, emotional distress, or financial loss for the person depicted in the intimate visual image; or

“(B) to harm substantially the depicted person with respect to that person’s health, safety, business, calling, career, financial condition, reputation, or personal relationships;

is guilty of wrongful distribution of intimate visual images and shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section (article):

“(1) **BROADCAST.**—The term ‘broadcast’ means to electronically transmit a visual image with the intent that it be viewed by a person or persons.

“(2) **DISTRIBUTE.**—The term ‘distribute’ means to deliver to the actual or constructive possession of another person, including transmission by mail or electronic means.

“(3) **INTIMATE VISUAL IMAGE.**—The term ‘intimate visual image’ means a photograph, video, film, or recording made by any means that depicts a private area of a person.

“(4) **PRIVATE AREA.**—The term ‘private area’ means the naked or underwear-clad genitalia, anus, buttocks, or female areola or nipple.

“(5) **REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF PRIVACY.**—The term ‘reasonable expectation of privacy’ refers to circumstances in which a reasonable person would believe that an intimate visual image

of a private area of the person would not be broadcast or distributed to another person.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter X of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 917 (article 117) the following new item:

“917a. 117a. Wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images.”.

SEC. 524. INFORMATION FOR THE SPECIAL VICTIMS’ COUNSEL OR VICTIMS’ LEGAL COUNSEL.

Section 1044e(b)(6) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “If there is a military prosecution of the alleged sex-related offense, the Special Victims’ Counsel or Victims’ Legal Counsel shall be entitled to a copy of all case information and documentation that is in the possession of the prosecutor, relevant to such military prosecution, and not privileged.”

SEC. 525. SPECIAL VICTIMS’ COUNSEL TRAINING REGARDING THE UNIQUE CHALLENGES OFTEN FACED BY MALE VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT.

The baseline Special Victims’ Counsel training established under section 1044e(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, shall include training for Special Victims’ Counsel to recognize and deal with the unique challenges often faced by male victims of sexual assault.

SEC. 526. GARNISHMENT TO SATISFY JUDGMENT RENDERED FOR PHYSICALLY, SEXUALLY, OR EMOTIONALLY ABUSING A CHILD.

(a) **GARNISHMENT AUTHORITY.**—Section 1408 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) **GARNISHMENT TO SATISFY A JUDGMENT RENDERED FOR PHYSICALLY, SEXUALLY, OR EMOTIONALLY ABUSING A CHILD.**—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), any payment of retired pay that would otherwise be made to a member shall be paid (in whole or in part) by the Secretary concerned to another person if and to the extent expressly provided for in the terms of a child abuse garnishment order.

“(2) A court order providing for the payment of child support or alimony or, with respect to a division of property, specifically providing for the payment of an amount of the disposable retired pay from a member to the spouse or a former spouse of the member, shall be given priority over a child abuse garnishment order. However, the limitations on the amount of disposable retired pay available for payments set forth in paragraphs (1) and (4)(B) of subsection (e) do not apply to a child abuse garnishment order.

“(3) In this section, the term ‘court order’ includes a child abuse garnishment order.

“(4) In this subsection, the term ‘child abuse garnishment order’ means a final decree issued by a court that—

“(A) is issued in accordance with the laws of the jurisdiction of that court; and

“(B) provides in the nature of garnishment for the enforcement of a judgment rendered against the member for physically, sexually, or emotionally abusing a child.

“(5) For purposes of this subsection, a judgment rendered for physically, sexually, or emotionally abusing a child is any legal claim perfected through a final enforceable judgment, which claim is based in whole or in part upon the physical, sexual, or emotional abuse of an individual under 18 years of age, whether or not that abuse is accompanied by other actionable wrongdoing, such as sexual exploitation or gross negligence.

“(6) If the Secretary concerned is served with more than one court order with respect to the retired pay of a member, the disposable retired

pay of the member shall be available to satisfy such court orders on a first-come, first-served basis, with any such process being satisfied out of such moneys as remain after the satisfaction of all such processes which have been previously served.

“(7) The Secretary concerned shall not be required to vary normal pay and disbursement cycles for retired pay in order to comply with a child abuse garnishment order.”.

(b) **APPLICATION OF AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (l) of section 1408 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to a court order received by the Secretary concerned on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, regardless of the date of the court order.

SEC. 527. INCLUSION OF INFORMATION IN ANNUAL SAPRO REPORTS REGARDING MILITARY SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND INCIDENTS INVOLVING NON-CONSENSUAL DISTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE SEXUAL IMAGES.

(a) **ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 1631(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(13) Information and data collected on official and unofficial reports of sexual harassment involving members of the Armed Forces during the year covered by the report, as follows:

“(A) The number of substantiated and unsubstantiated reports.

“(B) A synopsis of each substantiated report.

“(C) The action taken in the case of each substantiated report, including the type of disciplinary or administrative sanction imposed, if any, such as—

“(i) conviction and sentence by court-martial;

“(ii) imposition of non-judicial punishment under section 815 of title 10, United States Code (article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice); or

“(iii) administrative separation or other type of administrative action imposed.”.

“(14) Information and data collected during the year covered by the report on each reported incident involving the nonconsensual distribution by a person subject to chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice) of a private sexual image of another person, including the following:

“(A) The number of substantiated and unsubstantiated reports.

“(B) A synopsis of each substantiated report.

“(C) The action taken in the case of each substantiated report, including the type of disciplinary or administrative sanction imposed, if any, such as—

“(i) conviction and sentence by court-martial;

“(ii) imposition of non-judicial punishment under section 815 of title 10, United States Code (article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice); or

“(iii) administrative separation or other type of administrative action imposed.”.

(b) **APPLICATION OF AMENDMENT.**—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply beginning with the reports required to be submitted by March 1, 2018, under section 1631 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note).

SEC. 528. INCLUSION OF INFORMATION IN ANNUAL SAPRO REPORTS REGARDING MILITARY ASSAULTS COMMITTED BY A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES AGAINST THE MEMBER’S SPOUSE OR OTHER FAMILY MEMBER.

Beginning with the reports required to be submitted by March 1, 2018, under section 1631 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization

Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note), information regarding a sexual assault committed by a member of the Armed Forces against the spouse or intimate partner of the member or another dependent of the member shall be included in such reports in addition to the annual Family Advocacy Program report. The information shall be provided in such reports in the same manner as information is provided with respect to other official and unofficial reports of sexual assault.

SEC. 529. NOTIFICATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDERGOING CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE SEPARATIONS OF POTENTIAL ELIGIBILITY FOR VETERANS BENEFITS.

(a) **NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—A member of the Armed Forces who receives an administrative separation or mandatory discharge under conditions other than honorable shall be provided written notification that the member may petition the Veterans Benefits Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs to receive, despite the characterization of the member's service, certain benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(b) **DEADLINE FOR NOTIFICATION.**—Notification under subsection (a) shall be provided to a member described in such subsection in conjunction with the member's notification of the administrative separation or mandatory discharge or as soon thereafter as practicable.

SEC. 530. CONSISTENT ACCESS TO SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL FOR FORMER DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall revise Navy policy regarding the eligibility of former dependents of members of the Armed Forces to representation by a Victims' Legal Counsel so that Navy policy is consistent with Army and Air Force policy regarding Special Victims' Counsel, which provides that a former dependent is eligible for such representation if, while entitled to legal assistance, the dependent was the victim of an alleged sex-related offense by a member of the Armed Forces.

Subtitle D—Member Education, Training, Resilience, and Transition

SEC. 541. PROHIBITION ON RELEASE OF MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMY GRADUATES TO PARTICIPATE IN PROFESSIONAL ATHLETICS.

(a) **UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY.**—Section 4348(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) That the cadet will not seek release from the commissioned service obligation of the cadet to pursue a career as a professional athlete and understands that the appointment alternative described in paragraph (3) will not be used to allow the cadet to pursue such a career.”.

(b) **UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY.**—Section 6959(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) That the midshipman will not seek release from the commissioned service obligation of the midshipman to pursue a career as a professional athlete and understands that the appointment alternative described in paragraph (3) will not be used to allow the midshipman to pursue such a career.”.

(c) **UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY.**—Section 9348(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) That the cadet will not seek release from the commissioned service obligation of the cadet to pursue a career as a professional athlete and understands that the appointment alternative described in paragraph (2) will not be used to allow the cadet to pursue such a career.”.

(d) **APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.**—The Secretaries of the military departments shall promptly revise the cadet and midshipman service agreements under sections 4348, 6959, and 9348 of title 10, United States Code, to reflect the amendments made by this section. The revised agreement shall apply to cadets and midshipmen who are attending the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Air Force Academy on the date of the enactment of this Act and to persons who begin attendance at such military service academies on or after that date.

SEC. 542. ROTC CYBER INSTITUTES AT THE SENIOR MILITARY COLLEGES.

(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a program to establish a Reserve Officers' Training Corps Cyber Institute (referred to in this Act as an “ROTC Cyber Institute”) at each of the senior military colleges for purposes of accelerating the development of foundational expertise in critical cyber operational skills for future military and civilian leaders of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense including such leaders of the reserve components.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—Each ROTC Cyber Institute established under the program authorized by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Programs to provide future military and civilian leaders of the Armed Forces or the Department of Defense, as the case may be, who possess cyber operational expertise from beginning through advanced skill levels. Such programs shall include instruction and practical experiences that lead to recognized certifications in the cyber field.

(2) Programs of targeted strategic foreign language proficiency training for such future leaders that—

(A) are designed to significantly enhance critical cyber operational capabilities; and

(B) are tailored to current and anticipated readiness requirements.

(3) Programs related to mathematical foundations of cryptography and courses in cryptographic theory and practice designed to complement and reinforce cyber education along with the strategic language programs critical to cyber operations.

(4) Programs designed to develop early interest and cyber talent through summer programs for elementary school and secondary school students and dual enrollment opportunities for cyber, strategic language, and cryptography related courses.

(5) Training and education programs to expand the pool of qualified cyber instructors necessary to support cyber education in regional school systems.

(c) **PARTNERSHIPS WITH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE ARMED FORCES.**—Any ROTC Cyber Institute established under the program authorized by subsection (a) may enter into a partnership with one or more components of the Armed Forces, active or reserve, or any agency of the Department of Defense to facilitate the development of critical cyber skills for students who may pursue a military career.

(d) **PARTNERSHIPS WITH OTHER SCHOOLS.**—Any ROTC Cyber Institute established under the program authorized by subsection (a) may enter into a partnership with one or more local educational agencies to facilitate the development of critical cyber skills under the program among students attending the elementary schools and secondary schools of such agencies who may pursue a military career.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ESEA TERMS.**—The terms “elementary school”, “secondary school”, and “local educational agency” have the meanings given the terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) **SENIOR MILITARY COLLEGES.**—The term “senior military colleges” means the senior military colleges described in section 2111a(f) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 543. LIEUTENANT HENRY OSSIAN FLIPPER LEADERSHIP SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of the Army shall carry out a program to be known as the “Lieutenant Henry Ossian Flipper Leadership Scholarship Program” under which the Secretary may provide financial assistance, in accordance with this section, to a person—

(1) who is pursuing a recognized postsecondary credential at a minority-serving institution; and

(2) who enters into an agreement with the Secretary as described in subsection (b).

(b) **SERVICE AGREEMENT FOR SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To receive financial assistance under this section—

(A) a member of the Army shall enter into an agreement to serve on active duty in the Army for the period of obligated service determined under paragraph (2); and

(B) a person who is not a member of the Army shall enter into an agreement to enlist or accept a commission in the Army and to serve on active duty in the Army for the period of obligated service determined under paragraph (2).

(2) **PERIOD OF OBLIGATED SERVICE.**—The period of obligated service for a recipient of financial assistance under this section shall be the period determined by the Secretary of Army as being appropriate to obtain adequate service in exchange for the financial assistance. The period of service required of a recipient shall be not less than the period equal to three-fourths of the total period of pursuit of a credential for which the Secretary agrees to provide the recipient with financial assistance under this section. The period of obligated service is in addition to any other period for which the recipient is obligated to serve on active duty.

(3) **TERMS OF AGREEMENT.**—An agreement entered into under this section by a person pursuing a recognized postsecondary credential shall include the following terms:

(A) **SERVICE START DATE.**—The period of obligated service will begin on a date after the award of the credential, as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

(B) **ACADEMIC PROGRESS.**—The person will maintain satisfactory academic progress, as determined by the Secretary, and that failure to maintain such progress constitutes grounds for termination of the financial assistance for the person under this section.

(C) **OTHER TERMS.**—Any other terms and conditions that the Secretary determines to be appropriate for carrying out this section.

(c) **AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE.**—The amount of the financial assistance provided for a person under this section shall be the amount determined by the Secretary of the Army as being necessary to pay the person's cost of attendance at the minority-serving institution.

(d) **USE OF ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORT OF INTERNSHIPS.**—The financial assistance for a person under this section may also be provided to support internship activities of the person at the Department of Defense in periods between the academic years leading to the credential for which assistance is provided the person under this section.

(e) **REPAYMENT FOR PERIOD OF UNSERVED OBLIGATED SERVICE.**—A member of the Army who does not complete the period of active duty specified in the service agreement under subsection (b) shall be subject to the repayment provisions of section 303a(e) of title 37.

(f) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary

of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes—

(1) an assessment of the progress of the Secretary in carrying out the scholarship program under this section;

(2) the number of scholarships that the Secretary intends to award in the academic year beginning after the date of the submission of the report; and

(3) a description of the Secretary's efforts to promote the scholarship program at minority-serving institutions.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) COST OF ATTENDANCE.—The term “cost of attendance” has the meaning given the term in section 472 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 10871l).

(2) MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term “minority-serving institution” means an institution of higher education described in section 371(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1067q(a)).

(3) RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL.—The term “recognized postsecondary credential” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).

Subtitle E—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters

SEC. 551. CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO ASSIST LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES THAT BENEFIT DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

(a) ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOLS WITH SIGNIFICANT NUMBERS OF MILITARY DEPENDENT STUDENTS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 by section 301 and available for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities as specified in the funding table in division D, \$30,000,000 shall be available only for the purpose of providing assistance to local educational agencies under subsection (a) of section 572 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 20 U.S.C. 7703b).

(b) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “local educational agency” has the meaning given that term in section 7013(9) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7113(9)).

SEC. 552. EDUCATION FOR DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 2164(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “, dependents of retirees,” after “dependents of members of the armed forces”; and

(B) by inserting “and the dependents of such retirees” after “such members of the armed forces”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘retiree’ means a member or former member of the armed forces, not including a member or former member of the Coast Guard, who is entitled to retired or retainer pay under this title, or who, but for age, would be eligible for retired or retainer pay under chapter 1223 of this title.”

SEC. 553. CODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ASSIGNED TO SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES.

(a) CODIFICATION OF EXISTING AUTHORITY.—Chapter 88 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1788 a new section 1788a consisting of—

(1) a heading as follows:

“§1788a. Family support programs: immediate family members of members of special operations forces”; and

(2) a text consisting of subsections (a), (b), (d), and (e) of section 554 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 1788 note), redesignated as subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d), respectively.

(b) FUNDING.—Subsection (c) of section 1788a of title 10, United States Code, as added and redesignated by subsection (a) of this section, is amended by striking “specified” and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting “, from funds available for Major Force Program 11, to carry out family support programs under this section.”

(c) ELIMINATION OF PILOT PROGRAM REFERENCES AND OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1788a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, is further amended—

(1) by striking “Armed Forces” each place it appears and inserting “armed forces”;

(2) by striking “pilot” each place it appears;

(3) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “PILOT”; and

(B) by striking “up to three” and all that follows through “providing” and inserting “programs to provide”; and

(4) in subsection (d), as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “title 10, United States Code” and inserting “this title”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “such title” and inserting “this title”.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 88 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1788 the following new item:

“1788a. Family support programs: immediate family members of members of special operations forces.”

(e) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 554 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 1788 note) is repealed.

SEC. 554. REIMBURSEMENT FOR STATE LICENSE AND CERTIFICATION COSTS OF A SPOUSE OF A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES ARISING FROM RELOCATION TO ANOTHER STATE.

(a) REIMBURSEMENT AUTHORIZED.—Section 476 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(p)(1) The Secretary concerned may reimburse a member of the armed forces for qualified relicensing costs of the spouse of the member when—

“(A) the member is reassigned, either as a permanent change of station or permanent change of assignment, from a duty station in one State to a duty station in another State; and

“(B) the movement of the member's dependents is authorized at the expense of the United States under this section as part of the reassignment.”

(2) Reimbursement provided to a member under this subsection may not exceed \$500 in connection with each reassignment described in paragraph (1).

(3) In this subsection, the term ‘qualified relicensing costs’ means costs, including exam and registration fees, that—

“(A) are imposed by the State of the new duty station to secure a license or certification to engage in the same profession that the spouse of the member engaged in while in the State of the original duty station; and

“(B) are paid or incurred by the member or spouse to secure the license or certification from

the State of the new duty station after the date on which the orders directing the reassignment described in paragraph (1) are issued.”

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO EXPEDITE LICENSE PORTABILITY FOR MILITARY SPOUSES.—

(1) CONSULTATION WITH STATES.—The Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard, shall consult with States—

(A) to identify barriers to the portability between States of a license, certification, or other grant of permission held by the spouse of a member of the Armed Forces to engage in an occupation when the spouse moves between States as part of a permanent change of station or permanent change of assignment of the member; and

(B) to develop recommendations for the Federal Government and the States, together or separately, to expedite the portability of such licenses, certifications, and other grants of permission for military spouses.

(2) SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the consultation and preparing the recommendations under paragraph (1), the Secretaries shall consider the feasibility of—

(A) States accepting licenses, certifications, and other grants of permission described in paragraph (1) issued by another State and in good standing in that State;

(B) the issuance of a temporary license pending completion of State-specific requirements; and

(C) the establishment of an expedited review process for military spouses.

(3) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 15, 2018, the Secretaries shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the States a report containing the recommendations developed under this subsection.

(4) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle F—Decorations and Awards

SEC. 561. REPLACEMENT OF MILITARY DECORATIONS AT THE REQUEST OF RELATIVES OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Subsection (a) of section 1135 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) REPLACEMENT.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall replace, on a one-time basis, a military decoration upon the request of—

“(A) the recipient of the military decoration;

“(B) the immediate next of kin of a deceased recipient of a military decoration; or

“(C) a relative of a deceased recipient of a military decoration who is related within the second or third degree of consanguinity to the deceased recipient.

(2) The replacement of a military decoration under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) shall be provided without charge. The replacement of a military decoration under subparagraph (C) of such paragraph shall be provided at no cost to the Department of Defense.

(3) The authority provided by this subsection is in addition to any other authority available to the Secretary concerned to replace a military decoration.”

SEC. 562. CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE SERVICE MEDAL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter 57 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

§ 1136. Congressional Defense Service Medal

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense shall award, at the behest of and on behalf of Congress, a Congressional Defense Service Medal to a group or other entity to recognize, subject to subsection (c)(1), the exemplary service or significant achievement of the group or other entity in furtherance of the defense and national security of the United States.

“(b) **DESIGN AND CONTENT.**—A Congressional Defense Service Medal shall be a gold medal of appropriate design, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions. The Secretary of Defense may design a Congressional Defense Service Medal to recognize the specific group or other entity and the service or achievement for which the Congressional Defense Service Medal is being awarded.

“(c) **ELIGIBILITY LIMITATIONS.**—

“(1) **NATURE OF SERVICE OR ACHIEVEMENT.**—For a group or other entity to be eligible for the award of a Congressional Defense Service Medal, the service or achievement to be recognized must—

“(A) be in the field of endeavor of the group or other entity; and

“(B) represent either a lengthy period of continuous superior service or achievement or a single act of service or achievement so significant that the group or other entity is recognized and acclaimed by others in the same field of endeavor, as evidenced by the recipient having received the highest honors in the field.

“(2) **EFFECT OF OTHER FEDERAL RECOGNITION.**—A group or other entity may not receive a Congressional Defense Service Medal in recognition of service or achievement for which the group or other entity received a medal from the United States previously for the same or substantially the same service or achievement.

“(3) **PROHIBITION ON AWARD TO AN INDIVIDUAL.**—A Congressional Defense Service Medal may not be awarded to a single individual.

“(d) **TIME LIMITATIONS.**—A Congressional Defense Service Medal may not be awarded to a group or entity—

“(1) until at least five years after the conclusion of the exemplary service or significant achievement for which the Congressional Defense Service Medal is being awarded; and

“(2) unless the award is made within 25 years after the conclusion of the exemplary service or significant achievement for which the Congressional Defense Service Medal is being awarded.

“(e) **DUPLICATE MEDALS.**—The Secretary of Defense may arrange for the striking and sale of duplicates in bronze of a Congressional Defense Service Medal, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold Congressional Defense Service Medal.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 57 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1136. Congressional Defense Service Medal.”

SEC. 563. LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY TO REVOKE CERTAIN MILITARY DECORATIONS AWARDED TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **ARMY.**—

(1) **LIMITATIONS.**—Chapter 357 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 3757. Military decorations: limitations on revocation

“(a) **LIMITATIONS.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the President or the Secretary of the Army may not authorize the revocation of a military decoration after the actual award of the military decoration to a member of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

“(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—(1) Subsection (a) does not apply to the revocation of a military decoration if the revocation is ordered on account of—

“(A) the acquisition of new or additional information that calls into question the service for which the member was awarded the military decoration; or

“(B) the conviction of the member for a serious violent felony.

“(2) In applying the exception described in paragraph (1)(B), the President and the Secretary of the Army shall take into account, as an extenuating factor, whether the member has been diagnosed with Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) or Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

“(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘military decoration’ means the distinguished-service cross, distinguished-service medal, silver star, distinguished flying cross, or Soldier’s Medal. The term does not include the medal of honor.

“(2) The term ‘serious violent felony’ has the meaning given that term in section 3559(c)(2)(F) of title 18.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“3757. Military decorations: limitations on revocation.”

(b) **NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.**—

(1) **LIMITATIONS.**—Chapter 567 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 6259. Military decorations: limitations on revocation

“(a) **LIMITATIONS.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the President or the Secretary of the Navy may not authorize the revocation of a military decoration after the actual award of the military decoration to a member of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

“(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—(1) Subsection (a) does not apply to the revocation of a military decoration if the revocation is ordered on account of—

“(A) the acquisition of new or additional information that calls into question the service for which the member was awarded the military decoration; or

“(B) the conviction of the member for a serious violent felony.

“(2) In applying the exception described in paragraph (1)(B), the President and the Secretary of the Navy shall take into account, as an extenuating factor, whether the member has been diagnosed with Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) or Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

“(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘military decoration’ means the Navy cross, distinguished-service medal, silver star medal, distinguished flying cross, or Navy and Marine Corps Medal. The term does not include the medal of honor.

“(2) The term ‘serious violent felony’ has the meaning given that term in section 3559(c)(2)(F) of title 18.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“6259. Military decorations: limitations on revocation.”

(c) **AIR FORCE.**—

(1) **LIMITATIONS.**—Chapter 857 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 8757. Military decorations: limitations on revocation

“(a) **LIMITATIONS.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the President or the Secretary of the Air Force may not authorize the revocation of a military decoration after the actual award of

the military decoration to a member of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

“(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—(1) Subsection (a) does not apply to the revocation of a military decoration if the revocation is ordered on account of—

“(A) the acquisition of new or additional information that calls into question the service for which the member was awarded the military decoration; or

“(B) the conviction of the member for a serious violent felony.

“(2) In applying the exception described in paragraph (1)(B), the President and the Secretary of the Air Force shall take into account, as an extenuating factor, whether the member has been diagnosed with Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) or Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

“(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘military decoration’ means the Air Force cross, distinguished-service medal, silver star, distinguished flying cross, or Airman’s Medal. The term does not include the medal of honor.

“(2) The term ‘serious violent felony’ has the meaning given that term in section 3559(c)(2)(F) of title 18.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“8757. Military decorations: limitations on revocation.”

Subtitle G—Miscellaneous Reports and Other Matters**SEC. 571. EXPANSION OF UNITED STATES AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ENROLLMENT AUTHORITY TO INCLUDE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE HOMELAND SECURITY INDUSTRY.**

(a) **DEFINITION.**—Subsection (b) of section 9314a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **COVERED PRIVATE SECTOR EMPLOYEE DEFINED.**—(1) In this section, the term ‘covered private sector employee’ means—

“(A) an individual employed by a private firm that is engaged in providing to the Department of Defense significant and substantial defense-related systems, products, or services; or

“(B) an individual employed by a private firm in one of the critical infrastructure sectors identified in Presidential Policy Directive 21 (Critical Infrastructure Security and Resilience).

“(2) A covered private sector employee admitted for instruction at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology remains eligible for such instruction only so long as the person remains employed by the same firm.”

(b) **USE OF DEFINED TERM.**—Section 9314a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “defense industry employees described in subsection (b)” and inserting “a covered private sector employee”; and

(ii) by striking “Any such defense industry employee” and inserting “A covered private sector employee”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “defense industry employees” and inserting “covered private sector employees”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “defense industry employee” both places it appears and inserting “covered private sector employee”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “Defense industry employees” and inserting “A covered private sector employee”; and

(B) by striking “defense industry employees” and inserting “covered private sector employees”; and

(3) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “defense industry employees” and inserting “a covered private sector employee”; and

(4) in subsection (f), by striking “defense industry employees” and inserting “covered private sector employees”.

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 9314a of title 10, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “a defense focused” and inserting “a defense-focused or homeland security-focused”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or homeland security” after “and defense”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or the Department of Homeland Security, as applicable”.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of section 9314a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§9314a. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: admission of certain private sector civilians”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 901 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 9314a and inserting the following new item:

“9314a. United States Air Force Institute of Technology: admission of certain private sector civilians.”.

SEC. 572. SERVICEMEMBERS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE.

Section 1967(f)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking the second sentence.

SEC. 573. VOTER REGISTRATION.

Section 705 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 4025(a)), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) REGISTRATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of voting in any election for Federal office (as defined in section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101)) or State or local office, a servicemember who registers to vote in a State in which the servicemember is present in compliance with military orders for a permanent change of station shall not, solely by reason of that registration—

“(A) be deemed to have acquired a residence or domicile in that State;

“(B) be deemed to have become a resident in or a resident of that State; or

“(C) be deemed to have lost a residence or domicile in any other State, without regard to whether or not the person intends to return to that State.

“(2) NOTIFICATION BY THE SERVICEMEMBER.—A servicemember who elects to register to vote in the State in which the servicemember is present in compliance with military orders for a permanent change of station shall notify the Service Voting Action Officer of the military department concerned not later than 10 days after such registration.

“(3) NOTIFICATION BY THE SERVICE VOTING ACTION OFFICER.—A Service Voting Action Officer who receives a notification under paragraph (2) shall notify the chief State election official of the State in which the servicemember resides or is domiciled of such registration not later than 10 days after such registration.”.

SEC. 574. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SECTION 504 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, ON EXISTING AUTHORITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO ENLIST INDIVIDUALS, NOT OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE FOR ENLISTMENT, WHOSE ENLISTMENT IS VITAL TO THE NATIONAL INTEREST.

It is the sense of Congress that a statute currently exists, specifically paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 504 of title 10, United States Code, which states that “the Secretary

concerned may authorize the enlistment of a person not described in paragraph (1) [of that subsection] if the Secretary determines that such enlistment is vital to the national interest”.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

SEC. 601. ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT OF BASIC MONTHLY PAY.

The adjustment in the rates of monthly basic pay required by subsection (a) of section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, to be made on January 1, 2018, shall take effect, notwithstanding any determination made by the President under subsection (e) of such section with respect to an alternative pay adjustment to be made on such date.

SEC. 602. LIMITATION ON BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING MODIFICATION AUTHORITY FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES RESIDING IN MILITARY HOUSING PRIVATIZATION INITIATIVE HOUSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 403(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) The Secretary of Defense may not reduce the rate of basic allowance for housing in effect on December 31, 2017, for a member of a uniformed service who resides in a housing unit acquired or constructed under the alternative authority of subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10 (known as the Military Housing Privatization Initiative) until January 1, 2019.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (B) of such paragraph is amended in clause (iv) by striking “Four” and inserting “Subject to subparagraph (C), four”.

(c) GAO REVIEW.—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a review of the following:

(1) An analysis of the impact of reductions in the rate of the basic allowance for housing under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, on the long-term viability of the Military Housing Privatization Initiative (MHPI).

(2) An analysis of projected revenue for the MHPI, considering projected reductions in such basic allowance for housing, which compares projected revenue under the assumption that members of the armed forces will make out-of-pocket payments in addition to rent and under the assumption that members will not make such out-of-pocket payments.

(3) An analysis of the extent to which the Department of Defense has relied and continues to rely on the assumption that members of the armed forces who live in housing units acquired or constructed under the MHPI will make out-of-pocket payments in addition to basic rent in order to offset reductions in such basic housing allowance.

(4) An analysis of the future military construction costs that will be necessary to offset reduced reimbursement account distributions as a result of reductions in such basic housing allowance, consistent with the requirement included in project ground leases under the MHPI that all assets will be in like-new condition at the end of the lease.

(5) The impact on maintenance of housing units acquired or constructed under the MHPI because of the reductions in revenue for the MHPI that will result from reductions in such basic housing allowance.

(6) The impacts of the costs described in paragraph (4) and the reduction in revenue described in paragraph (5) on occupancy and revenue generated by occupancy under the MHPI, and the impact of changes in occupancy and associated revenue on the costs described in para-

graph (4) and the reduction in revenue described in paragraph (5).

(7) The process for establishing the criteria for and the execution of market surveys used to establish the rates of such basic housing allowance.

SEC. 603. HOUSING TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, AND THEIR SPOUSES AND OTHER DEPENDENTS, UNDERGOING A PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) HOUSING TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 403 the following new section:

“§403a. Housing treatment for certain members of the Armed Forces, and their spouses and other dependents, undergoing a permanent change of station within the United States

“(a) HOUSING TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS WHO HAVE A SPOUSE OR OTHER DEPENDENTS.—

“(1) HOUSING TREATMENT REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations that permit a member of the armed forces described in paragraph (2) who is undergoing a permanent change of station within the United States to request the housing treatment described in subsection (b) during the covered relocation period of the member.

“(2) ELIGIBLE MEMBERS.—A member described in this paragraph is any member who—

“(A) has a spouse who is gainfully employed or enrolled in a degree, certificate or license granting program at the beginning of the covered relocation period;

“(B) has one or more dependents attending an elementary or secondary school at the beginning of the covered relocation period;

“(C) has one or more dependents enrolled in the Exceptional Family Member Program; or

“(D) is caring for an immediate family member with a chronic or long-term illness at the beginning of the covered relocation period.

“(b) HOUSING TREATMENT.—

“(1) CONTINUATION OF HOUSING FOR THE SPOUSE AND OTHER DEPENDENTS.—If a spouse or other dependent of a member whose request under subsection (a) is approved resides in Government-owned or Government-leased housing at the beginning of the covered relocation period, the spouse or other dependent may continue to reside in such housing during a period determined in accordance with the regulations prescribed pursuant to this section.

“(2) EARLY HOUSING ELIGIBILITY.—If a spouse or other dependent of a member whose request under subsection (a) is approved is eligible to reside in Government-owned or Government-leased housing following the member's permanent change of station within the United States, the spouse or other dependent may commence residing in such housing at any time during the covered relocation period.

“(3) TEMPORARY USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED OR GOVERNMENT-LEASED HOUSING INTENDED FOR MEMBERS WITHOUT A SPOUSE OR DEPENDENT.—If a spouse or other dependent of a member relocates at a time different from the member in accordance with a request approved under subsection (a), the member may be assigned to Government-owned or Government-leased housing intended for the permanent housing of members without a spouse or dependent until the member's detachment date or the spouse or other dependent's arrival date, but only if such Government-owned or Government-leased housing is available without displacing a member without a spouse or dependent at such housing.

“(4) EQUITABLE BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.—If a spouse or other dependent of a member relocates at a time different from the member

in accordance with a request approved under subsection (a), the amount of basic allowance for housing payable may be based on whichever of the following areas the Secretary concerned determines to be the most equitable:

“(A) The area of the duty station to which the member is reassigned.

“(B) The area in which the spouse or other dependent resides, but only if the spouse or other dependent resides in that area when the member departs for the duty station to which the member is reassigned, and only for the period during which the spouse or other dependent resides in that area.

“(C) The area of the former duty station of the member, but only if that area is different from the area in which the spouse or other dependent resides.

“(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED TO CERTAIN BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING PAYMENTS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the payment or the amount of basic allowance for housing payable under section 403(d)(3)(A) of this title to a member whose request under subsection (a) is approved.

“(d) **HOUSING TREATMENT EDUCATION.**—The regulations prescribed pursuant to this section shall ensure the relocation assistance programs under section 1056 of title 10 include, as part of the assistance normally provided under such section, education about the housing treatment available under this section.

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **COVERED RELOCATION PERIOD.**—(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the term ‘covered relocation period’, when used with respect to a permanent change of station of a member of the armed forces, means the period that—

“(i) begins 180 days before the date of the permanent change of station; and

“(ii) ends 180 days after the date of the permanent change of station.

“(B) The regulations prescribed pursuant to this section may provide for a lengthening of the covered relocation period of a member for purposes of this section.

“(2) **DEPENDENT.**—The term ‘dependent’ has the meaning given that term in section 401 of this title.

“(3) **PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION.**—The term ‘permanent change of station’ means a permanent change of station described in section 452(b)(2) of this title.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 403 the following new item:

“403a. Housing treatment for certain members of the armed forces, and their spouses and other dependents, undergoing a permanent change of station within the United States.”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to permanent changes of station of members of the Armed Forces that occur on or after October 1 of the fiscal year that begins after such date of enactment.

SEC. 604. PER DIEM ALLOWANCE POLICIES.

(a) **POLICY AND REGULATIONS.**—

(1) **EXISTING POLICY AND REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary of each military department may not implement the policy in the memorandum dated October 1, 2014, titled “UTD/CTS for MAP 118-13/CAP 118-13—Flat Rate Per Diem for Long Term TDY”, regarding per diem allowances, or any regulations prescribed pursuant to such memorandum, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **FUTURE POLICY AND REGULATIONS.**—(A) The Secretary of each military department concerned may not implement a new policy regard-

ing per diem allowances under section 474 of title 37, United States Code, until after the Secretary of Defense issues the report under subsection (b).

(B) The Secretary of the military department concerned shall notify the appropriate congressional committees not less than 30 days before implementing a new policy regarding per diem allowances under section 474 of title 37, United States Code.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall issue a report to the appropriate congressional committees regarding options to reduce travel costs incurred by the Department of Defense, including the adoption of practices used by private entities.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

SEC. 611. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BONUS AND SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES FOR RESERVE FORCES.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”:

(1) Section 308b(g), relating to Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus.

(2) Section 308c(i), relating to Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus.

(3) Section 308d(c), relating to special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units.

(4) Section 308g(f)(2), relating to Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service.

(5) Section 308h(e), relating to Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service.

(6) Section 308i(f), relating to Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service.

(7) Section 478a(e), relating to reimbursement of travel expenses for inactive-duty training outside of normal commuting distance.

(8) Section 910(g), relating to income replacement payments for reserve component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active duty service.

SEC. 612. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BONUS AND SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES FOR HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS.

(a) **TITLE 10 AUTHORITIES.**—The following sections of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”:

(1) Section 2130a(a)(1), relating to nurse officer candidate accession program.

(2) Section 16302(d), relating to repayment of education loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve.

(b) **TITLE 37 AUTHORITIES.**—The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”:

(1) Section 302c-1(f), relating to accession and retention bonuses for psychologists.

(2) Section 302d(a)(1), relating to accession bonus for registered nurses.

(3) Section 302e(a)(1), relating to incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists.

(4) Section 302g(e), relating to special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties.

(5) Section 302h(a)(1), relating to accession bonus for dental officers.

(6) Section 302j(a), relating to accession bonus for pharmacy officers.

(7) Section 302k(f), relating to accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties.

(8) Section 302l(g), relating to accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties.

SEC. 613. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF SPECIAL PAY AND BONUS AUTHORITIES FOR NUCLEAR OFFICERS.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”:

(1) Section 312(f), relating to special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active service.

(2) Section 312b(c), relating to nuclear career accession bonus.

(3) Section 312c(d), relating to nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

SEC. 614. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO TITLE 37 CONSOLIDATED SPECIAL PAY, INCENTIVE PAY, AND BONUS AUTHORITIES.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”:

(1) Section 331(h), relating to general bonus authority for enlisted members.

(2) Section 332(g), relating to general bonus authority for officers.

(3) Section 333(i), relating to special bonus and incentive pay authorities for nuclear officers.

(4) Section 334(i), relating to special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities for officers.

(5) Section 335(k), relating to special bonus and incentive pay authorities for officers in health professions.

(6) Section 336(g), relating to contracting bonus for cadets and midshipmen enrolled in the Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps.

(7) Section 351(h), relating to hazardous duty pay.

(8) Section 352(g), relating to assignment pay or special duty pay.

(9) Section 353(i), relating to skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus.

(10) Section 355(h), relating to retention incentives for members qualified in critical military skills or assigned to high priority units.

SEC. 615. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO PAYMENT OF OTHER TITLE 37 BONUSES AND SPECIAL PAYS.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”:

(1) Section 301b(a), relating to aviation officer retention bonus.

(2) Section 307a(g), relating to assignment incentive pay.

(3) Section 308(g), relating to reenlistment bonus for active members.

(4) Section 309(e), relating to enlistment bonus.

(5) Section 316a(g), relating to incentive pay for members of precommissioning programs pursuing foreign language proficiency.

(6) Section 324(g), relating to accession bonus for new officers in critical skills.

(7) Section 326(g), relating to incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage.

(8) Section 327(h), relating to incentive bonus for transfer between Armed Forces.

(9) Section 330(f), relating to accession bonus for officer candidates.

SEC. 616. REIMBURSEMENT FOR STATE LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION COSTS OF A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES ARISING FROM SEPARATION FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **REIMBURSEMENT AUTHORIZED.**—Section 1143 of title 10, United States Code, is amended

by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) REIMBURSEMENT FOR STATE LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION COSTS.—(1) The Secretary concerned may reimburse a member of the armed forces who separates from the armed forces for qualified relicensing costs of the member.

“(2) Reimbursement provided to a member under this subsection may not exceed \$500.

“(3) In this subsection, the term ‘qualified relicensing costs’ means costs, including exam and registration fees, that—

“(A) are imposed by the State in which the member resides after separation from the armed forces to secure a license or certification to engage in a profession; and

“(B) are paid or incurred by the member to secure the license or certification from the State in which the member resides after separation from the armed forces.”.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO EXPEDITE LICENSE PORTABILITY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—

(1) CONSULTATION WITH STATES.—The Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard, shall consult with States—

(A) to identify barriers to the portability between States of a license, certification, or other grant of permission held by a member of the Armed Forces to engage in an occupation when the member separates from the Armed Forces; and

(B) to develop recommendations for the Federal Government and the States, together or separately, to expedite the portability of such licenses, certifications, and other grants of permission for separated members of the Armed Forces.

(2) SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the consultation and preparing the recommendations under paragraph (1), the Secretaries shall consider the feasibility of—

(A) States accepting licenses, certifications, and other grants of permission described in paragraph (1) issued by another State and in good standing in that State;

(B) the issuance of a temporary license pending completion of State-specific requirements; and

(C) the establishment of an expedited review process for separated members of the Armed Forces.

(3) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 15, 2018, the Secretaries shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the States a report containing the recommendations developed under this subsection.

(4) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 617. INCREASE IN MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF AVIATION BONUS FOR 12-MONTH PERIOD OF OBLIGATED SERVICE.

Section 334(c)(1)(B) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$35,000” and inserting “\$50,000”.

SEC. 618. TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO 2008 CONSOLIDATION OF CERTAIN SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES.

(a) REPAYMENT PROVISIONS.—

(1) TITLE 10.—Section 510(i), subsections (a)(3) and (c) of section 2005, paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2007(e), section 2105, section 2123(e)(1)(C), section 2128(c), section 2130a(d), section 2171(g), section 2173(g)(2), paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2200a(e), section 4348(f), section 6959(f), section 9348(f), subsections (a)(2) and (b) of section 16135, section 16203(a)(1)(B),

section 16301(h), section 16303(d), and the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of section 16401(f) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by inserting “or 373” before “of title 37”.

(2) TITLE 14.—Section 182(g) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or 373” before “of title 37”.

(b) OFFICERS APPOINTED PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT UNDER SECTION 329 OF TITLE 37.—Section 641 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (6).

(c) REENLISTMENT LEAVE.—The matter preceding paragraph (1) of section 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or paragraph (1) or (3) of section 351(a)” after “section 310(a)(2)”.

(d) REST AND RECUPERATION ABSENCE: QUALIFIED MEMBERS EXTENDING DUTY AT A DESIGNATED LOCATION OVERSEAS.—The matter following paragraph (4) of section 705(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or 352” after “section 314”.

(e) REST AND RECUPERATION ABSENCE: CERTAIN MEMBERS UNDERGOING EXTENDED DEPLOYMENT TO A COMBAT ZONE.—Section 705a(b)(1)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or 352(a)” after “section 305”.

(f) MILITARY PAY AND ALLOWANCES CONTINUANCE WHILE IN A MISSING STATUS.—Section 552(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or paragraph (2) of section 351(a)” after “section 301”.

(g) MILITARY PAY AND ALLOWANCES.—Section 907(d) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “or 351” after “section 301”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “or 352” after “section 301c”;

(C) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “or 353(a)” after “section 304”;

(D) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “or 352” after “section 305”;

(E) in subparagraph (E), by inserting “or 352” after “section 305a”;

(F) in subparagraph (F), by inserting “or 352” after “section 305b”;

(G) in subparagraph (G), by inserting “or 352” after “section 307a”;

(H) in subparagraph (I), by inserting “or 352” after “section 314”;

(I) in subparagraph (J), by striking “316” and inserting “353(b)”;

(J) in subparagraph (K), by striking “323” and inserting “355”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “or 352” after “section 307”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “308” and inserting “331”;

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking “309” and inserting “331”;

(D) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “or 353” after “section 320”.

(h) PAY AND ALLOWANCES.—Section 208(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 210(a)(2)) is amended by inserting “or 373” after “303a(b)”.

Subtitle C—Disability Pay, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits

SEC. 621. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE SPECIAL SURVIVOR INDEMNITY ALLOWANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Dependency and indemnity compensation administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs provides financial support to the surviving spouses, children, and dependent parents of deceased veterans.

(2) The survivor benefit plan administered by the Department of Defense provides an infla-

tion-adjusted annuity to the eligible survivors of certain deceased military personnel.

(3) The amount of compensation a surviving spouse may receive under the survivor benefit plan is offset on a dollar-for-dollar basis by any amount of dependency and indemnity compensation the surviving spouse receives.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the special survivor indemnity allowance was created to assist surviving spouses and begin to repay the offset described in subsection (a)(3); and

(2) such offset should be repealed as soon as possible.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 631. LAND CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE EXCHANGE SERVICE PROPERTY, DALLAS, TEXAS.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Army and Air Force Exchange Service may convey, by sale, exchange, or a combination thereof, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, that is located at 8901 Autobahn Drive in Dallas, Texas, and was purchased using nonappropriated funds of the Army and Air Force Exchange Service.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Consideration for the real property conveyed under subsection (a) shall be at least equal to the fair market value of the property, as determined by the Army and Air Force Exchange Service.

(2) TREATMENT OF CASH CONSIDERATION.—Any cash consideration received from the conveyance of the property under subsection (a) may be retained by the Army and Air Force Exchange Service since the property was acquired using nonappropriated funds.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Army and Air Force Exchange Service. The recipient of the property shall be required to cover the cost of the survey.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Army and Air Force Exchange Service may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Army and Air Force Exchange Service considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 632. ADVISORY BOARDS REGARDING MILITARY COMMISSARIES AND EXCHANGES.

The Secretary of Defense shall direct each commanding officer of a military base on which there is a military commissary or exchange to establish an advisory board, comprised of representatives of military or veterans service organizations, to advise the commanding officer regarding the interests of patrons and beneficiaries of military commissaries and exchanges.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS
Subtitle A—TRICARE and Other Health Care Benefits

SEC. 701. PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS FOR MEMBERS OF A RESERVE COMPONENT WHO ARE SEPARATING FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 1145 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF A RESERVE COMPONENT.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall provide a physical examination pursuant to subsection (a)(5) to each member of a reserve component who—

“(A) during the two-year period before the date on which the member is scheduled to be

separated from the armed force served on active duty in support of a contingency operation for a period of more than 30 days;

“(B) will not otherwise receive such an examination under such subsection; and

“(C) elects to receive such a physical examination.

“(2) The Secretary concerned shall—

“(A) provide the physical examination under paragraph (1) to a member during the 90-day period before the date on which the member is scheduled to be separated from the armed forces; and

“(B) issue orders to such a member to receive such physical examination.

“(3) A member may not be entitled to health care benefits pursuant to subsection (a), (b), or (c) solely by reason of being provided a physical examination under paragraph (1).

“(4) In providing to a member a physical examination under paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned shall provide to the member a record of the physical examination.”.

SEC. 702. MENTAL HEALTH EXAMINATIONS BEFORE MEMBERS SEPARATE FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 1145(a)(5)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and a mental health examination conducted pursuant to section 1074n of this title” after “a physical examination”.

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENT.*—Section 1074n(a) of such title is amended by inserting “(and before separation from active duty pursuant to section 1145(a)(5)(A) of this title)” after “each calendar year”.

SEC. 703. PROVISION OF HYPERBARIC OXYGEN THERAPY FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) *HBOT TREATMENT.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1074n the following new section:

“§ 1074o. Provision of hyperbaric oxygen therapy for certain members

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary may furnish hyperbaric oxygen therapy available at a military medical treatment facility to a covered member if such therapy is prescribed by a physician to treat post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury.

“(b) *COVERED MEMBER DEFINED.*—In this section, the term ‘covered member’ means a member of the armed forces who is—

“(1) serving on active duty; and

“(2) diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury.”.

(2) *CLERICAL AMENDMENT.*—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1074n the following new item:

“1074o. Provision of hyperbaric oxygen therapy for certain members.”.

(b) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle B—Health Care Administration

SEC. 711. CLARIFICATION OF ROLES OF COMMANDERS OF MILITARY MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES AND SURGEONS GENERAL.

(a) *ROLE OF COMMANDERS.*—Section 1073c(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph (A):

“(A) the operation of such facility;”.

(b) *ROLE OF SURGEONS GENERAL.*—

(1) *SURGEON GENERAL OF THE ARMY.*—Section 3036(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amend-

ed by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) The Surgeon General is responsible—

“(i) for the medical readiness provided by the military medical treatment facilities of the Army; and

“(ii) for maintaining a ready medical force of the Army.

“(B) In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Surgeon General shall provide operational oversight of readiness matters of the military medical treatment facilities of the Army.”.

(2) *SURGEON GENERAL OF THE NAVY.*—Section 5137(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) The Surgeon General is responsible—

“(i) for the medical readiness provided by the military medical treatment facilities of the Navy; and

“(ii) for maintaining a ready medical force of the Navy.

“(B) In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Surgeon General shall provide operational oversight of readiness matters of the military medical treatment facilities of the Navy.”.

(3) *SURGEON GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCE.*—Section 8036(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) The Surgeon General is responsible—

“(i) for the medical readiness provided by the military medical treatment facilities of the Air Force; and

“(ii) for maintaining a ready medical force of the Air Force.

“(B) In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Surgeon General shall provide operational oversight of readiness matters of the military medical treatment facilities of the Air Force.”.

SEC. 712. MAINTENANCE OF INPATIENT CAPABILITIES OF MILITARY MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES LOCATED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

In carrying out section 1073d of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each military medical treatment facility located outside the United States maintains, at a minimum, the inpatient capabilities of such facility as of September 30, 2016.

SEC. 713. REGULAR UPDATE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICING STANDARD UNDER TRICARE RETAIL PHARMACY PROGRAM.

Section 1074g(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) With respect to the TRICARE retail pharmacy program described in subsection (a)(2)(E)(ii), the Secretary shall ensure that a contract entered into with a TRICARE pharmacy program contractor includes requirements described in section 1860D–12(b)(6) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–112(b)(6)) to ensure the provision of information regarding the pricing standard for prescription drugs.”.

SEC. 714. RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR PODIATRISTS.

(a) *REQUIREMENT.*—In addition to any other qualification required by law or regulation, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that to serve as a podiatrist in the Armed Forces, an individual must have successfully completed a three-year podiatric medicine and surgical residency.

(b) *APPLICATION.*—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to an individual who is commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces on or after the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

SEC. 721. ONE YEAR EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG ACQUISITION COST PARITY IN THE TRICARE PHARMACY BENEFITS PROGRAM.

Section 743(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) is amended—

(1) by striking “October 1, 2017” and inserting “October 1, 2018”; and

(2) by striking “September 30, 2018” and inserting “September 30, 2019”.

SEC. 722. PILOT PROGRAM ON HEALTH CARE ASSISTANCE SYSTEM.

(a) *PILOT PROGRAM.*—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a pilot program to provide a health care assistance service to certain covered beneficiaries enrolled in TRICARE Prime or TRICARE Select to improve the health outcomes and patient experience for covered beneficiaries with complex medical conditions.

(b) *ELEMENTS.*—The pilot program under subsection (a) may include the following elements:

(1) Assisting families with complex medical conditions to understand and use the health benefits under the TRICARE program.

(2) Supporting such families in accessing and navigating the health care delivery system.

(3) Providing such families with information to allow the families to make informed decisions with health care providers.

(4) Improving the health outcomes for such families.

(c) *DURATION.*—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program for an amount of time determined appropriate by the Secretary during the five-year period beginning January 1, 2018.

(d) *REPORT.*—Not later than January 1, 2021, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report containing an evaluation of the success of the pilot program under subsection (a), including an analysis of the implementation of the elements under subsection (b).

(e) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section, the terms “covered beneficiary”, “TRICARE Prime”, “TRICARE program”, and “TRICARE Select” have the meaning given those terms in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 723. RESEARCH OF CHRONIC TRAUMATIC ENCEPHALOPATHY.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for advanced development for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Defense Health Program, not more than \$25,000,000 may be used to award grants to medical researchers and universities to support research into early detection of chronic traumatic encephalopathy.

SEC. 724. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ELIGIBILITY OF VICTIMS OF ACTS OF TERROR FOR EVALUATION AND TREATMENT AT MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITIES.

Section 717 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(d) *SENSE OF CONGRESS.*—It is the sense of Congress that the civilians covered by this section include United States victims of domestic and international terrorism.

“(e) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘act of terror’ means an act of domestic terrorism or international terrorism, as those terms are defined in section 2331 of title 18, United States Code.

“(2) The term ‘covered beneficiary’ has the meaning given that term in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

“(3) The term ‘victim’, with respect to an act of terror, means an individual who suffered

physical injury as a direct result of the act of terror.”.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Defense Acquisition Streamlining and Transparency

PART I—ACQUISITION SYSTEM STREAMLINING

SEC. 801. PROCUREMENT THROUGH ONLINE MARKETPLACES.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Administrator of General Services shall establish a program to procure commercial products through online marketplaces for purposes of expediting procurement and ensuring reasonable pricing of commercial products. The Administrator shall carry out the program in accordance with this section, through more than one contract with more than one online marketplace provider, and shall design the program to enable Government-wide use of such marketplaces.

(b) **USE OF PROGRAM BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.**—The Secretary of Defense shall purchase, as appropriate, commercial products for the Department of Defense using the program established pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) **CRITERIA FOR ONLINE MARKETPLACES.**—The Administrator shall ensure that an online marketplace used under the program established pursuant to subsection (a)—

(1) is used widely in the private sector, including in business-to-business e-commerce;

(2) provides dynamic selection, in which suppliers and products may be frequently updated, and dynamic pricing, in which product prices may be frequently updated;

(3) enables offers from multiple suppliers on the same or similar products to be sorted or filtered based on product and shipping price, delivery date, and reviews of suppliers or products;

(4) does not feature or prioritize a product of a supplier based on any compensation or fee paid to the online marketplace by the supplier that is exclusively for such featuring or prioritization on the online marketplace;

(5) provides the capability for procurement oversight controls, including spending limits, order approval, and order tracking;

(6) provides consolidated invoicing, payment, and customer service functions for all transactions;

(7) satisfies requirements for supplier and product screening in subsection (d); and

(8) collects information necessary to fulfill the information requirements in subsection (h).

(d) **SUPPLIER AND PRODUCT SCREENING.**—The Administrator shall—

(1) provide or ensure electronic availability to an online marketplace provider awarded a contract pursuant to subsection (a), no less frequently than the first day of each month—

(A) the list of suspended and debarred contractors contained in the System of Award Management maintained by the General Services Administration, or any successor system;

(B) a list of suppliers, by product, that certify compliance with the requirements of section 2533a or 2533b of title 10, United States Code;

(C) a list of suppliers, by product, that comply with the requirements of, or are subject to an exception under, chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code;

(D) a list of suppliers, by product, with respect to which the President has issued a waiver under section 301 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2511);

(E) a list of products, by supplier, that are suitable for the Federal Government to procure pursuant to section 2410m of title 10, United States Code, or section 8503 of title 41, United States Code; and

(F) a list of suppliers, by product, that are small business concerns;

(2) conduct reviews of suppliers to establish the lists required under paragraph (1);

(3) ensure that an online marketplace used under the program established pursuant to subsection (a) provides the ability to search suppliers and products and identify such suppliers and products as authorized or not authorized for purchase during the procurement and order approval process based on the most recent lists provided pursuant to paragraph (1).

(e) **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.**—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a procurement of a product made through an online marketplace under the program established pursuant to subsection (a)—

(A) is deemed to satisfy requirements for full and open competition pursuant to section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, and section 3301 of title 41, United States Code, if there are offers from two or more suppliers of such a product or similar product with substantially the same physical, functional, or performance characteristics on the online marketplace; and

(B) is deemed to be an award of a prime contract for purposes of the goals established under section 15(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)), if the purchase is from a supplier that is a small business concern.

(2) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as limiting the authority of a department or agency to restrict competition to small business concerns.

(f) **REQUIREMENT TO USE STANDARD TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF ONLINE MARKETPLACES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a procurement of a product through a commercial online marketplace used under the program established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made under the standard terms and conditions of the marketplace relating to purchasing on the marketplace, and the Administrator shall not require an online marketplace to modify its standard terms and conditions as a condition of receiving a contract pursuant to subsection (a).

(g) **PROCEDURES FOR AWARD OF CONTRACT.**—Notwithstanding section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law, the award of a contract to an online marketplace provider pursuant to subsection (a) may be made without the use of full and open competition.

(h) **ORDER INFORMATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall require each online marketplace provider awarded a contract pursuant to subsection (a) to provide to the General Services Administration, not less frequently than the first day of each month, the ability to electronically access the following information with respect to each product ordered during the preceding month:

(A) The product name and description.

(B) The date and time of the order.

(C) The product price.

(D) The person or entity within the department or agency that purchased the product and, if appropriate, the official who authorized the purchase.

(E) The delivery address specified in the order for the product.

(F) The number of suppliers that offered the same product or a similar product with substantially the same physical, functional, or performance characteristics on the same date and time that the product was ordered.

(2) **DATA SYSTEM.**—The Administrator shall ensure that order information listed in paragraph (1) is entered into the Federal Procurement Data System described in section 1122 of title 41, United States Code.

(i) **LIMITATION ON INFORMATION DISCLOSURE.**—In any contract awarded to an online marketplace provider pursuant to subsection (a),

the Administrator shall require that the provider agree not to sell or otherwise make available to any third party any of the information listed in subsection (h)(1) in a manner that identifies the Federal Government, or any of its departments or agencies, as the purchaser, except with written consent of the Administrator.

(j) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW OF SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION.**—

(1) **REPORT REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than three years after a contract with an online marketplace provider is awarded pursuant to subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the committees listed in paragraph (2) a report on small business participation in the program established pursuant to subsection (a). The report shall include—

(A) the number of small business concerns that have registered or that have sold goods with at least one online marketplace provider;

(B) trends in small business participation;

(C) the effect, if any, of the program on the ability of agencies to meet goals established under section 15(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)); and

(D) a discussion of the limitations, if any, to small business participation in the program.

(2) **COMMITTEES.**—The committees listed in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

(C) The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives.

(k) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ONLINE MARKETPLACE PROVIDER.**—The term “online marketplace provider” means a commercial, non-Government entity providing an online portal for the purchase of commercial products aggregated, distributed, sold, or manufactured by such entity. The term does not include an online portal managed by the Government for, or predominantly for use by, Government agencies.

(2) **COMMERCIAL PRODUCT.**—The term “commercial product” means a commercially available off-the-shelf item, as defined in section 104 of title 41, United States Code, except the term does not include services.

(3) **SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.**—The term “small business concern” has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

SEC. 802. PERFORMANCE OF INCURRED COST AUDITS.

(a) **PERFORMANCE OF INCURRED COST AUDITS.**—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2313a the following new section:

“§2313b. Performance of incurred cost audits

“(a) **COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS OF RISK AND MATERIALITY.**—For purposes of performing an incurred cost audit of costs associated with a contract of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense shall comply with commercially accepted standards of risk and materiality.

“(b) **SELECTION OF AUDITING ENTITY TO PERFORM INCURRED COST AUDITS.**—(1) For an incurred cost audit of a contract of the Department of Defense, the Defense Contract Management Agency or a contract administration office of a military department shall have the authority to select the Defense Contract Audit Agency or a qualified private auditor to perform an incurred cost audit, based upon guidelines that—

“(A) are issued by an audit planning committee that is comprised of one representative from each of the office of the Under Secretary of

Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment, the Defense Contract Management Agency, a contract administration office of a military department, and the Defense Contract Audit Agency;

“(B) ensure that, after September 1, 2020, not less than 25 percent of incurred costs on flexibly priced contracts are audited by qualified private auditors; and

“(C) ensure that multi-year auditing is conducted only to address outstanding incurred cost audits for which a qualified incurred cost submission was submitted to the Defense Contract Audit Agency more than 12 months before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2)(A) Not later than September 1, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall award an indefinite delivery-indefinite quantity task order contract to two or more qualified private auditors to perform incurred cost audits of costs associated with contracts of the Department of Defense.

“(B) The Defense Contract Management Agency, a contract administration office of a military department, or an authorized entity outside the Department of the Defense may issue a task order to perform an incurred cost audit to a qualified private auditor under a task order contract awarded under subparagraph (A). Such task order may be issued only to a qualified private auditor that certifies that the qualified private auditor possesses the necessary independence to perform such an audit.

“(C) The Defense Contract Audit Agency may not conduct further audit or review of an incurred cost audit performed by a qualified private auditor pursuant to this section, unless requested to do so as part of conducting contract quality assurance functions in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(3)(A) Effective September 1, 2022, the Defense Contract Audit Agency may issue unqualified audit findings for an incurred cost audit only if the Defense Contract Audit Agency is peer reviewed by a commercial auditor and passes such peer review. Such peer review shall be conducted in accordance with the peer review requirements of the generally accepted government auditing standards of the Comptroller General of the United States and shall be deemed to meet the requirements of the Defense Contract Audit Agency for a peer review under such standards.

“(B) The peer review referred to in subparagraph (A) shall occur not less frequently than once every three years.

“(C) Not later than September 1, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives an update on the process of securing a commercial auditor to perform the peer review referred to in subparagraph (A).

“(4) The Secretary of Defense shall consider the results of an incurred cost audit performed under this section without regard to whether the Defense Contract Audit Agency or a qualified private auditor performed the audit.

“(5) The contracting officer for a contract that is the subject of an incurred cost audit shall have the sole discretion to accept or reject an audit finding on direct costs of the contract.

“(c) MATERIALITY STANDARDS FOR INCURRED COST AUDITS.—(1) Not later than September 1, 2020, and except as provided in paragraph (2), the minimum materiality standard used by an auditor shall—

“(A) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount less than or equal to \$100,000, be 4 percent of such costs;

“(B) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$100,000 but less than \$500,000, be \$2,000 plus 2 percent of such costs;

“(C) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$500,000 but less than \$1,000,000, be \$5,000 plus 1 percent of such costs;

“(D) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$1,000,000 but less than

\$5,000,000, be \$8,000 plus 0.9 percent of such costs;

“(E) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$5,000,000 but less than \$10,000,000, be \$13,000 plus 0.8 percent of such costs;

“(F) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$10,000,000 but less than \$50,000,000, be \$23,000 plus 0.7 percent of such costs;

“(G) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$50,000,000 but less than \$100,000,000, be \$73,000 plus 0.6 percent of such costs;

“(H) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$100,000,000 but less than \$500,000,000, be \$153,000 plus 0.52 percent of such costs; and

“(I) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$500,000,000, be \$503,000 plus 0.45 percent of such costs.

“(2) An auditor that performs an incurred cost audit under this section may use a materiality standard of a lesser amount than the materiality standard described under paragraph (1) with respect to a particular qualified incurred cost submission from a contractor based on an assessment of risk presented by such qualified incurred cost submission. The risk shall be assessed by the auditor in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards and guidance issued by the Secretary of Defense.

“(3) Not later than March 1, 2019, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on practices for assessing risk and materiality in auditing, which shall include—

“(A) a summary of commercially accepted standards of risk and materiality and Government standards for risk and materiality as related to incurred cost audits;

“(B) examples of how commercial auditing firms apply such standards in developing methodologies for conducting incurred cost audits; and

“(C) recommendations, if appropriate, to modify the minimum materiality standards under paragraph (1) to be consistent with commercially accepted standards of risk and materiality.

“(4) Not later than September 1, 2019, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on commercially accepted standards of risk and materiality as related to incurred cost audits. The report may contain recommendations to modify the materiality standards under paragraph (1) to be consistent with such commercially accepted standards of risk and materiality.

“(d) TIMELINESS OF INCURRED COST AUDITS.—

(1) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that all incurred cost audits performed pursuant to subsection (b) are performed in a timely manner.

“(2) The Secretary of Defense shall notify a contractor within 60 days after receipt of an incurred cost submission from the contractor whether the submission is a qualified incurred cost submission.

“(3) With respect to qualified incurred cost submissions received on or after the date of the enactment of this section, audit findings shall be issued for an incurred cost audit not later than one year after the date of receipt of such qualified incurred cost submission.

“(4) If audit findings are not issued within one year after the date of receipt of a qualified incurred cost submission, such qualified incurred cost submission shall be considered accepted in its entirety unless the Secretary of Defense can demonstrate that the contractor unreasonably withheld information necessary to perform the incurred cost audit.

“(e) REVIEW OF AUDIT PERFORMANCE.—Not later than April 1, 2025, the Comptroller General of the United States shall provide a report to the congressional defense committees that evaluates for the period beginning on September 1, 2020, and ending on August 31, 2023—

“(1) the timeliness, individual cost, and quality of incurred cost audits, set forth separately by incurred cost audits performed by the Defense Contract Audit Agency and by qualified private auditors;

“(2) the cost to contractors of the Department of Defense for incurred cost audits, set forth separately by incurred cost audits performed by the Defense Contract Audit Agency and by qualified private auditors;

“(3) the effect, if any, on other types of audits conducted by the Defense Contract Audit Agency that results from incurred cost audits conducted by qualified private auditors; and

“(4) the capability and capacity of commercial auditors to conduct incurred cost audits for the Department of Defense.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘commercial auditor’ means a private entity engaged in the business of performing audits.

“(2) The term ‘flexibly priced contract’ means—

“(A) a cost-type contract, fixed-price incentive fee contract, or price-redeterminable contract, or a task order issued under an indefinite delivery-indefinite quantity task order contract, for which final payment is based on actual costs incurred; or

“(B) the materials portion of a time-and-materials contract or labor-hour contract of the Department of Defense.

“(3) The term ‘incurred cost audit’ means an audit of charges to the Government by a contractor under a flexibly priced contract.

“(4) The term ‘materiality standard’ means a dollar amount of misstatements, including omissions, contained in an incurred cost audit that would be material if the misstatements, individually or in the aggregate, could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of the Government made on the basis of the incurred cost audit.

“(5) The term ‘qualified incurred cost submission’ means a submission by a contractor of costs incurred under a flexibly priced contract that has been qualified by the Department of Defense as sufficient to conduct an incurred cost audit.

“(6) The term ‘qualified private auditor’ means a commercial auditor—

“(A) that performs audits in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards of the Comptroller General of the United States; and

“(B) that has received a passing peer review rating, as defined under the generally accepted government auditing standards.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2313a the following new item:

“2313b. Performance of incurred cost audits.”.

SEC. 803. MODIFICATIONS TO COST OR PRICING DATA AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) MODIFICATIONS TO SUBMISSIONS OF COST OR PRICING DATA.—

(1) TITLE 10.—Subsection (a) of section 2306a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “December 5, 1990” each place it appears and inserting “June 30, 2018”;

(B) by striking “December 5, 1991” each place it appears and inserting “July 1, 2018”;

(C) by striking “\$100,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$750,000”;

(D) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraphs (A)(i), (B)(i), (C)(i), (C)(ii), and (D)(i), by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$2,500,000”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$750,000”;

(E) in paragraph (6), by striking “December 5, 1990” and inserting “June 30, 2018”; and

(F) in paragraph (7), by striking “to the amount” and all that follows through “higher multiple of \$50,000.” and inserting “in accordance with section 1908 of title 41.”.

(2) TITLE 41.—Section 3502 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “October 13, 1994” each place it appears and inserting “June 30, 2018”;

(ii) by striking “\$100,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$750,000”;

(iii) in paragraphs (1)(A), (2)(A), (3)(A), (3)(B), and (4)(A), by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$2,500,000”; and

(iv) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$750,000”;

(B) in subsection (f), by striking “October 13, 1994” and inserting “June 30, 2018”; and

(C) in subsection (g), by striking “to the amount” and all that follows through “higher multiple of \$50,000.” and inserting “in accordance with section 1908.”.

(b) MODIFICATION TO AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE SUBMISSION.—Paragraph (1) of section 2306a(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “the contracting officer shall require submission of” and all that follows through “to the extent necessary” and inserting “the offeror shall be required to submit to the contracting officer data other than certified cost or pricing data (if requested by the contracting officer), to the extent necessary”.

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW OF MODIFICATIONS TO COST OR PRICING DATA SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than March 1, 2022, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation and effect of the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b).

(d) REQUIREMENTS FOR DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2313a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “and dollar value” after “number”; and

(II) by inserting “, set forth separately by type of audit” after “pending”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “, both from the date of receipt of a qualified incurred cost submission and from the date the audit begins” after “audit”;

(iii) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

“(D) the sustained questioned costs, set forth separately by type of audit, both as a total value and as a percentage of the total questioned costs for the audit;”;

(iv) by striking subparagraph (E); and

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraphs:

“(E) the total number and dollar value of incurred cost audits completed, and the method by which such incurred cost audits were completed;

“(F) the aggregate cost of performing audits, set forth separately by type of audit;

“(G) the ratio of sustained questioned costs to the aggregate costs of performing audits, set forth separately by type of audit; and

“(H) the total number and dollar value of audits that are pending for a period longer than one year as of the end of the fiscal year covered by the report, and the fiscal year in which the qualified submission was received, set forth separately by type of audit;”;

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—

“(1) The terms ‘incurred cost audit’ and ‘qualified incurred cost submission’ have the meaning given those terms in section 2313b of this title.

“(2) The term ‘sustained questioned costs’ means questioned costs that were recovered by the Federal Government as a result of contract negotiations related to such questioned costs.”.

(2) EXEMPTION TO REPORT TERMINATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1080 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 129 Stat. 1000; 10 U.S.C. 111 note), as amended by section 1061(j) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328), does not apply to the report required to be submitted to Congress under section 2313a of title 10, United States Code.

(e) ADJUSTMENT TO VALUE OF COVERED CONTRACTS FOR REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ALLOWABLE COSTS.—Subparagraph (B) of section 2324(l)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “to the equivalent” and all that follows through “higher multiple of \$50,000.” and inserting “in accordance with section 1908 of title 41.”.

PART II—EARLY INVESTMENTS IN ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

SEC. 811. REQUIREMENT TO EMPHASIZE RELIABILITY AND MAINTAINABILITY IN WEAPON SYSTEM DESIGN.

(a) SUSTAINMENT FACTORS IN WEAPON SYSTEM DESIGN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2442. Sustainment factors in weapon system design

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the defense acquisition system gives ample emphasis to sustainment factors, particularly those factors that are affected principally by the design of a weapon system, in the development of a weapon system.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS PROCESS.—The Secretary shall ensure that reliability and maintainability are included in the performance attributes of the key performance parameter on sustainment during the development of capabilities requirements.

“(c) SOLICITATION AND AWARD OF CONTRACTS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—The program manager of a weapon system shall include in the solicitation for and terms of a covered contract for the weapon system clearly defined and measurable requirements for engineering activities and design specifications for reliability and maintainability.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—If the program manager determines that engineering activities and design specifications for reliability or maintainability should not be a requirement in a covered contract, the program manager shall document in writing the justification for the decision.

“(3) SOURCE SELECTION CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall ensure that sustainment factors, including reliability and maintainability, are given ample emphasis in the process for source selection. The Secretary shall encourage the use of objective reliability and maintainability criteria in the evaluation of competitive proposals.

“(d) CONTRACT PERFORMANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that the Department of Defense uses best practices for responding to the positive or negative performance of a contractor in meeting the sustainment requirements of a covered contract for a weapon system. The Secretary shall encourage the use of incentive fees authorized in paragraph (2) in all covered contracts for weapons systems. The Secretary shall take the necessary actions to enable program offices to execute the recovery options required for each covered contract under paragraph (3).

“(2) AUTHORITY FOR INCENTIVE FEES.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to pay an incentive fee to a contractor that exceeds the design specification requirements for reliability or maintainability for a covered contract. In exercising the authority provided in this paragraph, the Secretary may provide in the terms of the contract for the payment of an incentive fee to a contractor not later than the date of acceptance of the last item under the contract.

“(3) RECOVERY OPTIONS.—(A) Any covered contract for a weapon system shall include terms for amounts to be paid by the contractor to the Government for failure to meet the design specification requirements for reliability and maintainability of the contract by the date of acceptance of the last item under the contract. Terms for such amounts shall be included in the solicitation for the contract. Such terms shall include provisions providing that—

“(i) the contractor, at no or minimal cost to the Government as determined by the Secretary and included in the contract, identifies the cause of the failure in the system design, develops an engineering change, and, in the case of a production contract, modifies all end items to be delivered or already delivered under the contract; or

“(ii) the contractor provides the Government—

“(1) a refund in the amount required to identify the cause of the failure in the system design, develop an engineering change, and modify all end items delivered under the contract; and

“(II) associated technical data required to make the necessary modifications.

“(B) The Secretary may waive the requirement in subparagraph (A) with respect to a covered contract if the Secretary determines that such requirement is not in the national security interests of the United States.

“(4) MEASUREMENT OF RELIABILITY AND MAINTAINABILITY.—In carrying out paragraphs (2) and (3), the program manager shall base determinations of a contractor’s performance on reliability and maintainability data collected during developmental testing and operational testing.

“(e) COVERED CONTRACT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘covered contract’, with respect to a weapon system, means a contract—

“(1) for the engineering and manufacturing development of a weapon system; or

“(2) for the production of a weapon system.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2442. Sustainment factors in weapon system design.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE FOR CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Subsections (c) and (d) of section 2442 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to any covered contract (as defined in that section) for which the contract solicitation is issued on or after the date occurring one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) INVESTMENT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish an investment program for funding engineering changes to the design of a weapon system in the engineering and manufacturing development phase or in the production phase of an acquisition program to improve reliability or maintainability of the weapon system and reduce projected operating and support costs. The program may be funded from the Defense Modernization Account authorized in section 2216 of title 10, United States Code. A program manager may apply for available funds by presenting a business case analysis of the anticipated return on investment of such funds.

(2) BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services in the Senate and the House of Representatives on an implementation plan for the program authorized under paragraph (1). The implementation plan shall set forth the process by which program managers apply for available funds, including information on the validation of business case analyses and the evaluation of applications. The briefing shall also include the results of a review of past or existing programs to improve reliability and maintainability and reduce operating and support costs of weapon systems, an assessment of best practices and lessons learned from these programs, and an assessment of the opportunities for consolidation of existing similar programs.

SEC. 812. LICENSING OF APPROPRIATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY TO SUPPORT MAJOR WEAPON SYSTEMS.

(a) NEGOTIATION OF PRICE FOR TECHNICAL DATA BEFORE DEVELOPMENT OR PRODUCTION OF MAJOR WEAPON SYSTEM.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2438 the following new section:

“§2439. Negotiation of price for technical data before development or production of major weapon systems

“The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Department of Defense, before selecting a contractor for the engineering and manufacturing development of a major weapon system, or for the production of a major weapon system, negotiates a price for technical data to be delivered under a contract for such development or production.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2438 the following new item:

“2439. Negotiation of price for technical data before development or production of major weapon systems.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2439 of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall apply with respect to any contract for engineering and manufacturing development of a major weapon system, or for the production of a major weapon system, for which the contract solicitation is issued on or after the date occurring one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) WRITTEN DETERMINATION FOR MILESTONE B APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(3) of section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (M); and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (N) the following new subparagraph:

“(O) appropriate actions have been taken to negotiate and enter into a contract or contract options for the technical data required to support the program; and”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2366b(a)(3)(O) of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall apply with respect to any major defense acquisition program receiving Milestone B approval on or after the date occurring one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) PREFERENCE FOR NEGOTIATION OF CUSTOMIZED LICENSE AGREEMENTS.—Section 2320 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection (f):

“(f) PREFERENCE FOR SPECIALLY NEGOTIATED LICENSES.—The Secretary of Defense shall, to the maximum extent practicable, negotiate and

enter into a contract with a contractor for a specially negotiated license for technical data to support the product support strategy of a major weapon system or subsystem of a major weapon system. In performing the assessment and developing the corresponding strategy required under subsection (e) for such a system or subsystem, a program manager shall consider the use of specially negotiated licenses to acquire customized technical data appropriate for the particular elements of the product support strategy.”.

SEC. 813. MANAGEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY MATTERS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) MANAGEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2321 the following new section:

“§2322. Management of intellectual property matters within the Department of Defense

“(a) OFFICE AND DIRECTOR OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—(1) There is an Office of Intellectual Property within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment.

“(2) The Office shall be headed by a Director of Intellectual Property, who shall have the qualifications described in paragraph (3). The Director is responsible in the Department of Defense to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment for policy and oversight of the acquisition and licensing of intellectual property within the Department of Defense. The Director shall report directly to the Under Secretary.

“(3) In order to qualify to be assigned to the position of Director, an individual shall—

“(A) have management expertise in, and professional experience with, intellectual property matters, including an understanding of intellectual property law, regulations, and policies, especially with respect to regulations and policies of the Federal Government and the Department of Defense for acquiring or licensing intellectual property, and best practices for negotiating and executing business arrangements with industry for the acquisition or licensing of intellectual property;

“(B) have an understanding of Department of Defense weapon system acquisition; and

“(C) have an understanding of the commercial marketplace; commercial industry operations, including supply chain operations; business strategies; and private investment in research and development.

“(4) The Secretary of Defense shall designate the position of Director as a critical acquisition position under section 1733(b)(1)(C) of this title.

“(b) DUTIES.—(1) The Director of Intellectual Property (in this section referred to as the ‘Director’) shall oversee and coordinate efforts throughout the Department of Defense to acquire or license intellectual property within the Department of Defense. The duties under this paragraph shall include the duties specified in paragraphs (2) through (8).

“(2) The Director shall develop and recommend any policy guidance on the acquisition or licensing of intellectual property to be issued by the Secretary of Defense.

“(3) The Director shall provide oversight and coordination of the efforts within the Department of Defense to acquire or license intellectual property—

“(A) to ensure that program managers are aware of the rights afforded the Federal Government and contractors in intellectual property and that program managers fully consider and use all available techniques and best practices for acquiring or licensing intellectual property early in the acquisition process;

“(B) to enable consistency across the military departments and the Department of Defense in

strategies for obtaining intellectual property and communicating with industry; and

“(C) to raise awareness within the acquisition, science and technology, and logistics communities within the Department of intellectual property issues.

“(4) The Director shall assist program managers in developing customized intellectual property strategies for each weapon system based on, at a minimum, the unique characteristics of the weapon system and its components, the product support strategy for the weapon system, the organic industrial base strategy of the military department concerned, and the commercial market.

“(5) The Director shall develop resources, including guidelines on intellectual property matters and, as appropriate, templates for specially negotiated licenses, and make them available to the acquisition workforce.

“(6) The Director shall establish, maintain, supervise, and assign to program offices the cadre of intellectual property experts established under subsection (c).

“(7) The Director, in coordination with the Defense Acquisition University and in consultation with industry, shall—

“(A) develop a career path, including development opportunities, talent management programs, and training, for the cadre of intellectual property experts established under subsection (c); and

“(B) develop, update, and coordinate intellectual property training provided to the acquisition workforce.

“(8) The Director shall foster communications with industry and serve as a central point of contact within the Department of Defense for communications with contractors on intellectual property matters. The Director may interact directly with industry, trade associations, other Government agencies, academic research and educational institutions, and scientific organizations engaged in intellectual property matters.

“(c) CADRE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY EXPERTS.—(1) The Director shall establish within the Office of Intellectual Property a cadre of personnel who are experts in intellectual property matters. The purpose of the cadre is to ensure a consistent, strategic, and highly knowledgeable approach to acquiring or licensing intellectual property by providing expert advice, assistance, and resources to the acquisition workforce on intellectual property matters, including acquiring or licensing intellectual property.

“(2) The cadre of experts shall be assigned to a weapons system program office or an acquisition command within a military department to advise, assist, and provide resources to a program manager or program executive officer on intellectual property matters at various stages of the life cycle of a weapon system. In performing such duties, the experts shall—

“(A) interpret and provide counsel on laws, regulations, and policies relating to intellectual property;

“(B) advise and assist in the development of an acquisition strategy, product support strategy, and intellectual property strategy for a weapon system;

“(C) conduct or assist with financial analysis and valuation of intellectual property;

“(D) assist in the drafting of a contract solicitation or contract;

“(E) interact with or assist in interactions with contractors, including communications and negotiations with contractors on contract solicitations and contract awards; and

“(F) conduct or assist with mediation if technical data delivered pursuant to a contract is incomplete or does not comply with the terms of the contract.

“(3)(A) In order to achieve the purpose set forth in paragraph (1), the Director shall ensure

the cadre has the appropriate number of staff and such staff possesses the necessary skills, knowledge, and experience to carry out the duties under paragraph (2), including in relevant areas of law, contracting, acquisition, logistics, engineering, financial analysis, and valuation. The Director may use existing authorities to staff the cadre, including those in subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (F).

“(B) Civilian personnel from within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Joint Staff, military departments, Defense Agencies, and combatant commands may be assigned to serve as members of the cadre, upon request of the Director.

“(C) The Director may use the authorities for highly qualified experts under section 9903 of title 5, to hire experts as members of the cadre who are skilled professionals in intellectual property and related matters.

“(D) The Director may enter into a contract with a private-sector entity for specialized expertise to support the cadre. Such entity may be considered a covered Government support contractor, as defined in section 2320 of this title.

“(E) In establishing the cadre, the Director shall give preference to civilian employees of the Department of Defense, rather than members of the armed forces, to maintain continuity in the cadre.

“(F) The Director is authorized to use funding from the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund for the purpose of recruitment, training, and retention of the cadre, including paying salaries of newly hired members of the cadre for up to three years.

“(G) Members of the cadre shall report to the Director.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item: “2322. Management of intellectual property matters within the Department of Defense.”.

(b) PLACEMENT IN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Subsection 131(b)(8) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(J) The Director of the Office of Intellectual Property assigned pursuant to section 2322(a) of this title.”.

(c) ADDITIONAL ACQUISITION POSITION.—Subsection 1721(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(12) Intellectual property.”.

(d) REVIEW OF ACQUISITION WORKFORCE TRAINING.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall revise the education and training programs provided to the acquisition workforce under chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code—

(1) to ensure the acquisition workforce maintains a basic familiarity with the fundamental aspects of the acquisition and licensing of intellectual property; and

(2) to establish and maintain advanced expertise in the acquisition and licensing of intellectual property to staff the cadre of intellectual property experts required under section 2322 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

SEC. 814. IMPROVEMENT OF PLANNING FOR ACQUISITION OF SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) IMPROVEMENT OF PLANNING FOR ACQUISITION OF SERVICES.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2328 the following new section:

“§2329. Procurement of services: data analysis and requirements validation

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that—

“(1) appropriate and sufficiently detailed data are collected and analyzed to support the vali-

dation of requirements for services contracts and inform the planning, programming, budgeting, and execution process of the Department of Defense;

“(2) requirements for services contracts are evaluated appropriately and in a timely manner to inform decisions regarding the procurement of services; and

“(3) decisions regarding the procurement of services consider available resources and total force management policies and procedures.

“(b) SPECIFICATION OF AMOUNTS REQUESTED IN BUDGET.—Effective October 1, 2022, the Secretary of Defense shall annually submit to Congress information on services contracts that clearly and separately identifies the amount requested for each category of services to be procured for each Defense Agency, Department of Defense Field Activity, command, or military installation. Such information shall—

“(1) be submitted at or about the time of the budget submission by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31;

“(2) cover the fiscal year covered by such budget submission by the President;

“(3) be consistent with total amounts of estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations necessary to support the programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Defense included in such budget submission by the President for that fiscal year; and

“(4) be organized using a common enterprise data structure developed under section 2222 of this title.

“(c) DATA ANALYSIS.—(1) Each Secretary of a military department shall regularly analyze past spending patterns and anticipated future requirements with respect to the procurement of services within such military department.

“(2)(A) The Secretary of Defense shall regularly analyze past spending patterns and anticipated future requirements with respect to the procurement of services—

“(i) within each Defense Agency and Department of Defense Field Activity; and

“(ii) across military departments, Defense Agencies, and Department of Defense Field Activities.

“(B) The Secretaries of the military departments shall make data on services contracts available to the Secretary of Defense for purposes of conducting the analysis required under subparagraph (A).

“(3) The analyses conducted under this subsection shall—

“(A) identify contracts for similar services that are procured for three or more consecutive years at each Defense Agency, Department of Defense Field Activity, command, or military installation;

“(B) evaluate patterns in the procurement of services, to the extent practicable, at each Defense Agency, Department of Defense Field Activity, command, or military installation and by category of services procured;

“(C) be used to validate requirements for services contracts entered into after the date of the enactment of this subsection; and

“(D) be used to inform decisions on the award of and funding for such services contracts.

“(d) REQUIREMENTS EVALUATION.—Each Services Requirements Review Board shall evaluate each requirement for a services contract, taking into consideration total force management policies and procedures, available resources, the analyses conducted under subsection (c), and contracting efficacy and efficiency. An evaluation of a services contract for compliance with contracting policies and procedures may not be considered to be an evaluation of a requirement for such services contract.

“(e) TIMELY PLANNING TO AVOID BRIDGE CONTRACTS.—(1) Effective October 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that a require-

ments owner shall, to the extent practicable, plan appropriately before the date of need of a service at a Defense Agency, Department of Defense Field Activity, command, or military installation to avoid the use of a bridge contract to provide for continuation of a service to be performed through a services contract. Such planning shall include allowing time for a requirement to be validated, a services contract to be entered into, and funding for the services contract to be secured.

“(2)(A) Upon the first use, due to inadequate planning (as determined by the Secretary of Defense), of a bridge contract to provide for continuation of a service to be performed through a services contract, the requirements owner, along with the contracting officer or a designee of the contracting officer for the contract, shall—

“(i) for a services contract in an amount less than \$10,000,000, provide an update on the status of the bridge contract (including the rationale for using the bridge contract) to the commander or the senior civilian official of the Defense Agency concerned, Department of Defense Field Activity concerned, command concerned, or military installation concerned, as applicable; or

“(ii) for a services contract in an amount equal to or greater than \$10,000,000, provide an update on the status of the bridge contract (including the rationale for using the bridge contract) to the service acquisition executive for the military department concerned, the head of the Defense Agency concerned, the combatant commander concerned, or the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment, as applicable.

“(B) Upon the second use, due to inadequate planning (as determined by the Secretary of Defense), of a bridge contract to provide for continuation of a service to be performed through a services contract in an amount less than \$10,000,000, the commander or senior civilian official referred to in subparagraph (A)(i) shall provide notification of such second use to the Vice Chief of Staff of the armed force concerned and the service acquisition executive of the military department concerned, the head of the Defense Agency concerned, the combatant commander concerned, or the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment, as applicable.

“(f) EXCEPTION.—Except with respect to the analyses required under subsection (c), this section shall not apply to—

“(1) services contracts in support of contingency operations, humanitarian assistance, disaster relief, or national security emergencies; or

“(2) services contracts entered into pursuant to an international agreement.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘bridge contract’ means—

“(A) an extension to an existing contract beyond the period of performance to avoid a lapse in service caused by a delay in awarding a subsequent contract; or

“(B) a new short-term contract awarded on a sole-source basis to avoid a lapse in service caused by a delay in awarding a subsequent contract.

“(2) The term ‘requirements owner’ means a member of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard) or a civilian employee of the Department of Defense responsible for a requirement for a service to be performed through a services contract.

“(3) The term ‘Services Requirements Review Board’ has the meaning given in Department of Defense Instruction 5000.74, titled ‘Defense Acquisition of Services’ and dated January 5, 2016, or a successor instruction.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2328 the following new item:

“2329. Procurement of services: data analysis and requirements validation.”.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Effective October 1, 2022—

(1) section 235 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed; and

(2) the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 9 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 235.

SEC. 815. IMPROVEMENTS TO TEST AND EVALUATION PROCESSES AND TOOLS.

(a) DEVELOPMENTAL TEST PLAN SUFFICIENCY ASSESSMENTS.—

(1) ADDITION TO MILESTONE B BRIEF SUMMARY REPORT.—Section 2366b(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (H); and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following new subparagraph (G):

“(G) An assessment of the sufficiency of developmental test and evaluation plans, including the use of automated data analytics or modeling and simulation tools.”.

(2) ADDITION TO MILESTONE C BRIEF SUMMARY REPORT.—Section 2366c(a) of such title is amended by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) An assessment of the sufficiency of the developmental test and evaluation completed, including the use of automated data analytics or modeling and simulation tools.”.

(3) RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONDUCTING ASSESSMENTS.—For purposes of the sufficiency assessments required by section 2366b(c)(1) and section 2366c(a)(4) of such title, as added by paragraphs (1) and (2), with respect to a major defense acquisition program—

(A) if the milestone decision authority for the program is the service acquisition executive of the military department that is managing the program, the sufficiency assessment shall be conducted by the senior official within the military department with responsibility for developmental testing; and

(B) if the milestone decision authority for the program is the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment, the sufficiency assessment shall be conducted by the senior Department of Defense official with responsibility for developmental testing.

(4) GUIDANCE REQUIRED.—Within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the senior Department of Defense official with responsibility for developmental testing shall develop guidance for the sufficiency assessments required by section 2366b(c)(1) and section 2366c(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraphs (1) and (2). At a minimum, the guidance shall require—

(A) for the sufficiency assessment required by section 2366b(c)(1) of such title, that the assessment address the sufficiency of—

(i) the developmental test and evaluation plan;

(ii) the developmental test and evaluation schedule, including a comparison to historic analogous systems;

(iii) the developmental test and evaluation resources (facilities, personnel, test assets, data analytics tools, and modeling and simulation capabilities);

(iv) the risks of developmental test and production concurrency; and

(v) the developmental test criteria for entering the production phase; and

(B) for the sufficiency assessment required by section 2366c(a)(4) of such title, that the assessment address—

(i) the sufficiency of the developmental test and evaluation completed;

(ii) the sufficiency of the plans and resources available for remaining developmental test and evaluation;

(iii) the risks identified during developmental testing to the production and deployment phase;

(iv) the sufficiency of the plans and resources for remaining developmental test and evaluation; and

(v) the readiness of the system to perform scheduled initial operational test and evaluation.

(b) EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NEED FOR CENTRALIZED TOOLS FOR DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall evaluate the strategy of the Department of Defense for developing and expanding the use of tools designed to facilitate the cost effectiveness and efficiency of developmental testing, including automated test methods and tools, modeling and simulation tools, and big data analytics technologies. The evaluation shall include a determination of the appropriate role of the senior Department of Defense official with responsibility for developmental testing in developing enterprise level strategies related to such types of testing tools.

(2) BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on the results of the evaluation required by paragraph (1).

PART III—ACQUISITION WORKFORCE IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 821. ENHANCEMENTS TO THE CIVILIAN PROGRAM MANAGEMENT WORKFORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM MANAGER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall implement a program manager development program to provide for the professional development of high-potential, experienced civilian personnel. Personnel shall be competitively selected for the program based on their potential to become a program manager of a major defense acquisition program, as defined in section 2430 of title 10, United States Code. The program shall be administered and overseen by the Secretary of each military department, acting through the service acquisition executive for the department concerned.

(2) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a comprehensive plan to implement the program established under paragraph (1). In developing the plan, the Secretary of Defense shall seek the input of relevant external parties, including professional associations, other government entities, and industry. The plan shall include the following elements:

(A) An assessment of the minimum level of subject matter experience, education, years of experience, certifications, and other qualifications required to be selected into the program, set forth separately for current Department of Defense employees and for personnel hired into the program from outside the Department of Defense.

(B) A description of hiring flexibilities to be used to recruit qualified personnel from outside the Department of Defense.

(C) A description of the extent to which mobility agreements will be required to be signed by personnel selected for the program during their participation in the program and after their completion of the program. The use of mobility agreements shall be applied to help maximize the flexibility of the Department of Defense in assigning personnel, while not inhibiting the participation of the most capable candidates.

(D) A description of the tenure obligation required of personnel selected for the program.

(E) A plan for training during the course of the program, including training in leadership, program management, engineering, finance and budgeting, market research, business acumen, contracting, supplier management, requirement setting and tradeoffs, intellectual property matters, and software.

(F) A description of career paths to be followed by personnel in the program in order to ensure that personnel in the program gain expertise in the program management functional career field competencies identified by the Department in existing guidance and the topics listed in subparagraph (E), including—

(i) a determination of the types of advanced educational degrees that enhance program management skills and the mechanisms available to the Department of Defense to facilitate the attainment of those degrees by personnel in the program;

(ii) a determination of required assignments to positions within acquisition programs, including position type and acquisition category of the program office;

(iii) a determination of required or encouraged rotations to career broadening positions outside of acquisition programs; and

(iv) a determination of how the program will ensure the opportunity for a required rotation to industry of at least six months to develop an understanding of industry motivation and business acumen, such as by developing an industry exchange program for civilian program managers, similar to the Corporate Fellows Program of the Secretary of Defense.

(G) A general description of the number of personnel anticipated to be selected into the program, how frequently selections will occur, how long personnel selected into the program will participate in the program, and how personnel will be placed into an assignment at the completion of the program.

(H) A description of benefits that will be offered under the program using existing human capital flexibilities to retain qualified employees, such as student loan repayments.

(I) An assessment of personnel flexibilities needed to allow the military departments and the Defense Agencies to reassign or remove program managers that do not perform effectively.

(J) A description of how the program will be administered and overseen by the Secretaries of each military department, acting through the service acquisition executive for the department concerned.

(K) A description of how the program will be integrated with existing program manager development efforts at each military department.

(3) USE OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND.—Amounts in the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (established under section 1705 of title 10, United States Code) may be used to pay the base salary of personnel in the program established under paragraph (1) during the period of time such personnel are temporarily assigned to a developmental rotation or training program anticipated to last at least six months.

(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—The program established under paragraph (1) shall be implemented not later than September 30, 2019.

(b) INDEPENDENT STUDY OF INCENTIVES FOR PROGRAM MANAGERS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT FOR STUDY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall enter into a contract with an independent research entity described in paragraph (2) to carry out a comprehensive study of incentives for Department of Defense civilian and military program managers for major defense acquisition programs, including—

(A) additional pay options for program managers to provide incentives to senior civilian employees and military officers to accept and remain in program manager roles;

(B) a financial incentive structure to reward program managers for delivering capabilities on budget and on time; and

(C) a comparison between financial and non-financial incentive structures for program managers in the Department of Defense and an appropriate comparison group of private industry companies.

(2) **INDEPENDENT RESEARCH ENTITY.**—The entity described in this subsection is an independent research entity that is a not-for-profit entity or a federally funded research and development center with appropriate expertise and analytical capability.

(3) **REPORTS.**—

(A) **TO SECRETARY.**—Not later than nine months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the independent research entity shall provide to the Secretary a report containing—

(i) the results of the study required by paragraph (1); and

(ii) such recommendations to improve the financial incentive structure of program managers for major defense acquisition programs as the independent research entity considers to be appropriate.

(B) **TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days after receipt of the report under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Defense shall submit such report, together with any additional views or recommendations of the Secretary, to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 822. IMPROVEMENTS TO THE HIRING AND TRAINING OF THE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE.

(a) **USE OF FUNDS FROM THE DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND TO PAY SALARIES OF PERSONNEL TO MANAGE THE FUND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection 1705(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “(A)” before “Subject to the provisions of this subsection”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) Amounts in the Fund also may be used to pay salaries of personnel at the Office of the Secretary of Defense, military departments, and Defense Agencies to manage the Fund.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C);

(ii) by striking the period and inserting “; and” at the end of subparagraph (D); and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) describing the amount from the Fund that may be used to pay salaries of personnel at the Office of the Secretary of Defense, military departments, and Defense Agencies to manage the Fund and the circumstances under which such amounts may be used for such purpose.”.

(2) **GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall issue, and submit to the congressional defense committees, the policy guidance required by subparagraph (E) of section 1705(e)(3) of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

(b) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS OF HIRING AND RETENTION FLEXIBILITIES FOR ACQUISITION WORKFORCE PERSONNEL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than June 30, 2019, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the effectiveness of hiring and retention flexibilities for the acquisition workforce.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under this subsection shall include the following:

(A) A determination of the extent to which the Department of Defense experiences challenges

with recruitment and retention of the acquisition workforce, such as post-employment restrictions.

(B) A description of the hiring and retention flexibilities available to the Department to fill civilian acquisition positions and the extent to which the Department has used the flexibilities available to it to target critical or understaffed career fields.

(C) A determination of the extent to which the Department has the necessary data on its use of hiring and retention flexibilities for the civilian acquisition workforce to strategically manage the use of such flexibilities.

(D) An identification of the factors that affect the use of hiring and retention flexibilities for the civilian acquisition workforce.

(E) Recommendations for any necessary changes to the hiring and retention flexibilities available to the Department to fill civilian acquisition positions.

(F) A description of the flexibilities available to the Department to remove underperforming members of the acquisition workforce and the extent to which any such flexibilities are used.

(c) **ASSESSMENT AND REPORT REQUIRED ON BUSINESS-RELATED TRAINING FOR THE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE.**—

(1) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment shall conduct an assessment of the following:

(A) The effectiveness of industry certifications and other industry training programs, including fellowships, available to defense acquisition workforce personnel.

(B) Gaps in knowledge of industry operations, industry motivation, and business acumen in the acquisition workforce.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2018, the Under Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the assessment conducted under this subsection.

(3) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment and report under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall address the following:

(A) Current sources of training and career development opportunities, industry rotations, and other career development opportunities related to knowledge of industry operations, industry motivation, and business acumen for each acquisition position, as designated under section 1721 of title 10, United States Code.

(B) Gaps in training, industry rotations, and other career development opportunities related to knowledge of industry operations, industry motivation, and business acumen for each such acquisition position.

(C) Plans to address those gaps for each such acquisition position.

(D) Consideration of the role industry-taught classes and classes taught at educational institutions outside of the Defense Acquisition University could play in addressing gaps.

(d) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW OF ACQUISITION TRAINING FOR NON-ACQUISITION WORKFORCE PERSONNEL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than June 30, 2019, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on acquisition-related training for personnel working on acquisitions but not considered to be part of the acquisition workforce (as defined in section 101(18) of title 10, United States Code) (hereafter in this subsection referred to as “non-acquisition workforce personnel”).

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report shall address the following:

(A) The extent to which non-acquisition workforce personnel play a significant role in defining requirements, conducting market research, participating in source selection and contract

negotiation efforts, and overseeing contract performance.

(B) The extent to which the Department is able to identify and track non-acquisition workforce personnel performing the roles identified in subparagraph (A).

(C) The extent to which non-acquisition workforce personnel are taking acquisition training.

(D) The extent to which the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund has been used to provide acquisition training to non-acquisition workforce personnel.

(E) A description of sources of funding other than the Fund that are available to and used by the Department to provide non-acquisition workforce personnel with acquisition training.

(F) The extent to which additional acquisition training is needed for non-acquisition workforce personnel, including the types of training needed, the positions that need the training, and any challenges to delivering necessary additional training.

(e) **BRIEFING ON IMPROVEMENTS TO THE DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY WORKFORCE.**—

(1) **BRIEFING REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), shall provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The briefing required by paragraph (1) shall address the following:

(A) The current education, certifications, and qualifications of the Defense Contract Audit Agency workforce, by supervisory and non-supervisory levels and type of position.

(B) Shortfalls (if any) in education, qualification, or training in the Defense Contract Audit Agency workforce, by supervisory and non-supervisory levels and type of position, and the reasons for those shortfalls.

(C) The link (if any) between Defense Contract Audit Agency workforce skill and experience gaps and the Agency’s backlog of audits.

(D) The link (if any) between the effectiveness of Defense Contract Audit Agency regional directors and their education, certifications, and qualifications.

(E) The number of Defense Contract Audit Agency auditors who have relevant private sector experience, including from industry exchanges while at the Defense Contract Audit Agency and from prior employment experiences, and the perspective of the Defense Contract Audit Agency on the benefits of those experiences.

(F) Ongoing efforts and future plans by the Defense Contract Audit Agency to improve the professionalization of its audit workforce, including changes in hiring, training, required certifications or qualifications, compensation structure, and increased opportunities for industry exchanges or rotations.

SEC. 823. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATIONS TO ACQUISITION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Section 1762(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “December 31, 2020” and inserting “December 31, 2023”.

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN ACQUISITION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.**—

(1) **STRATEGY REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop an implementation strategy to address areas for improvement in the demonstration project required by section 1762 of title 10, United States Code, as identified in the second assessment of such demonstration project required by section 1762(e) of such title.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy shall include the following elements:

(A) Actions that have been or will be taken to assess whether the flexibility to set starting salaries at different levels is being used appropriately by supervisors and managers to compete effectively for highly skilled and motivated employees.

(B) Actions that have been or will be taken to assess reasons for any disparities in career outcomes across race and gender for employees in the demonstration project.

(C) Actions that have been or will be taken to strengthen the link between employee contribution and compensation for employees in the demonstration project.

(D) Actions that have been or will be taken to enhance the transparency of the pay system for employees in the demonstration project.

(E) A time frame and individual responsible for each action identified under subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(3) **BRIEFING REQUIRED.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives on the implementation strategy required by paragraph (1).

SEC. 824. ACQUISITION POSITIONS IN THE OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.

(a) **OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY MAXIMUM NUMBER OF PERSONNEL.**—Section 3014(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) The limitation in paragraph (1) may be exceeded if a civilian employee is assigned on permanent duty in the Office of the Secretary of the Army or on the Army Staff and—

“(A) the employee was employed immediately preceding that assignment either—

“(i) in a position within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics that had responsibility for oversight of acquisition programs or processes prior to February 1, 2018, and that was determined to be no longer needed as a result of section 901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2339) and the amendments made by that section; or

“(ii) in a Joint Staff position that supported the Joint Requirements Oversight Council prior to December 23, 2016, and that was determined to be no longer needed as a result of section 925 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2359) and the amendments made by that section; and

“(B) the position described in subparagraph (A) is not filled by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment or the Joint Staff after the employee’s permanent duty assignment.”.

(b) **OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY MAXIMUM NUMBER OF PERSONNEL.**—Section 5014(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) The limitation in paragraph (1) may be exceeded if a civilian employee is assigned on permanent duty in the Department of the Navy or assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, the Office of Chief of Naval Operations, or the Headquarters, Marine Corps, and—

“(A) the employee was employed immediately preceding that assignment either—

“(i) in a position within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics that had responsibility for oversight of acquisition programs or processes prior to February 1, 2018, and that

was determined to be no longer needed as a result of section 901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2339) and the amendments made by that section; or

“(ii) in a Joint Staff position that supported the Joint Requirements Oversight Council prior to December 23, 2016, and that was determined to be no longer needed as a result of section 925 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2359) and the amendments made by that section; and

“(B) the position described in subparagraph (A) is not filled by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment or the Joint Staff after the employee’s permanent duty assignment.”.

(c) **OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF PERSONNEL.**—Section 8014(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) The limitation in paragraph (1) may be exceeded if a civilian employee is assigned on permanent duty in the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force or on the Air Staff and—

“(A) the employee was employed immediately preceding that assignment either—

“(i) in a position within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics that had responsibility for oversight of acquisition programs or processes prior to February 1, 2018, and that was determined to be no longer needed as a result of section 901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2339) and the amendments made by that section; or

“(ii) in a Joint Staff position that supported the Joint Requirements Oversight Council prior to December 23, 2016, and that was determined to be no longer needed as a result of section 925 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2359) and the amendments made by that section; and

“(B) the position described in subparagraph (A) is not filled by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment or the Joint Staff after the employee’s permanent duty assignment.”.

PART IV—TRANSPARENCY IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 831. TRANSPARENCY OF DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM DATA.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMON ENTERPRISE DATA STRUCTURES.**—Section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) Policy requiring that any data contained in a defense business system is an asset of the Department of Defense, and that such data should be made readily available to members of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, and the military departments (except as otherwise provided by law or regulation).”.

(2) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) **COMMON ENTERPRISE DATA STRUCTURES.**—(A) The defense business enterprise architecture shall include one or more common enterprise data structures which can be used to code data that are automatically extracted from the relevant defense business systems to facilitate Department of Defense-wide analysis and management of such data.

“(B) The Deputy Chief Management Officer shall—

“(i) in consultation with the Defense Business Council established under subsection (f), develop one or more common enterprise data structures and an associated data governance process; and

“(ii) have primary decision-making authority with respect to the development of any such common enterprise data structure.

“(C) The Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall—

“(i) in consultation with the Defense Business Council established under subsection (f), document and maintain any common enterprise data structure developed under subparagraph (B);

“(ii) extract data from defense business systems using the appropriate common data enterprise structure on a specified schedule;

“(iii) provide access to such data to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, and the military departments (except as otherwise provided by law or regulation) on a specified schedule developed in consultation with the Defense Business Council established under subsection (f); and

“(iv) have primary decision-making authority with respect to the maintenance of any such common enterprise data structure.

“(D) Common enterprise data structures shall be established and maintained for the following types of data of the Department of Defense:

“(i) An accounting of expenditures of the Department of Defense, set forth separately for each type of expenditure.

“(ii) Data from the future-years defense program established under section 221 and budget data.

“(iii) Acquisition cost data and earned value management data.

“(iv) Operating and support costs for weapon systems, including data on maintenance procedures conducted on each major weapon system (as defined in section 2379 of this title).

“(v) Data on contracts and task orders of the Department of Defense, including goods and services acquired under such contracts or task orders and associated obligations and expenditures.

“(E) The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries of the military departments, the Commanders of the combatant commands, the heads of the Defense Agencies, the heads of the Department of Defense Field Activities, and the heads of all other organizations of the Department of Defense shall provide access to the relevant defense business system of such department, combatant command, Defense Agency, Field Activity, or organization, as applicable, and data extracted from such system, for purposes of automatically populating data sets coded with common enterprise data structures.”.

(3) in subsection (f)(2), by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iv) The Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation with respect to common enterprise data structures.”; and

(4) in subsection (i), by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(10) **COMMON ENTERPRISE DATA STRUCTURE.**—The term ‘common enterprise data structure’ means a mapping and organization of data from defense business systems into a common data set.

“(11) **DATA GOVERNANCE PROCESS.**—The term ‘data governance process’ means a system to manage the timely Department of Defense-wide sharing of data described under paragraph (5)(A).”.

(b) **ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF COST ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM EVALUATION.**—Section 139a(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) Maintenance of common enterprise data structures established pursuant to section 2222 of this title, including establishing and maintaining access to any data contained in a defense business system (as defined in such section) and used in a common enterprise data

structure, as determined appropriate by the Secretary of Defense or the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation.”.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR COMMON ENTERPRISE DATA STRUCTURES.—

(1) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Deputy Chief Management Officer and the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall jointly develop a plan to implement the requirements of subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—At a minimum, the implementation plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) The major tasks required to implement the requirements of subsection (a) and the recommended time frames for each task.

(B) The estimated resources required to complete each major task identified pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(C) Any challenges associated with each major task identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) and related steps to mitigate such challenge.

(D) A description of how data security issues will be appropriately addressed in the implementation of the requirements of subsection (a).

(3) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Upon completion of the plan required under paragraph (1), the Deputy Chief Management Officer and the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall submit such plan to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 832. MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS: DISPLAY OF BUDGET INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2433a the following new section:

“§2434. Major defense acquisition programs: display of budget information

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the defense budget materials for fiscal year 2020 and each subsequent fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the funding requirements listed in subsection (b) are displayed separately for major defense acquisition programs, as defined in section 2340 of title 10, United States Code.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR BUDGET DISPLAY.—The budget justification display for a fiscal year shall include the funding requirement for each major defense acquisition program, including all sources of appropriations—

“(1) for developmental test and evaluation;

“(2) for operational test and evaluation;

“(3) for the purchase of cost data from contractors; and

“(4) for the purchase or license of technical data.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘budget’ and ‘defense budget materials’ have the meaning given those terms in section 234 of this title.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2433a following new item:

“2434. Major defense acquisition programs: display of budget information.”.

SEC. 833. ENHANCEMENTS TO TRANSPARENCY IN TEST AND EVALUATION PROCESSES AND DATA.

(a) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO DESIGNATION OF A MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—Section 139 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and in accordance with subsection (l).”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(l) For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B), before designating a program that is not a major defense acquisition program for the purposes of section 2430 of this title as a major defense ac-

quisition program for the purposes of this section, the Director shall provide in writing to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment, and the test and evaluation executive of the military department or departments executing the program, the specific circumstances of the program that led to the designation decision.”; and

(3) by adding at the end of subsection (h)(4) the following: “The report shall also include a brief statement of the rationale for placing on the oversight list of the Director each program that is not a major defense acquisition program for the purposes of section 2430 of this title but has been designated as a major defense acquisition program for the purposes of this section.”.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF LEGACY ITEMS OR COMPONENTS IN OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION REPORTS.—Section 2399(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A)(ii);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) a description of the performance of the items or components tested in relation to comparable legacy items or components, if such items or components exist and relevant data are available without requiring additional testing; and”.

(c) OPPORTUNITY FOR MILITARY DEPARTMENT COMMENTS ON ANNUAL REPORT ON OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION.—Section 139(h) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6), and in that paragraph by striking “and the Secretaries of the military departments”; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

“(5) Within 45 days after the submission of an annual report by the Director to Congress, the Secretaries of the military departments may each submit a report to the congressional defense committees addressing any concerns related to information included in the annual report, or providing updated or additional information as appropriate.”.

(d) GUIDELINES FOR COLLECTION OF COST DATA ON TEST AND EVALUATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation and the senior Department of Defense official with responsibility for developmental testing shall jointly develop policies, procedures, guidance, and a collection method to ensure that consistent, high quality data are collected on the full range of estimated and actual developmental, live fire, and operational testing costs for major defense acquisition programs. Data on estimated and actual developmental, live fire, and operational testing costs shall be maintained in an electronic database maintained by the Director for Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation.

(2) CONCURRENCE AND COORDINATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation and the senior Department of Defense official with responsibility for developmental testing shall obtain the concurrence of the Director for Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation and shall coordinate with the Director of the Test Resource Management Center and the Secretaries of the military departments.

(3) MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term “major defense acquisition program” has the meaning provided in section 2430 of title 10, United States Code.

(e) REPORT ON ENTERPRISE APPROACH TO TEST AND EVALUATION KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Test Resource Management Center and the senior Department of Defense official with responsibility for developmental testing shall provide to the congressional defense committees a report on the development of an approach for managing test and evaluation knowledge across the entire Department of Defense.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) The detailed concepts, requirements, technologies, methodologies, and architecture necessary for an enterprise approach to knowledge management for test and evaluation, including data, data analysis tools, and modeling and simulation capabilities.

(B) Resources needed to develop and adopt an enterprise approach to knowledge management for test and evaluation.

(C) Roles and responsibilities of various Department of Defense entities to develop and adopt an enterprise approach to knowledge management for test and evaluation.

(D) Time frames required to develop and adopt an enterprise approach to knowledge management for test and evaluation.

(E) A description of pilot studies ongoing at the time of the date of the enactment of this Act or previously conducted related to developing an enterprise approach to test and evaluation knowledge management, including results of the pilot studies (if available) and lessons learned.

Subtitle B—Streamlining of Defense Acquisition Statutes and Regulations

SEC. 841. MODIFICATIONS TO THE ADVISORY PANEL ON STREAMLINING AND CODIFYING ACQUISITION REGULATIONS.

(a) EXTENSION OF DATE FOR FINAL REPORT.—(1) TRANSMITTAL OF PANEL FINAL REPORT.—Subsection (e)(1) of section 809 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 889), as amended by section 863(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2303), is amended—

(A) by striking “Not later than two years after the date on which the Secretary of Defense establishes the advisory panel” and inserting “Not later than January 15, 2019”; and

(B) by striking “the Secretary” and inserting “the Secretary of Defense and the congressional defense committees”.

(2) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ACTION ON FINAL REPORT.—Subsection (e)(4) of such section is amended—

(A) by striking “Not later than 30 days” and inserting “Not later than 60 days”; and

(B) by striking “the final report, together with such comments as the Secretary determines appropriate,” and inserting “such comments as the Secretary determines appropriate”.

(b) TERMINATION OF PANEL.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) TERMINATION OF PANEL.—The advisory panel shall terminate 180 days after the date on which the final report of the panel is transmitted pursuant to subsection (e)(1) or on such later date as may be specified by the Secretary of Defense.”.

SEC. 842. EXTENSION OF MAXIMUM DURATION OF FUEL STORAGE CONTRACTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 2922(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “20 years” and inserting “30 years”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to contracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and may be applied to a contract entered into before that date if the total contract period under the contract (including options) has not expired as of the date of

any extension of such contract period by reason of such amendment.

SEC. 843. EXCEPTION FOR BUSINESS OPERATIONS FROM REQUIREMENT TO ACCEPT \$1 COINS.

Paragraph (1) of section 5112(p) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

“This paragraph does not apply with respect to business operations conducted by any entity under a contract with an agency or instrumentality of the United States, including any non-appropriated fund instrumentality established under title 10, United States Code.”.

SEC. 844. REPEAL OF EXPIRED PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 807(c) of Public Law 104–106 (10 U.S.C. 2401a note) is repealed.

Subtitle C—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

SEC. 851. LIMITATION ON UNILATERAL DEFINITIZATION.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Section 2326 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) **LIMITATION ON UNILATERAL DEFINITIZATION BY CONTRACTING OFFICER.**—With respect to any undefinitized contractual action with a value greater than \$1,000,000,000, if agreement is not reached on contractual terms, specifications, and price within the period or by the date provided in subsection (b)(1), the contracting officer may not unilaterally definitize those terms, specifications, or price over the objection of the contractor until—

“(1) the head of the agency approves the definitization in writing;

“(2) the contracting officer provides a copy of the written approval to the contractor; and

“(3) a period of 30 calendar days has elapsed after the written approval is provided to the contractor.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 2326(b)(3) of such title is amended by striking “subsection (g)” and inserting “subsection (h)”.

(c) **CONFORMING REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall revise the Department of Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation to implement section 2326 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this section.

SEC. 852. CODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS PERTAINING TO ASSESSMENT, MANAGEMENT, AND CONTROL OF OPERATING AND SUPPORT COSTS FOR MAJOR WEAPON SYSTEMS.

(a) **CODIFICATION AND AMENDMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2337 the following new section:

“§2337a. Assessment, management, and control of operating and support costs for major weapon systems

“(a) **GUIDANCE REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall issue and maintain guidance on actions to be taken to assess, manage, and control Department of Defense costs for the operation and support of major weapon systems.

“(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The guidance required by subsection (a) shall, at a minimum—

“(1) be issued in conjunction with the comprehensive guidance on life-cycle management and the development and implementation of product support strategies for major weapon systems required by section 2337 of this title;

“(2) require the military departments to retain each estimate of operating and support costs that is developed at any time during the life

cycle of a major weapon system, together with supporting documentation used to develop the estimate;

“(3) require the military departments to update estimates of operating and support costs periodically throughout the life cycle of a major weapon system, to determine whether preliminary information and assumptions remain relevant and accurate, and identify and record reasons for variances;

“(4) establish policies and procedures for the collection, organization, maintenance, and availability of standardized data on operating and support costs for major weapon systems in accordance with section 2222 of this title;

“(5) establish standard requirements for the collection and reporting of data on operating and support costs for major weapon systems by contractors performing weapon system sustainment functions in an appropriate format, and develop contract clauses to ensure that contractors comply with such requirements;

“(6) require the military departments—

“(A) to collect and retain data from operational and developmental testing and evaluation on the reliability and maintainability of major weapon systems; and

“(B) to use such data to inform system design decisions, provide insight into sustainment costs, and inform estimates of operating and support costs for such systems;

“(7) require the military departments to ensure that sustainment factors are fully considered at key life cycle management decision points and that appropriate measures are taken to reduce operating and support costs by influencing system design early in development, developing sound sustainment strategies, and addressing key drivers of costs;

“(8) require the military departments to conduct an independent logistics assessment of each major weapon system prior to key acquisition decision points (including milestone decisions) to identify features that are likely to drive future operating and support costs, changes to system design that could reduce such costs, and effective strategies for managing such costs;

“(9) include—

“(A) reliability metrics for major weapon systems; and

“(B) requirements on the use of metrics under subparagraph (A) as triggers—

“(i) to conduct further investigation and analysis into drivers of those metrics; and

“(ii) to develop strategies for improving reliability, availability, and maintainability of such systems at an affordable cost; and

“(10) require the military departments to conduct periodic reviews of operating and support costs of major weapon systems after such systems achieve initial operational capability to identify and address factors resulting in growth in operating and support costs and adapt support strategies to reduce such costs.

“(c) **RETENTION OF DATA ON OPERATING AND SUPPORT COSTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall be responsible for developing and maintaining a database on operating and support estimates, supporting documentation, and actual operating and support costs for major weapon systems.

“(2) **SUPPORT.**—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Director, in carrying out such responsibility—

“(A) promptly receives the results of all cost estimates and cost analyses conducted by the military departments with regard to operating and support costs of major weapon systems;

“(B) has timely access to any records and data of the military departments (including classified and proprietary information) that the Director considers necessary to carry out such responsibility; and

“(C) with the concurrence of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment, may direct the military departments to collect and retain information necessary to support the database.

“(d) **MAJOR WEAPON SYSTEM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘major weapon system’ has the meaning given that term in section 2379(f) of title 10, United States Code.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of such title is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2337 the following new item:

“2337a. Assessment, management, and control of operating and support costs for major weapon systems.”.

(b) **REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED SECTION.**—

(1) **REPEAL.**—Section 832 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 10 U.S.C. 2430 note) is repealed.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 2441(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 2337 of this title” and all that follows through the period and inserting “sections 2337 and 2337a of this title.”.

SEC. 853. USE OF PROGRAM INCOME BY ELIGIBLE ENTITIES THAT CARRY OUT PROCUREMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

Section 2414 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**LIMITATION**” and inserting “**IFUNDING**”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **USE OF PROGRAM INCOME.**—

“(1) An eligible entity that earned income in a specified fiscal year from activities carried out pursuant to a procurement technical assistance program funded under this chapter may expend an amount of such income not to exceed 25 percent of the cost of furnishing procurement technical assistance in such specified fiscal year, during the fiscal year following the specified fiscal year, to carry out a procurement technical assistance program funded under this chapter.

“(2) An eligible entity that does not enter into a cooperative agreement with the Secretary for a fiscal year—

“(A) shall notify the Secretary of the amount of any income the eligible entity carried over from the previous fiscal year; and

“(B) may retain an amount of such income equal to 10 percent of the value of assistance furnished by the Secretary under this section during the previous fiscal year.

“(3) In determining the value of assistance furnished by the Secretary under this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall account for the amount of any income the eligible entity carried over from the previous fiscal year.”.

SEC. 854. AMENDMENT TO SUSTAINMENT REVIEWS.

Section 2441(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“The Secretary concerned shall make the memorandum and supporting documentation for each sustainment review available to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment within 30 days after the review is completed.”.

SEC. 855. CLARIFICATION TO OTHER TRANSACTION AUTHORITY.

(a) **CLARIFICATION TO REQUIREMENT FOR WRITTEN DETERMINATIONS FOR PROTOTYPE PROJECTS.**—Section 2371b(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “for a prototype project” each place such term appears and inserting “for a transaction (for a prototype project)”.

(b) **CLARIFICATION OF INCLUSION OF SMALL BUSINESSES PARTICIPATING IN SBIR OR STTR.**—Section 2371b(d)(1)(B) of title 10, United States

Code, is amended by inserting “(including small businesses participating in a program described under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638))” after “small businesses”.

SEC. 856. CLARIFYING THE USE OF LOWEST PRICE TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS.

Section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2270; 10 U.S.C. 2305 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(7) the Department of Defense would realize minimal or no additional innovation or future technological advantage; and

“(8) with respect to a contract for procurement of goods, the goods procured are predominantly expendable in nature, nontechnical, or have a short life expectancy or short shelf life.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) electronic test and measurement equipment for which calibration or repair costs are expected to substantially affect full life-cycle costs.”.

SEC. 857. AMENDMENT TO NONTRADITIONAL AND SMALL CONTRACTOR INNOVATION PROTOTYPING PROGRAM.

Section 884(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2318; 10 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph (9):

“(9) Unmanned ground logistics and unmanned air logistics capabilities enhancement.”.

SEC. 858. MODIFICATION TO ANNUAL MEETING REQUIREMENT OF CONFIGURATION STEERING BOARDS.

Section 814(c)(4) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4529; 10 U.S.C. 2430 note) is amended by striking “year.” and inserting “year, unless the senior acquisition executive of the military department concerned determines in writing that there have been no changes to the program requirements of a major defense acquisition program during the preceding year.”.

SEC. 859. CHANGE TO DEFINITION OF SUB-CONTRACT IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.

Section 1906(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “The term does not include agreements entered into by a contractor for the supply of commodities that are intended for use in the performance of multiple contracts with the Government and other parties and are not identifiable to any particular contract.”.

SEC. 860. AMENDMENT RELATING TO APPLICABILITY OF INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS.

Subsection 1908(d) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and shall apply, in the case of the procurement of property or services by contract, to a contract, and any sub-contract at any tier under the contract, in effect on that date without regard to the date of award of the contract or subcontract.”.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 861. EXEMPTION FROM DESIGN-BUILD SELECTION PROCEDURES.

Subsection (d) of section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the second and third sentences and inserting the following: “If the contract value exceeds \$4,000,000, the maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless—

“(1) the solicitation is issued pursuant to a indefinite delivery-indefinite quantity contract for design-build construction; or

“(2)(A) the head of the contracting activity, delegable to a level no lower than the senior contracting official within the contracting activity, approves the contracting officer’s justification with respect to an individual solicitation that a number greater than 5 is in the Federal Government’s interest; and

“(B) the contracting officer shall provide written documentation of how a maximum number exceeding 5 is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection procedures.”.

SEC. 862. REQUIREMENT THAT CERTAIN SHIP COMPONENTS BE MANUFACTURED IN THE NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL BASE.

(a) ADDITIONAL PROCUREMENT LIMITATION.—Section 2534(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) COMPONENTS FOR AUXILIARY SHIPS.—Subject to subsection (k), the following components:

“(A) Auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services.

“(B) Propulsion system components, including engines, reduction gears, and propellers.

“(C) Shipboard cranes.

“(D) Spreaders for shipboard cranes.”.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) IMPLEMENTATION OF AUXILIARY SHIP COMPONENT LIMITATION.—Subsection (a)(6) applies only with respect to contracts awarded by the Secretary of a military department for new construction of an auxiliary ship after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 using funds available for National Defense Sealift Fund programs or Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy.”.

SEC. 863. PROCUREMENT OF AVIATION CRITICAL SAFETY ITEMS.

Section 814(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2271; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “or an aviation critical safety item (as defined in section 2319(g) of this title)” after “personal protective equipment”; and

(B) by inserting “equipment or” after “failure of the”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “or item” after “equipment”.

SEC. 864. MILESTONES AND TIMELINES FOR CONTRACTS FOR FOREIGN MILITARY SALES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARD TIMELINES FOR FOREIGN MILITARY SALES.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish specific milestones and standard timelines to achieve such milestones for a foreign military sale (as authorized under chapter 2 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761 et seq.)), including milestones and timelines for actions that occur after a letter of offer and acceptance (as described in chapter 5 of the Security Assistance Management Manual of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency) for such foreign military sale is completed. Such milestones and timelines—

(1) may vary depending on the complexity of the foreign military sale; and

(2) shall cover the period beginning on the date of receipt of a complete letter of request (as described in such chapter 5) from a foreign country and ending on the date of the final delivery of a defense article or defense service sold through the foreign military sale.

(b) SUBMISSIONS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) QUARTERLY NOTIFICATION.—During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2021, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, on a quarterly basis, a report that includes a list of each foreign military sale with a value greater than or equal to the dollar threshold for congressional notification under section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776)—

(A) for which the final delivery of a defense article or defense service has not been completed; and

(B) that failed to meet a standard timeline to achieve a milestone as established under subsection (a).

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than November 1, 2019, and annually thereafter until December 31, 2021, the Secretary shall submit to the committees described in paragraph (1) a report that summarizes—

(A) the number, set forth separately by dollar value and milestone, of foreign military sales that met the standard timeline to achieve a milestone established under subsection (a) during the preceding fiscal year; and

(B) the number, set forth separately by dollar value, milestone, and case development extenuating factor, of foreign military sales that failed to meet the standard timeline to achieve a milestone established under subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DEFENSE ARTICLE; DEFENSE SERVICE.—The terms “defense article” and “defense service” have the meanings given those terms, respectively, in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

(2) CASE DEVELOPMENT EXTENUATING FACTOR.—The term “case development extenuating factor” means a reason from a list of reasons developed by the Secretary (such as a change in requirements, delay in performance, or failure to receive funding) for the failure of a foreign military sale to meet a standard timeline to achieve a milestone established under subsection (a).

SEC. 865. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN CONTRACTS FOR AUDIT SERVICES.

(a) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—If the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) makes a written finding that a delay in performance of a covered contract while a protest is pending would hinder the annual preparation of audited financial statements for the Department of Defense, and the head of the procuring activity responsible for the award of the covered contract does not authorize the award of the contract (pursuant to section 3553(c)(2) of title 31, United States Code) or the performance of the contract (pursuant to section 3553(d)(3)(C) of such title), the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) notify the congressional defense committees within 10 days after such finding is made; and

(2) describe any steps the Department of Defense plans to take to mitigate any hindrance identified in such finding to the annual preparation of audited financial statements for the Department.

(b) COVERED CONTRACT DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered contract” means a contract for services to perform an audit to comply with the requirements of section 3515 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 866. TRAINING IN ACQUISITION OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS.

(a) **TRAINING.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President of the Defense Acquisition University shall establish a comprehensive training program on the acquisition of commercial items, including part 12 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation. The curriculum shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) The reasons for and appropriate uses of part 12 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, including the preference for the acquisition of commercial items under section 2377 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The definition of a commercial item, including the interpretation of the phrase “of a type”.

(3) Price analysis and negotiations.

(4) Market research and analysis.

(5) Independent cost estimates.

(6) Parametric estimating methods.

(7) Value analysis.

(8) Other topics on the acquisition of commercial items necessary to ensure a well-educated acquisition workforce.

(b) **STUDENT ENROLLMENT.**—The President of the Defense Acquisition University shall set goals for student enrollment for the training program established under subsection (a).

SEC. 867. NOTICE OF COST-FREE FEDERAL PROCUREMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN CONNECTION WITH REGISTRATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS ON PROCUREMENT WEBSITES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures to ensure that any notice or direct communication regarding the registration of a small business concern on a website maintained by the Department of Defense relating to contracting opportunities contains information about cost-free Federal procurement technical assistance services that are available through a procurement technical assistance program established under chapter 142 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) **SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN DEFINED.**—The term “small business concern” has the meaning given such term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

SEC. 868. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON CONTRACTOR BUSINESS SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the feasibility and effects of an increase to the percentage of total gross revenue included in the definition of the term “covered contractor” in section 893(g)(2) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note). Such report shall include—

(1) an assessment of the effects of the amendment to such definition made by subsection (c) of section 893 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328); and

(2) the feasibility and effects of a subsequent increase to the percentage of total gross revenue included in such definition.

SEC. 869. STANDARD GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR SERVICES CONTRACTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall encourage the use of standard guidelines within the Department of Defense for the evaluation of requirements for services contracts. Such guidelines shall be available to the Services Requirements Review Boards (established under Department of Defense Instruction 5000.74, titled “Defense Acquisition of Services” and dated January 5, 2016, or a successor in-

struction) within each Defense Agency, each Department of Defense Field Activity, and each military department for the purpose of standardizing the requirements evaluation required under section 2329 of title 10, United States Code, as added by this Act. Such guidelines may provide policy guidance or tools, including a comprehensive checklist of total force management policies and procedures that is modeled after the checklist used by the Army, to aid uniform decision-making during the requirements evaluation process.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the terms “Defense Agency”, “Department of Defense Field Activity”, and “military department” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of title 10, United States Code; and

(2) the term “total force management policies and procedures” means the policies and procedures established under section 129a of such title.

SEC. 870. TEMPORARY LIMITATION ON AGGREGATE ANNUAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR CONTRACT SERVICES.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the total amount obligated by the Department of Defense for contract services in fiscal year 2018 may not exceed the total amount requested for the Department for contract services in the budget of the President for fiscal year 2010 (as submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) adjusted for net transfers from funding for overseas contingency operations.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CONTRACT SERVICES.**—The term “contract services” has the meaning given that term in section 235 of title 10, United States Code, except that the term does not include services that are funded out of amounts available for overseas contingency operations.

(2) **TRANSFERS FROM FUNDING FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**—The term “transfers from funding for overseas contingency operations” means amounts funded out of amounts available for overseas contingency operations in fiscal year 2010 that are funded out of amounts other than amounts so available in fiscal year 2018.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT**Subtitle A—Organization and Management of the Department of Defense Generally****SEC. 901. RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR RISK MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES REGARDING SUPPLY CHAIN FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.**

Section 142(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(J) has the responsibilities for policy, oversight, guidance, and coordination for risk management activities for the Department regarding the supply chain for information technology systems.”.

SEC. 902. REPEAL OF OFFICE OF CORROSION POLICY AND OVERSIGHT.

(a) **REPEAL.**—Section 2228 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 131 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 2228.

SEC. 903. DESIGNATION OF CORROSION CONTROL AND PREVENTION EXECUTIVES FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.

(a) **DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY.**—

(1) **DESIGNATION.**—Chapter 303 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§3025. Corrosion control and prevention executive

“(a) **DESIGNATION.**—(1) There is a corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department of the Army. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall designate the corrosion control and prevention executive.

“(2) In addition to the duties assigned under subsection (c), the principal responsibility of the civilian employee designated as the corrosion control and prevention executive shall be coordinating Department of the Army corrosion control and prevention program activities (including budget programming) with the Department and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the program executive officers of the Department, and relevant major subordinate commands of the Department.

“(3) The corrosion control and prevention executive shall be a civilian employee of the Department in the grade GS–15 or higher of the General Schedule.

“(b) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—In order to qualify for designation as the corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department of the Army, an individual shall, at a minimum—

“(1) have a working knowledge of corrosion prevention and control;

“(2) have strong program management and communication skills; and

“(3) understand the acquisition, research and development, test and evaluation, and sustainment policies and procedures across the Department, including sustainment of infrastructure.

“(c) **DUTIES.**—(1) The corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department of the Army shall ensure that corrosion control and prevention is maintained in the Department’s policy and guidance for management of each of the following:

“(A) System acquisition and production, including design and maintenance.

“(B) Research, development, test, and evaluation programs and activities.

“(C) Equipment standardization programs, including international standardization agreements.

“(D) Logistics research and development initiatives.

“(E) Logistics support analysis as it relates to integrated logistic support in the materiel acquisition process.

“(F) Military infrastructure design, construction, and maintenance.

“(2) The corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department shall be responsible for identifying the funding levels necessary to accomplish the items specified in paragraph (1).

“(3) In cooperation with the appropriate staff of the Department, the corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department shall, develop, support, and provide the rationale for resources—

“(A) to initiate and sustain an effective corrosion control and prevention program in the Department;

“(B) to evaluate the program’s effectiveness; and

“(C) to ensure that corrosion control and prevention requirements for materiel are reflected in budgeting and policies of the Department for the formulation, management, and evaluation of personnel and programs for the entire Department, including the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard.

“(4) The corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department shall submit an annual report, not later than December 31 of each year, to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Defense containing recommendations

pertaining to the corrosion control and prevention program of the Department, including corrosion-related funding levels to carry out all of the duties of the executive under this section.

“(5) The corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department may not be assigned other duties that may interfere with the duties specified in this subsection and the principal responsibility assigned under subsection (a)(2).”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 303 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“3025. Corrosion control and prevention executive.”.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Chapter 503 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§5029. Corrosion control and prevention executive

“(a) DESIGNATION.—(1) There is a corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department of the Navy. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition shall designate the corrosion control and prevention executive.

“(2) In addition to the duties assigned under subsection (c), the principal responsibility of the civilian employee designated as the corrosion control and prevention executive shall be coordinating Department of the Navy corrosion control and prevention program activities (including budget programming) with the Department and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the program executive officers of the Department, and relevant major subordinate commands of the Department.

“(3) The corrosion control and prevention executive shall be a civilian employee of the Department in the grade GS-15 or higher of the General Schedule.

“(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—In order to qualify for designation as the corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department of the Navy, an individual shall, at a minimum—

“(1) have a working knowledge of corrosion prevention and control;

“(2) have strong program management and communication skills; and

“(3) understand the acquisition, research and development, test and evaluation, and sustainment policies and procedures across the Department, including sustainment of infrastructure.

“(c) DUTIES.—(1) The corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department of the Navy shall ensure that corrosion control and prevention is maintained in the Department's policy and guidance for management of each of the following:

“(A) System acquisition and production, including design and maintenance.

“(B) Research, development, test, and evaluation programs and activities.

“(C) Equipment standardization programs, including international standardization agreements.

“(D) Logistics research and development initiatives.

“(E) Logistics support analysis as it relates to integrated logistic support in the materiel acquisition process.

“(F) Military infrastructure design, construction, and maintenance.

“(2) The corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department shall be responsible for identifying the funding levels necessary to accomplish the items specified in paragraph (1).

“(3) In cooperation with the appropriate staff of the Department, the corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department shall, develop, support, and provide the rationale for resources—

“(A) to initiate and sustain an effective corrosion control and prevention program in the Department;

“(B) to evaluate the program's effectiveness; and

“(C) to ensure that corrosion control and prevention requirements for materiel are reflected in budgeting and policies of the Department for the formulation, management, and evaluation of personnel and programs for the entire Department, including the Navy Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve.

“(4) The corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department shall submit an annual report, not later than December 31 of each year, to the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Defense containing recommendations pertaining to the corrosion control and prevention program of the Department, including corrosion-related funding levels to carry out all of the duties of the executive under this section.

“(5) The corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department may not be assigned other duties that may interfere with the duties specified in this subsection and the principal responsibility assigned under subsection (a)(2).”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 503 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“5029. Corrosion control and prevention executive.”.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Chapter 803 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§8025. Corrosion control and prevention executive

“(a) DESIGNATION.—(1) There is a corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department of the Air Force. The Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall designate the corrosion control and prevention executive.

“(2) In addition to the duties assigned under subsection (c), the principal responsibility of the civilian employee designated as the corrosion control and prevention executive shall be coordinating Department of the Air Force corrosion control and prevention program activities (including budget programming) with the Department and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the program executive officers of the Department, and relevant major subordinate commands of the Department.

“(3) The corrosion control and prevention executive shall be a civilian employee of the Department in the grade GS-15 or higher of the General Schedule.

“(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—In order to qualify for designation as the corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department of the Air Force, an individual shall, at a minimum—

“(1) have a working knowledge of corrosion prevention and control;

“(2) have strong program management and communication skills; and

“(3) understand the acquisition, research and development, test and evaluation, and sustainment policies and procedures across the Department, including sustainment of infrastructure.

“(c) DUTIES.—(1) The corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department of the Air Force shall ensure that corrosion control and prevention is maintained in the Department's policy and guidance for management of each of the following:

“(A) System acquisition and production, including design and maintenance.

“(B) Research, development, test, and evaluation programs and activities.

“(C) Equipment standardization programs, including international standardization agreements.

“(D) Logistics research and development initiatives.

“(E) Logistics support analysis as it relates to integrated logistic support in the materiel acquisition process.

“(F) Military infrastructure design, construction, and maintenance.

“(2) The corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department shall be responsible for identifying the funding levels necessary to accomplish the items specified in paragraph (1).

“(3) In cooperation with the appropriate staff of the Department, the corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department shall, develop, support, and provide the rationale for resources—

“(A) to initiate and sustain an effective corrosion control and prevention program in the Department;

“(B) to evaluate the program's effectiveness; and

“(C) to ensure that corrosion control and prevention requirements for materiel are reflected in budgeting and policies of the Department for the formulation, management, and evaluation of personnel and programs for the entire Department, including the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard.

“(4) The corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department shall submit an annual report, not later than December 31 of each year, to the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of Defense containing recommendations pertaining to the corrosion control and prevention program of the Department, including corrosion-related funding levels to carry out all of the duties of the executive under this section.

“(5) The corrosion control and prevention executive in the Department may not be assigned other duties that may interfere with the duties specified in this subsection and the principal responsibility assigned under subsection (a)(2).”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 803 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“8025. Corrosion control and prevention executive.”.

(d) REPEAL OF REPLACED PROVISION.—Effective 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, section 903 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-117; 10 U.S.C. 2228 note) is repealed.

(e) DEADLINE FOR DESIGNATION.—Corrosion control and prevention executives who satisfy the qualifications specified in subsection (b) of sections 3025, 5029, and 8025 of title 10, United States Code, as added by this section, shall be designated not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 904. MAINTAINING CIVILIAN WORKFORCE CAPABILITIES TO SUSTAIN READINESS, THE ALL VOLUNTEER FORCE, AND OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS.

Section 912(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(D) The minimum civilian end strength specified in section 691 of title 10, United States Code, needed to support the national military strategy.

“(E) A civilian operating force structure sized for operational effectiveness, that is manned, equipped and trained to support deployment time and rotation ratios sized to sustain the readiness and needed retention levels for the regular and reserve components according to the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in fulfillment of their responsibilities under sections 151, 3033, 5033, 8033 and 5044 of title 10, United States Code.

“(F) The development of civilian workforce levels to ensure that every proposal to change military force structure is accompanied with the associated civilian force structure changes needed to support that military force structure.

“(G) The hiring authorities and other actions that the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department will take to eliminate any gaps between desired programmed civilian workforce levels and the existing size of the civilian workforce by mission and functional area.

“(H) A civilian workforce plan that is consistent with the total force management requirements of sections 129 and 129a of title 10, United States Code.”.

Subtitle B—Designation of the Navy and Marine Corps

SEC. 911. REDESIGNATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AS THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

(a) REDESIGNATION OF MILITARY DEPARTMENT.—The military department designated as the Department of the Navy is redesignated as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

(b) REDESIGNATION OF SECRETARY AND OTHER STATUTORY OFFICES.—

(1) SECRETARY.—The position of the Secretary of the Navy is redesignated as the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps.

(2) OTHER STATUTORY OFFICES.—The positions of the Under Secretary of the Navy, the four Assistant Secretaries of the Navy, and the General Counsel of the Department of the Navy are redesignated as the Under Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps, the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the General Counsel of the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, respectively.

SEC. 912. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) DEFINITION OF “MILITARY DEPARTMENT”.—Paragraph (8) of section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(8) The term ‘military department’ means the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Department of the Air Force.”.

(b) ORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT.—The text of section 5011 of such title is amended to read as follows: “The Department of the Navy and Marine Corps is separately organized under the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps.”.

(c) POSITION OF SECRETARY.—Section 5013(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking “There is a Secretary of the Navy” and inserting “There is a Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps”.

(d) CHAPTER HEADINGS.—

(1) The heading of chapter 503 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 503—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS”.

(2) The heading of chapter 507 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 507—COMPOSITION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS”.

(e) OTHER AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “Department of the Navy” and “Secretary of the Navy” each place they appear other than as specified in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) (including in section headings, subsection captions, tables of chapters, and tables of sections) and inserting “Department of the Navy and Marine Corps” and “Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps”, respectively, in each case with the matter inserted to be in the same typeface and typestyle as the matter stricken.

(2)(A) Sections 5013(f), 5014(b)(2), 5016(a), 5017(2), 5032(a), and 5042(a) of such title are

amended by striking “Assistant Secretaries of the Navy” and inserting “Assistant Secretaries of the Navy and Marine Corps”.

(B) The heading of section 5016 of such title, and the item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 503 of such title, are each amended by inserting “and Marine Corps” after “of the Navy”, with the matter inserted in each case to be in the same typeface and typestyle as the matter amended.

SEC. 913. OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW AND OTHER REFERENCES.

(a) TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking “Department of the Navy” and “Secretary of the Navy” each place they appear and inserting “Department of the Navy and Marine Corps” and “Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps”, respectively.

(b) OTHER REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law other than in title 10 or title 37, United States Code, or in any regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States, to the Department of the Navy shall be considered to be a reference to the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. Any such reference to an office specified in section 911(b) shall be considered to be a reference to that office as redesignated by that section.

SEC. 914. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on the first day of the first month beginning more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

SEC. 921. TRANSITION OF THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO REFLECT ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITIONS OF UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING, UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR ACQUISITION AND SUSTAINMENT, AND CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER.

(a) REFERENCES TO POSITIONS PENDING EXECUTION OF AMENDMENTS.—Until February 1, 2018, any reference in this Act, or an amendment made by this Act—

(1) to the position of Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, to be established by the amendment made by section 901(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2339), shall be deemed to be a reference to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics under section 133 of title 10, United States Code;

(2) to the position of Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment, to be established by the amendment made by section 901(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2340), shall be deemed to be a reference to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics under section 133 of title 10, United States Code; and

(3) to the position of Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense, to be established by section 901(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2341; 10 U.S.C. 131 note), shall be deemed to be a reference to the Deputy Secretary of Defense under section 132 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) SERVICE OF INCUMBENTS.—

(1) PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR ACQUISITION, TECHNOLOGY, AND LOGISTICS.—The individual serving as Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics under section 137a(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, as of February 1, 2018, may continue to serve as Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment commencing as of that date, with-

out further appointment under section 133b of such title, as added by section 901(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2340).

(2) DEPUTY CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER.—The individual serving as Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense under section 132a of title 10, United States Code, as of February 1, 2018, may continue to serve as Chief Management Officer commencing as of that date, without further appointment under section 901(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2341; 10 U.S.C. 131 note).

SEC. 922. EXTENSION OF DEADLINES FOR REPORTING AND BRIEFING REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMISSION ON THE NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY FOR THE UNITED STATES.

Section 942(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2368) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “December 1, 2017” and inserting “January 31, 2018”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “June 1, 2017” and inserting “September 1, 2017”.

SEC. 923. BRIEFING ON FORCE MANAGEMENT LEVEL POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) The force management level policy that previously restricted the total number of members of the Armed Forces of the United States deployed to Afghanistan increased the cost of operations in Afghanistan.

(B) The restriction meant that the Department of Defense had to substitute available military personnel for costlier contract support.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should discourage the practice of substituting contractor personnel for available members of the Armed Forces when a unit deploys overseas and should revise this practice as it pertains to unit deployment to Afghanistan.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than March 31, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing detailing—

(1) the steps that the Secretary is taking to revise deployment guidelines to ensure that readiness, unit cohesion, and maintenance are prioritized; and

(2) the plan of the Secretary to establish a policy that will avoid to the extent practicable these costly practices in the future.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

SEC. 1001. GENERAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense in this division for fiscal year 2018 between any such authorizations for that fiscal year (or any subdivisions thereof). Amounts of authorizations so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the authorization to which transferred.

(2) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the total amount of authorizations that the Secretary may transfer under the authority of this section may not exceed \$5,000,000,000.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR TRANSFERS BETWEEN MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS.—A transfer of funds between military personnel authorizations under title IV shall not be counted toward the dollar limitation in paragraph (2).

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) to transfer authorizations—

(1) may only be used to provide authority for items that have a higher priority than the items from which authority is transferred; and

(2) may not be used to provide authority for an item that has been denied authorization by Congress.

(c) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION AMOUNTS.—A transfer made from one account to another under the authority of this section shall be deemed to increase the amount authorized for the account to which the amount is transferred by an amount equal to the amount transferred.

(d) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall promptly notify Congress of each transfer made under subsection (a).

SEC. 1002. PREPARATION OF CONSOLIDATED CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF CENTRALIZED REPORTING SYSTEM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—In accordance with the recommendations included in the Government Accountability Office report numbered GAO-17-85 and entitled “DOD Financial Management: Significant Efforts Still Needed for Remediating Audit Readiness Deficiencies”, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) of the Department of Defense shall—

(1) on a bimonthly basis, prepare a consolidated corrective action plan management summary on the status of all corrective actions plans related to critical capabilities for the military services and for the service providers and other defense organizations; and

(2) develop and implement a centralized monitoring and reporting process that captures and maintains up-to-date information, including the standard data elements recommended in the implementation guide for Office of Management and Budget Circular A-123, for all corrective action plans and findings and recommendations Department-wide that pertain to critical capabilities.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2017.

SEC. 1003. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUDITS.

(a) FINANCIAL IMPROVEMENT AUDIT READINESS PLAN.—Section 1003(a)(2)(A)(ii) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note) is amended by striking “are validated as ready for audit by not later than September 30, 2017” and inserting “go under full financial statement audit beginning September 30, 2017, and that the department leadership make every effort to reach an unmodified opinion as soon as possible”.

(b) AUDIT OF FISCAL YEAR 2018 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—Section 1003(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note) is amended by striking “are validated as ready for audit by not later than” and inserting “go under full financial statement audit beginning”.

Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

SEC. 1011. NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND.

(a) FUND PURPOSES; DEPOSITS.—Section 2218 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—
(A) in paragraph (1)—
(i) by striking subparagraph (D); and
(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D);

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “or (D)”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—
(A) in paragraph (1)—
(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and” after the semicolon;
(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and
(iii) by striking subparagraph (D);
(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph (3):

“(3) Any other funds made available to the Department of Defense to carry out any of the purposes described in subsection (c).”

(b) AUTHORITY TO PURCHASE USED VESSELS.—Subsection (f) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3)(A) Notwithstanding the limitations under subsection (c)(1)(E) and paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense may, as part of a program to recapitalize the Ready Reserve Force component of the national defense reserve fleet and the Military Sealift Command surge fleet, purchase any used vessel, regardless of where such vessel was constructed if such vessel—

“(i) participated in the Maritime Security Fleet; and
“(ii) is available for purchase at a reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) If the Secretary determines that no used vessel meeting the requirements under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) is available, the Secretary may purchase a used vessel comparable to a vessel described in clause (i) of subparagraph (A), regardless of the source of the vessel or where the vessel was constructed, if such vessel is available for purchase at a reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary.

“(C) The Secretary may not use the authority under this paragraph to purchase more than five additional foreign constructed ships. Any such ships may not be purchased at a rate that exceeds one vessel constructed outside the United States for every new Department of Defense sealift vessel authorized by law to be constructed.

“(D) Prior to the purchase of any vessel that was not constructed in the United States, the Secretary, in consultation with the Maritime Administrator, shall certify that there is no vessel available for purchase at a reasonable price that—

“(i) was constructed in the United States; and
“(ii) is suitable for use by the United States for national defense or military purposes in a time of war or national emergency.”

(c) DEFINITION OF MARITIME SECURITY FLEET.—Subsection (k) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) The term ‘Maritime Security Fleet’ means the fleet established under section 53102(a) of title 46.”

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Such section is further amended by striking “(50 U.S.C. App. 1744)” each place it appears and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 4405)”.

SEC. 1012. NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND: CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL ICEBREAKER VESSELS.

Section 2218 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 2211, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) Construction (including design of vessels), purchase, alteration, and conversion of national icebreaker vessels.”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1),
(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” and the end;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) construction (including design of vessels), purchase, alteration, and conversion of national icebreaker vessels.”

SEC. 1013. USE OF NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND FOR MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN CRITICAL COMPONENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (i) of section 2218a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “the common missile compartment” each place it appears and inserting “critical components”; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “critical parts, components, systems, and subsystems” and inserting “critical components”.

(b) DEFINITION OF CRITICAL COMPONENT.—Subsection (k) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) The term ‘critical component’ means any—

“(A) any item that is high volume or high value; or

“(B) any common missile compartment component, shipyard manufactured component, valve, torpedo tube, or Government furnished equipment, including propulsors and strategic weapons system launchers.”

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The subsection heading for subsection (i) of such section is amended by striking “OF THE COMMON MISSILE COMPARTMENT”.

SEC. 1014. RESTRICTIONS ON THE OVERHAUL AND REPAIR OF VESSELS IN FOREIGN SHIPYARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7310(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “In the case” and inserting “(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in the case”;

(2) by striking “during the 15-month” and all that follows through “United States”;

(3) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, other than in the case of voyage repairs”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) The Secretary of the Navy may waive the application of subparagraph (A) to a contract award if the Secretary determines that the waiver is essential to the national security interests of the United States.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the later of the following dates:

(1) The date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.
(2) October 1, 2018.

SEC. 1015. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OR INACTIVATION OF TICONDEROGA-CLASS CRUISERS OR DOCK LANDING SHIPS.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 may be obligated or expended—

(1) to retire, prepare to retire, or inactivate a cruiser or dock landing ship; or

(2) to place more than six cruisers and one dock landing ship in the modernization program under section 1026(a)(2) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3490).

SEC. 1016. POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES ON MINIMUM NUMBER OF BATTLE FORCE SHIPS.

It shall be the policy of the United States to have available, as soon as practicable, not fewer than 355 battle force ships, with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriation and the annual appropriation of funds.

Subtitle C—Counterterrorism

SEC. 1021. TERMINATION OF REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT ANNUAL BUDGET JUSTIFICATION DISPLAY FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COMBATING TERRORISM PROGRAM.

Section 229 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) TERMINATION.—The requirement to submit a budget justification display under this section shall terminate on December 31, 2020.”

SEC. 1022. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA TO THE UNITED STATES.

No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2018, to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after January 20, 2009, at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 1023. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT OR MODIFY FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES TO HOUSE DETAINEES TRANSFERRED FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2018, to construct or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual detained at Guantanamo for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO DEFINED.—In this section, the term “individual detained at Guantanamo” has the meaning given that term in section 1034(f)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 129 Stat. 971; 10 U.S.C. 801 note).

SEC. 1024. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES.

No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2018, to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release of any individual detained in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the custody or control of any country, or any entity within such country, as follows:

- (1) Libya.
- (2) Somalia.
- (3) Syria.
- (4) Yemen.

SEC. 1025. BIENNIAL REPORT ON SUPPORT OF SPECIAL OPERATIONS TO COMBAT TERRORISM.

Section 127(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “March 1” and inserting “120 days after the last day of a fiscal year”; and

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking “September 1” and inserting “six months after the date of the submittal of the report most recently submitted under paragraph (1)”.

Subtitle D—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

SEC. 1031. LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR EMERGENCY AND EXTRAORDINARY EXPENSES FOR INTELLIGENCE AND COUNTER-INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES AND REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES.

(a) RECURRING EXPENSES.—The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 127 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and is not a recurring expense”.

(b) LIMITATION.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) Funds may not be obligated or expended in an amount in excess of \$25,000 under the authority of subsection (a) or (b) for intelligence or counter-intelligence activities or representation allowances until the Secretary of Defense has notified the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees of the intent to obligate or expend the funds, and—

“(A) in the case of an obligation or expenditure in excess of \$100,000, 15 days have elapsed since the date of the notification; or

“(B) in the case of an obligation or expenditure in excess of \$25,000, but not in excess of \$100,000, five days have elapsed since the date of the notification.”.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking “to the congressional defense committees” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting an em dash; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(1) to the congressional defense committees a report on all expenditures during the preceding fiscal year under subsections (a) and (b); and

“(2) to the congressional intelligence committees a report on expenditures relating to intelligence and counter-intelligence during the preceding fiscal year under subsections (a) and (b).”.

(d) DEFINITION.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) DEFINITION OF CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term ‘congressional intelligence committees’ means the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.”.

SEC. 1032. MODIFICATIONS TO HUMANITARIAN DEMINING ASSISTANCE AUTHORITIES.

(a) MODIFICATION TO THE ROLE OF ARMED FORCES IN PROVIDING HUMANITARIAN DEMINING ASSISTANCE.—Subsection (a)(3) of section 407 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “or stockpiled conventional munitions assistance”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting “, unexploded explosive ordnance,” after “landmines”; and

(B) by striking “, or stockpiled conventional munitions, as applicable”.

(b) MODIFICATION TO DEFINITION OF HUMANITARIAN DEMINING ASSISTANCE.—Subsection (e)(1) of such section is amended—

(1) by inserting “, unexploded explosive ordnance,” after “landmines” in each place it appears; and

(2) by striking “, and the disposal” and all that follows and inserting a period.

(c) MODIFICATION TO DEFINITION OF STOCKPILED CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS ASSISTANCE.—Subsection (e)(2) of such section is amended, in the second sentence, by striking “, the detection and clearance of landmines and other explosive remnants of war,”.

SEC. 1033. PROHIBITION ON CHARGE OF CERTAIN TARIFFS ON AIRCRAFT TRAVELING THROUGH CHANNEL ROUTES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2652. Prohibition on charge of certain tariffs on aircraft traveling through channel routes

“The United States Transportation Command may not charge a tariff by reason of the use by a military service of an aircraft of that military service on a route designated by the United States Transportation Command as a channel route.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2652. Prohibition on charge of certain tariffs on aircraft traveling through channel routes”.

SEC. 1034. LIMITATION ON DIVESTMENT OF U-2 OR RQ-4 AIRCRAFT.

(a) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for any fiscal year before fiscal year 2024 may be obligated or expended to prepare to divest, divest, place in storage, or place in a status awaiting further disposition of the possessing commander any U-2 or RQ-4 aircraft of the Department of Defense.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an individual U-2 or RQ-4 aircraft that the Secretary of the Air Force determines, on a case-by-case basis, to be non-returnable to flying service due to any mishap, other damage, or being uneconomical to repair.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 1035. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF LEGACY MARITIME MINE COUNTERMEASURES PLATFORMS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Navy may not obligate or expend funds to—

(1) retire, prepare to retire, transfer, or place in storage any AVENGER-class mine countermeasures ship or associated equipment;

(2) retire, prepare to retire, transfer, or place in storage any SEA DRAGON (MH-53) helicopter or associated equipment;

(3) make any reductions to manning levels with respect to any AVENGER-class mine countermeasures ship; or

(4) make any reductions to manning levels with respect to any SEA DRAGON (MH-53) helicopter squadron or detachment.

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary of the Navy may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) if the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary has—

(1) identified a replacement capability and the necessary quantity of such systems to meet all combatant commander mine countermeasures operational requirements that are currently being met by any AVENGER-class ship or SEA DRAGON helicopter to be retired, transferred, or placed in storage;

(2) achieved initial operational capability of all systems described in paragraph (1); and

(3) deployed a sufficient quantity of systems described in paragraph (1) that have achieved initial operational capability to continue to meet or exceed all combatant commander mine countermeasures operational requirements currently being met by the AVENGER-class ships and SEA DRAGON helicopters to be retired, transferred, or placed in storage.

SEC. 1036. RESTRICTION ON USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS PENDING SOLICITATION OF BIDS FOR WESTERN PACIFIC DRY DOCK.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

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

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

(3) From 1997 to 2012, the private operator successfully performed 28 major overhauls with dry-dockings of Navy, Military Sealift Command, and Coast Guard vessels, 27 mid-term availabilities, as well as the emergency dry-docking of USS San Francisco (SSN-711) after the nuclear powered submarine collided with a seamount off the coast of Guam in 2005.

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

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

(6) Despite repeated requests from the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, the Delegate from Guam, and the Governor of Guam over the past four years, the Secretary of the Navy has failed to issue the dry-dock contract.

(7) The Navy conducted a business case analysis to assess options for a dry-docking capability in Guam in 2014 and agreed to provide a copy of the report to Congress upon completion. The draft business case analysis was provided to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on March 3, 2016, but a final document was not produced.

(8) The draft business case analysis evaluated 200 potential options for restoring a dry-docking capability in Guam, recommending seven potential courses of action, with estimated costs ranging from \$324,000,000 to \$398,000,000 over a 50-year life cycle. The business case analysis concluded that any of these options are significant savings when compared with the cost of not having a dry-docking capability in Guam, which exceeds \$700,000,000 over a 50-year period.

(9) The Navy has removed machinery and equipment needed to perform major overhauls from the former ship repair facility, and shifted ship repair work previously performed in Guam to various foreign locations in the Western Pacific. The total cost of Navy ship repair contracts in Guam have gone from \$45,000,000 in 2010 to \$16,000,000 in 2016.

(10) As a result of Navy actions over the past five years, the number of skilled workers engaged in ship repair in Guam has been reduced from a combined total of approximately 550 at three ship-repair companies in Guam to the current level of 150. Due to this degraded workforce and equipment capabilities, the Navy is now forced to rely almost exclusively on foreign ship repair instead at a time when the Committee believes tensions and threats of crisis in the Western Pacific can put access to foreign shipyards at risk.

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

(A) “Robust depot-level ship repair capability in Guam is a matter of strategic importance and remains an operational necessity because ships of the 7th Fleet have high operational tempo and experience vast distances between repair facilities.” (Letter from the Commander of the Pacific Fleet to the Governor of Guam, dated February 15, 2013).

(B) “We must maintain a viable ship maintenance capability in Guam to include dry-docking in support of operations and contingency plans (OPLANS and CONPLANS) and the U.S. Navy rebalance to the Pacific. Guam is a strategic in-theater location for depot-level ship maintenance on sovereign U.S. territory. This is a significant factor given that commercial dry docks available in foreign countries considered friendly to the United States may become unavailable to SEVENTH Fleet ships in time of crisis or war. Availability of CPF ships would be stressed if assets are required to dry dock in CONUS due to the non-availability of a secure dry docking capability in the Western Pacific. Dry-docking in Guam is a critical component of depot-level ship repair. The capability must be maintained and regularly exercised so that a capability and expertise are available to support ships of the SEVENTH Fleet in peace and war.” (Letter from the Commander of the Pacific Fleet to the Chief of Naval Operations, dated February 7, 2014).

(C) On February 24, 2016, in testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, Admiral Harry Harris, Commander of the United States Pacific Command, affirmed that he continues to view robust ship repair capabilities as a matter of strategic importance and an operational priority for United States Pacific Fleet.

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

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

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

(15) Amounts were authorized to be appropriated in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) and appropriated in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (Public Law 115-31) for funds be applied to chartering a dry dock to meet fleet maintenance requirements in the Western Pacific.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Not more than 75 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Office of the Secretary of the Navy may be obligated or expended until the Secretary submits to Congress notice that a request for proposals has been issued to solicit bids for the chartering of a dry dock in the Western Pacific that satisfies the minimum requirements for heavy ship depot-level repair.

SEC. 1037. NATIONAL GUARD FLYOVERS OF PUBLIC EVENTS.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the Department of Defense that flyovers of public events in support of community relations activities may only be flown as part of an approved training mission at no additional expense to the Federal Government.

(b) NATIONAL GUARD FLYOVER APPROVAL PROCESS.—The Adjutant General of a State or territory in which an Army National Guard or

Air National Guard unit is based will be the approval authority for all Air National Guard and Army National Guard flyovers in that State or territory, including any request for a flyover in any civilian domain at a nonaviation related event.

(c) FLYOVER RECORD MAINTENANCE; REPORT.—

(1) RECORD MAINTENANCE.—The Secretary of Defense shall keep and maintain records of flyover requests and approvals in a publicly accessible database that is updated annually.

(2) GAO REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report on flyovers and the process whereby flyover requests are made and evaluated, including—

(A) whether there is any cost to taxpayers associated with flyovers;

(B) whether there is any appreciable public relations or recruitment value that comes from flyovers; and

(C) the impact flyovers have to aviator training and readiness.

(d) FLYOVER DEFINED.—In this section, the term “flyover” means aviation support—

(1) in which a straight and level flight limited to one pass by a single military aircraft, or by a single formation of four or fewer military aircraft of the same type, from the same military department over a predetermined point on the ground at a specific time;

(2) that does not involve aerobatics or demonstrations; and

(3) uses bank angles of up to 90 degrees if required to improve the spectator visibility of the aircraft.

SEC. 1038. TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER FUNDS.—The Secretary of Defense may transfer to the World War I Centennial Commission, from amounts described in subsection (b), such amount as the Secretary and the Chair of the World War I Centennial Commission consider appropriate to assist the Commission in carrying out activities under paragraphs (2) through (5) of section 5(a) of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272; 36 U.S.C. prec. 101 note) after fiscal year 2017.

(b) DESIGNATED ACCOUNT.—Funds transferred pursuant to subsection (a) shall be maintained in a specially designated account and may not be obligated or expended for the designation, establishment, or enhancement of a memorial or commemorative work by the World War I Centennial Commission.

(c) COVERED FUNDS.—The funds transferrable by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) shall be derived from amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for Civil Military Programs as provided in section 4301 of this Act.

(d) TREATMENT AS GIFT.—Any amounts transferred to the World War I Centennial Commission pursuant to subsection (a) shall be treated as a gift to the Commission for purposes of sections 6(g) and 7(f) of the World War I Centennial Commission Act.

(e) LIMITATION.—The total amount provided by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) shall not exceed \$5,000,000.

(f) WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMISSION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “World War I Centennial Commission” means the Commission established by section 4 of the World War I Centennial Commission Act.

Subtitle E—Studies and Reports**SEC. 1051. ELIMINATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS TERMINATED AFTER NOVEMBER 25, 2017, PURSUANT TO SECTION 1080 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.**

(a) TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) SECTION 113 REPORTS.—

(A) RESERVE FORCES POLICY BOARD REPORT.—Section 113(c) is amended—

(i) by striking paragraph (2);
(ii) by striking “(1)” after “(c)”; and
(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

(B) TOTAL FORCE MANAGEMENT REPORT.—Section 113 is amended by striking subsection (1).

(2) ANNUAL DEFENSE MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS REPORT.—

(A) ELIMINATION.—Section 115a is repealed.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 2 is amended by striking the item relating to section 115a.

(3) INFORMATION ON PROCUREMENT OF CONTRACT SERVICES.—

(A) ELIMINATION.—Section 235 is repealed.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 9 is amended by striking the item relating to section 235.

(4) DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL SECURITY REPORT.—Section 428 is amended by striking subsection (f).

(5) MILITARY MUSICAL UNITS GIFT REPORT.—Section 974(d) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(6) HEALTH PROTECTION QUALITY REPORT.—Section 1073b is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (a); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (a) and (b), respectively.

(7) MASTER PLANS FOR REDUCTIONS IN CIVILIAN POSITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1597 is amended—

(i) by striking subsection (c);
(ii) by striking subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively; and
(iii) in subsection (c), as redesignated, by striking “or a master plan prepared under subsection (c)”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 129a(d) is amended—

(i) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2); and
(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

(8) ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND REPORT.—Section 1705 is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “subsection (h)(2)” and inserting “subsection (g)(2)”;
(B) by striking subsection (f); and
(C) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively.

(9) ACQUISITION CORPS REPORT.—Section 1722b is amended by striking subsection (c).

(10) MILITARY FAMILY READINESS REPORT.—Section 1781b is amended by striking subsection (d).

(11) PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION REPORT.—

(A) ELIMINATION.—Section 2157 is repealed.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 107 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2157.

(12) STARBASE PROGRAM REPORT.—Section 2193b is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (g); and
(B) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

(13) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONFERENCES FEE-COLLECTION REPORT.—Section 2262 is amended by striking subsection (d).

(14) UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATO COMMON-FUNDED BUDGETS REPORT.—Section 2263 is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(15) FOREIGN COUNTER-SPACE PROGRAMS REPORT.—

(A) ELIMINATION.—Section 2277 is repealed.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 135 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2277.

(16) USE OF MULTIYEAR CONTRACTS REPORT.—Section 2306b(l)(4) is amended by striking “Not later than” and all that follows through the colon and inserting the following: “Each report required by paragraph (5) with respect to a contract (or contract extension) shall contain the following:”.

(17) BURDEN SHARING CONTRIBUTIONS REPORT.—Section 2350j is amended by striking subsection (f).

(18) CONTRACT PROHIBITION WAIVER REPORT.—Section 2410i(c) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(19) STRATEGIC SOURCING PLAN OF ACTION REPORT.—Subsection (a) of section 2475 is amended to read as follows:

“(a) STRATEGIC SOURCING PLAN OF ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘Strategic Sourcing Plan of Action’ means a Strategic Sourcing Plan of Action for the Department of Defense (as identified in the Department of Defense Interim Guidance dated February 29, 2000, or any successor Department of Defense guidance or directive) in effect for a fiscal year.”.

(20) TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL BASE POLICY GUIDANCE REPORT.—Section 2506 is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and
(B) in subsection (a), by striking “Such guidance” and inserting the following:

“(b) PURPOSE OF GUIDANCE.—The guidance prescribed pursuant to subsection (a)”.

(21) FOREIGN-CONTROLLED CONTRACTORS REPORT.—Section 2537 is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and
(B) by redesignating subsection (c).

(22) SUPPORT FOR SPORTING EVENTS REPORT.—Section 2564 is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively.

(23) GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICER QUARTERS REPORT.—Section 2831 is amended by striking subsection (e).

(24) MILITARY INSTALLATIONS VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT REPORTS.—Section 2859 is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and
(B) by designating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(25) INDUSTRIAL FACILITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM CONSTRUCTION REPORT.—Section 2861 is amended by striking subsection (d).

(26) STATEMENT OF AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR WATER CONSERVATION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—Section 2866(b) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(27) ACQUISITION OR CONSTRUCTION OF MILITARY UNACCOMPANIED HOUSING PILOT PROJECTS REPORT.—Section 2881a is amended by striking subsection (e).

(28) STATEMENT OF AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FROM ENERGY COST SAVINGS.—Section 2912 is amended by striking subsection (d).

(29) ARMY TRAINING REPORT.—

(A) ELIMINATION.—Section 4316 is repealed.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 401 is amended by striking the item relating to section 4316.

(30) STATE OF THE ARMY RESERVE REPORT.—Section 3038(f) is amended—

(A) by striking “(1)” before “The”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(31) STATE OF THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE REPORT.—Section 5144(d) is amended—

(A) by striking “(1)” before “The”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(32) STATE OF THE AIR FORCE RESERVE REPORT.—Section 8038(f) is amended—

(A) by striking “(1)” before “The”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(b) TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 509 of title 32, United States Code, relating to an annual report on the National Guard Youth Challenge Program, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (k); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (l) and (m) as subsections (k) and (l).

(c) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1985.—Section 1003 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-525; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), relating to an annual report on allied contributions to the common defense, is amended by striking subsections (c) and (d).

(d) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1989.—Section 1009 of the National Defense Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1989 (Public Law 100-456; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), relating to an annual report on the official development assistance program of Japan, is amended by striking subsection (b).

(e) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991.—Section 1518 of the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 24 U.S.C. 418), relating to reports on the results of inspection of Armed Forces Retirement Homes, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “Congress and”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by striking “(1)” before “Not later”; and

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

(f) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1992 AND 1993.—Section 1046 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102-190; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), relating to an annual report on defense cost-sharing, is amended by striking subsections (e) and (f).

(g) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.—Section 1603 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160; 22 U.S.C. 2751 note), relating to an annual report on counter-proliferation policy and programs of the United States, is amended by striking subsection (d).

(h) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995.—Section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), relating to an annual report on personnel readiness factors by race and gender, is repealed.

(i) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—Section 366 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), relating to an annual report on spare parts, logistics, and sustainment standards, is amended by striking subsection (f).

(j) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002.—The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107) is amended as follows:

(1) ARMY WORKLOAD AND PERFORMANCE SYSTEM REPORT.—Section 346 (115 Stat. 1062) is amended—

(A) by striking subsections (b) and (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b).

(2) RELIABILITY OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS REPORT.—Section 1008(d) (10 U.S.C. 113 note) is amended—

(A) by striking “(1)” before “On each”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(k) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003.—Section 817 of the Bob

Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314; 10 U.S.C. 2306a note), relating to an annual report on commercial item and exceptional case exceptions and waivers, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and
(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(l) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.—Section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136), relating to an annual report on support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and
(2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d).

(m) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR 2006.—The National Defense Authorization Act for 2006 (Public Law 109-163) is amended as follows:

(1) NOTIFICATION OF ADJUSTMENT IN LIMITATION AMOUNT FOR NEXT-GENERATION DESTROYER PROGRAM.—Section 123 (119 Stat. 3156) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d); and
(B) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(2) CERTIFICATION OF BUDGETS FOR JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM REPORT.—Section 218(c) (119 Stat. 3171) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(3) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COSTS TO CARRY OUT UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTIONS REPORT.—Section 1224 (10 U.S.C. 113 note) is repealed.

(n) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007.—Section 357(b) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364; 22 U.S.C. 4865 note), relating to an annual report on Department of Defense overseas personnel subject to chief of mission authority, is amended by striking “shall submit to the congressional defense committees” and inserting “shall prepare”.

(o) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008.—The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) is amended as follows:

(1) ARMY INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES REPORT.—Section 328 (10 U.S.C. 4544 note) is amended by striking subsection (b).

(2) ARMY PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT REPORT.—Section 330 (122 Stat. 68) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(p) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.—The Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417) is amended as follows:

(1) SUPPORT FOR NON-CONVENTIONAL ASSISTED RECOVERY ACTIVITIES REPORT.—Section 943 (122 Stat. 4578) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively.

(2) REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY MESS EXPENSES REPORT.—Section 1014 (122 Stat. 4585) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(3) ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE ATTACK REPORT.—Section 1048 (122 Stat. 4603) is repealed.

(q) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010.—Section 121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2211), relating to an annual report on the Littoral Combat Ship Program, is amended by striking subsection (e).

(r) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011.—The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) is amended as follows:

(1) NAVY AIRBORNE SIGNALS INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE CAPABILITIES REPORT.—Section 112(b) (124 Stat. 4153) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (3); and
(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(2) INCLUSION OF TECHNOLOGY PROTECTION FEATURES DURING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF DEFENSE SYSTEMS REPORT.—Section 243 (10 U.S.C. 2358 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(3) ACQUISITION OF MILITARY PURPOSE NON-DEVELOPMENTAL ITEMS REPORT.—Section 866 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d); and
(B) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(4) NUCLEAR TRIAD REPORT.—Section 1054 (10 U.S.C. 113 note) is repealed.

(s) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012.—The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) is amended as follows:

(1) PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES REPORT.—Section 1102 (5 U.S.C. 9902 note) is amended by striking subsection (b).

(2) GLOBAL SECURITY CONTINGENCY FUND REPORT.—Section 1207 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (n); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (o) and (p) as subsections (n) and (o).

(3) DATA SERVERS AND CENTERS COST SAVINGS REPORT.—Section 2867 (10 U.S.C. 2223a note) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(t) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.—The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) is amended as follows:

(1) F-22A RAPTOR MODERNIZATION PROGRAM REPORT.—Section 144 (126 Stat. 1663) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(2) TRICARE MAIL-ORDER PHARMACY PROGRAM REPORT.—Section 716 (10 U.S.C. 1074g note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f).

(3) WARRIORS IN TRANSITION PROGRAMS REPORT.—Section 738 (10 U.S.C. 1071 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and
(B) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(4) USE OF INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENTS REPORT.—Section 865 (126 Stat. 1861) is repealed.

(5) COUNTER SPACE TECHNOLOGY REPORT.—Section 917 (126 Stat. 1878) is repealed.

(6) IMAGERY INTELLIGENCE AND GEOSPATIAL INFORMATION SUPPORT REPORT.—Section 921 (126 Stat. 1878) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(7) COMPUTER NETWORK OPERATIONS COORDINATION REPORT.—Section 1079 (10 U.S.C. 221 note) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(8) UPDATES OF ACTIVITIES OF OFFICE OF SECURITY COOPERATION IN IRAQ REPORT.—Section 1211 (126 Stat. 1983) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(9) UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE ATARES PROGRAM REPORT.—Section 1276 (10 U.S.C. 2350c note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsections (e) and (f); and
(B) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (e).

(u) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.—The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) is amended as follows:

(1) MODERNIZING PERSONNEL SECURITY STRATEGY METRICS REPORT.—Section 907(c)(3) (10 U.S.C. 1564 note) is amended—

(A) by striking “(A) METRICS REQUIRED.—In” and inserting “In”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B).

(2) DEFENSE CLANDESTINE SERVICE REPORT.—Section 923 (10 U.S.C. prec. 421 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsection (b), (c), and (d), respectively.

(3) INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS RELATING TO DOD REPORT.—Section 1249 (127 Stat. 925) is repealed.

(4) SMALL BUSINESS GROWTH REPORT.—Section 1611 (127 Stat. 946) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(v) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015.—The Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) is amended as follows:

(1) ASSIGNMENT OF PRIVATE SECTOR PERSONNEL TO DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY REPORT.—Section 232 (10 U.S.C. 2358 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively.

(2) GOVERNMENT LODGING PROGRAM REPORT.—Section 914 (5 U.S.C. 5911 note) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(3) DOD RESPONSE TO COMPROMISES OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION REPORT.—Section 1052 (128 Stat. 3497) is repealed.

(4) PERSONNEL PROTECTION AND PERSONNEL SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT LOAN REPORT.—Section 1207 (10 U.S.C. 2342 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d); and
(B) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(5) DOD ASSISTANCE TO COUNTER ISIS REPORT.—Section 1236 (128 Stat. 3558) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(6) COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM USE OF CONTRIBUTIONS REPORT.—Section 1325 (50 U.S.C. 3715) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively.

(7) COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM FACILITIES CERTIFICATION REPORT.—Section 1341 (50 U.S.C. 3741) is repealed.

(8) COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM PROJECT CATEGORY REPORT.—Section 1342 (50 U.S.C. 3742) is repealed.

(9) STATEMENT ON ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM.—Section 1607 (128 Stat. 3625) is amended—

(A) by striking “(a) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—”;

(B) by striking subsections (b), (c), and (d); and

(C) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “This requirement shall terminate on December 19, 2019.”

(w) PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—Effective as of December 23, 2016, and as if included therein as enacted, section 1061(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) is amended as follows:

(1) GENERAL DEFENSE REPORTS.—Paragraph (1) is amended by striking “113(i)” and inserting “113(c), (e), and (i)”.

(2) ANNUAL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE REPORT.—Paragraph (2) is amended by inserting after “Section” the following: “116 and section”.

(3) SELECTED ACQUISITION REPORTS.—Paragraph (44) is amended by inserting after “Section” the following: “2432 and section”.

(4) NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU REPORT.—By inserting after paragraph (63) the following new paragraph:

“(64) Section 10504(b).”

(x) **PRESERVATION OF VETTED SYRIAN OPPOSITION REPORT.**—Effective as of December 23, 2016, and as if included therein as enacted, section 1061(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(18) Section 1209(d) (127 Stat. 3542).”.

(y) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Except as provided in subsections (w) and (x), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the later of—
(1) the date of the enactment of this Act; or
(2) November 25, 2017.

SEC. 1052. REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ARCTIC CAPABILITY AND RESOURCE GAPS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding necessary steps the Department of Defense is undertaking to resolve arctic security capability and resource gaps.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall include an analysis of each of the following:

(1) The infrastructure needed to ensure national security in the arctic region.

(2) Any shortfalls in observation, remote sensing capabilities, ice prediction, and weather forecasting.

(3) Any shortfalls of the Department in navigational aids.

(4) Any additional, necessary high-latitude electronic and communications infrastructure requirements.

(5) Any gaps in intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance coverage and recommendations for additional intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities

(6) Any shortfalls in personnel recovery capabilities.

(7) Any additional capabilities the Secretary determines should be incorporated into future Navy surface combatants.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1053. REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONNEL RECOVERY AND NONCONVENTIONAL ASSISTED RECOVERY MECHANISMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a review and assessment of personnel recovery and nonconventional assisted recovery programs, authorities, and policies.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall include each of the following elements:

(1) An overall strategy defining personnel recovery and nonconventional assisted recovery programs and activities, including how such programs and activities support the requirements of the geographic combatant commanders.

(2) A comprehensive review and assessment of statutory authorities, policies, and interagency coordination mechanisms, including limitations and shortfalls, for personnel recovery and nonconventional assisted recovery programs and activities.

(3) A comprehensive description of current and anticipated future personnel recovery and nonconventional assisted recovery requirements across the future years defense program, as validated by the Joint Staff.

(4) An overview of validated current and expected future force structure requirements necessary to meet near-, mid-, and long-term personnel recovery and nonconventional assisted recovery programs and activities of the geographic combatant commanders.

(5) Any other matters the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) **FORM OF ASSESSMENT.**—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the assessment required under subsection (a) is submitted, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a review of such assessment.

SEC. 1054. MINE WARFARE READINESS INSPECTION PLAN AND REPORT.

(a) **INSPECTION PLAN.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Chief of Naval Operations, in consultation with the Combatant Commanders, shall submit a plan for inspections of each unit and organization tasked with delivering operational capability, missions and mission essential tasks, functions, supporting roles, organization, manning, training, and materiel for naval mine warfare. At a minimum, inspected units and organizations shall include those required in the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan and those assigned in the Forces For Unified Commands document or have the potential to support, by deployment or otherwise, a directed Operation Plan, Concept Plan, contingency operation, homeland security operation, or Defense Support of Civil Authorities requirements for naval offensive or defensive mine warfare.

(b) **CRITERIA.**—This inspection plan shall propose methods to analytically assess, evaluate, improve and assure mission readiness of each unit or organization with required operational capabilities for naval mine warfare. Inspection shall include—

(1) an assessment or verification of material condition;

(2) unit wide training and personnel readiness as measured by established tasks, conditions and standards that demonstrate the unit readiness to perform their wartime or homeland defense mission;

(3) force through unit level training;

(4) readiness to support multi-echelon, joint service mine warfare operations as part of an offensive, defensive mining or mine countermeasures task;

(5) readiness to support combatant commander campaign plans, operational plan, concept plan, or the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan;

(6) required operational capability;

(7) inspection and reinspection process; and

(8) inspection periodicity.

(c) **APPLICABILITY.**—The inspection requirements under this subsection apply to the following units and organizations:

(1) Surface MCM vessels or vessels performing MCM tasks.

(2) Airborne MCM squadrons.

(3) Mobile mine assembly groups and mobile mine assembly units.

(4) Fleet patrol squadrons with mine laying capabilities.

(5) LCS and LCS MCM mission modules upon reaching IOC.

(6) Mine countermeasures squadrons.

(7) Units exercising command and control over MIW forces.

(8) MCM operational support ships.

(9) Attack and guided missile submarines with mine laying capabilities.

(10) Magnetic and acoustic silencing facilities.

(11) EOD MCM or VSW Companies and Platoons.

(12) SEAL (ESG / CSG) USMC units with VSW capability.

(d) **CERTIFICATION.**—The Chief of Naval Operations shall submit to the Secretary of Defense, the Combatant Commanders, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to Congress a report on the program under this subsection. The report shall contain a classified section which

addresses capability and capacity to meet JSCP, OPLAN, CONPLAN and contingency requirements and unclassified section with general summary and readiness trends.

(e) **CONFORMING REPEAL.**—Section 1090 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) is repealed.

SEC. 1055. REPORT ON CIVILIAN CASUALTIES FROM DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STRIKES.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—For each calendar year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on strikes carried out by the Department of Defense against terrorist targets located outside Government-designated areas of active hostilities and against enemy combatants located inside Government-designated areas of active hostilities during the period beginning on January 1 and ending on December 31 of the year covered by the report. Such report shall include each of the following, for the period covered by the report:

(1) The number of such strikes carried out in—
(A) locations outside Government-designated areas of active hostilities; and

(B) locations inside Government-designated areas of active hostilities.

(2) An assessment of the combatant and non-combatant deaths resulting from those strikes, including the number of such deaths—

(A) occurring outside of Government-designated areas of active hostilities; and

(B) occurring within Government-designated areas of active hostilities, with the number of such deaths displayed to indicate the Government-designated country or location within the Government-designated country where such deaths occurred.

(3) To the extent feasible and appropriate, the general reasons for any discrepancies between post-strike assessments from the Department of Defense and credible reporting from nongovernmental organizations regarding non-combatant deaths resulting from such strikes.

(4) A description of steps taken by the Department of Defense to mitigate harm to civilians in conducting such strikes.

(5) Definitions of the terms “combatant” and “noncombatant” as used in the report.

(6) The monthly tabulations collected by the Department of Defense of combatant and non-combatant casualties occurring inside of areas of active hostilities, and any revisions to previously reported tabulations.

(7) A specification of the countries where strikes occurred, or locations within countries where strikes occurred—

(A) designated as areas of active hostilities; and

(B) not designated as areas of active hostilities.

(b) **DEADLINE FOR REPORTS.**—The reports required by subsection (a) shall be submitted as follows:

(1) The report for 2018 shall be submitted not later than December 31, 2018.

(2) The report for 2019, and for each subsequent year, shall be submitted by not later than March 1 of the year following the year covered by the report.

(c) **REVIEW OF REPORTING.**—In preparing a report under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall review relevant and credible post-strike all-source reporting, including such information from nongovernmental sources.

(d) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The reports required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(e) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall make the unclassified form of the reports publicly available.

SEC. 1056. REPORTS ON INFRASTRUCTURE AND CAPABILITIES OF LAJES FIELD, PORTUGAL.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Lajes Field, Portugal, is an enabler of United States operations in Europe, Africa, and the Atlantic.

(2) Lajes field has capabilities and infrastructure that reflect significant long-term investments by the United States, including a 10,000 foot runway, housing for more than 650 personnel and their families, a power plant and water facilities, significant communication capability, and an award-winning medical clinic.

(3) Lajes Field provides a strategic location to monitor the activities of foreign powers in the Atlantic and Mediterranean, including Russia's increased naval presence and China's efforts to establish a military presence in the Atlantic.

(4) The Department of Defense has not fully utilized the infrastructure at Lajes Field.

(b) **INFRASTRUCTURE AND CAPABILITIES REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the infrastructure and capabilities of Lajes Field, Portugal. Such report shall include each of the following:

(1) An assessment of the communications infrastructure at Lajes Field, including the estimated cost to—

(A) upgrade the existing infrastructure to add additional bandwidth of 56 giga-bits-per-second; and

(B) connect the existing infrastructure to any currently planned additional undersea cables to increase the available bandwidth by at least 56 giga-bits-per-second.

(2) A justification for the current status of Lajes Field as an unaccompanied tour location and an assessment of the estimated costs of converting assignments at Lajes Field to an accompanied tour location.

(3) An assessment of the estimated cost of allowing members of the Armed Forces of the United States to occupy the on-base housing owned by the United States.

(4) An update to the Housing Requirements and Market Analysis for Lajes Field to assess the housing availability for a base population of up to 2000 military and civilian personnel.

(5) The cost to establish Lajes Field as a location for air-to-air training or anti-submarine warfare missions, including the costs of any necessary infrastructure upgrades, as well as any potential operational benefits.

(c) **FUEL STORAGE SYSTEM REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the environmental impact of fuel storage systems at Lajes Field, Portugal. Such report shall include an impact assessment of the soil contamination from Department of Defense fuel storage systems at Lajes Field, including an assessment of the causes of the leak of the Cabrito Pipeline.

SEC. 1057. REPORT ON JOINT PACIFIC ALASKA RANGE COMPLEX MODERNIZATION.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding proposed improvements to the Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of existing JPARC infrastructure.

(2) A summary of improvements to the range infrastructure the Secretary determines are necessary—

(A) for fifth generation fighters to train at maximum potential; and

(B) to provide a realistic air warfare environment versus a near-peer adversary for—

(i) four squadrons of fifth generation fighters;

(ii) annual Red Flag-Alaska exercises; and

(iii) biannual Operation Northern Edge exercises.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

SEC. 1061. TECHNICAL, CONFORMING, AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) **TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.**—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 113(j)(1) is amended by striking “the Committee on” the first place it appears and all that follows through “of Representatives” and inserting “congressional defense committees”.

(2) Section 115(i)(9) is amended by striking “section 1203(b) of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (22 U.S.C. 5952(b))” and inserting “section 1321(a) of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act (50 U.S.C. 3711(a))”.

(3) Section 122a(a) is amended by striking “acting through the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs” and inserting “acting through the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs”.

(4) Section 127(c)(1) is amended by striking “the Committee on” the first place it appears and all that follows through “of Representatives” and inserting “congressional defense committees”.

(5) Section 129a is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking “(as identified pursuant to section 118b of this title)”;

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) by striking paragraph (1); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

(6) Section 130f(b)(1) is amended by adding a period at the end.

(7) Section 139b(c)(2) is amended by inserting a period at the end of subparagraph (K).

(8) Section 153(a) is amended by inserting a colon after “the following” in the matter preceding paragraph (1).

(9) Section 162(a)(4) is amended by striking the comma after “command of”.

(10) Section 164(a)(1)(B) is amended by striking “section 664(f)” and inserting “section 664(d)”.

(11) Section 166(c) is amended by striking “section 2011” and inserting “section 322”.

(12) Section 167b(e)(2)(A)(iii)(II) is amended by striking “Fiscal Year 2014” and inserting “Fiscal Year 2016”.

(13) Section 171a is amended—

(A) in subsection (f), by striking “(4)” and inserting “(4)”; and

(B) in subsection (i)(3), by striking “section 2366(e)” and inserting “sections 2366(e) and 2366a(d)”.

(14) Section 179(f)(3)(B)(iii) is amended by striking “Joints” and inserting “Joint”.

(15) Section 181(b)(1) is amended by striking “section 118” and inserting “section 113(g)”.

(16) Section 222(b) is amended by striking “both” through the period at the end and inserting “major force programs.”.

(17) Section 342(j)(2) is amended by striking the second period at the end.

(18) Section 347(a)(1)(A) is amended by inserting “section” in clauses (i) and (iii) after “Academy under”.

(19) Section 494(b)(2)(B) is amended by striking “of title 10” and inserting “of this title”.

(20) Section 661(c) is amended by striking “section 664(f)” in paragraphs (1)(B)(i) and (3)(A) and inserting “section 664(d)”.

(21) Section 801 (article 1 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “chapter:” and inserting “chapter (the Uniform Code of Military Justice):”.

(22) Section 806b(b) (article 6b(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) is amended by striking “(the Uniform Code of Military Justice)”.

(23) Section 1073c(a)(1)(E) is amended by striking “military” and inserting “military”.

(24) Section 1074g(a)(9) is amended by moving subparagraphs (B) and (C) two ems to the left.

(25) Section 1451 is amended in subsections (a) and (b) by striking “section 1450(a)(4)” each place it appears and inserting “section 1450(a)(5)”.

(26) Section 1452(c) is amended in paragraphs (1) and (3) by striking “section 1450(a)(4)” both places it appears and inserting “section 1450(a)(5)”.

(27) Section 1552(h) is amended by striking “calendar” each place it appears and inserting “calendar”.

(28) Section 1553(f) is amended by striking “calendar” each place it appears and inserting “calendar”.

(29) Section 2264(b)(3) is amended by striking “the date of the” and all the follows through “2015” and inserting “December 19, 2014”.

(30) Section 2330a is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(1)(C), by striking “management;” and inserting “management;”;

(B) in subsection (h)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting “PERFORMANCE-BASED.—” after “(1)”;

(ii) by designating the four paragraphs after paragraph (4) as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (8), respectively;

(iii) in paragraph (5), as redesignated, by inserting “SERVICE ACQUISITION PORTFOLIO GROUPS.—” after “(5)”;

(iv) in paragraph (6), as redesignated, by inserting “STAFF AUGMENTATION CONTRACTS.—” after “(6)”.

(31) Section 2334(a)(6)(B) is amended by adding a semicolon at the end.

(32) Section 2335 is amended by striking “(2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.)” in subsections (c)(1) and (d)(3) and inserting “(52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.)”.

(33) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 139 is amended by inserting at period at the end of the items relating to sections 2372 and 2372a.

(34) Section 2364(a)(6) is amended by striking “conveys” and inserting “convey”.

(35) Section 2411(1)(D) is amended by striking “(Public Law 93–638; 25 U.S.C. 450b(1))” and inserting “(25 U.S.C. 5304(1))”.

(36) The item relating to section 2431b in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 144 is amended to read as follows:

“2431b. Risk management and mitigation in major defense acquisition programs and major systems.”.

(37) Section 2430 is amended by striking “subsection (a)(2)” in subsections (b) and (c) and inserting “subsection (a)(1)(B)”.

(38) Section 2431a(d) is amended by inserting “(1)” after “REVIEW.—”.

(39) Section 2446b(e) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “in writing that—” and inserting “in writing—”; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, that” after “open system approach”.

(40) Section 2548(e) is amended—

(A) by striking “REQUIREMENTS” and all that follows through “by the Secretary” and inserting “REQUIREMENT.—The annual report prepared by the Secretary”;

(B) by striking “system; and” and inserting “system.”;

(C) by striking paragraph (2).

(41) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 152 is amended by inserting a period at the end of the item relating to section 2567.

(42) Section 2564 is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “section 377” and inserting “section 277”; and

(B) in subsection (f), by striking “sections 375 and 376” and inserting “sections 275 and 276”.

(43) Section 2576a(b) is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4).

(44) Section 2612(a) is amended by striking “section 2166(f)(4)” and inserting “section 343(f)(4)”.

(45) Section 2662(f)(1)(D) is amended by striking “section 334” and inserting “section 254”.

(46) Section 2667(e) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(E), by striking “military museum described in section 489(a) of this title” and inserting “military museum”;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “before January 1, 2005, shall be deposited into the account” and inserting “shall be deposited into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account”; and

(C) by striking paragraph (5).

(47) Section 2667(k) is amended by striking “section 9101” and inserting “section 8101”.

(48) Section 2674(f)(2) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The term includes the Raven Rock Mountain Complex.”.

(49) Section 2925(b)(1) is amended by striking “section 138c” and inserting “section 2926(b)”.

(50) Chapter 449 is amended—

(A) by striking the second section 4781; and

(B) in the table of sections, by striking the item relating to the second section 4781.

(51) Section 7235(e)(1) is amended by striking “24 months after the date of the enactment of this section” and inserting “November 25, 2017.”.

(52) The item relating to section 9517 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 931 is amended by making the first letter of the third word lower case.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO REPEAL OF PENDING AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND INFORMATION.—

(1) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015.—Effective as of December 23, 2016, section 901 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3462), as amended by section 901(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2342), is further amended—

(A) by striking subsection (j);

(B) in subsection (l)(1), by striking subparagraph (A);

(C) in subsection (m), by striking paragraphs (1) and (2); and

(D) in subsection (n), by striking paragraph (1).

(2) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.—Effective as of November 25, 2015, subsection (f) of section 883 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), as added by section 1081(c)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328), is amended by striking paragraph (1).

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATED TO UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE REFORM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328), is further amended as follows:

(A) Subsection (a)(4) of section 839 (article 39), as added by section 5222(1) of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2909), is amended by striking “in non-capital cases unless the accused requests sentencing by members under section 825 of this title (article 25)” and inserting “under section 853(b)(1) of this title (article 53(b)(1))”.

(B) Subsection (i) of section 843 (article 43), as added by section 5225(c) of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2909), is amended by striking “DNA EVIDENCE.—” and inserting “DNA EVIDENCE.—”.

(C) Section 848(c)(1) (article 48(c)(1)), as amended by section 5230 of the Military Justice

Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2913), is further amended by striking “section 866(g) of this title (article 66(g))” and inserting “section 866(h) of this title (article 66(h))”.

(D) Section 853(b)(1)(B) (article 53(b)(1)(B)), as amended by section 5236 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2937), is further amended by striking “in a trial”.

(E) Subsection (d) of section 853a (article 53a), as added by section 5237 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2917), is amended by striking “military judge” the second place it appears and inserting “court-martial”.

(F) Section 864(a) (article 64(a)), as amended by section 5328(a) of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2929), is further amended by striking “(a) (a) IN GENERAL.—” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—”.

(G) Subsection (b)(1) of section 865 (article 65), as added by section 5329 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2930), is amended by striking “section 866(b)(2) of this title (article 66(b)(2))” and inserting “section 866(b)(3) of this title (article 66(b)(3))”.

(H) Subsection (f)(3) of section 866 (article 66), as added by section 5330 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2932), is amended by inserting after “Court” the first place it appears the following: “of Criminal Appeals”.

(I) Section 869(c)(1)(A) (article 69(c)(1)(A)), as amended by section 5333 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2935), is further amended by inserting a comma after “in part”.

(J) Section 882(b) (article 82(b)), as amended by section 5403 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2939), is further amended by striking “section 99” and inserting “section 899”.

(K) Section 919a(b) (article 119a(b)), as amended by section 5401(13)(B) of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2939), is further amended—

(i) by striking “928a, 926, and 928” and inserting “926, 928, and 928a”; and

(ii) by striking “128a 126, and 128” and inserting “126, 128, and 128a”.

(L) Section 920(g)(2) (article 120(g)(2)), as amended by section 5430(b) of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2949), is further amended in the first sentence by striking “brest” and inserting “breast”.

(M) Section 928(b)(2) (article 128(b)(2)), as amended by section 5441 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2954), is further amended by striking the comma after “substantial bodily harm”.

(N) Subsection (b)(2) of section 932 (article 132), as added by section 5450 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2957), is amended by striking “section 1034(h)” and inserting “section 1034(j)”.

(O) Section 937 (article 137), as amended by section 5503 of the Military Justice Act of 2016 (130 Stat. 2960), is further amended by striking “(the Uniform Code of Military Justice)” each place it appears as follows:

(i) In subsection (a)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A).

(ii) In subsection (b), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A).

(iii) In subsection (d), in the matter preceding paragraph (1).

(2) CROSS-REFERENCES TO STALKING.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(A) Section 673(a) is amended—

(i) by striking “920a, or 920c” and inserting “920c, or 930”; and

(ii) by striking “120a, or 120c” and inserting “120c, or 130”.

(B) Section 674(a) is amended—

(i) by striking “920a, 920b, 920c, or 925” and inserting “920b, 920c, 125, or 930”; and

(ii) by striking “120a, 120b, 120c, or 125” and inserting “120b, 120c, 125, or 130”.

(C) Section 1034(c)(2)(A) is amended by striking “sections 920 through 920c of this title (articles 120 through 120c of the Uniform Code of Military Justice)” and inserting “section 920, 920b, 920c, or 930 of this title (article 120, 120b, 120c, or 130 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice)”.

(D) Section 1044e(g)(1) is amended—

(i) by striking “920a, 920b, 920c, or 925” and inserting “920b, 920c, 125, or 930”; and

(ii) by striking “120a, 120b, 120c, or 125” and inserting “120b, 120c, 125, or 130”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect immediately after the amendments made by the Military Justice Act of 2016 (division E of Public Law 114–328) take effect as provided for in section 5542 of that Act (130 Stat. 2967).

(d) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017.—Effective as of December 23, 2016, and as if included therein as enacted, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 217(a)(2) (130 Stat. 2051) is amended by striking “section 821b” and inserting “section 821(b)”.

(2) Section 233 (10 U.S.C. 2358 note; 130 Stat. 2061) is amended in subsections (a)(1) and (b)(1), by striking “secretaries” and inserting “Secretaries”.

(3) Section 728(b)(1) (130 Stat. 2234) is amended by inserting “(c)” after “Section 1073b”.

(4) Section 805(a)(2) (130 Stat. 2255) is amended by striking “The table of chapters for title 10, United States Code, is” and inserting “The tables of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A, and at the beginning of part IV of subtitle A, of title 10, United States Code, are”.

(5) The matter to be inserted by section 824(d)(1)(B) (130 Stat. 2279) is amended—

(A) by striking “(3)” and inserting “(4)”; and

(B) by striking “(4)” and inserting “(5)”.

(6) Section 833(b)(2)(C) (130 Stat. 2284) is amended—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking “Section 2330a(j) of title 10, United States Code,” and inserting “Section 2330a(h) of title 10, United States Code,”;

(B) in clause (iii), in the matter proposed to be inserted, by striking “section 2330a(j)” and inserting “section 2330a(h)”.

(7) Section 865(b)(2) (130 Stat. 2305) is amended by striking “section 2330a(g)(5)” and inserting “section 2330a(h)(6)”.

(8) Section 893(c) (130 Stat. 2324) is amended by inserting “paragraph (2) of” after “is further amended in”.

(9) Section 902(b) (130 Stat. 2344) is amended by striking “Section 151(b)(5)” and inserting “Section 131(b)(5)”.

(10) Section 921(c) (130 Stat. 2351) is amended by inserting after “The text of” the following: “subsection (a) (after the subsection heading)”.

(11) Section 1061(c)(23) (130 Stat. 2400) is amended by striking “488(c)” and inserting “488”.

(12) Section 1061(i) (130 Stat. 2404) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (23), by striking “2010 (Public Law 110–417)” and inserting “2009 (Public Law 110–417; 10 U.S.C. prec. 701 note)”;

(B) in paragraph (24), by striking “2010” and inserting “2009”.

(13) Section 1064(b) (130 Stat. 2409) is amended by striking “Public Law 113–239” and inserting “Public Law 112–239”.

(14) Section 1253(b) (130 Stat. 2532) is amended by striking “this subchapter” both places it appears and inserting “this subtitle”.

(15) Section 2811(c) (130 Stat. 2716) is amended by striking “, and the provisions of law amended by subsections (a) and (b) of that section shall be restored as if such section had not been enacted into law”.

(16) Section 2829E(a) (130 Stat. 2733) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(17) Section 5225(f) (130 Stat. 2910) is amended by striking “this subsection” and inserting “this section”.

(18) The table of sections to be inserted by section 5452 (130 Stat. 2958) is amended—

(A) by striking “Art.” each place it appears, except the first place it appears;

(B) in the item relating to section 887a, by striking “Resistance” and inserting “Resistance”;

(C) in the item relating to section 908, by striking “of the United States—Loss” and inserting “of United States—Loss,”;

(D) in the item relating to section 909, by striking “of the” and inserting “of”;

(E) in the item relating to section 909a, by striking the second period at the end.

(19) The matters to be inserted by section 5541 (130 Stat. 2965) is amended—

(A) by striking “Art.” each place it appears;

(B) by striking “825.” and inserting “825a.”; and

(C) by striking “830.” and inserting “830a.”.

(e) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.—Effective as of November 25, 2015, and as if included therein as enacted, section 574 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 129 Stat. 831) is amended by striking “1785 note” both places it appears and inserting “1788 note”.

(f) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015.—Effective as of December 19, 2014, and as if included therein as enacted, section 1044(a)(2)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3493) is amended by striking “October 28” and inserting “September 30”.

(g) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011.—Effective as of January 7, 2011, and as if included therein as enacted, section 896(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–398; 124 Stat. 4315) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “Chapter” and inserting “Subchapter II of chapter”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “chapter” and inserting “subchapter”.

(h) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.—Section 943(d)(1) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), as amended by section 1205(c)(2) of Public Law 112–81 (125 Stat. 1623), is further amended by striking the second period at the end of the first sentence.

(i) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.—Section 1022(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 10 U.S.C. 271 note) is amended by striking “section 1004(j)” and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting “section 284(i) of title 10, United States Code”.

(j) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AMENDMENTS MADE BY THIS ACT.—For purposes of applying amendments made by provisions of this Act other than this section, the amendments made by this section shall be treated as having been enacted immediately before any such amendments by other provisions of this Act.

SEC. 1062. WORKFORCE ISSUES FOR RELOCATION OF MARINES TO GUAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(b) of the Joint Resolution entitled “A Joint Resolution to approve the ‘Covenant To Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union With the United States of America’, and for other purposes”, approved March 24, 1976 (48 U.S.C. 1806(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS FOR NON-IMMIGRANT WORKERS.—An alien, if otherwise qualified, may seek admission to Guam or to the Commonwealth during the transition program as a nonimmigrant worker under section 101(a)(15)(H) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)) without counting against the numerical limitations set forth in section 214(g) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)). An alien, if otherwise qualified, may, before October 1, 2020, be admitted under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) of such Act for a period of up to 3 years (which may be extended by the Secretary of Homeland Security before October 1, 2020, for an additional period or periods not to exceed 3 years each) to perform services or labor on Guam pursuant to any agreement entered into by a prime contractor or subcontractor calling for services or labor required for performance of the contract or subcontract in direct support of all military-funded construction, repairs, renovation, and facilities services, or to perform services or labor on Guam as a health-care worker, notwithstanding the requirement of such section that the service or labor be temporary. This subsection does not apply to any employment to be performed outside of Guam or the Commonwealth.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1063. PROTECTION OF SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF MILITARY FAMILIES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Protect Our Military Families’ 2nd Amendment Rights Act”.

(b) RESIDENCY OF SPOUSES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO BE DETERMINED ON THE SAME BASIS AS THE RESIDENCY OF SUCH MEMBERS FOR PURPOSES OF FEDERAL FIREARMS LAWS.—Section 921(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) For purposes of this chapter:

“(1) A member of the Armed Forces on active duty and the spouse of such a member are residents of the State in which the permanent duty station of the member is located.

“(2) The spouse of such a member may satisfy the identification document requirements of this chapter by presenting—

“(A) the military identification card issued to the spouse; and

“(B) the official Permanent Change of Station Orders annotating the spouse as being authorized for collocation, or an official letter from the commanding officer of the member verifying that the member and the spouse are collocated at the permanent duty station of the member.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to conduct engaged in after the 6-month period that begins with the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1064. TRANSFER OF SURPLUS FIREARMS TO CORPORATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE AND FIREARMS SAFETY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 40728(h) of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may transfer” and inserting “The Secretary shall transfer”;

(2) by striking “The Secretary shall determine a reasonable schedule for the transfer of such surplus pistols.”; and

(3) by striking paragraph (2).

(b) TERMINATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 1087 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 129 Stat. 1012) is amended by striking subsections (b) and (c).

SEC. 1065. NATIONAL GUARD ACCESSIBILITY TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ISSUED UNMANNED AIRCRAFT.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, the Commander of United States Northern Command, and the Commander of United States Pacific Command, shall conduct an efficiency and effectiveness review of the governance structure, coordination processes, documentation, and timing and deadline requirements stipulated in Department of Defense Policy Memorandum 15–002, entitled “Guidance for the Domestic Use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems” and dated February 17, 2015. In conducting the review, the Secretary shall take into account information and data points provided by State governors and State adjutant generals in assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of accessing Department of Defense issued unmanned aircraft systems for State and National Guard operations.

(b) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after the completion of the review required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit the review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 1066. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING AIRCRAFT CARRIERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Naval aviation was born in the United States when Eugene Ely launched from the deck of a United States Navy ship on November 14, 1910, in a Curtiss Model D.

(2) In 1915, Cpt. Henry C. Mustin made the first catapult launch and first take off in a ship underway in a Curtiss Model AB–2, beginning a century of technological advancements that have led to today’s Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System which has replaced the steam pistons with powerful magnets to launch jet aircraft.

(3) In 1924, Lt. Dixie Kiefer made the first night catapult launch in a Vought UO–1 in San Diego harbor, leading to today’s aircraft carriers being a floating city at sea with a 24-hour airport.

(4) The first nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, USS Enterprise (CVN 65), was commissioned in 1961, ushering in a new era of the world’s most dominant and capable warships.

(5) In 2013, the first of the next generation of aircraft carriers, Gerald R. Ford, was christened, marking a continuation of the innovative naval aviation spirit, technological advancement, and war fighting capabilities of aircraft carriers.

(6) In 2013, aircraft carrier USS George Washington (CVN 73) provided humanitarian assistance, medical supplies, food, and water to the victims in the Philippines of Super Typhoon Haiyan, once again demonstrating versatility of the aircraft carrier for combat, diplomatic and humanitarian operations.

(7) For over 70 years, aircraft carriers have been employed in every major and many smaller conflicts, including World War II, Korea, Vietnam, Grenada, Lebanon, Libya, Operation Desert Storm, Afghanistan, Iraq, and the fight against terrorism.

(8) The United States Navy’s aircraft carriers are a cornerstone of the Nation’s ability to project its power and strength.

(9) When aircraft carriers sail the globe they are a statement of national purpose and a symbol of the Nation’s industrial strength, competitive edge, and economic prosperity.

(10) Aircraft carriers are 4.5 acres of sovereign United States territory enabling the Nation to reduce its dependency on other nations while it pursues its national security interests.

(11) Aircraft carriers enable the United States Armed Forces to carry out operations from international waters, avoiding the complications of securing fly-over rights and land-base rights from other nations.

(12) Aircraft carriers are a modern, very mobile United States military base complete with airfield, hospital, and communications systems from which the United States can strike at its enemies.

(13) Over 90 percent of world trade is moved by sea, including much of the world's gas and oil supply, and aircraft carriers and their strike forces are constantly on patrol in vital regions of the world to keep shipping lanes open and protect the interests of the United States and its allies.

(14) There are more than 2,450 companies in 48 States and over 364 congressional districts, and more than 13,100 shipbuilders who proudly contribute to the construction and maintenance of these complex and technologically advanced ships.

(15) Thousands of members of the United States Armed Forces have served the Nation aboard aircraft carriers in war, peace, and times of crisis.

(16) When crisis occurs the first question that comes to everyone's lips is "Where is the nearest carrier?"

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) United States aircraft carriers are the pre-eminent power projection platform and have served the Nation's interests in times of war and in times of peace, adapting to the immediate and ever-changing nature of the world for over 90 years;

(2) aircraft carrier contributions and heritage should be celebrated; and

(3) the people of the United States should be encouraged to celebrate the history of aircraft carriers in the United States and to always remember the vital role these vessels play in defending the Nation's freedom.

SEC. 1067. NOTICE TO CONGRESS OF TERMS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any court order, at the request of the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or the House of Representatives or the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense shall make available (in an appropriate manner with respect to classified information, if necessary) to such chairman a settlement agreement (including a consent decree) in any civil action involving the Department of Defense, a military department, or a Defense Agency, if, in the opinion of the Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, the terms of the settlement agreement affect the congressional authorization or appropriations process with respect to the Department of Defense.

(b) CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT.—Before making a request under subsection (a)—

(1) the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall consult with the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(2) the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives shall consult with the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1068. SENSE OF CONGRESS RECOGNIZING THE UNITED STATES NAVY SEABEES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On March 5, 1942, Navy Construction Battalion personnel were officially named Seabees by the Navy Department.

(2) The purpose of the Navy Seabees is to build, maintain, and support base infrastructure in remote locations for the Navy and Marine Corps, while simultaneously being capable of engaging in combat operations.

(3) The Navy Seabees dual-role is exemplified by the Seabee motto *Construimus, Batuimus: We Build, We Fight*.

(4) Throughout their history, the Navy Seabees have answered the call of duty to protect the United States and its democratic values both in times of war and peace.

(5) The Navy Seabees support United States national security at combatant commands worldwide, through the construction, both on land and underwater, of bases, airfields, roads, bridges, and other infrastructure.

(6) Members of the Navy Seabees and their families have demonstrated unmatched courage and dedication to sacrifice for the United States, from service in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam to the recent conflicts in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere.

(7) The Navy Seabees exhibit honor, personal courage, and commitment as they sacrifice their personal comfort to keep the United States safe from threats.

(8) The Navy Seabees continue to display strength, professionalism, and bravery in the all-volunteer force.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress recognizes the United States Navy Seabees and the Navy personnel who comprise the construction force for the Navy and the Marine Corps as critical elements in deterring conflict, overcoming aggression, and rebuilding democratic institutions.

SEC. 1069. RECOGNITION OF THE UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On April 16, 1987, Congress required the establishment of a Special Operations Command, which was to be an elite fighting force drawn from all of the branches of the Armed Forces.

(2) As a headquarters organization, USSOCOM comprises four service-component commands, consisting of the United States Army Special Operations Command, United States Naval Special Warfare Command, United States Marine Corps Forces Special Operations Command, and United States Air Force Special Operations Command, and includes various sub-unified commands.

(3) Each service-component command has sub-component commands consisting of—

(A) Army Special Forces (Green Berets), Rangers, Special Operations Aviation, Civil Affairs, Military Information Support Operations;

(B) Navy SEALs and Special Warfare Combatant-Craft Crewmen;

(C) Air Force Commandos and Special Tactics Airmen;

(D) Marine Raiders; and

(E) other Joint Special Operations Forces;

(4) USSOCOM protects and defends the United States in a variety of ways, including direct action, special reconnaissance, unconventional warfare, foreign internal defense, civil affairs operations, counterterrorism, military information support operations, counter-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, security force assistance, counterinsurgency, hostage rescue and recovery, foreign humanitarian assistance, and other missions as assigned.

(5) USSOCOM has an unequalled ability to analyze and respond to terrorist threats and USSOCOM has led many successful missions globally.

(6) Many USSOCOM missions are classified, so the American people may never know the details and extent of the bravery of Special Operations Forces, but a sample of missions provide a glimpse into the bravery and talents of these members of the Armed Forces:

(A) On May 2, 2011, Osama bin Laden was killed in a special operations mission in Pakistan, for which the outstanding men and women in America's intelligence and Armed Forces, especially those from SOCOM, remained focused

on bringing Osama bin Laden to justice, and on May 2, 2011, justice was done.

(B) On April 12, 2009, the Maersk Alabama was rescued unharmed in a special operations mission in the Indian Ocean, after a five-day standoff between the United States Navy and Somali pirates.

(C) On April 1, 2003, Jessica Lynch, a United States Army clerk taken prisoner for nine days in Iraq, was rescued by Special Operations Forces during a night raid in the hospital where she was being held.

(D) On December 13, 2003, in Operation Red Dawn, Special Operations Forces captured deposed Iraqi president Saddam Hussein, who was hiding in a spider hole.

(E) On January 17, 1991, as Operation Desert Storm began, Special Operations Forces slipped hundreds of miles into Iraq to identify Iraqi Scud missiles as targets for American fighter jets.

(F) On December 20, 1989, in Operation Just Cause and Operation Nifty Package, Special Operations Forces ventured into Panama to bring its then President Manuel Noriega to justice for drug-trafficking.

(7) Approximately 70,000 Regular component, National Guard, and reserve component personnel from all four services and Department of Defense civilians are assigned to USSOCOM headquarters in Tampa, its four service-component commands, and eight sub-unified commands.

(8) The heroism, skill, and patriotism of USSOCOM personnel and their families are without parallel.

(9) The responsibilities of USSOCOM are growing and its mission is now and will continue to be central to the defense of the United States in future decades.

(10) The sacrifices of many, the service of all, and the talents of the Special Operations Forces are cause for confidence and optimism.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and civilians who, together with their family members, comprise the United States Special Operations Forces community should be honored for their service and commitment to keeping the United States safe.

SEC. 1070. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING WORLD WAR I.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States declared war against Germany on April 6, 1917, to redress wrongs, including Germany's resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare, violation of United States neutrality, and denial of freedom of the seas to nonbelligerent nations.

(2) The United States associated itself with the allied powers of the United Kingdom and its Commonwealth, France and its colonies, Russia, Italy, and Japan to defeat the German Empire.

(3) The United States Army, consisting of the Regular Army, National Guard, and Reserve Corps, with the addition of volunteers and the draftees of the National Army, underwent a transformation from a frontier constabulary and coastal defense force to a modern land warfare force.

(4) Early 20th century military and technological advances resulted in the incorporation of motor transport, aviation, anti-aircraft artillery, tanks, chemical weapons, aircraft carriers, submarines and anti-submarine warfare, sonar, underwater mines, and other innovations into the military arsenal of the United States.

(5) The need to quickly build a military strength of four million soldiers and half a million sailors required the mobilization of the human resources of the United States, during which members of diverse ethnic groups, races, and creeds, both native-born and immigrant, forged a new American identity.

(6) The United States Army maintained its defense of American seacoasts, southern border, and overseas possessions, while the Army American Expeditionary Forces deployed "Over There" for combat operations in Europe starting in June 1917.

(7) By the end of World War I, almost two million members of the Army served overseas in the American Expeditionary Forces; Whereas, during World War I, the United States Navy increased in strength from approximately 69,000 officers and sailors and 342 vessels to more than 533,000 officers and sailors and 774 vessels.

(8) The Navy operated in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and the North and Mediterranean Seas in cooperation with allied navies.

(9) The Navy began the fight against the German U-boat menace by dispatching destroyers, which eventually totaled 70 in number, and 169 other vessels to counter the submarine threat.

(10) Navy vessels escorted troop transports carrying 1,250,000 passengers and escorted supply transports carrying 27 percent of all cargo shipped to Europe.

(11) The Navy deployed five batteries of large-caliber battleship guns mounted on railroad trains to France for service as long-range artillery for the Army.

(12) The United States Coast Guard transferred to the operational control of the Navy, and augmented that service with approximately 5,000 officers and sailors, 47 vessels of all types, and 279 shore stations.

(13) The United States Marine Corps, with an eventual wartime strength of 75,000 officers and men, detached two regiments and a machine gun battalion to constitute an infantry brigade integrated into the Army's 2d Division for service in France.

(14) On July 4, 1917, Colonel Charles E. Stanton, one of the officers on the staff of General John Pershing, commander of the American Expeditionary Forces in Europe, famously announced America's commitment to the fight when Colonel Stanton proclaimed upon his arrival in France, "Lafayette, we are here!"

(15) Whereas the American Expeditionary Forces formed three field armies, nine corps and forty-three divisions, plus various units of the Services of Supply.

(16) The American Expeditionary Forces suffered 244,000 casualties in fighting in thirteen named campaigns in World War I.

(17) Participation in World War I resulted in the completion of a period of reform and professionalism that transformed the Armed Forces from a small dispersed organization to a modern industrialized fighting force capable of global reach and influence.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) honors the memory of the fallen heroes who wore the uniform of the United States Armed Forces during World War I;

(2) commends the United States Armed Forces for preserving and protecting the interests of the United States during World War I;

(3) commends the brave members of the United States Armed Forces for their efforts in "making the world safe for democracy," and preserving the founding principles of the United States at home and abroad during World War I;

(4) commends the brave members of the United States Armed Forces for preserving and protecting the sea lanes of commerce and communications during World War I that ensured the continued prosperity of the United States;

(5) celebrates and congratulates the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard during the commemoration of the centennial of World War I for a job well done; and

(6) calls on all people of the United States to join in the commemoration of the centennial of World War I in events throughout the United States and overseas.

SEC. 1071. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NATIONAL GUARD YOUTH CHALLENGE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Fewer than 30 percent of youth in the United States qualify for military service, either because of poor physical health, a criminal record, or lack of a high school degree.

(2) The National Guard Youth Challenge Program provides the Department of Defense an opportunity to work with State and local governments to engage with the youth of the nation, providing military-based training, the opportunity to earn a high school degree, and high physical fitness standards.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that it is critical to allocate the necessary resources to the National Guard Youth Challenge Program of the Department of Defense as it plays a critical role in preparing the next generation of qualified youth for military service.

SEC. 1072. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NATIONAL PURPLE HEART RECOGNITION DAY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On August 7, 1782, during the Revolutionary War, General George Washington established what is now known as the Purple Heart medal when he issued an order establishing the Badge of Military Merit.

(2) The Badge of Military Merit was designed in the shape of a heart in purple cloth or silk.

(3) While the award of the Badge of Military Merit ceased with the end of the Revolutionary War, the Purple Heart medal was authorized in 1932 as the official successor decoration to the Badge of Military Merit.

(4) The Purple Heart medal is the oldest United States military decoration in present use.

(5) The Purple Heart medal is awarded in the name of the President of the United States to recognize members of the Armed Forces who are killed or wounded in action against an enemy of the United States or are killed or wounded while held as prisoners of war.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Purple Heart Recognition Day; and

(2) encourages all people of the United States—

(A) to learn about the history of the Purple Heart medal;

(B) to honor recipients of the Purple Heart medal; and

(C) to conduct appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for people who have been awarded the Purple Heart medal.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

SEC. 1101. EXTENSION OF DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY FOR DOMESTIC DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE FACILITIES AND MAJOR RANGE AND TEST FACILITIES BASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1125 of subtitle B of title XI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) is amended by striking "During fiscal years 2017 and 2018," and inserting "During each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021,".

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the end of each of fiscal years 2018 through 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives including—

(1) a description of the effect of such section 1125 (as amended by subsection (a)) on the management of the Department of Defense civilian workforce during the most recently ended fiscal year; and

(2) the number of employees—

(A) hired under such section during such fiscal year; and

(B) expected to be hired under such section during the fiscal year in which the briefing is provided.

SEC. 1102. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PAY FOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1107 of subtitle A of title XI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) is amended by striking "September 30, 2018" and inserting "September 30, 2021".

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the end of each of fiscal years 2018 through 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives including—

(1) a description of the effect of such section 1107 (as amended by subsection (a)) on the management of the Department of Defense civilian workforce during the most recently ended fiscal year;

(2) the number of employees offered voluntary separation incentive payments during such fiscal year by operation of such section; and

(3) the number of such employees that accepted such payments.

SEC. 1103. ADDITIONAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY REINVENTION LABORATORIES.

Section 1105(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2487; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(20) The Naval Medical Research Center.

"(21) The Joint Warfighting Analysis Center."

SEC. 1104. ONE YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE ANNUAL LIMITATION ON PREMIUM PAY AND AGGREGATE LIMITATION ON PAY FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES WORKING OVERSEAS.

Subsection (a) of section 1101 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4615), as most recently amended by section 1137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2460), is amended by striking "through 2017" and inserting "through 2018".

SEC. 1105. APPOINTMENT OF RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO POSITIONS IN OR UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—During fiscal years 2017 through 2021, in addition to the authority provided under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) of section 3326 of title 5, United States Code, and consistent with the requirements of such section, a retired member of the armed forces may be appointed under such subsection if—

(1) the Department of Defense has been granted direct hire authority to fill the position;

(2) the appointment is to fill an emergency appointment for which the Secretary concerned determines competitive appointment is not appropriate or reasonable due to the need to fill the emergency need as quickly as possible; or

(3) the appointment is for a highly qualified expert under section 9903 of such title.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the end of each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives including—

(1) with respect to the waiver process under section 3326(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code—

(A) the number of individuals appointed during the most recently ended fiscal year under such process; and

(B) the Department of Defense's plan on the use of such process during the fiscal year in which the report is submitted;

(2) the number of individuals—

(A) appointed under the authority provided by subsection (a) during the most recently ended fiscal year; and

(B) expected to be appointed under such subsection during the fiscal year in which the briefing is provided; and

(3) the impact of subsection (a) on the management of the Department civilian workforce during the most recently ended fiscal year.

SEC. 1106. DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT EXPERTS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WORKFORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1110 of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2017 (Public Law 114–328) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “the Defense Agencies or the applicable military Department” and inserting “a Department of Defense component”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “the Defense Agencies” and inserting “each Department of Defense component listed in subsection (f)(2) other than the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force”;

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “any Defense Agency or military department” and inserting “any Department of Defense component”;

(B) by striking “such Defense Agency or military department” and inserting “such Department of Defense component”;

(4) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘employee’ has the meaning given that term in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COMPONENT.—The term ‘Department of Defense component’ means the following:

“(A) A Defense Agency.

“(B) The Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

“(C) The Joint Staff.

“(D) A combatant command.

“(E) The Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense.

“(F) A Field Activity of the Department of Defense.

“(G) The Department of the Army.

“(H) The Department of the Navy.

“(I) The Department of the Air Force.

“(J) Any organizational entity within the Department of Defense that is not described in subparagraphs (A) through (I).”

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the end of each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives including—

(1) a description of the effect of section 1110 of subtitle A of title XI of the National Defense Authorization Act, 2017 (Public Law 114–328), as amended by subsection (a), on the management of the Department of Defense civilian workforce during the most recently ended fiscal year; and

(2) the number of employees—

(A) hired under such section during such fiscal year; and

(B) expected to be hired under such section during the fiscal year in which the briefing is provided.

SEC. 1107. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR TEMPORARY PERSONNEL FLEXIBILITIES FOR DOMESTIC DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE FACILITIES AND MAJOR RANGE AND TEST FACILITIES BASE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2457) is amended by striking “and 2018” and inserting “through 2021”.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the end of each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives including—

(1) a description of the effect of such section 1132 (as amended by subsection (a)) on the management of civilian personnel at domestic defense industrial base facilities and Major Range and Test Facilities Base during the most recently ended fiscal year; and

(2) the number of employees—

(A) hired under such section during such fiscal year; and

(B) expected to be hired under such section during the fiscal year in which the briefing is provided.

SEC. 1108. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO GRANT ALLOWANCES, BENEFITS, AND GRATUITIES TO CIVILIAN PERSONNEL ON OFFICIAL DUTY IN A COMBAT ZONE.

Paragraph (2) of section 1603(a) of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109–234; 120 Stat. 443), as added by section 1102 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4616) and as most recently amended by section 1133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2459), is further amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2019”.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Subtitle A—Assistance and Training

SEC. 1201. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF LOGISTICAL SUPPORT FOR COALITION FORCES SUPPORTING CERTAIN UNITED STATES MILITARY OPERATIONS.

Section 1234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 394), as most recently amended by section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2473), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal year 2018”;

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “during the period beginning on October 1, 2016, and ending on December 31, 2017” and inserting “during the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending on December 31, 2018”;

(3) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”.

SEC. 1202. MODIFICATION TO SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective as of October 1, 2017, paragraph (1) of section 114(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$2,500,000,000” and inserting “\$2,000,000,000”.

(b) INCREASE IN SIZE OF FUND.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “The size” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (3), the size”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “Of the amount available in the Special Defense Acquisition Fund in any fiscal year after fiscal year 2016, \$500,000,000” and inserting “The size of the Special Defense Acquisition Fund in any fis-

cal year after fiscal year 2017 may exceed the dollar amount limitation described in paragraph (1) by an amount not to exceed \$500,000,000 and such excess amount”.

SEC. 1203. MODIFICATION TO MINISTRY OF DEFENSE ADVISOR AUTHORITY.

(a) MINISTRY OF DEFENSE ADVISOR AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 332 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and members of the armed forces” after “civilian employees of the Department of Defense”.

(b) TRAINING OF PERSONNEL OF FOREIGN INDUSTRIES WITH SECURITY MISSIONS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “to assign civilian employees of the Department of Defense and members of the armed forces as advisors or trainers” after “carry out a program”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(A) by striking “employees” in each place it appears and inserting “advisors or trainers”; and

(B) by striking “each assigned employee’s activities” and inserting “the activities of each assigned advisor or trainer”.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL NOTICE.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “or a member of the armed forces” after “a civilian employee of the Department of Defense”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “employee as an advisor” and inserting “advisor or trainer”; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “employee” and inserting “advisor or trainer”.

SEC. 1204. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO BUILD CAPACITY OF FOREIGN SECURITY FORCES.

Subsection (c) of section 333 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) Institutional capacity building to organize, administer, employ, manage, maintain, sustain, or oversee national security forces.”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting “or the Department of State” after “Department of Defense”;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING” and inserting “RESPECT FOR CIVILIAN CONTROL OF THE MILITARY”;

(B) in the first sentence, by striking “that the Department is already undertaking, or will undertake as part of the program” and all that follows and inserting “that the Department of Defense or another department or agency is already undertaking, or will undertake as part of the security sector assistance provided to the foreign country concerned, a program to enhance the capacity of such foreign country to exercise responsible civilian control of the national security forces of such foreign country.”;

and

(C) by striking the second sentence; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING.—In order to meet the requirement in paragraph (2)(C) with respect to a particular foreign country under a program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall certify, prior to the initiation of the program, that the Department of Defense or another department or agency is already undertaking, or will undertake as part of the security sector assistance provided to the foreign country concerned, a program of institutional capacity building with appropriate institutions of such foreign country to enhance the capacity of such foreign country to organize, administer, employ, manage, maintain, sustain, or oversee the national security forces of such foreign country.”.

SEC. 1205. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY ON TRAINING FOR EASTERN EUROPEAN NATIONAL MILITARY FORCES IN THE COURSE OF MULTILATERAL EXERCISES.

(a) ONE-YEAR EXTENSION.—Subsection (h) of section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1070; 10 U.S.C. 2282 note), as amended by section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2489), is further amended—

(1) by striking “September 30, 2018” and inserting “December 31, 2019”; and

(2) by striking “fiscal years 2016 through 2018” and inserting “for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on December 31, 2019”.

(b) REGULATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF INCREMENTAL EXPENSES.—Subsection (d) of such section, as so amended, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) REGULATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations for payment of incremental expenses under subsection (a). Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall submit the regulations to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

“(B) PROCEDURES TO BE INCLUDED.—The regulations required under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

“(i) Procedures to limit the payment of incremental expenses to developing countries determined pursuant to subsection (c) to be eligible for the provision of training under subsection (a), except in the case of exceptional circumstances as specified in the regulations.

“(ii) Procedures to require reimbursement of incremental expenses from non-developing countries determined pursuant to subsection (c) to be eligible for the provision of training under subsection (a), except in the case of exceptional circumstances as specified in the regulations.

“(C) DEVELOPING COUNTRY DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘developing country’ has the meaning given such term in section 301(4) of title 10, United States Code.”

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section, as so amended, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking “that” and inserting “than”;

(2) in subsection (f), by striking “section 2282” and inserting “chapter 16”; and

(3) in subsection (g), by striking “means” and all that follows and inserting “has the meaning given such term in section 301(5) of title 10, United States Code.”

SEC. 1206. EXTENSION OF PARTICIPATION IN AND SUPPORT OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEFENSE COLLEGE.

Subsection (c) of section 1243 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2516; 10 U.S.C. 1050 note) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “FISCAL YEAR 2017” and inserting “FISCAL YEARS 2017 AND 2018”; and

(2) by striking “fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal years 2017 and 2018”.

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan and Pakistan

SEC. 1211. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER DEFENSE ARTICLES AND PROVIDE DEFENSE SERVICES TO THE MILITARY AND SECURITY FORCES OF AFGHANISTAN.

(a) EXTENSION OF EXPIRATION.—Subsection (h) of section 1222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1992), as most recently amended by section 1213 of the National Defense Au-

thorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2478), is further amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”.

(b) EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.—Subsection (i)(2) of such section, as so amended, is further amended by striking “December 31, 2017,” in each place it appears and inserting “December 31, 2018”.

SEC. 1212. REPORT ON UNITED STATES STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than February 15, 2018, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes the United States strategy in Afghanistan.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of United States assumptions, security interests, and corresponding objectives in Afghanistan.

(2) A description of how current military efforts align to such objectives and, given current or projected progress, a realistic prognosis for a timeline necessary to achieve such objectives.

(3) An explanation of the conditions necessary for the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces to become self-sufficient.

(4) A description of the projected long-term and sustainable United States role in Afghanistan.

(5) A description of the threat of harm to United States forces in Afghanistan and a justification based on the threat to United States interests.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and
(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1213. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN COALITION NATIONS FOR SUPPORT PROVIDED TO UNITED STATES MILITARY OPERATIONS.

(a) EXTENSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 393), as most recently amended by section 1218(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2482), is further amended—

(A) by striking “October 1, 2016” and inserting “October 1, 2017”; and

(B) by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”.

(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the expenditure of funds under the authority in subsection (a)(2) of section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 393), including a description of the following:

(i) The purpose for which such funds were expended.

(ii) Each organization on whose behalf such funds were expended, including the amount expended on such organization and the number of members of such organization supported by such amount.

(iii) Any limitation imposed on the expenditure of funds under such subsection, including on any recipient of funds or any use of funds expended.

(B) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(i) the congressional defense committees; and

(ii) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—Section 1232(b)(6) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 393), as most recently amended by section 1218(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2484), is further amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”.

(c) LIMITATION ON REIMBURSEMENT PENDING CERTIFICATION.—Section 1227(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2001), as most recently amended by section 1218(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2484), is further amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”.

(d) ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS ON REIMBURSEMENT.—

(1) EXTENSION OF LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNTS.—Subsection (d)(1) of section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 393), as most recently amended by section 1218(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2483), is further amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “\$1,000,000,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000,000”;

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “\$900,000,000” and inserting “\$800,000,000”;

(C) by striking “October 1, 2016” in each place it appears and inserting “October 1, 2017”; and

(D) by striking “December 31, 2017” in each place it appears and inserting “December 31, 2018”.

(2) EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS ELIGIBLE FOR WAIVER.—Subsection (g) of section 1218 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2484) is amended—

(A) by striking “October 1, 2016” and inserting “October 1, 2017”; and

(B) by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”.

Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Syria, Iraq, and Iran

SEC. 1221. REPORT ON UNITED STATES STRATEGY IN SYRIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes the strategy of the United States in Syria.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) A description of the key security and geopolitical interests, objectives, and long-term goals in Syria for the United States and indicators for the effectiveness of efforts to achieve such objectives and goals.

(2) A description of United States assumptions regarding the current intelligence picture, the roles and ambitions of other countries, and the interests of relevant Syrian groups with respect to such objectives.

(3) A description of how current military and diplomatic efforts in Syria align with such objectives, and a realistic projection of the timeline necessary to achieve such objectives.

(4) The resources required to achieve such objectives.

(5) An analysis of the threats posed to United States interests by Russian and Iranian influences in Syria, as well as the threats posed to such interests by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, Al Qaeda, Hezbollah, and other violent extremist organizations in Syria.

(6) A description of long-term and sustainable United States involvement in Syria and the conclusion of the current United States effort in Syria.

(7) A description of the coordination between the Department of Defense and the Department of State regarding the transition from military operations to stabilization programming, including a description of how local governance and civil society will be restored in areas secured through United States military operations in Syria.

(8) A description of the threat of harm to United States forces in Syria and a justification based on the threat to United States interests.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and
(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 1222. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO COUNTER THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 1236 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3559), as most recently amended by section 1222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2485), is further amended by striking “December 31, 2018” and inserting “December 31, 2019”.

(b) QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT.—Subsection (d) of such section is further amended—

(1) in the first sentence of the matter preceding paragraph (1), by adding at the end before the period the following: “, which shall be provided in unclassified form with a classified annex if necessary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(12) An assessment of—

“(A) security in liberated areas in Iraq;

“(B) the extent to which security forces trained and equipped, directly or indirectly, through the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC-I) are prepared to provide post-conflict stabilization and security in such liberated areas; and

“(C) the effectiveness of security forces in the post-conflict environment and an identification of which such forces will provide post-conflict stabilization and security in such liberated areas.”

(c) FUNDING.—Subsection (g) of such section is further amended—

(1) by striking “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017” and inserting “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018”;

(2) by striking “fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal year 2018”; and

(3) by striking “\$630,000,000” and inserting “\$1,269,000,000”.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Recognizing the important role of the Iraqi Christian militias within the military campaign against ISIL in Iraq, and the specific threat to the Christian population in Iraq, it is the sense of Congress that the United States should provide arms, training, and appropriate equipment to vetted elements of the Nineveh Plain Council.

SEC. 1223. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO SUPPORT OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF SECURITY COOPERATION IN IRAQ.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (f)(1) of section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1631; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), as most recently amended by section 1223 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal

Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2486), is further amended by striking “fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal year 2018”.

(b) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking “fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal year 2018”; and

(2) by striking “\$70,000,000” and inserting “\$42,000,000”.

(c) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by striking “fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal year 2018”.

SEC. 1224. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THREATS POSED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.

(a) FINDING.—Congress expressed concerns over state-sponsored threats posed by Iran and over Iran’s integration of conventional warfare, cyber and information operations, intelligence operations, and other activities to undermine United States national security interests.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should counter the malign activities of the Government of Iran;

(2) the United States should maintain a capable military presence in the Arabian Gulf region to deter, and, if necessary, respond to Iranian aggression;

(3) the United States should strengthen ballistic missile defense capabilities;

(4) the United States should ensure freedom of navigation at the Bab al Mandab strait and the Strait of Hormuz; and

(5) the United States should counter Iranian efforts to illicitly proliferate weapons, including cruise and ballistic missiles.

Subtitle D—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation

SEC. 1231. EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON MILITARY COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

Section 1232(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2488) is amended by striking “fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal year 2018”.

SEC. 1232. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS RELATING TO SOVEREIGNTY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION OVER CRIMEA.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to implement any activity that recognizes the sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea.

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may waive the restriction on the obligation or expenditure of funds required by subsection (a) if the Secretary—

(1) determines that to do so is in the national security interest of the United States; and

(2) submits a notification of the waiver, at the time the waiver is invoked, to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 1233. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Russian Federation, under the leadership of President Vladimir Putin, continues to demonstrate its malign activities to expand its sphere of influence and undermine international norms and institutions both regionally and globally, including through the following activities:

(A) An assessment of the United States intelligence community stated “. . . Russian Presi-

dent Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election”, presented in the intelligence community’s January 6, 2017, declassified report, “Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent U.S. Elections”.

(B) The Russian Federation has interfered in the April 2017 election and runoff election in May 2017 of the French Presidential elections. As confirmed by Admiral Mike Rogers, Director of the National Security Agency, at a Senate Committee on Armed Services hearing on May 9, 2017, “If you look at the French elections . . . we had become aware of Russian activity.”

(C) The Russian Federation has threatened stability in their sphere of influence. As stated by General Curtis M. Scaparrotti, Commander of the United States European Command, in testimony at a House Committee on Armed Services hearing on March 28, 2017, “In the east, a resurgent Russia has turned from partner to antagonist. Countries along Russia’s periphery, especially Ukraine and Georgia, are under threat from Moscow’s malign influence and military aggression.”

(D) The Russian Federation has occupied and attempted to annex Crimea from Ukraine.

(E) The Russian Federation has employed hybrid warfare tactics, including cyber warfare, electronic warfare, and information warfare to gain influence. This includes the use of hybrid tactics in assisting combined Russian-separatist forces in eastern Ukraine and, in 2008, the Russian incursion in Georgia.

(F) Military intervention in the civil war in Syria.

(2) Both the Secretary of Defense, James Mattis, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Joseph Dunford, highlight the Russian Federation as the number one geo-strategic threat to the United States.

(3) The Government of the Russian Federation continues its decades’ long modernization of its conventional military force with the buildup of large numbers of professionalized forces on Russia’s borders with Europe, re-establishing military presence in the Arctic, investment in its nuclear triad, advanced weapons systems, fighter jets, and naval vessels.

(4) In June 2016, the Center for Strategic and International Studies released its report, “Evaluating U.S. Army Force Posture in Europe: Phase II”, which included the recommendation that an Armed Brigade Combat Team and a combat aviation brigade should be permanently assigned to Europe. The report also recommends additional prepositioned equipment in Western Europe.

(5) In January 2016, the National Commission on the Future of the Army released its findings and recommendations, which included Recommendation 14, calling for permanently stationing an Armored Brigade Combat Team Forward in Europe and Recommendation 15 calling for the conversion of Army Europe Aviation Headquarters to a warfighting mission command.

(6) In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328), Congress authorized approximately \$5,200,000 for the European Reassurance Initiative, now the European Deterrence Initiative, to reassure partners and allies and begin building a credible deterrence to the Russian Federation through—

(A) large increases in conventional resources, including additional rotational deployments of United States troops and prepositioning of equipment into Europe; and

(B) increased funding for unconventional warfare resources, including cyber and special

operations forces, and for intelligence and indicators and warnings.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States to develop, implement, and sustain credible deterrence against aggression by the Government of the Russian Federation, in order to enhance regional and global security and stability.

(2) CONDUCT OF POLICY.—The policy described in paragraph (1) shall, among other things, be carried out through a comprehensive defense strategy and guidance to outline and resource the necessary defense capabilities in the European theater. Such policy shall include the following:

(A) Increased United States presence in Europe through additional permanently stationed forces.

(B) Continued United States presence in Europe through additional rotational forces.

(C) Increased United States prepositioned military equipment to include logistics enablers and a division headquarters.

(D) Sufficient and necessary infrastructure additions and improvements throughout the European theater.

(E) Increased investment and priority to counter unconventional methods of warfare, including sufficient cyber warfare resources, information operations resources, and intelligence resources.

(F) Effective security cooperation resources and opportunities with partners and allies, including NATO member countries.

SEC. 1234. MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION OF UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.

Section 1250 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 129 Stat. 1068), as amended by section 1237 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2494), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$175,000,000 of the funds available for fiscal year 2017 pursuant to subsection (f)(2)” and inserting “\$75,000,000 of the funds available for fiscal year 2018 pursuant to subsection (f)(3)”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal year 2018”; and

(ii) by striking “\$100,000,000” and inserting “\$50,000,000”;

(2) in subsection (f), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) For fiscal year 2018, \$150,000,000.”; and

(3) in subsection (h), by striking “December 31, 2018” and inserting “December 31, 2019”.

SEC. 1235. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS RELATING TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OPEN SKIES TREATY.

(a) LIMITATION ON CONDUCT OF FLIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, or operation and maintenance, Air Force, may be obligated or expended to conduct any flight during such fiscal year for purposes of implementing the Open Skies Treaty until the date that is seven days after the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a plan described in paragraph (2) with respect to such fiscal year.

(2) PLAN DESCRIBED.—The plan described in this paragraph is a plan developed by the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of National Intelligence, that contains a description of the objectives for all planned flights described in paragraph (1) during such fiscal year.

(3) UPDATE.—To the extent necessary and appropriate, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of National Intelligence, may update the plan described in paragraph (2) with respect to a fiscal year and submit the updated plan to the appropriate congressional committees.

(4) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence and Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(5) SUNSET.—The requirements of this subsection shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) PROHIBITION ON ACTIVITIES TO MODIFY UNITED STATES AIRCRAFT.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for arms control implementation (PE 0305145F) or procurement, Air Force, for digital visual imaging system (BA–05, Line Item #1900) may be obligated or expended to carry out any activities to modify any United States aircraft for purposes of implementing the Open Skies Treaty.

(c) OPEN SKIES TREATY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Open Skies Treaty” means the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002.

SEC. 1236. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPORTANCE OF NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES OF NATO.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Warsaw Summit Communiqué, issued on July 9, 2016, by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (in this section referred to as “NATO”) clearly defines the need for, and the importance of, the nuclear mission of NATO.

(2) The Warsaw Summit Communiqué states—

(A) with respect to the nuclear deterrence capability of NATO, “As a means to prevent conflict and war, credible deterrence and defence is essential. Therefore, deterrence and defence, based on an appropriate mix of nuclear, conventional, and missile defence capabilities, remains a core element of our overall strategy . . . The fundamental purpose of NATO’s nuclear capability is to preserve peace, prevent coercion, and deter aggression. Nuclear weapons are unique. Any employment of nuclear weapons against NATO would fundamentally alter the nature of a conflict. The circumstances in which NATO might have to use nuclear weapons are extremely remote”;

(B) with respect to the nature of the nuclear deterrence posture of NATO, “NATO must continue to adapt its strategy in line with trends in the security environment—including with respect to capabilities and other measures required—to ensure that NATO’s overall deterrence and defence posture is capable of addressing potential adversaries’ doctrine and capabilities, and that it remains credible, flexible, resilient, and adaptable.”; and

(C) with respect to the importance of contributions to the nuclear deterrence mission from across the NATO alliance, “The strategic forces of the Alliance, particularly those of the United States, are the supreme guarantee of the security of the Allies. The independent strategic nuclear forces of the United Kingdom and France have a deterrent role of their own and contribute to the overall security of the Alliance. These Allies’ separate centres of decision-making contribute to deterrence by complicating the calculations of potential adversaries. NATO’s

nuclear deterrence posture also relies, in part, on United States’ nuclear weapons forward-deployed in Europe and on capabilities and infrastructure provided by Allies concerned. These Allies will ensure that all components of NATO’s nuclear deterrent remain safe, secure, and effective. That requires sustained leadership focus and institutional excellence for the nuclear deterrence mission and planning guidance aligned with 21st century requirements. The Alliance will ensure the broadest possible participation of Allies concerned in their agreed nuclear burden-sharing arrangements.”.

(3) Secretary of Defense James Mattis, in response to the advance policy questions for his Senate confirmation hearing on January 12, 2017, stated that—

(A) “NATO’s nuclear deterrence posture relies in part on U.S. nuclear weapons forward-deployed in Europe and on capabilities and infrastructure provided by NATO allies. These capabilities include dual-capable aircraft that contribute to current burden-sharing arrangements within NATO. In general, we must take care to maintain this particular capability, and to modernize it appropriately and in a timely fashion.”; and

(B) the role of the nuclear weapons of the United States is “to deter nuclear war and to serve as last resort weapons of self-defense. In this sense, U.S. nuclear weapons are fundamental to our nation’s security and have historically provided a deterrent against aggression and security assurance to U.S. allies. A robust, flexible, and survivable U.S. nuclear arsenal underpins the U.S. ability to deploy conventional forces worldwide.”.

(4) On March 28, 2017, General Curtis Scaparrotti, Commander of the United States European Command and the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, testified to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that “NATO and U.S. nuclear forces continue to be a vital component of our deterrence. Our modernization efforts are crucial; we must preserve a ready, credible, and safe nuclear capability.”.

(5) The Russian Federation is currently undergoing significant modernization and recapitalization of all three legs of its nuclear triad, continues to field and modernize a large variety of non-strategic nuclear weapons, and is developing and deploying new and unique nuclear capabilities.

(6) Russia remains in violation of the INF Treaty due to the development, testing, and, most recently, the operational deployment of ground-launched cruise missiles in violation of the INF Treaty.

(7) On March 28, 2017, General Paul Selva, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, described the security consequences of the deployment of such INF Treaty-violating missiles, testifying to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives that “our assessment of the impact is that it more threatens NATO and infrastructure within the European continent than any other . . . area of the world that we have national interests in or alliance interests in.”.

(8) On March 28, 2017, General Curtis Scaparrotti, in testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, responded to a question asking if Russia intends to return to compliance with the INF Treaty by stating, “I don’t have any indication that they will at this time.”.

(9) Rhetoric from Russian officials has demonstrated that Moscow has sought to leverage its nuclear arsenal to threaten and intimidate neighboring countries, including members of NATO, as was the case when the Russian Ambassador to Denmark stated, “Danish warships will be targets for Russian nuclear missiles” in

response to Denmark's potential cooperation in the NATO missile defense system.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the nuclear and conventional deterrence capabilities of NATO are of critical importance to the security of the United States and of the NATO alliance, and must continue to adapt to the changed security environment in Europe;

(2) the ability of the United States to forward-deploy dual-capable aircraft and nuclear weapons, and of select members of NATO to participate in the nuclear deterrence mission of NATO by hosting forward-deployed nuclear weapons of the United States or operating dual-capable aircraft, is central to the credibility of the nuclear deterrence and defense posture of NATO;

(3) the strategic forces of the United States, the independent nuclear forces of the United Kingdom and the French Republic, and the dual-capable aircraft operated by the United States and other members of NATO constitute foundational elements of the nuclear deterrence and defense posture of NATO;

(4) NATO should modernize its nuclear-related infrastructure to ensure the highest-level of safety and security;

(5) effective deterrence requires NATO to conduct nuclear planning and exercises aligned with 21st century requirements and modernize nuclear-related capabilities and infrastructure, including dual-capable aircraft, command and control networks, and facilities; and

(6) to ensure the continued credibility of the deterrence and defense posture of NATO, the planned completion of F-35A aircraft development and testing, as well as the delivery of such aircraft to members of NATO, must not be delayed.

(c) **INF TREATY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “INF Treaty” means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the “Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty”, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

SEC. 1237. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SUPPORT FOR GEORGIA.

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

(1) Georgia is a valued friend of the United States and has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to advancing the mutual interests of both countries, including the deployment of Georgian forces as part of the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan and the Multi-National Force in Iraq.

(2) The European Deterrence Initiative builds the partnership capacity of Georgia so it can work more closely with the United States and NATO, as well as provide for its own defense.

(3) In addition to the European Deterrence Initiative, Georgia's participation in the NATO initiative Partnership for Peace is paramount to interoperability with the United States and NATO, and establishing a more peaceful environment in the region.

(4) Despite the losses suffered, as a NATO partner of ISAF, Georgia is engaged in the Resolute Support Mission in Afghanistan with the second largest contingent on the ground.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—Congress—

(1) reaffirms United States support for Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity within its internationally-recognized borders, and does not recognize the independence of the Abkhazia and South Ossetia regions currently occupied by the Russian Federation; and

(2) supports continued cooperation between the United States and Georgia and the efforts of the Government of Georgia to provide for the defense of its people and sovereign territory.

SEC. 1238. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SUPPORT FOR ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA.

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

(1) The Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are highly valued allies of the United States, and they have repeatedly demonstrated their commitment to advancing our mutual interests as well as those of the NATO Alliance.

(2) Operation Atlantic Resolve is a series of exercises and coordinating efforts demonstrating the United States' commitment to its European partners and allies, including the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, with the shared goal of peace and stability in the region. Operation Atlantic Resolve strengthens communication and understanding, and is an important effort to deter Russian aggression in the region.

(3) Through Operation Atlantic Resolve, the European Deterrence Initiative undertakes exercises, training, and rotational presence necessary to reassure and integrate our allies, including the Baltic States, into a common defense framework.

(4) All three Baltic States contributed to the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, sending disproportionate numbers of troops and operating with few caveats. The Baltic States continue to engage in Operation Resolute Support in Afghanistan.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—Congress—

(1) reaffirms its support for the principle of collective defense in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty for our NATO allies, including Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

(2) supports the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, and inviolability of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as well as their internationally recognized borders, and expresses concerns over increasingly aggressive military maneuvering by the Russian Federation near their borders and airspace;

(3) expresses concern over and condemns subversive and destabilizing activities by the Russian Federation within the Baltic States; and

(4) encourages the Administration to further enhance defense cooperation efforts with Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and supports the efforts of their Governments to provide for the defense of their people and sovereign territory.

Subtitle E—Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty Preservation Act of 2017

SEC. 1241. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty Preservation Act of 2017”.

SEC. 1242. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The 2014, 2015, and 2016 Department of State reports entitled, “Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments”, all stated that “the Russian Federation has determined that “the Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty not to possess, produce, or flight-test a ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM) with a range capability of 500 km to 5,500 km, or to possess or produce launchers of such missiles”.

(2) The 2016 report also noted that “the cruise missile developed by Russia meets the INF Treaty definition of a ground-launched cruise missile with a range capability of 500 km to 5,500 km, and as such, all missiles of that type, and all launchers of the type used or tested to launch such a missile, are prohibited under the provisions of the INF Treaty”.

(3) Potential consistency and compliance concerns regarding the INF Treaty noncompliant GLCM have existed since 2008, were not officially raised with the Russian Federation until 2013, and were not briefed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) until January 2014.

(4) The United States Government is aware of other consistency and compliance concerns regarding Russia actions vis-à-vis its INF Treaty obligations.

(5) Since 2013, senior United States officials, including the President, the Secretary of State, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have raised Russian noncompliance with the INF Treaty to their counterparts, but no progress has been made in bringing the Russian Federation back into compliance with the INF Treaty.

(6) In April 2014, General Breedlove, the Supreme Allied Commander Europe, correctly stated, “A weapon capability that violates the INF, that is introduced into the greater European land mass, is absolutely a tool that will have to be dealt with . . . It can't go unanswered.”.

(7) The Department of Defense in its September 2013 report, Report on Conventional Prompt Global Strike Options if Exempt from the Restrictions of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, stated that it has multiple validated military requirement gaps due to the prohibitions imposed on the United States as a result of its compliance with the INF Treaty.

(8) It is not in the national security interests of the United States to be unilaterally legally prohibited from developing dual-capable ground-launched cruise missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers, while Russia makes advances in developing and fielding this class of weapon systems, and such unilateral limitation cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely.

(9) Admiral Harry Harris, Jr., Commander of the United States Pacific Command, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 27, 2017, that “[W]e're in a multi-polar world where we have a lot of countries who are developing these weapons, including China, that I worry about. And I worry about their DF-21 and DF-26 missile programs, their anti-carrier ballistic missile programs, if you will. INF doesn't address missiles launched from ships or airplanes, but it focuses on those land-based systems. I think there's goodness in the INF treaty, anything you can do to limit nuclear weapons writ-large is generally good. But the aspects of the INF Treaty that limit our ability to counter Chinese and other countries' land-based missiles, I think, is problematic.”.

(10) A material breach of the INF Treaty by the Russian Federation affords the United States the right to invoke legal countermeasures which include suspension of the treaty in whole or in part.

(11) Article XV of the INF Treaty provides that “Each Party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from this Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this Treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests.”.

SEC. 1243. COMPLIANCE ENFORCEMENT REGARDING RUSSIAN VIOLATIONS OF THE INF TREATY.

(a) **STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States as follows:

(1) The actions undertaken by the Russian Federation in violation of the INF Treaty constitute a material breach of the treaty.

(2) In light of the Russian Federation's material breach of the INF Treaty, the United States is legally entitled to suspend the operation of the INF Treaty in whole or in part for so long as the Russian Federation continues to be in material breach.

(3) For so long as the Russian Federation remains in noncompliance with the INF Treaty, the United States should take actions to encourage the Russian Federation return to compliance, including by—

(A) providing additional funds for the capabilities identified in section 1243(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1062); and

(B) seeking additional missile defense assets in the European theater to protect United States and NATO forces from ground-launched missile systems of the Russian Federation that are in noncompliance with the INF Treaty.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2018 for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the funding table in division D, \$50,000,000 shall be made available for—

(A) the development of active defenses to counter ground-launched missile systems with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers;

(B) counterforce capabilities to prevent attacks from these missiles; and

(C) countervailing strike capabilities to enhance the capabilities of the United States identified in section 1243(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1062).

(2) DEVELOPMENT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1), \$25,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for activities undertaken to carry out section 1244(a), including with respect to research and development activities.

SEC. 1244. DEVELOPMENT OF INF RANGE GROUND-LAUNCHED MISSILE SYSTEM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROGRAM OF RECORD.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program of record to develop a conventional road-mobile ground-launched cruise missile system with a range of between 500 to 5,500 kilometers.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the cost, schedule, and feasibility to modify existing and planned missile systems, including the tomahawk land attack cruise missile, the standard missile-3, the standard missile-6, and Army tactical missile system missiles for ground launch with a range of between 500 and 5,500 kilometers in order to provide any of the capabilities identified in section 1243(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1062).

SEC. 1245. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT RELATED TO RUSSIAN FEDERATION DEVELOPMENT OF NONCOMPLIANT SYSTEMS AND UNITED STATES ACTIONS REGARDING MATERIAL BREACH OF INF TREATY BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Congress declares that because of the Russian Federation's violations of the INF Treaty, including the flight-test, production, and possession of prohibited systems, its actions have defeated the object and purpose of the INF Treaty, and thus constitute a material breach of the INF Treaty.

(b) NOTIFICATION BY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of any development, deployment, or test of a system by the Russian Federation that the Director determines is inconsistent with the INF Treaty.

(2) DEADLINE.—A notification under this subsection shall be made not later than 15 days after the date on which the Director makes the determination under this subsection with respect to which the notification is required.

(c) REPORT BY PRESIDENT.—Not later than 15 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a determination of the President of whether the Russian Federation has flight-tested, produced, or is in possession of a ground-launched cruise missile or ground-launched ballistic missile with a range of between 500 and 5,500 kilometers during each of the three consecutive 120-day periods beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) UNITED STATES ACTIONS.—If the determination of the President contained in the report required to be submitted under subsection (c) is that the Russian Federation has flight-tested, produced, or is in possession of any missile described in subsection (c) during each of the periods described in subsection (c), the prohibitions set forth in Article VI of the INF Treaty shall no longer be binding on the United States as a matter of United States law.

SEC. 1246. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS TO EXTEND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW START TREATY.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to extend the implementation of the New START Treaty unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Russian Federation has verifiably eliminated all missiles that are in violation of or may be inconsistent with the INF Treaty.

SEC. 1247. REVIEW OF RS-26 BALLISTIC MISSILE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall conduct a review of the RS-26 ballistic missile of the Russian Federation.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the review conducted under subsection (a). The report shall include—

(1) a determination whether the RS-26 ballistic missile is covered under the New START Treaty or would be a violation of the INF Treaty because Russia has flight-tested such missile to ranges covered by the INF Treaty in more than one warhead configuration; and

(2) if the President determines that the RS-26 ballistic missile is covered under the New START Treaty, a determination whether the Russian Federation—

(A) has agreed through the Bilateral Consultative Commission that such a system is limited under the New START Treaty central limits; and

(B) has agreed to an exhibition of such a system.

(c) EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.—If the President, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of National Intelligence, determines that the RS-26 ballistic missile is covered under the New START Treaty and that the Russian Federation has not taken the steps described under subsection (b)(2), the United States Government shall consider for purposes of all policies and decisions that the RS-26 ballistic missile of the Russian Federation is a violation of the INF Treaty.

SEC. 1248. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) INF TREATY.—The term “INF Treaty” means the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

(3) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term “intelligence community” has the meaning given the term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

(4) NEW START TREATY.—The term “New START Treaty” means the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed at Prague April 8, 2010, and entered into force February 5, 2011.

(5) OPEN SKIES TREATY.—The term “Open Skies Treaty” means the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002.

Subtitle F—Fostering Unity Against Russian Aggression Act of 2017

SEC. 1251. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Fostering Unity Against Russian Aggression Act of 2017”.

SEC. 1252. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) General Curtis M. Scaparrotti, Commander of the United States European Command, testified before the House Armed Services Committee on March 27, 2017, that “Today we face the most dynamic European security environment in history.” and that “Russia’s malign actions are supported by its diplomatic, information, economic, and military initiatives.”

(2) The Russian Federation has shifted to a military doctrine that envisions using nuclear weapons in an attempt to end a failing regional conventional conflict. On June 25, 2015, Deputy Secretary of Defense Robert Work and then-Vice-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral James Winnefeld testified before the House Armed Services Committee that “Russian military doctrine includes what some have called an ‘escalate to de-escalate’ strategy—a strategy that purportedly seeks to deescalate a conventional conflict through coercive threats, including limited nuclear use. We think that this label is dangerously misleading. Anyone who thinks they can control escalation through the use of nuclear weapons is literally playing with fire. Escalation is escalation, and nuclear use would be the ultimate escalation.”

(3) General Scaparrotti noted in his March 27, 2017, testimony before the House Armed Services Committee that “Moscow’s provocative rhetoric and nuclear threats increase the likelihood of misunderstanding and miscalculation.”

(4) The Russian Federation continues to conduct ongoing influence campaigns aimed at undermining democracies around the world. According to an assessment by the intelligence community, “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election”, which included the use of the Russian military intelligence organization. The intelligence community also assessed that Russia would apply lessons learned to future influence efforts worldwide, including against United States allies and their election systems.

(5) The Russian Federation continues its aggression on its periphery. In 2008, the Russian

Federation fomented conflict in Georgia. Further, the Russian Federation is directing combined Russian-Separatist units in eastern Ukraine, actively inciting violence and prolonging the most significant conflict in Europe.

(6) The investment of over \$5 billion in the European Reassurance Initiative (ERI), now the European Deterrence Initiative (EDI), has proven successful in significantly enhancing the ability of United States forces, NATO allies, and regional partners to deter Russian aggression. EDI has not only assured our European allies and partners but supported essential investments in NATO's military capacity, interoperability, and agility.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the risks of miscalculation in a crisis are exacerbated by the Russian Federation's shift to a military doctrine of "escalate to de-escalate", lowering the threshold for Russian use of nuclear weapons and thereby increasing the risk of using nuclear weapons, potentially escalating in to a massive nuclear exchange;

(2) subversive and destabilizing activities by the Russian Federation targeting NATO allies and partners causes concern and should be condemned;

(3) European Deterrence Initiative (EDI) investments are long-term and, as such, Congress expects future budgets to reflect United States commitment by planning for funding in the base budget, and further EDI should build on United States presence by increasing the United States permanent force posture; and

(4) credible deterrence requires steadfast cooperation and joint action with NATO allies and partners and other United States allies and partners in Europe.

SEC. 1253. STRATEGY TO COUNTER THREATS BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and in consultation with each of the Secretaries of the military departments, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the commanders of each of the regional and functional combatant commands, shall develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to counter threats by the Russian Federation.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the strategy required by subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by this subsection shall include the following elements:

(A) An evaluation of strategic objectives and motivations of the Russian Federation.

(B) A detailed description of Russian threats to the national security of the United States, including threats that may pose challenges below the threshold of armed conflict.

(C) A discussion of how the strategy complements the National Defense Strategy and the National Military Strategy.

(D) A discussion of the ends, ways, and means inherent to the strategy.

(E) A discussion of the strategy's objectives with respect to deterrence, escalation control, and conflict resolution.

(F) A description of the military activities across geographic regions and military functions and domains that are inherent to the strategy.

(G) A description of the posture, forward presence, and readiness requirements inherent to the strategy.

(H) A description of the roles of the United States Armed Forces in implementing the strategy, including—

(i) the role of United States nuclear capabilities;

(ii) the role of United States space capabilities;

(iii) the role of United States cyber capabilities;

(iv) the role of United States conventional ground forces;

(v) the role of United States naval forces;

(vi) the role of United States air forces; and

(vii) the role of United States special operations forces.

(I) An assessment of the force requirements needed to implement and sustain the strategy.

(J) A description of the logistical requirements needed to implement and sustain the strategy.

(K) An assessment of the technological research and development requirements needed to implement and sustain the strategy.

(L) An assessment of the training and exercise requirements needed to implement and sustain the strategy.

(M) An assessment of the budgetary resource requirements needed to implement and sustain the strategy through December 31, 2030.

(N) A discussion of how the strategy provides a framework for future planning and investments in regional defense initiatives, including the European Deterrence Initiative.

(3) FORM.—The report required by this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 1254. STRATEGY TO INCREASE CONVENTIONAL PRECISION STRIKE WEAPON STOCKPILES IN THE UNITED STATES EUROPEAN COMMAND'S AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall develop and implement a strategy to increase conventional precision strike weapon stockpiles in the United States European Command's areas of responsibility.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required by this subsection shall include necessary increases in the quantities of such stockpiles that the Secretary determines will enhance deterrence and warfighting capability of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the strategy required by subsection (a).

(2) FORM.—The report required by this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 1255. PLAN TO COUNTER THE MILITARY CAPABILITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop and implement a plan to counter the military capabilities of the Russian Federation.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan required by this subsection shall include the following:

(A) Accelerating programs to improve the capability of United States military forces to operate in a Global Positioning System (GPS)-denied or GPS-degraded environment.

(B) Accelerating programs of the Department of the Army to counter Russian unmanned aircraft systems, electronic warfare, and long-range precision strike capabilities.

(C) Countering unconventional capabilities and hybrid threats from the Russian Federation.

(D) Any other elements that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the plan required by subsection (a).

(2) FORM.—The report required by this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that concerns persist over the growing sophistication of unconventional and hybrid state-sponsored threats by the Russian Federation as demonstrated through its advancement and integration of conventional warfare, economic warfare, cyber and information operations, intelligence operations, and other activities to undermine United States national security objectives.

SEC. 1256. PLAN TO INCREASE CYBER AND INFORMATION OPERATIONS, DETERRENCE, AND DEFENSE.

(a) PLAN.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly develop a plan to—

(1) increase inclusion of regional cyber planning within larger United States joint planning exercises in the European region;

(2) enhance joint, regional, and combined information operations and strategic communication strategies to counter Russian Federation information warfare, malign influence, and propaganda activities; and

(3) identify potential areas of cybersecurity collaboration and partnership capabilities with NATO and other European allies and partners of the United States.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the plan required under subsection (a).

SEC. 1257. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ENHANCING MARITIME CAPABILITIES.

Congress notes the 2016 Force Structure Assessment (FSA) that increased the requirement for fast attack submarine (SSN) from 48 to 66 and supports an acquisition plan that enhances maritime capabilities that address this requirement.

SEC. 1258. PLAN TO REDUCE THE RISKS OF MISCALCULATION AND UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES THAT COULD PRECIPITATE A NUCLEAR WAR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Russian Federation has adopted a dangerous nuclear doctrine that includes a strategy of "escalate to de-escalate", which could lower the threshold for Russian use of nuclear weapons in a regional conflict; and

(2) such nuclear doctrine exacerbates the risks of miscalculation and unintended consequences that could precipitate a nuclear war.

(b) PLAN REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff, the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, and the Commander of the United States European Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan that includes options to reduce the risk of miscalculation and unintended consequences that could precipitate a nuclear war.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The plan required under this subsection shall include—

(A) an assessment of the value of military-to-military dialog to reduce such risk; and

(B) any other recommendations the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 1259. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) NATO.—The term "NATO" means the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Subtitle G—Matters Relating to the Indo-Asia-Pacific Region

SEC. 1261. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the security, stability, and prosperity of the Indo-Asia-Pacific region are vital to the national interests of the United States;

(2) the United States should maintain a military capability in the region that is able to project power, deter acts of aggression, and respond, if necessary, to regional threats;

(3) continuing efforts by the Department of Defense to realign forces, commit additional assets, and increase investments to the Indo-Asia-Pacific region are necessary to maintain a robust United States commitment to the region;

(4) the Secretary of Defense should—

(A) assess the current United States force posture in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region to ensure that the United States maintains an appropriate forward presence in the region;

(B) invest in critical munitions, undersea warfare capabilities, amphibious capabilities, resilient space architectures, missile defense, offensive and defensive cyber capabilities, and other capabilities conducive to operating effectively in contested environments; and

(C) enhance regional force readiness through joint training and exercises, considering contingencies ranging from grey zone to high-end near-peer conflict; and

(5) the United States should continue to engage in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region by strengthening alliances and partnerships, supporting regional institutions and bodies such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), building cooperative security arrangements, addressing shared challenges, and reinforcing the role of international law.

SEC. 1262. REPORT ON STRATEGY TO PRIORITIZE UNITED STATES DEFENSE INTERESTS IN THE INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) **REQUIRED REPORT.**—Not later than February 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains a strategy to prioritize United States defense interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. The strategy shall address the following:

(1) The security challenges, including threats, emanating from the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(2) The primary objectives and priorities in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region, including—

(A) the military missions necessary to address threats on the Korean Peninsula;

(B) the role of the Department of Defense in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region regarding security challenges posed by China;

(C) the primary objectives and priorities for combating terrorism in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region;

(3) Department of Defense plans, force posture, capabilities, and resources to address any gaps.

(4) The roles of allies, partners, and other countries in achieving United States defense objectives and priorities.

(5) Actions the Department of Defense could take, in cooperation with other Federal departments or agencies, to advance United States national security interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(6) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense determines to be appropriate.

(b) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(c) **ANNUAL BUDGET.**—The President, acting through the Director of the Office of Manage-

ment and Budget, shall ensure that the annual budget submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, clearly highlights programs and projects that are being funded in the annual budget of the United States Government that relate to the strategy referred to in subsection (a).

(d) **REPEAL.**—Section 1251 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3570) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 1263. ASSESSMENT OF UNITED STATES FORCE POSTURE AND BASING NEEDS IN THE INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) **ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an assessment of United States force posture and basing needs in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A review of military requirements based on operation and contingency plans, scenarios, capabilities of potential adversaries, and any assessed gaps or shortfalls of the Armed Forces.

(B) A review of current United States military force posture and deployment plans of the United States Pacific Command.

(C) An analysis of potential future realignments of United States forces in the region, including options for strengthening United States presence, access, readiness, training, exercises, logistics, and pre-positioning.

(D) A discussion of any factors that may influence the United States posture.

(E) Any recommended changes to the United States posture in the region.

(F) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense determines to be appropriate.

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the assessment required under subsection (a).

(2) **FORM.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 1264. EXTENDED DETERRENCE COMMITMENT TO THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

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

(1) The 2010 Nuclear Posture Review reaffirmed the commitment of the United States to extended deterrence and continued protection of the treaty allies of the United States under the United States nuclear umbrella.

(2) The United States–Republic of Korea Deterrence Strategy Committee and the United States–Japan Extended Deterrence Dialogue provide valuable communication channels for ensuring the commitment of the United States to the policy of extended nuclear deterrence and allow for bilateral discussions on how United States capabilities can be leveraged to credibly deter, and if necessary, defeat, North Korean nuclear weapons, weapons of mass destruction, and missile threats and aggression.

(3) Statements by officials of the United States have consistently emphasized the United States commitment to providing extended deterrence and defense across the full spectrum of military capabilities, including nuclear capabilities.

(4) On September 9, 2016, President Obama responded to a North Korean nuclear test by issuing the following statement, “I restated to President Park and Prime Minister Abe the unshakable U.S. commitment to take necessary steps to defend our allies in the region, including through our deployment of a Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) battery to the ROK, and the commitment to extended deterrence, guaranteed by the full spectrum of U.S. defense capabilities.”.

(5) On October 14, 2016, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Joseph Dunford, “reaffirmed the ironclad commitment of the U.S. to defend both the ROK and Japan and provide extended deterrence guaranteed by the full spectrum of U.S. military capabilities, including conventional, nuclear, and missile defense capabilities”.

(6) On October 19, 2016, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter, stated, “the U.S. commitment to the defense of South Korea is unwavering. This includes our commitment to provide extended deterrence, guaranteed by the full spectrum of U.S. defense capabilities. Make no mistake: Any attack on America or our allies will not only be defeated, but any use of nuclear weapons will be met with an overwhelming and effective response.”.

(7) On October 19, 2016, Secretary of State John Kerry, during a joint press conference with the South Korean Foreign Minister, confirmed the United States would “defend South Korea through a robust combined defense posture and through extended deterrence, including the US nuclear umbrella, conventional strike and missile defense capabilities.”.

(8) On February 3, 2017, Secretary of Defense James Mattis, during a visit to South Korea, stated, “America’s commitments to defending our allies and to upholding our extended deterrence guarantees remain ironclad: Any attack on the United States, or our allies, will be defeated, and any use of nuclear weapons would be met with a response that would be effective and overwhelming.”.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the defense of the Republic of Korea and Japan must remain a top priority for the administration;

(2) the United States maintains an unwavering and steadfast commitment to the policy of extended deterrence, especially with respect to South Korea and Japan;

(3) bilateral extended deterrence dialogues and discussions with South Korea and Japan are of great value to the United States and its partners and must remain a central component of these relationships;

(4) the United States must sustain and modernize current United States nuclear capabilities to ensure the extended deterrence commitments of the United States remain credible and executable; and

(5) the timely development, production, and deployment of modern nuclear-capable aircraft are fundamental to ensure that the United States remains able to meet extended deterrence requirements in the Asia-Pacific region far into the future.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to alter the shared goal of the United States, South Korea, and Japan for a denuclearized Korean Peninsula or to change the United States nuclear posture in the Asia-Pacific region.

SEC. 1265. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO MEET UNITED STATES FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS UNDER COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION WITH PALAU.

There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 \$123,900,000 to the Secretary of the Interior, to remain available until expended, for use in meeting the financial obligations of the Government of the United States under the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Palau under section 432 of the Compact of Free Association with Palau (48 U.S.C. 1931 note; Public Law 99–658).

SEC. 1266. SENSE OF CONGRESS REAFFIRMING SECURITY COMMITMENTS TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF JAPAN AND SOUTH KOREA AND TRILATERAL COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES, JAPAN, AND SOUTH KOREA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States values its alliances with the Governments of Japan and the Republic of Korea, based on shared values of democracy, the rule of law, free and open markets, and respect for human rights;

(2) the United States reaffirms its commitment to these alliances with Japan and South Korea, which are critical for the preservation of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region and throughout the world;

(3) the United States recognizes the substantial financial commitments of Japan and South Korea to the maintenance of United States forces in these countries, making them among the most significant burden-sharing partners of the United States;

(4) the United States reaffirms its commitment to Article V of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States of America and Japan, which applies to the Japanese-administered Senkaku Islands;

(5) the United States supports continued implementation and expansion of defense cooperation with Japan in accordance with the 2015 U.S.-Japan Defense Guidelines and additional measures to strengthen this defense cooperation, including by expanding foreign military sales, establishing new cooperative technology development programs, increasing military exercises, or other actions as appropriate;

(6) the United States and South Korea share deep concerns that the nuclear and ballistic missile programs of North Korea and its repeated provocations pose great threats to peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula, and the United States recognizes that South Korea has made important commitments to the bilateral security alliance, including by hosting a Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system;

(7) the United States and South Korea should continue further defense cooperation, by enhancing mutual security based on the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of Korea and investing in capabilities critical to the combined defense;

(8) the United States welcomes greater security cooperation with, and among, Japan and South Korea to promote mutual interests and address shared concerns, including the bilateral military intelligence-sharing pact between Japan and South Korea, signed on November 23, 2016, and the trilateral intelligence sharing agreement between the United States, Japan, and South Korea, signed on December 29, 2015; and

(9) recognizing that North Korea poses a threat to the United States, Japan, and South Korea, and that the security of the three countries is intertwined, the United States welcomes and encourages deeper trilateral defense cooperation, including through expanded exercises, training, and information sharing that strengthens integration.

SEC. 1267. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION OPERATIONS IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States has a national interest in maintaining freedom of navigation, respect for international law, and unimpeded lawful commerce in the South China Sea;

(2) the United States should condemn any assertion that limits the right to freedom of navigation and overflight; and

(3) the United States should keep to a regular and routine schedule for freedom of navigation operations in the sea and air.

SEC. 1268. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON STRENGTHENING THE DEFENSE OF TAIWAN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96–8; 22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) codified the basis for commercial, cultural, and other relations between the United States and Taiwan, and the Six Assurances are an important aspect in guiding bilateral relations;

(2) Section 3(a) of that Act states that “the United States will make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability”;

(3) the United States, in accordance with such section, should make available and provide timely review of requests for defense articles and defense services that may be necessary for Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability;

(4) Taiwan should significantly increase its defense budget to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability;

(5) the United States should support expanded exchanges focused on practical training for Taiwan personnel by and with United States military units, including exchanges between services, to empower senior military officers to identify and develop asymmetric and innovative capabilities that strengthen Taiwan’s ability to deter aggression;

(6) the United States should seek opportunities for expanded training and exercises with Taiwan;

(7) the United States should encourage Taiwan’s continued investments in asymmetric self-defense capabilities that are mobile, survivable against threatening forces, and able to take full advantage of Taiwan’s geography; and

(8) the United States should continue to—

(A) support humanitarian assistance and disaster relief exercises that increase Taiwan’s resiliency and ability to respond to and recover from natural disasters; and

(B) recognize Taiwan’s already valuable military contributions to such efforts.

SEC. 1269. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS.

(a) **FINDING.**—Congress finds that 2017 is the 50th anniversary of the formation of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), which includes Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Brunei, Vietnam, Laos, Burma, and Cambodia.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States supports the development of regional institutions and bodies, including the ASEAN Regional Forum, the ASEAN Defense Ministers Meeting Plus, the East Asia Summit, and the expanded ASEAN Maritime Forum, to increase regional cooperation and ensure that disputes are managed without intimidation, coercion, or force;

(2) the United States recognizes ASEAN efforts to promote peace, stability, and prosperity in the region, including the steps taken to highlight the importance of peaceful dispute resolution and the need for adherence to international rules and standards.

(3) United States defense engagement with ASEAN and the ASEAN Defense Ministers Meeting Plus should continue to be forums to discuss shared challenges in the maritime domain and the need for greater information sharing among ASEAN nations; and

(4) the United States welcomes continued work with ASEAN and other regional partners to establish more reliable and routine crisis communication mechanisms.

SEC. 1270. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REAFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE UNITED STATES-AUSTRALIA DEFENSE ALLIANCE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States values its alliance with the Government of Australia, and the shared

values and interests between both countries are essential to promoting peace, security, stability, and economic prosperity in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region;

(2) the annual rotations of United States Marine Corps forces to Darwin, Australia and enhanced rotations of United States Air Force aircraft to Australia pave the way for even closer defense and security cooperation;

(3) the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Australia Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation, done at Sydney, September 5, 2007, should continue to facilitate industry collaboration and innovation to meet shared security challenges and reinforce military ties;

(4) as described by Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull, North Korea is “a threat to the peace of the region” and the United States and Australia should continue to cooperate to defend against the threat of North Korea’s nuclear and missile capabilities; and

(5) the United States and Australia also should continue to address the threat of terrorism and strengthen information sharing.

Subtitle H—Other Matters

SEC. 1271. NATO COOPERATIVE CYBER DEFENSE CENTER OF EXCELLENCE.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2018 for support of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (in this section referred to as “NATO”) operations, as specified in the funding tables in division D, not more than \$5,000,000 may be obligated or expended for the purposes described in subsection (b).

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The Secretary of Defense shall provide funds for the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence (in this section referred to as the “Center”) to—

(1) enhance the capability, cooperation, and information sharing among NATO, NATO member nations, and partners, with respect to cyber defense and warfare; and

(2) facilitate education, research and development, lessons learned and consultation in cyber defense and warfare.

(c) **CERTIFICATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall certify to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the Secretary has assigned executive agent responsibility for the Center to an appropriate organization within the Department of Defense, and detail the steps being undertaken to strengthen the role of the Center in fostering cyber defense and warfare capabilities within NATO.

(d) **BRIEFING REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense shall periodically brief the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the efforts of the Department of Defense to strengthen the role of the Center in fostering cyber defense and warfare capabilities within NATO.

SEC. 1272. NATO STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS CENTER OF EXCELLENCE.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2018 for support of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (in this section referred to as “NATO”) operations, as specified in the funding tables in division D, not more than \$5,000,000 may be obligated or expended for the purposes described in subsection (b).

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The Secretary of Defense shall provide funds for the NATO Strategic Communications Center of Excellence (in this section referred to as the “Center”) to—

(1) enhance the capability, cooperation, and information sharing among NATO, NATO member nations, and partners, with respect to strategic communications and information operations; and

(2) facilitate education, research and development, lessons learned, and consultation in strategic communications and information operations.

(c) **CERTIFICATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall certify to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the Secretary has assigned executive agent responsibility for the Center to an appropriate organization within the Department of Defense, and detail the steps being undertaken to strengthen the role of Center in fostering strategic communications and information operations within NATO.

(d) **BRIEFING REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall periodically brief the committees listed in paragraph (2) on the efforts of the Department of Defense to strengthen the role of the Center in fostering strategic communications and information operations within NATO.

(2) **COMMITTEES.**—The committees listed in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(B) The Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 1273. SECURITY AND STABILITY STRATEGY FOR SOMALIA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a comprehensive United States strategy to achieve long-term security and stability in Somalia and includes each of the following elements:

(1) A description of United States strategic objectives in Somalia and the benchmarks for assessing progress toward such objectives.

(2) An assessment of the threats posed to Somalia, the broader region, the United States, and partners of the United States, by al-Shabaab and organizations affiliated with the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in Somalia, including the origins, strategic aims, tactical methods, funding sources, and leadership of each organization.

(3) A description of the key international and United States governance, diplomatic, development, military, and intelligence resources available to address instability in Somalia.

(4) A plan to improve coordination among, and effectiveness of, United States governance, diplomatic, development, military, and intelligence resources to counter the threat of al-Shabaab and organizations affiliated with the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in Somalia.

(5) A description of the role the United States is playing or will play to address political instability and support long-term security and stability in Somalia.

(6) A description of the contributions made by the African Union Mission in Somalia (in this section referred to as “AMISOM”) to security in Somalia and an assessment of the anticipated duration of support provided to AMISOM by troop contributing countries.

(7) A plan to train the Somali National Army and other Somali security forces, that also includes—

(A) a description of the assistance provided by other countries for such training; and

(B) a description of the efforts to integrate regional militias into the uniformed Somali security forces; and

(C) a description of the security assistance authorities under which any such training would be provided by the United States and the recommendations of the Secretary to address any gaps under such authorities to advise, assist, or accompany the Somali National Army or other Somali security forces within appropriate roles

and responsibilities that are not fulfilled by other countries or by international organizations.

(8) A description of the steps the United States, AMISOM, and any forces trained by the United States are taking in Somalia to minimize civilian casualties and other harm to civilians.

(9) Any other matters the President considers appropriate.

(b) **FORM.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 1274. ASSESSMENT OF GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment, obtained by the Secretary for purposes of the report, of the effectiveness of measures taken to improve the functionality of the Global Theater Security Cooperation Management Information System (in this section referred to as the “G-TSCMIS”).

(b) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall be conducted by a federally funded research and development center (FRDC), or another appropriate independent entity with expertise in security cooperation programs and activities of the Department of Defense, selected by the Secretary for purposes of the assessment.

(2) **USE OF PREVIOUS STUDIES.**—The entity conducting the assessment may use and incorporate information from previous studies on matters appropriate to the assessment.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment obtained for purposes of subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the extent to which security cooperation organizations are entering consistent, full, and accurate information into G-TSCMIS in a timely manner, and the impacts of inconsistent, incomplete, inaccurate, and tardy data entry on the functionality of the G-TSCMIS as a tool for security cooperation planning, resource allocation, and program adjustment.

(2) An assessment of any measures taken by the Department of Defense to ensure the full scope of security cooperation activities are entered into the G-TSCMIS in a timely manner, including any guidance issued or resource allocation determinations.

(3) An assessment of the effectiveness of oversight measures to ensure the full scope of security cooperation activities are entered into the G-TSCMIS in a timely manner.

(4) An assessment of utilization by and functionality for users of the G-TSCMIS across the Department of Defense, including the extent of G-TSCMIS business process reengineering that was conducted to best align needs from the functional community with the capabilities of the information management tool.

(5) Such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) **FORM.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1275. FUTURE YEARS PLAN FOR THE EUROPEAN DETERRENCE INITIATIVE.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commander of the United States European Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a future years plan on activities and resources of the European Deterrence Initiative (in this section referred to as the “EDI”).

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—The plan shall apply with respect fiscal year 2018 and at least the four succeeding fiscal years.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The plan required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the objectives of the EDI.

(2) An assessment of resource requirements to achieve the objectives of the EDI.

(3) An assessment of capabilities requirements to achieve the objectives of the EDI.

(4) An assessment of logistics requirements, including force enablers, equipment, supplies, storage, and maintenance requirements, to achieve the objectives of the EDI.

(5) An identification and assessment of required infrastructure investments to achieve the objectives of the EDI, including potential infrastructure investments by host nations and new construction or modernization of existing sites that would be funded by the United States.

(6) An assessment of security cooperation investments required to achieve the objectives of the EDI.

(7) A plan to fully resource United States force posture and capabilities, including—

(A) details regarding the strategy to balance the force structure of the United States forces to source additional permanently stationed United States forces in Europe as a part of any planned growth in end strength and force posture;

(B) the infrastructure capacity of existing locations and their ability to accommodate additional permanently stationed United States forces in Europe;

(C) the potential new locations for additional permanently stationed United States forces in Europe, including an assessment of infrastructure and military construction resources necessary to accommodate additional United States forces in Europe;

(D) a detailed timeline to achieve desired permanent posture requirements;

(E) a reevaluation of sites identified for divestiture but not yet divested under the European Infrastructure Consolidation initiative, accounting for updated military requirements; and

(F) any changes and associated costs incurred with retaining each site identified for divestiture but not yet divested under the European Infrastructure Consolidation initiative, including possible leasing agreements, sustainment, and maintenance.

(c) **FORM.**—The plan required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **GENERAL LIMITATION.**—The Secretary of Defense may not take any action to divest any site identified for divestiture but not yet divested under the European Infrastructure Consolidation initiative until the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees the plan required under subsection (a).

(2) **SITE-SPECIFIC LIMITATION.**—In the case of a proposed divestiture of a site under the European Infrastructure Consolidation initiative, the Secretary of Defense may not take any action to divest the site unless prior to taking such action, the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that no military requirement for future use of the site is foreseeable.

SEC. 1276. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS WITH PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES IN THE AMERICAN, BRITISH, CANADIAN, AND AUSTRALIAN ARMIES' PROGRAM.

Section 1274(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2026; 10 U.S.C. 2350a note) is amended by striking "five years" and inserting "ten years".

SEC. 1277. SECURITY STRATEGY FOR YEMEN.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a security strategy for Yemen.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A discussion of the strategy's compliance with applicable legal authorities.

(2) A detailed description of the security environment.

(3) A detailed description of the threats posed by Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant—Yemen Province, including the origins, leadership, strategic aims, tactical methods, and resources attributable to each organization.

(4) A detailed description of the threats posed to freedom of navigation through the Bab al Mandab Strait and waters in proximity to Yemen as well as any United States efforts to mitigate those threats.

(5) A discussion of the ends, ways, and means inherent to the strategy.

(6) A discussion of the strategy's objectives regarding counterterrorism and long-term stability in Yemen.

(7) A plan to coordinate the United States diplomatic, development, military, and intelligence resources necessary to implement the strategy.

(8) A detailed description of the roles of the United States Armed Forces in implementing the strategy.

(c) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1278. LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES THAT ARE HIGH MOBILITY MULTI-PURPOSE WHEELED VEHICLES.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—The President may not transfer excess defense articles that are high mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicles under the authority of section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j) to foreign countries until 30 days after the date on which the Comptroller General of the United States has submitted the report required under subsection (b) to the appropriate congressional committees.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on all proposed and completed transfers of excess defense articles that are high mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicles under the authority of section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j) during fiscal years 2012 through 2016. Such report shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the timing, rigorosity, and procedures used in conducting the analysis

of the impact of each such transfer on the national technology and industrial base and, particularly, the impact on opportunities of entities in the national technology and industrial base to sell new or used equipment to the countries to which such articles were to be or were transferred in accordance with section 516(b)(1)(E) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(b)(1)(E)).

(2) Any other related matters the Comptroller General determines to be appropriate.

(c) **WAIVER.**—The President may waive the limitation in subsection (a) with respect to a proposed transfer of excess defense articles if the President—

(1) determines that such transfer is in the national interest of the United States; and

(2) notifies the appropriate congressional committees of such waiver in writing not less than 30 days prior to such transfer.

(d) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to letters of offer to transfer excess defense articles that are high mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicles issued on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 1279. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAM TO PROTECT UNITED STATES STUDENTS AGAINST FOREIGN AGENTS.

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop and implement a program to prepare United States students studying abroad through Department of Defense National Security Education Programs to recognize and protect themselves against recruitment efforts by intelligence agents.

(b) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a briefing on the program required under subsection (a).

SEC. 1280. EXTENSION OF UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ANTI-TUNNEL COOPERATION AUTHORITY.

Section 1279(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1079; 22 U.S.C. 8606 note) is amended by striking "December 31, 2018" and inserting "December 31, 2020".

SEC. 1281. ANTICORRUPTION STRATEGY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the United States engages in a contingency operation, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall jointly develop a strategy to prevent corruption in any reconstruction efforts associated with such operation and submit such strategy to—

(1) the congressional defense committees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(b) **BENCHMARKS.**—The strategy described in subsection (a) shall include measurable benchmarks to be met as a condition for disbursement of any funds for reconstruction efforts associated with such operation.

(c) **REPORT.**—For the duration of a contingency operation for which the Secretary of Defense has submitted a strategy pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report evaluating the imple-

mentation and effectiveness of such strategy and describing any necessary adjustments to the strategy.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

SEC. 1301. SPECIFICATION OF COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION FUNDS.

(a) **FISCAL YEAR 2018 COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION FUNDS DEFINED.**—In this title, the term "fiscal year 2018 Cooperative Threat Reduction funds" means the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 301 and made available by the funding table in division D for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program established under section 1321 of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act (50 U.S.C. 3711).

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 301 and made available by the funding table in division D for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program shall be available for obligation for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020.

SEC. 1302. FUNDING ALLOCATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the \$324,600,000 authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 in section 301 and made available by the funding table in division D for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program established under section 1321 of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act (50 U.S.C. 3711), the following amounts may be obligated for the purposes specified:

(1) For strategic offensive arms elimination, \$12,100,000.

(2) For chemical weapons destruction, \$5,000,000.

(3) For global nuclear security, \$17,900,000.

(4) For cooperative biological engagement, \$172,800,000.

(5) For proliferation prevention, \$89,800,000.

(6) For activities designated as Other Assessments/Administrative Costs, \$27,000,000.

(b) **MODIFICATION TO CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.**—The Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act (50 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1321(g)(1) (50 U.S.C. 3711(g)(1)) is amended by striking "45 days" and inserting "15 days".

(2) Section 1324 (50 U.S.C. 3714) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(C), by striking "45 days" and inserting "15 days"; and

(B) in subsection (b)(3), by striking "45 days" and inserting "15 days".

(3) Section 1335(a) (50 U.S.C. 3735(a)) is amended by striking "or expended".

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Military Programs

SEC. 1401. WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working capital and revolving funds, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1402. CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

(b) **USE.**—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) are authorized for—

(1) the destruction of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with section 1412

of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521); and

(2) the destruction of chemical warfare materiel of the United States that is not covered by section 1412 of such Act.

SEC. 1403. DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES DEFENSE-WIDE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1404. DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1405. DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the funding table in section 4501, for use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense in providing for the health of eligible beneficiaries.

SEC. 1406. NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the National Defense Sealift Fund, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

SEC. 1411. AUTHORITY FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO JOINT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL FACILITY DEMONSTRATION FUND FOR CAPTAIN JAMES A. LOVELL HEALTH CARE CENTER, ILLINOIS.

(a) **AUTHORITY FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by section 1405 and available for the Defense Health Program for operation and maintenance, \$115,500,000 may be transferred by the Secretary of Defense to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund established by subsection (a)(1) of section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2571). For purposes of subsection (a)(2) of such section 1704, any funds so transferred shall be treated as amounts authorized and appropriated specifically for the purpose of such a transfer.

(b) **USE OF TRANSFERRED FUNDS.**—For the purposes of subsection (b) of such section 1704, facility operations for which funds transferred under subsection (a) may be used are operations of the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility under an operational agreement covered by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4500).

SEC. 1412. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund the sum of \$64,300,000 for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 1501. PURPOSE AND TREATMENT OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this subtitle is to authorize appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 to provide additional funds—

(1) for overseas contingency operations being carried out by the Armed Forces; and

(2) pursuant to sections 1502, 1503, 1504, and 1505 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation, operation and maintenance, and military personnel, as specified in the funding tables in sections 4103, 4203, 4303, and 4403.

(b) **TREATMENT OF FUNDS.**—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall apportion the funds identified in subsection (a)(2) to the Department of Defense without restriction, limitation, or constraint on the execution of such funds in support of base requirements, including any restriction, limitation, or constraint imposed by, or described in, the document entitled “Criteria for War/Overseas Contingency Operations Funding Requests” transmitted by the Director to the Department of Defense on September 9, 2010, or any successor or related guidance.

SEC. 1502. PROCUREMENT.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for procurement accounts for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and Defense-wide activities, as specified in—

(1) the funding table in section 4102; or

(2) the funding table in section 4103.

SEC. 1503. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the use of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in—

(1) the funding table in section 4202; or

(2) the funding table in section 4203.

SEC. 1504. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, as specified in—

(1) the funding table in section 4302, or

(2) the funding table in section 4303.

SEC. 1505. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for military personnel, as specified in—

(1) the funding table in section 4402; or

(2) the funding table in section 4403.

SEC. 1506. WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working capital and revolving funds, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1507. DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE-WIDE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1508. DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal

year 2018 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1509. DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

Subtitle B—Financial Matters

SEC. 1511. TREATMENT AS ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.

The amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 1512. SPECIAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense in this title for fiscal year 2018 between any such authorizations for that fiscal year (or any subdivisions thereof).

(2) **EFFECT OF TRANSFER.**—Amounts of authorizations transferred under this subsection shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the authorization to which transferred.

(3) **LIMITATIONS.**—The total amount of authorizations that the Secretary may transfer under the authority of this subsection may not exceed \$2,500,000,000.

(4) **EXCEPTION.**—In the case of the authorizations of appropriations contained in sections 1502, 1503, 1504, and 1505 that are provided for the purpose specified in section 1501(2), the transfer authority provided under section 1001, rather than the transfer authority provided by this subsection, shall apply to any transfer of amounts of such authorizations.

(b) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—Transfers under this section shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as transfers under section 1001.

(c) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.**—The transfer authority provided by this section is in addition to the transfer authority provided under section 1001.

Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters

SEC. 1521. AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND.

(a) **CONTINUATION OF PRIOR AUTHORITIES AND NOTICE AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Funds available to the Department of Defense for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund for fiscal year 2018 shall be subject to the conditions contained in subsections (b) through (g) of section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 428), as amended by section 1531(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4424).

(b) **EQUIPMENT DISPOSITION.**—

(1) **ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN EQUIPMENT.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense may accept equipment that is procured using amounts in the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund authorized under this Act and is intended for transfer to the security forces of Afghanistan, but is not accepted by such security forces.

(2) **CONDITIONS ON ACCEPTANCE OF EQUIPMENT.**—Before accepting any equipment under the authority provided by paragraph (1), the Commander of United States forces in Afghanistan shall make a determination that the equipment was procured for the purpose of meeting requirements of the security forces of Afghanistan, as agreed to by both the Government of

Afghanistan and the United States, but is no longer required by such security forces or was damaged before transfer to such security forces.

(3) **ELEMENTS OF DETERMINATION.**—In making a determination under paragraph (2) regarding equipment, the Commander of United States forces in Afghanistan shall consider alternatives to Secretary of Defense acceptance of the equipment. An explanation of each determination, including the basis for the determination and the alternatives considered, shall be included in the relevant quarterly report required under paragraph (5).

(4) **TREATMENT AS DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STOCKS.**—Equipment accepted under the authority provided by paragraph (1) may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense upon notification to the congressional defense committees of such treatment.

(5) **QUARTERLY REPORTS ON EQUIPMENT DISPOSITION.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 90-day period thereafter during which the authority provided by paragraph (1) is exercised, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing the equipment accepted under this subsection, section 1531(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 938; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note), section 1532(b) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3612), section 1531(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1088), and section 1521(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) during the period covered by the report. Each report shall include a list of all equipment that was accepted during the period covered by the report and treated as stocks of the Department and copies of the determinations made under paragraph (2), as required by paragraph (3).

(c) **ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the Afghan Security Forces Fund for fiscal year 2018, it is the goal that \$41,000,000 shall be used for—

(A) the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and treatment of women in the Afghan National Security Forces; and

(B) the recruitment, training, and contracting of female security personnel for future elections.

(2) **TYPES OF PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.**—Such programs and activities may include—

(A) efforts to recruit women into the Afghan National Security Forces, including the special operations forces;

(B) programs and activities of the Afghan Ministry of Defense Directorate of Human Rights and Gender Integration and the Afghan Ministry of Interior Office of Human Rights, Gender and Child Rights;

(C) development and dissemination of gender and human rights educational and training materials and programs within the Afghan Ministry of Defense and the Afghan Ministry of Interior;

(D) efforts to address harassment and violence against women within the Afghan National Security Forces;

(E) improvements to infrastructure that address the requirements of women serving in the Afghan National Security Forces, including appropriate equipment for female security and police forces, and transportation for policewomen to their station;

(F) support for Afghanistan National Police Family Response Units; and

(G) security provisions for high-profile female police and army officers.

(d) **ASSESSMENT OF AFGHANISTAN PROGRESS ON SECURITY OBJECTIVES.**—

(1) **ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—Not later than June 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate an assessment describing the progress of the government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan toward meeting shared security objectives. In conducting such assessment the Secretary shall consider each of the following:

(A) The extent to which the government of Afghanistan has taken steps toward increased accountability and reducing corruption within the Ministries of Defense and Interior.

(B) The extent to which the capability and capacity of the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces have improved as a result of Afghan Security Forces Fund investment, including through training.

(C) The extent to which the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces have been able to increase pressure on the Taliban, al-Qaeda, the Haqqani network, and other terrorist organizations, including by re-taking territory, defending territory, and disrupting attacks.

(D) Whether or not the government of Afghanistan is ensuring that supplies, equipment, and weaponry supplied by the United States are appropriately distributed to security forces charged with fighting the Taliban and other terrorist organizations.

(E) Such other factors as the Secretaries consider appropriate.

(2) **WITHHOLDING OF ASSISTANCE FOR INSUFFICIENT PROGRESS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determines pursuant to the assessment under paragraph (1) that the government of Afghanistan has made insufficient progress, the Secretary of Defense may withhold assistance for the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces until such time as the Secretary determines sufficient progress has been made.

(B) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS.**—If the Secretary of Defense withholds assistance under subparagraph (A), the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall provide notice to Congress not later than 30 days after making the decision to withhold such assistance.

SEC. 1522. JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT DEFEAT FUND.

(a) **USE AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS.**—Subsections (b) and (c) of section 1514 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364; 120 Stat. 2439), as in effect before the amendments made by section 1503 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4649), shall apply to the funds made available for fiscal year 2018 to the Department of Defense for the Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund.

(b) **INTERDICTION OF IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE PRECURSOR CHEMICALS.**—

(1) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Of the funds made available to the Department of Defense for the Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund for fiscal year 2018, \$15,000,000 may be available to the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide training, equipment, supplies, and services to ministries and other entities of foreign governments that the Secretary has identified as critical for countering the flow of improvised explosive device precursor chemicals.

(2) **PROVISION THROUGH OTHER US AGENCIES.**—If jointly agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the head of another department or agency of the United States Government, the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds avail-

able under paragraph (1) to such department or agency for the provision by such department or agency of training, equipment, supplies, and services to ministries and other entities of foreign governments as described in that paragraph.

(3) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS.**—None of the funds made available pursuant to paragraph (1) may be obligated or expended to supply training, equipment, supplies, or services to a foreign country before the date that is 15 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submits to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a notice that contains—

(A) the foreign country for which training, equipment, supplies, or services are proposed to be supplied;

(B) a description of the training, equipment, supplies, and services to be provided using such funds;

(C) a detailed description of the amount of funds proposed to be obligated or expended to supply such training, equipment, supplies or services, including any funds proposed to be obligated or expended to support the participation of another department or agency of the United States and a description of the training, equipment, supplies, or services proposed to be supplied;

(D) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the efforts of the foreign country identified under subparagraph (A) to counter the flow of improvised explosive device precursor chemicals; and

(E) an overall plan for countering the flow of precursor chemicals in the foreign country identified under subparagraph (A).

(4) **EXPIRATION.**—The authority provided by this subsection expires on December 31, 2018.

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS
Subtitle A—Management and Organization of Space Programs

SEC. 1601. ESTABLISHMENT OF SPACE CORPS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE.

(a) **CERTIFICATION.**—Not later than January 1, 2019, the Secretary of the Air Force shall certify to the congressional defense committees that the Space Corps under chapter 809 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (b), is established.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Part I of subtitle D of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 809—SPACE CORPS

“Subchapter **Sec.**
“I. General Matters **8091**
“II. Organization **8096**

“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL MATTERS

“Sec.

“8091. Establishment.

“8092. Authorities and Responsibilities.

“8093. Research and development and procurement of satellites and terminals.

“8094. Space functions of other elements of Department of Defense.

“§8091. Establishment

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than January 1, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall establish in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force a Space Corps. The function of the Space Corps shall be to assist the Secretary of the Air Force in carrying out the duties described in subsection (c).

“(b) **COMPOSITION.**—The Space Corps shall be composed of the following:

“(1) The Chief of Staff of the Space Corps.

“(2) Such other offices and officials as may be established by law or as the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Space Corps, may establish or designate.

“(c) DUTIES.—Except as otherwise specifically prescribed by law, the Space Corps shall be organized in such manner, and the members of the Space Corps shall perform, such duties and have such titles, as the Secretary may prescribe. Such duties shall include—

“(1) protecting the interests of the United States in space;

“(2) deterring aggression in, from, and through space;

“(3) providing combat-ready space forces that enable the commanders of the combatant commands to fight and win wars;

“(4) organizing, training, and equipping space forces; and

“(5) conducting space operations of the Space Corps under the command of the Commander of the United States Space Command.

“§8092. Authorities and responsibilities

“(a) PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE.—The Chief of Staff of the Space Corps shall furnish professional assistance to the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force.

“(b) AUTHORITIES.—Under the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff of the Space Corps, shall—

“(1) subject to subsections (c) and (d) of section 8014 of this title, prepare for such employment of the Space Corps, and for such recruiting, organizing, supplying, equipping (including research and development), training, servicing, mobilizing, demobilizing, administering, and maintaining of the Space Corps, as will assist in the execution of any power, duty, or function of the Secretary or the Chief of Staff;

“(2) investigate and report upon the efficiency of the Space Corps and its preparation to support military operations by commanders of the combatant commands;

“(3) prepare detailed instructions for the execution of approved plans and supervise the execution of those plans and instructions;

“(4) as directed by the Secretary, coordinate the action of organizations of the Space Corps; and

“(5) perform such other duties, not otherwise assigned by law, as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

“(c) FUNCTIONS.—To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall provide to the Space Corps the functions of the Department of the Air Force that may be feasibly shared with the Space Corps, including with respect to the United States Air Force Academy, recruitment, and basic training.

“§8093. Research and development and procurement of satellites and terminals

“(a) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall serve as the primary agent of the Department of Defense with respect to the research, development, test, and evaluation of satellites and user satellite terminals used by the Air Force, the Space Corps, and the Defense Agencies (except as otherwise provided by section 8094 of this title).

“(b) PROCUREMENT.—The Secretary shall serve as the primary agent of the Department of Defense with respect to the procurement of satellites and user satellite terminals used by the military departments and the Defense Agencies (except as otherwise provided by section 8094 of this title).

“(c) MILESTONE DECISION AUTHORITY.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall serve as the milestone decision authority (as defined in section 2366a of this

title) for major defense acquisition programs or major subprograms relating to space.

“(2) The Secretary may not serve as the milestone decision authority for the user satellite terminal programs of—

“(A) the military departments other than the Air Force and the Space Corps; and

“(B) the Defense Agencies specified in section 8094(c)(1) of this title.

“(d) REQUIREMENTS.—The Chief of Staff of the Space Corps shall develop the requirements for the satellites and user satellite terminals for which the Secretary has the authority for research, development, test, and evaluation, procurement, and milestone decisions pursuant to this section.

“§8094. Space functions of other elements of Department of Defense

“(a) MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—Nothing in this chapter shall affect the authority of each Secretary concerned to—

“(1) carry out the research, development, test, and evaluation of satellites and user satellite terminals of the military department of the Secretary concerned;

“(2) operate such terminals; and

“(3) develop requirements to ensure that the space programs of the Department of Defense support the mission of the Secretary concerned.

“(b) CERTAIN DEFENSE AGENCIES.—Nothing in this chapter shall affect the authority of each Director concerned to—

“(1) carry out the research, development, test, and evaluation and procurement of satellites and user satellite terminals of the Defense Agency of the Director concerned;

“(2) operate such terminals; and

“(3) develop requirements to ensure that the space programs of the Department of Defense support the mission of the Director concerned.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘Director concerned’ means—

“(A) the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, with respect to matters concerning the National Reconnaissance Office; and

“(B) the Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, with respect to matters concerning the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

“(2) The term ‘Secretary concerned’ means—

“(A) the Secretary of the Army, with respect to matters concerning the Army; and

“(B) the Secretary of the Navy, with respect to matters concerning the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard when it is operating as a service in the Department of the Navy.

“SUBCHAPTER II—ORGANIZATION

“Sec.

“8096. Chief of Staff of the Space Corps.

“§8096. Chief of Staff of the Space Corps

“(a) APPOINTMENT.—(1) There shall be a Chief of Staff of the Space Corps, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chief of Staff shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

“(2) The Chief of Staff shall be appointed for a term of six years. In time of war or during a national emergency declared by Congress, the Chief of Staff may be reappointed for a term of not more than six years.

“(3)(A) The first Chief of Staff appointed after the date of the enactment of this section shall be appointed from the general officers of the Air Force. The President may appoint the incumbent Commander of the Air Force Space Command as the first such Chief of Staff without regard to the requirement in paragraph (1) for the advice and consent of the Senate.

“(B) Each subsequent Chief of Staff shall be appointed from the general officers of the Space Corps.

“(4) The President may appoint an officer as Chief of Staff only if—

“(A) the officer has had significant experience in joint duty assignments; and

“(B) such experience includes at least one full tour of duty in a joint duty assignment (as defined in section 664(d) of this title) as a general officer.

“(5) The President may waive paragraph (4) in the case of an officer if the President determines such action is necessary in the national interest.

“(b) GRADE.—The Chief of Staff of the Space Corps, while so serving, has the grade of general without vacating the permanent grade of the officer.

“(c) REPORTING.—Except as otherwise prescribed by law and subject to section 8013(f) of this title, the Chief of Staff of the Space Corps performs the duties of such position under the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of the Air Force and is directly responsible to the Secretary.

“(d) DUTIES.—Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff of the Space Corps shall—

“(1) preside over the Space Corps;

“(2) transmit the plans and recommendations of the Space Corps to the Secretary and advise the Secretary with regard to such plans and recommendations;

“(3) after approval of the plans or recommendations of the Space Corps by the Secretary, act as the agent of the Secretary in carrying them into effect;

“(4) exercise supervision, consistent with the authority assigned to commanders of unified or specified combatant commands under chapter 6 of this title, over such of the members and organizations of the Space Corps and the Air Force as the Secretary determines;

“(5) perform the duties prescribed for the Chief of Staff by sections 171 and 2547 of this title and other provisions of law; and

“(6) perform such other military duties, not otherwise assigned by law, as are assigned to the Chief of Staff by the President, the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the Air Force.

“(e) JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF.—(1) The Chief of Staff of the Space Corps shall also perform the duties prescribed for the Chief of Staff as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under section 151 of this title.

“(2) To the extent that such action does not impair the independence of the Chief of Staff in the performance of the duties of the Chief of Staff as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Staff shall inform the Secretary regarding military advice rendered by members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on matters affecting the Department of the Air Force.

“(3) Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, the Chief of Staff shall keep the Secretary of the Air Force fully informed of significant military operations affecting the duties and responsibilities of the Secretary.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle D of title 10, United States Code, and at the beginning of part I of such subtitle, are each amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 807 the following new item:

“809. Space Corps 8091.”.

(c) JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF.—Chapter 5 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) In section 151(a), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(B) The Chief of Staff of the Space Corps.”.

(2) In section 152(b)(1)(B), by striking “or the Commandant of the Marine Corps” and inserting “the Commandant of the Marine Corps, or the Chief of Staff of the Space Corps”.

(d) ARMED FORCES POLICY COUNCIL.—Section 171 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12), by striking “; and”;

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(14) the Chief of Staff of the Space Corps.”.

(e) CHIEF OF SERVICE.—Section 1406(i)(3)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vi) Chief of Staff of the Space Corps.”.

(f) ACQUISITION-RELATED FUNCTIONS OF CHIEFS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—Section 2547(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “and the Commandant of the Marine Corps” and inserting “the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Chief of Staff of the Space Corps”.

(g) SUCCESSORS TO DUTIES.—Section 8017 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) The Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

“(5) The Chief of Staff of the Space Corps.”.

(h) TERMINATION OF PRINCIPAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SPACE ADVISOR AND DEFENSE SPACE COUNCIL.—Effective on the date on which the Space Corps is established under section 8091 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1)—

(1) the position, and the office of, the Principal Department of Defense Space Advisor (previously known as the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space) shall be terminated;

(2) the personnel of such office shall be transferred to the Air Force and to the Space Corps, as determined appropriate by the Secretary of Defense;

(3) any reference in Federal law, regulations, guidance, instructions, or other documents of the Federal Government to the Principal Department of Defense Space Advisor or the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space shall be deemed to be a reference to the Secretary of the Air Force or the Chief of Staff of the Space Corps, as appropriate; and

(4) the Defense Space Council shall be terminated.

(i) MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall be construed to authorize or require the relocation of any facility, infrastructure, or military installation of the Air Force.

(j) REPORTS.—

(1) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees an interim report on the Space Corps established under chapter 809 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), that includes—

(A) a review of the organizational and management structure of the Space Corps; and

(B) recommendations for the modification and improvement of such organizational and management structure.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than August 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a final report on the Space Corps that includes—

(A) an update of the review and recommendations described in paragraph (1), including recommendations for any necessary revisions to appointments and qualifications, duties and powers, and precedent in the Department of Defense;

(B) recommendations for the appropriate sharing of functions between the Air Force and the Space Corps, including functions with respect to personnel matters and uniforms;

(C) a plan for implementing the recommendations described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), which shall include proposed legislative and administrative actions, including conforming and other amendments to law, that the Secretary determines to be appropriate for carrying out such plan;

(D) the estimated number of general officers of the Space Corps, including an identification of the current positions of such general officers that will be transferred to the Space Corps and whether the Secretary determines it necessary for the number of general officers authorized in chapter 32 of title 10, United States Code, to be increased; and

(E) any other matters that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 1602. ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBORDINATE UNIFIED COMMAND OF THE UNITED STATES STRATEGIC COMMAND.

(a) SUBORDINATE UNIFIED COMMAND.—Not later than January 1, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a subordinate unified command to be known as the United States Space Command under the United States Strategic Command.

(b) COMMANDER.—The Commander of the United States Space Command shall hold the grade of general or, in the case of an officer of the Navy, admiral while serving in that position, without vacating the permanent grade of the officer. The Commander shall be appointed to that grade by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for service in that position.

(c) COMMAND OF JOINT SPACE ACTIVITY OR MISSIONS.—Unless otherwise directed by the President or the Secretary of Defense, the Commander of the United States Space Command shall exercise command of joint space activities or missions.

(d) JOINTLY STAFFED.—The United States Space Command shall be jointly staffed.

Subtitle B—Space Activities

SEC. 1611. CODIFICATION, EXTENSION, AND MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION ON UNITED STATES TERRITORY OF SATELLITE POSITIONING GROUND MONITORING STATIONS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

(a) CODIFICATION, EXTENSION, AND MODIFICATION.—Chapter 135 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2279c. Limitation on construction on United States territory of satellite positioning ground monitoring stations of certain foreign governments.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to foreign governments that are allies of the United States.

“(c) SUNSET.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall terminate on December 31, 2023.”.

(b) TRANSFER OF PROVISION.—Subsection (b) of section 1602 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C. 2281 note) is—

(1) transferred to section 2279c of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a);

(2) inserted as the first subsection of such section;

(3) redesignated as subsection (a); and

(4) amended—

(A) by amending the subsection heading to read as follows: “LIMITATION”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (6).

SEC. 1612. FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SATELLITE SERVICES: CYBERSECURITY THREATS AND LAUNCHES.

(a) CYBERSECURITY RISKS.—Subsection (a) of section 2279 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting: “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) entering into such contract would create a cybersecurity risk for the Department of Defense.”.

(b) LAUNCHES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Such section is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (c) through (f), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

“(b) LAUNCHES AND MANUFACTURERS.—

“(1) LIMITATION.—In addition to the prohibition in subsection (a), and except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary may not enter into a contract for satellite services with any entity if the Secretary reasonably believes that such satellite services will be provided using satellites that will be—

“(A) designed or manufactured in a covered foreign country, or by an entity controlled in whole or in part by, or acting on behalf of, the government of a covered foreign country; or

“(B) launched using a launch vehicle that is designed or manufactured in a covered foreign country, or that is provided by the government of a covered foreign country or by an entity controlled in whole or in part by, or acting on behalf of, the government of a covered foreign country, regardless of the location of the launch (unless such location is in the United States).

“(2) UNITED STATES LAUNCHES.—The limitation in paragraph (1) shall not—

“(A) apply to launches in the United States using launch vehicles with engines designed or manufactured in or provided by any entity of the Russian Federation; or

“(B) affect any other provision of law authorizing the use of Russian rocket engines within a United States launch vehicle.

“(3) LAUNCH VEHICLE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘launch vehicle’ means a fully integrated space launch vehicle.”.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (b) of section 2279 of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall not apply with respect to—

(A) a launch that occurred prior to the date that is six months after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) a contract or other agreement relating to launch services that, prior to the date that is six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, was either fully paid for by the contractor or covered by a legally binding commitment of the contractor to pay for such services.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (f) of section 2279 of title 10, United States Code, as redesignated by subsection (b)(1)(A), is amended to read as follows:

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘covered foreign country’ means any of the following:

“(A) A country described in section 1261(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2019).

“(B) The Russian Federation.

“(2) The term ‘cybersecurity risk’ means threats to and vulnerabilities of information or information systems and any related consequences caused by or resulting from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, degradation, disruption, modification, or destruction of such information or information systems, including such related consequences caused by an act of terrorism.”.

(d) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section 2279 is further amended—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “services” and inserting “services and foreign launches”;

(B) by striking “subsection (b)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (c)”;

(C) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “launch or other”;

(D) in subsection (c), as redesignated by subsection (b)(1), by striking “prohibition in subsection (a)” and inserting “prohibitions in subsection (a) and (b)”;

(E) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by striking “prohibition under subsection (a)” and inserting “prohibition under subsection (a) or (b)”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 135 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 2279 and inserting the following:

“2279. Foreign commercial satellite services and foreign launches.”.

(e) APPLICATION.—Except as provided by subsection (b)(2), the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to contracts for satellite services awarded by the Secretary of Defense on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1613. EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM ON COMMERCIAL WEATHER DATA.

Section 1613 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “one year” and inserting “two years”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate” each place it appears and inserting “appropriate congressional committees”;

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.”.

SEC. 1614. CONDITIONAL TRANSFER OF ACQUISITION AND FUNDING AUTHORITY OF CERTAIN WEATHER MISSIONS TO NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE.

Section 1614 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANS.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall implement the plan developed under paragraph (1) of subsection (b), and the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office shall implement the plan developed under paragraph (2) of such subsection, unless the Secretary and the Director each make a waiver under subsection (c).”.

SEC. 1615. EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE MODERNIZATION AND SUSTAINMENT OF ASSURED ACCESS TO SPACE.

(a) DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE.—Using funds described in paragraph (3), the Secretary of Defense may only obligate or expend funds to carry out the evolved expendable launch vehicle program to—

(A) develop a domestic rocket propulsion system to replace non-allied space launch engines;

(B) develop the necessary interfaces to, or integration of, such domestic rocket propulsion system with an existing or new launch vehicle;

(C) develop capabilities necessary to enable commercially available space launch vehicles or infrastructure to meet any requirements that are unique to national security space missions to meet the assured access to space requirements pursuant to section 2273 of title 10, United States Code, with respect to only—

(i) modifications to such vehicles required for national security space missions, including—

(I) certification and compliance of such vehicles for use in national security space missions;

(II) fairings necessary for the launch of national security space payloads to orbit; and

(III) other upgrades to meet performance, reliability, and orbital requirements that cannot otherwise be met through the use of commercially available launch vehicles; and

(ii) the development of infrastructure unique to national security space missions, such as infrastructure for the use of heavy launch vehicles, including—

(I) facilities and equipment for the vertical integration of payloads;

(II) secure facilities for the processing of classified payloads; and

(III) other facilities and equipment, including ground systems and expanded capabilities, unique to national security space launches and the launch of national security payloads;

(D) conduct activities to modernize and improve existing certified launch vehicles, or existing launch vehicles previously contracted for use by the Air Force, including restarting a dormant supply chain, and infrastructure to increase the cost effectiveness of the launch system;

(E) certify new, modified, or existing launch vehicle systems; or

(F) develop, design, and integrate parts for new launch vehicle systems to the extent such parts are developed primarily for national security use.

(2) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in this section, none of the funds described in paragraph (3) shall be obligated or expended for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program, including the development of new launch vehicles under such program.

(3) FUNDS DESCRIBED.—The funds described in this paragraph are the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

(b) OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this section shall affect or prohibit the Secretary from procuring launch services of evolved expendable launch vehicle launch systems, including with respect to any associated operation and maintenance of capabilities and infrastructure relating to such systems.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days before any date on which the Secretary publishes a draft or final request for proposals, or obligates funds, for the development under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees of such proposed draft or final request for proposals or proposed obligation, as the case may be. If such proposed draft or final request for proposals or proposed obligation relates to intelligence requirements, the Secretary shall also notify the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(d) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report containing an assessment of the most cost-effective method to meet the assured access to space requirements pursuant to section 2273 of title 10, United States Code, with respect to each of the following periods:

(1) The five-year period beginning on the date of the report.

(2) The 10-year period beginning on the date of the report.

(3) The period consisting of the full lifecycle of the evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

(e) ROCKET PROPULSION SYSTEM DEFINED.—In this section, the term “rocket propulsion system” means, with respect to the development authorized by subsection (a)(1), a main booster, first-stage rocket engine (including such an engine using kerosene or methane-based or other propellant) or motor. The term does not include a launch vehicle, an upper stage, a strap-on motor, or related infrastructure.

SEC. 1616. COMMERCIAL SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS PATHFINDER PROGRAM.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the Sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Air Force should—

(1) use the acquisition authority under the pathfinder program to acquire, from commercial providers, satellite bandwidth, ground services, and advanced services; and

(2) use the transaction authority provided by section 2371 of title 10, United States Code, to make a portion of such acquisitions.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that includes the views and plans of the Secretary with respect to making a portion of the acquisitions described in subsection (a)(1) using the transaction authority provided by section 2371 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “pathfinder program” means the commercial satellite communications programs of the Air Force designed to demonstrate the feasibility of new, alternative acquisition and procurement models for commercial satellite communications.

SEC. 1617. DEMONSTRATION OF BACKUP AND COMPLEMENTARY POSITIONING, NAVIGATION, AND TIMING CAPABILITIES OF GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM.

(a) PLAN.—During fiscal year 2018, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Secretary of Homeland Security (referred to in this section as the “Secretaries”) shall jointly develop a plan for carrying out a backup GPS capability demonstration. The plan shall—

(1) be based on the results of the study conducted under section 1618 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2595); and

(2) include the activities that the Secretaries determine necessary to carry out such demonstration.

(b) BRIEFING.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the plan developed under subsection (a). The briefing shall include—

(1) identification of the sectors that would be expected to participate in the backup GPS capability demonstration described in the plan;

(2) an estimate of the costs of implementing the demonstration in each sector identified in paragraph (1); and

(3) an explanation of the extent to which the demonstration may be carried out with the funds appropriated for such purpose.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations and beginning not earlier than the day after the date on which the briefing is provided under subsection (b), the Secretaries shall jointly initiate the backup GPS capability demonstration to the extent described under subsection (b)(3).

(2) TERMINATION.—The authority to carry out the backup GPS capability demonstration under paragraph (1) shall terminate on the date that is 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the backup GPS capability demonstration carried out under subsection (c) that includes—

(1) a description of the opportunities and challenges learned from such demonstration; and

(2) a description of the next actions the Secretaries determine appropriate to backup and complement the positioning, navigation, and timing capabilities of the Global Positioning System for national security and critical infrastructure, including, at a minimum, the timeline and funding required to issue a request for proposals for such capabilities.

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section for fiscal year 2018 not more than \$10,000,000 for the Department of Defense, as specified in the funding tables in division D.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(C) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(2) The term “backup GPS capability demonstration” means a proof-of-concept demonstration of capabilities to backup and complement the positioning, navigation, and timing capabilities of the Global Positioning System for national security and critical infrastructure.

SEC. 1618. ENHANCEMENT OF POSITIONING, NAVIGATION, AND TIMING CAPACITY.

(a) **PLAN.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop and implement a plan to increase the positioning, navigation, and timing capacity of the Department of Defense to provide resilience to the positioning, navigation, and timing capabilities of the Department. Such plan shall—

(1) ensure that military Global Positioning System user equipment terminals have the capability to receive signals from the Galileo satellites of the European Union and the QZSS satellites of Japan, beginning with increment 2 of the acquisition of such terminals;

(2) include an assessment of the feasibility, benefits, and risks of military Global Positioning System user equipment terminals having the capability to receive foreign positioning, navigation, and timing signals (with respect to such signals described in the classified annex accompanying this Act), beginning with increment 2 of the acquisition of such terminals;

(3) include an assessment of options to use hosted payloads to provide redundancy for the Global Positioning System signal;

(4) ensure that the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, engages with relevant allies of the United States to—

(A) enable military Global Positioning System user equipment terminals to receive the positioning, navigation, and timing signals of such allies; and

(B) negotiate other potential agreements relating to the enhancement of positioning, navigation, and timing;

(5) include any other options the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate; and

(6) include an evaluation by the Director of National Intelligence of the benefits and risks, if any, of using foreign positioning, navigation, and timing signals.

(b) **SUBMISSION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate the plan under subsection (a); and

(2) submit to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate the evaluation described in paragraph (6) of such subsection.

SEC. 1619. ESTABLISHMENT OF SPACE FLAG TRAINING EVENT.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than December 31, 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall establish an annual capstone training event titled “Space Flag” for space professionals to—

(1) develop and test doctrine, concepts of operation, and tactics, techniques, and procedures, for—

(A) protecting and defending assets and interests of the United States through the spectrum of space control activities;

(B) operating in the event of degradation or loss of space capabilities;

(C) conducting space operations in a conflict that extends to space;

(D) deterring conflict in space; and

(E) other areas the Secretary determines necessary; and

(2) inform and develop the appropriate design of the operational training infrastructure of the space domain, including with respect to appropriate and dedicated ranges, threat replication, test community support, advanced space training requirements, training simulators, and multi-domain force packaging.

(b) **TRAINING.**—In establishing the Space Flag training event under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) model the training event on the Red Flag and Cyber Flag exercises; and

(2) ensure that Space Flag includes live, virtual, and constructive training and on-orbit threat replication, as appropriate.

(c) **PLAN.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Commander of the Air Force Space Command, the Commander of the Army Space and Missile Defense Command, and the Commander of the Navy Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to establish the Space Flag training under subsection (a), including a description of each objective of the training.

SEC. 1620. REPORT ON OPERATIONAL AND CONTINGENCY PLANS FOR LOSS OR DEGRADATION OF SPACE CAPABILITIES.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in coordination with each commander of a combatant command, shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report evaluating all operational and contingency plans to assess the implications for mission performance in the event of a loss or degradation of space capabilities of the United States (including with respect to space control) either through the loss or degradation of on-orbit assets or through the disabling of ground components.

(b) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—The report under subsection (a) shall address and describe the extent to which the operational and contingency plans described in such subsection—

(1) depend upon space capabilities to achieve successful execution;

(2) account for the loss or degradation of space capabilities;

(3) appropriately reflect intelligence concerning current and projected adversary counter-space capabilities and vulnerabilities of the space systems of the United States;

(4) include measures to mitigate any loss or degradation of space capabilities;

(5) include specific guidance for the short- and long-term loss or disruption of space capabilities; and

(6) include specific guidance for the period in which there is a total loss of space capabilities before replacement assets are able to be brought online and operational; and

(7) assess the extent to which adversaries rely on space, including the potential effects of a short or long term loss of, or disruption to, the space capabilities of such adversaries.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

(A) With respect to the full report under subsection (a), the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(B) With respect to the matters in the report described in subsection (b)(3), and for any other matters in the report relating to the limitations, impacts, and vulnerabilities of the capabilities and systems of the intelligence community, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) The term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

SEC. 1621. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING FOR JOINT SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER MISSION SYSTEM.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Joint Space Operations Center mission system, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary has developed the plan under subsection (b).

(b) **PLAN.**—The Secretary shall develop and implement a plan to operationalize existing commercial space situational awareness capabilities to address warfighter requirements, consistent with the best-in-breed concept. The Secretary shall commence such implementation by not later than March 30, 2018.

SEC. 1622. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS RELATING TO ADVANCED EXTREMELY HIGH FREQUENCY PROGRAM.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for protected tactical enterprise (PE 1206760F), protected tactical service (PE 1206761F), or protected satellite communication services (PE 1206855F) for the Evolved Strategic SATCOM (EES) system, may be obligated or expended on a final request for proposals, other than evolution of the AEHF program of record until the date on which the reports required under subsection (b) are submitted to the congressional defense committees.

(b) **ASSESSMENTS AND CERTIFICATIONS.**—

(1) The Commanders of STRATCOM and NORTHCOM jointly certifies a protected satcom system other than the AEHF program of record or an evolution of the same will meet all applicable requirements for Nuclear Command and Control and continuity of government, and all other functions related to protected communications of the National Command Authority and the Combatant Commands, to include operational forces in a peer-near-peer jamming environment;

(2) The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff submits the validated military requirement for resilience and mission assurance, and the criteria to measure and evaluate the same, of each and any alternative to an evolved advanced extremely high frequency program; how each alternative affects deterrence and full spectrum warfighting, warfighter requirements and relative costs, including with respect to ground

station and user terminals; the assessed order of battle of adversaries; and the required capabilities of the broader space security and defense enterprise;

(3) The Secretary of the Air Force submits a detailed plan for the ground control system and all user terminals developed and acquired by the Air Force will be synchronized through development and deployment to meet all applicable requirements for Nuclear Command and Control and continuity of government, and other functions related to protected communications of the National Command Authority and the Combatant Commands; and

(4) The Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff completes an assessment concerning the impact of developing and fielding all the waveforms and terminals required to utilize the proposed alternative systems to the AEHF program of record or an evolution of the same.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The limitation in paragraph (a) shall not apply to efforts to examine and develop technology insertion opportunities for the satellite communications programs of record.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as delaying the request for proposals for the Enhanced Advanced Extremely High Frequency (E-AEHF) program.

Subtitle C—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Activities

SEC. 1631. SECURITY CLEARANCES FOR FACILITIES OF CERTAIN CONTRACTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 141 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2410s. Security clearances for facilities of certain contractors.

“If the senior management official of a contractor of the Department of Defense does not have a security clearance, the Secretary of Defense may grant a security clearance to a facility of such contractor only if the following criteria are met:

“(1) The contractor has appointed a senior officer, director, or employee of the contractor who has a security clearance at the level of the security clearance of the facility to act as the senior management official of the contractor with respect to such facility.

“(2) Any senior management official, senior officer, or director of the contractor who does not have such a security clearance will not have access to any classified information, including with respect to such facility.

“(3) The contractor has certified to the Secretary that the senior officer, director, or employee appointed under paragraph (1) has the authority to act on behalf of the contractor with respect to such facility independent of any senior management official, senior officer, or director described in paragraph (2).

“(4) The facility meets all of the requirements to be granted a security clearance other than any requirement relating to the senior management official of the contractor having an appropriate security clearance.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item: “2410s. Security clearances for facilities of certain contractors”.

SEC. 1632. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO ENGAGE IN CERTAIN COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES.

Section 431(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2023”.

SEC. 1633. SUBMISSION OF AUDITS OF COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY FUNDS.

Section 432(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “promptly”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “by not later than December 31 of each year”.

SEC. 1634. CLARIFICATION OF ANNUAL BRIEFING ON THE INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMBATANT COMMANDS.

Section 1626 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3635) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(including with respect to space-based intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance)” after “intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements” both places it appears; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “critical intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance requirements” and inserting “critical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements (including with respect to space-based intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance)”.

SEC. 1635. REVIEW OF SUPPORT PROVIDED BY DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE ELEMENTS TO ACQUISITION ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT.

(a) REVIEW.—The Secretary of Defense shall review the support provided by Defense intelligence elements to the acquisition activities conducted by the Secretary, with a specific focus on such support—

(1) consisting of planning, prioritizing, and resourcing relating to developmental weapon systems; and

(2) for existing weapon systems throughout the program lifecycle of such systems.

(b) BUDGET STRUCTURE.—The Secretary shall develop a specific budget structure for a sustainable funding profile to ensure the support provided by Defense intelligence elements described in subsection (a). The Secretary shall implement such structure beginning with the defense budget materials for fiscal year 2020.

(c) BRIEFING.—Not later than May 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the results of the review under subsection (a) and a plan to carry out subsection (b).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and
(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) The term “defense budget materials” has the meaning given that term in section 231(f) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term “Defense intelligence element” means any of the agencies, offices, and elements of the Department of Defense included within the definition of “intelligence community” under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

SEC. 1636. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN OFFENSIVE COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

(a) LIMITATION ON OFFENSIVE COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds described in paragraph (2), not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until—

(A) the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate congressional committees the report under subsection (b);

(B) the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency submits to such committees the report under subsection (c); and

(C) the Director and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence jointly provide to such committees the briefing under subsection (d).

(2) FUNDS DESCRIBED.—The funds described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 under the General Defense Intel-

ligence Program for any operations and maintenance account for offensive counterintelligence activities.

(B) Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 under the Military Intelligence Program for any operations and maintenance account for offensive counterintelligence activities.

(b) REPORT ON OVERSIGHT PROCESSES.—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report certifying that each Defense intelligence element with offensive counterintelligence authorities has the appropriate oversight processes necessary to ensure compliance with the regulations of the Department of Defense.

(c) REPORT ON CERTAIN RESOURCES.—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes an accounting of the counterintelligence enterprise management resources transferred from the Counterintelligence Field Activity to the Defense Intelligence Agency that identifies such resources that are no longer dedicated to counterintelligence activities, as of the date of the report.

(d) BRIEFING ON FUNCTIONAL MANAGEMENT.—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Director and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence shall jointly provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on how the Director and the Under Secretary plan to improve the functional management of offensive counterintelligence activities.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and
(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) The term “Defense intelligence element” means any of the Department of Defense agencies, offices, and elements included within the definition of “intelligence community” under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

SEC. 1637. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN RELOCATION ACTIVITIES FOR NATO INTELLIGENCE FUSION CENTER.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for operation and maintenance may be obligated or expended for the procurement of fit-out supplies and equipment to support the relocation of the NATO Intelligence Fusion Center from Royal Air Force Molesworth, United Kingdom, to Royal Air Force Croughton, United Kingdom.

SEC. 1638. ESTABLISHMENT OF CHAIRMAN'S CONTROLLED ACTIVITY WITHIN JOINT STAFF FOR INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE.

(a) CHAIRMAN'S CONTROLLED ACTIVITY.—The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall—

(1) undertake the roles, missions, and responsibilities of, and an equal or greater number of personnel billets than the amount of such billets previously prescribed for the Joint Functional Component Command for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance of United States Strategic Command; and

(2) not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, establish an organization within the Joint Staff—

(A) that is designated as a chairman's controlled activity;

(B) for which the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall serve as the joint functional manager; and

(C) which shall synchronize cross-combatant command intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance plans and develop strategies integrating all joint service-provided and allied intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities to satisfy combatant command intelligence needs for the Department of Defense.

(b) EXECUTIVE AGENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate the Secretary of the Air Force as the executive agent and sponsor for funding for the organization established under subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 1639. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORT ON GEOSPATIAL COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES FOR BASIC AND APPLIED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) rapid technology change and a significant increase in data collection by the intelligence community has outpaced the ability of the intelligence community to exploit vast quantities of intelligence data;

(2) the data collection capabilities of the intelligence community and the Department of Defense have outpaced to exploit vast quantities of data;

(3) furthermore, international competitors may be catching up, and in some cases leading, in key technology areas;

(4) many U.S. companies have talent and technological capability that the Federal Government could harness; and

(5) these companies would be able to more effectively develop automation, artificial intelligence, and associated algorithms if given access to data of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, consistent with the protection of sources and methods.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the authorities necessary to conduct commercial activities relating to geospatial intelligence that the Director determines necessary to engage in basic research, applied research, data transfers, and development projects, with respect to automation, artificial intelligence, and associated algorithms, including how the Director would use such authorities, consistent with applicable laws and procedures relating to the protection of sources and methods.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 1640. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COUNTER-INTELLIGENCE POLYGRAPH PROGRAM.

Section 1564a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) Any person who is a United States national who also has the nationality of a foreign state.”.

SEC. 1641. SECURITY CLEARANCE FOR DUAL-NATIONALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 80 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1564a the following new section:

“§ 1564b. Security clearance for dual nationals

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is a United States national who also has the nationality of a foreign state who is appointed to or hired for a position designated by the Office of Personnel Management as critical sensitive or special sensitive, the Secretary shall

provide additional review before approving a security clearance for such individual.

“(b) WAIVER.—

“(1) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—In the case of a person who is a United States national who also has the nationality of a foreign state identified under paragraph (2), the Secretary may waive the requirement under subsection (a).

“(2) FOREIGN STATES.—The Director of National Intelligence shall identify foreign states that permit citizens or nationals of the United States to serve in positions of trust equivalent to positions identified by the Office of Personnel Management as critical sensitive or special sensitive.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1564a the following new item:

“1564b. Security clearance for dual nationals of high threat foreign states.”.

SEC. 1642. SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF SECURITY CLEARANCES BASED ON UNLAWFUL OR INAPPROPRIATE CONTACTS WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT.

The Secretary of Defense may suspend or revoke any security clearance granted by the Department of Defense if the holder of that security clearance has engaged in unlawful or inappropriate contacts with representatives of the government of a foreign country.

Subtitle D—Cyberspace-Related Matters

SEC. 1651. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SENSITIVE MILITARY CYBER OPERATIONS AND CYBER WEAPONS.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—Chapter 3 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

“§ 130j. Notification requirements for sensitive military cyber operations

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense shall promptly submit to the congressional defense committees notice in writing of any sensitive military cyber operation conducted under this title no later than 48 hours following such operation.

“(b) PROCEDURES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish and submit to the congressional defense committees procedures for complying with the requirements of subsection (a) consistent with the national security of the United States and the protection of operational integrity. The Secretary shall promptly notify the congressional defense committees in writing of any changes to such procedures at least 14 days prior to the adoption of any such changes.

“(2) The congressional defense committees shall ensure that committee procedures designed to protect from unauthorized disclosure classified information relating to national security of the United States are sufficient to protect the information that is submitted to the committees pursuant to this section.

“(3) In the event of an unauthorized disclosure of a sensitive military cyber operation covered by this section, the Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the congressional defense committees are notified immediately of the sensitive military cyber operation concerned. The notification under this paragraph may be verbal or written, but in the event of a verbal notification a written notification shall be provided by not later than 48 hours after the provision of the verbal notification.

“(c) SENSITIVE MILITARY CYBER OPERATION DEFINED.—(1) In this section, the term ‘sensitive military cyber operation’ means an action described in paragraph (2) that—

“(A) is carried out by the armed forces or by a foreign partner in coordination with the armed forces; and

“(B) is intended to cause effects outside a geographic location where United States armed

forces are involved in hostilities (as that term is used in section 1543 of title 50, United States Code).

“(2) The actions described in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) An offensive cyber operation.

“(B) A defensive cyber operation outside the Department of Defense Information Networks to defeat an ongoing or imminent threat.

“(d) EXCEPTIONS.—The notification requirement under subsection (a) does not apply—

“(1) to a training exercise conducted with the consent of all nations where the intended effects of the exercise will occur; or

“(2) to a covert action (as that term is defined in section 3093 of title 50, United States Code).

“(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide any new authority or to alter or otherwise affect the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note), or any requirement under the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.).

“§ 130k. Notification requirements for cyber weapons

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall promptly submit to the congressional defense committees notice in writing of the following:

“(1) With respect to a cyber capability that is intended for use as a weapon, the results of any review of the capability for legality under international law pursuant to Department of Defense Directive 5000.01 no later than 48 hours after any military department concerned has completed such review.

“(2) The use as a weapon of any cyber capability that has been approved for such use under international law by a military department no later than 48 hours following such use.

“(b) PROCEDURES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish and submit to the congressional defense committees procedures for complying with the requirements of subsection (a) consistent with the national security of the United States and the protection of operational integrity. The Secretary shall promptly notify the congressional defense committees in writing of any changes to such procedures at least 14 days prior to the adoption of any such changes.

“(2) The congressional defense committees shall ensure that committee procedures designed to protect from unauthorized disclosure classified information relating to national security of the United States are sufficient to protect the information that is submitted to the committees pursuant to this section.

“(3) In the event of an unauthorized disclosure of a cyber capability covered by this section, the Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the congressional defense committees are notified immediately of the cyber capability concerned. The notification under this paragraph may be verbal or written, but in the event of a verbal notification a written notification shall be provided by not later than 48 hours after the provision of the verbal notification.

“(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The notification requirement under subsection (a) does not apply—

“(1) to a training exercise conducted with the consent of all nations where the intended effects of the exercise will occur; or

“(2) to a covert action (as that term is defined in section 3093 of title 50, United States Code).

“(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide any new authority or to alter or otherwise affect the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note), or any requirement under the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new items: “130j. Notification requirements for sensitive military cyber operations.”

“130k. Notification requirements for cyber weapons.”.

SEC. 1652. MODIFICATION TO QUARTERLY CYBER OPERATIONS BRIEFINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 484 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate” and inserting the following:

“(a) BRIEFINGS REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide to the congressional defense committees”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) ELEMENTS.—Each briefing under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to the military operations in cyberspace described in such subsection, the following:

“(1) An update, set forth separately for each geographic and functional command, that describes the operations carried out by the command and any hostile cyber activity directed at the command.

“(2) An overview of the authorities and legal issues applicable to the operations, including any relevant legal limitations.

“(3) An outline of any interagency activities and initiatives relating to the operations.

“(4) Any other matters the Secretary determines to be appropriate.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to briefings required by provided under section 484 of title 10, United States Code, on or after that date.

SEC. 1653. CYBER SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) NAME OF PROGRAM.—Section 2200 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) NAME OF PROGRAM.—The programs authorized under this chapter shall be known as the ‘Cyber Scholarship Program’.”.

(b) MODIFICATION TO ALLOCATION OF FUNDING FOR CYBER SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 2200a(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “Not less”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) Not less than five percent of the amount available for financial assistance under this section for a fiscal year shall be available for providing financial assistance for the pursuit of an associate degree at an institution described in paragraph (1).”.

(c) CYBER DEFINITION.—Section 2200e of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§2200e. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) The term ‘cyber’ includes the following:

“(A) Offensive cyber operations.

“(B) Defensive cyber operations.

“(C) Department of Defense information network operations and defense.

“(D) Any other information technology that the Secretary of Defense considers to be related to the cyber activities of the Department of Defense.

“(2) The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

“(3) The term ‘Center of Academic Excellence in Cyber Education’ means an institution of higher education that is designated by the Director of the National Security Agency as a Cen-

ter of Academic Excellence in Cyber Education.”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Chapter 112 of title 10, United States Code, is further amended—

(A) in the chapter heading, by striking “INFORMATION SECURITY” and inserting “CYBER”;

(B) in section 2200 (as amended by subsection (a))—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking “Department of Defense information assurance requirements” and inserting “the cyber requirements of the Department of Defense”; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “information assurance” and inserting “cyber disciplines”;

(C) in section 2200a (as amended by subsection (b))—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “an information assurance discipline” and inserting “a cyber discipline”;

(ii) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “information assurance” and inserting “cyber disciplines”;

(iii) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “an information technology position” and inserting “a cyber position”;

(D) in section 2200b, by striking “information assurance disciplines” and inserting “cyber disciplines”;

(E) in section 2200c, by striking “Information Assurance” each place it appears and inserting “Cyber”.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 112 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 2200c and inserting the following:

“2200c. Centers of Academic Excellence in Cyber Education.”.

(3) Section 7045 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “Information Security Scholarship program” each place it appears and inserting “Cyber Scholarship program”; and

(B) in subsection (a)(2)(B), by striking “information assurance” and inserting “a cyber discipline”.

(4) Section 7904(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “Information Assurance” and inserting “Cyber”.

(e) REDESIGNATIONS.—

(1) SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—The Information Security Scholarship program under chapter 112 of title 10, United States Code, is redesignated as the “Cyber Scholarship program”. Any reference in a law (other than this section), map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Information Security Scholarship program shall be deemed to be a reference to the Cyber Scholarship Program.

(2) CENTERS OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE.—Any institution of higher education designated by the Director of the National Security Agency as a Center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education is redesignated as a Center of Academic Excellence in Cyber Education. Any reference in a law (other than this section), map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to a Center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education shall be deemed to be a reference to a Center of Academic Excellence in Cyber Education.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense to provide financial assistance under section 2200a of title 10, United States Code (as amended by this section), and grants under section 2200b of such title (as so amended), \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2018.

SEC. 1654. PLAN TO INCREASE CYBER AND INFORMATION OPERATIONS, DETERRENCE, AND DEFENSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds following:

(1) Cyber threats originating from the Asia-Pacific region targeting the United States and the allies of the United States have grown through the use of cyber intrusions, exfiltration, and espionage by China and North Korea.

(2) In February 2016, Admiral Harry Harris Jr., Commander of the United States Pacific Command, in his testimony noted “increased cyber capacity and nefarious activity, especially by China, North Korea, and Russia underscore the growing requirement to evolve command, control, and operational authorities”.

(3) Admiral Harris stated “that in order to fully leverage the cyber domain, PACOM requires an enduring theater cyber capability able to provide cyber planning, integration, synchronization, and direction of cyber forces.”.

(b) PLAN.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop a plan to—

(1) increase inclusion of regional cyber planning within larger United States joint planning exercises in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region;

(2) enhance joint, regional, and combined information operations and strategic communication strategies to counter Chinese and North Korean information warfare, malign influence, and propaganda activities; and

(3) identify potential areas of cybersecurity collaboration and partnership capabilities with Asian allies and partners of the United States.

(c) BRIEFING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the plan required under subsection (b).

SEC. 1655. REPORT ON TERMINATION OF DUAL-HAT ARRANGEMENT FOR COMMANDER OF THE UNITED STATES CYBER COMMAND.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than December 1, 2017, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the progress of the Department of Defense in meeting the requirements of section 1642 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2601).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to any decision to terminate the dual-hat arrangement as described in section 1642 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2601), the following:

(1) Metrics and milestones for meeting the conditions described in subsection (b)(2)(C) of such section 1642.

(2) Identification of any challenges to meeting such conditions.

(3) Identification of entities or persons requiring additional resources as a result of any decision to terminate the dual-hat arrangement.

(4) Identification of any updates to statutory authorities needed as a result of any decision to terminate the dual-hat arrangement.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees;

(2) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(3) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle E—Nuclear Forces

SEC. 1661. NOTIFICATIONS REGARDING DUAL-CAPABLE F-35A AIRCRAFT.

Section 179(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph (6):

“(6) If a House of Congress adopts a bill authorizing or appropriating funds for the Department of Defense that, as determined by the Council, provides funds in an amount that will

result in a delay in the nuclear certification or delivery of F-35A dual-capable aircraft, the Council shall notify the congressional defense committees of the determination.”.

SEC. 1662. OVERSIGHT OF DELAYED ACQUISITION PROGRAMS BY COUNCIL ON OVERSIGHT OF THE NATIONAL LEADERSHIP COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM.

(a) STATUS UPDATES.—Section 171a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection (k):

“(k) STATUS OF ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.—(1) On a quarterly basis, each program manager of a covered acquisition program shall transmit to the co-chairs of the Council, acting through the senior steering group of the Council, a report that identifies—

“(A) the covered acquisition program;

“(B) the requirements of the program;

“(C) the development timeline of the program; and

“(D) the status of the program, including whether the program is delayed and, if so, whether such delay will result in a program schedule delay.

“(2) Not later than seven days after the end of each quarter, the co-chairs of the Council shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that identifies, with respect to the reports transmitted to the Council under paragraph (1) for that quarter—

“(A) each covered acquisition program that is delayed more than 180 days; and

“(B) any covered acquisition program that should have been included in such reports but was excluded, and the reasons for such exclusion.

“(3) In this subsection, the term ‘covered acquisition program’ means each acquisition program of the Department of Defense that materially contributes to—

“(A) the nuclear command, control, and communications systems of the United States; or

“(B) the continuity of government systems of the United States.”.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall issue a Department of Defense Instruction, or revise such an Instruction, to ensure that program managers carry out subsection (k)(1) of section 171a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

SEC. 1663. ESTABLISHMENT OF NUCLEAR COMMAND AND CONTROL INTELLIGENCE FUSION CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence shall jointly establish an intelligence fusion center to enhance the protection of nuclear command, control, and communications programs, systems, and processes and continuity of government programs, systems, and processes.

(b) CHARTER.—In establishing the fusion center under subsection (a), the Secretary and the Director shall develop a charter for the fusion center that includes the following:

(1) To carry out the duties of the fusion center, a description of—

(A) the roles and responsibilities of officials and elements of the Federal Government, including a detailed description of the organizational relationships of such officials and the elements of the Federal Government that are key stakeholders;

(B) the organization reporting chain of the fusion center;

(C) the staffing of the fusion center;

(D) the processes of the fusion center; and

(E) how the fusion center integrates with other elements of the Federal Government;

(2) The management and administration processes required to carry out the fusion center, including with respect to facilities and security authorities.

(3) Procedures to ensure that the appropriate number of staff of the fusion center have the security clearance necessary to access information on the programs, systems, and processes that relate, either wholly or substantially, to nuclear command, control, and communications or continuity of government, including with respect to both the programs, systems, and processes that are designated as special access programs (as described in section 4.3 of Executive Order 13526 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note) or any successor Executive order) and the programs, systems, and processes that contain sensitive compartmented information.

(c) COORDINATION.—In establishing the fusion center under subsection (a), the Secretary and the Director shall coordinate with the elements of the Federal Government that the Secretary and Director determine appropriate.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Director shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing—

(A) the charter for the fusion center developed under subsection (b); and

(B) a plan on the budget and staffing of the fusion center.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—At the same time as the President submits to Congress the annual budget request under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary and the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the fusion center, including, with respect to the period covered by the report—

(A) any updates to the plan on the budget and staffing of the fusion center;

(B) any updates to the charter developed under subsection (b); and

(C) a summary of the activities and accomplishments of the fusion center.

(3) SUNSET.—No report is required under this subsection after December 31, 2021.

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 1664. SECURITY OF NUCLEAR COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM FROM COMMERCIAL DEPENDENCIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) At a hearing before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on September 30, 2015, Deputy Secretary of Defense Robert Work, responding to a question about the use of Huawei telecommunications equipment, stated, “In the Office of the Secretary of Defense, absolutely not. And I know of no other—I don’t believe we operate in the Pentagon, any [Huawei] systems in the Pentagon.”.

(2) At such hearing, the Commander of the United States Cyber Command, Admiral Mike Rogers, responding to a question about why such Huawei telecommunications equipment is not used, stated, “as we look at supply chain and we look at potential vulnerabilities within the system, that it is a risk we felt was unacceptable.”.

(3) At a hearing before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on June 22, 2016, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Global Security Thomas Atkin, stated, “There are currently no Huawei or ZTE products on the DoD Unified Capabilities Approved Products List (APL).”.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall certify to the congressional defense committees whether the Secretary uses covered telecommunications equipment or services as a substantial or essential component of any system, or as critical technology as part of any system, to carry out—

(1) the nuclear deterrence mission of the Department of Defense, including with respect to nuclear command, control, and communications, integrated tactical warning and attack assessment, and continuity of government; or

(2) the homeland defense mission of the Department, including with respect to ballistic missile defense.

(c) PROHIBITION AND MITIGATION.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided by paragraph (2), beginning on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense may not procure or obtain, or extend or renew a contract to procure or obtain, any equipment, system, or service to carry out the missions described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) that uses covered telecommunications equipment or services as a substantial or essential component of any system, or as critical technology as part of any system.

(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the prohibition in paragraph (1) on a case-by-case basis for a single one-year period if the Secretary—

(A) determines such waiver to be in the national security interests of the United States; and

(B) certifies to the congressional committees that—

(i) there are sufficient mitigations in place to guarantee the ability of the Secretary to carry out the missions described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b); and

(ii) the Secretary is removing the use of covered telecommunications equipment or services in carrying out such missions.

(3) DELEGATION.—The Secretary may not delegate the authority to make a waiver under paragraph (2) to any official other than the Deputy Secretary of Defense or the co-chairs of the Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System established by section 171a of title 10, United States Code.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “congressional defense committees” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term “covered foreign country” means any of the following:

(A) The People’s Republic of China.

(B) The Russian Federation.

(3) The term “covered telecommunications equipment or services” means any of the following:

(A) Telecommunications equipment produced by Huawei Technologies Company or ZTE Corporation (or any subsidiary or affiliate of such entities).

(B) Telecommunications services provided by such entities or using such equipment.

(C) Telecommunications equipment or services produced or provided by an entity that the Secretary of Defense reasonably believes to be an entity owned or controlled by, or otherwise connected to, the government of a covered foreign country.

SECTION 1665. OVERSIGHT OF AERIAL-LAYER PROGRAMS BY COUNCIL ON OVERSIGHT OF THE NATIONAL LEADERSHIP COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM.

Any analysis of alternatives for the Senior Leader Airborne Operations Center, the executive airlift program of the Air Force, and the E-6B modernization program may not receive final

approval by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, and the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation may not conduct any sufficiency review of such an analysis of alternatives, unless—

(1) the Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System established by section 171a of title 10, United States Code, determines that the alternatives for such programs are capable of meeting the requirements for senior leadership communications in support of the nuclear command, control, and communications mission of the Department of Defense and the continuity of government mission of the Department;

(2) the Council submits to the congressional defense committees such determination; and

(3) a period of 30 days elapses following the date of such submission.

SEC. 1666. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION GUIDE FOR PROGRAMS RELATING TO NUCLEAR COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS AND NUCLEAR DETERRENCE.

(a) **REQUIREMENT FOR SECURITY CLASSIFICATION GUIDE.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall require the issuance of a security classification guide for each covered program to ensure the protection of sensitive information from public disclosure.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each security classification guide issued pursuant to subsection (a) shall be—

(1) approved by—

(A) the Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System with respect to covered programs under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c); or

(B) the Nuclear Weapons Council with respect to covered programs under paragraph (3) of such subsection; and

(2) issued not later than March 19, 2019, with respect to a covered program in existence as of such date.

(c) **COVERED PROGRAM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered program” means programs of the Department of Defense in existence on or after the date of the enactment of this Act relating to any of the following:

(1) Continuity of government.

(2) Nuclear command, control, and communications.

(3) Nuclear deterrence.

SEC. 1667. EVALUATION AND ENHANCED SECURITY OF SUPPLY CHAIN FOR NUCLEAR COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS AND CONTINUITY OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) **EVALUATIONS OF SUPPLY CHAIN VULNERABILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than December 31, 2019, and in accordance with the plan under paragraph (2)(A), the Secretary of Defense shall conduct evaluations of the supply chain vulnerabilities of each covered program.

(2) **PLAN.**—

(A) **DEVELOPMENT.**—The Secretary shall develop a plan to carry out the evaluations under paragraph (1).

(B) **SUBMISSION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees the plan under subparagraph (A).

(3) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary may waive, on a case-by-case basis with respect to a weapons system, a program, or a system of systems, of a covered program, either the requirement to conduct an evaluation under paragraph (1) or the deadline specified in such paragraph if the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees before such date that all known supply chain vulnerabilities of such weapons system,

program, or system of systems have minimal consequences for the capability of such weapons system, program, or system of systems to meet operational requirements or otherwise satisfy mission requirements.

(4) **RISK MITIGATION STRATEGIES.**—In carrying out an evaluation under paragraph (1) with respect to a covered program specified in subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (c)(2), the Secretary shall develop strategies for mitigating the risks of supply chain vulnerabilities identified in the course of such evaluation.

(b) **PRIORITIZATION OF CERTAIN SUPPLY CHAIN RISK MANAGEMENT EFFORTS.**—

(1) **INSTRUCTIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a Department of Defense Instruction, or update such an Instruction, establishing the prioritization of supply chain risk management programs, including supply chain risk management threat assessment reporting, to ensure that acquisition and sustainment programs relating to covered programs receive the highest priority of such supply chain risk management programs and reporting.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall establish requirements to carry out supply chain risk management threat assessment collections and analyses under acquisition and sustainment programs relating to covered programs.

(B) **SUBMISSION.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the requirements established under subparagraph (A).

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and

(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) The term “covered programs” means programs relating to any of the following:

(A) Nuclear weapons.

(B) Nuclear command, control, and communications.

(C) Continuity of government.

(D) Ballistic missile defense.

SEC. 1668. LIMITATION ON PURSUIT OF CERTAIN COMMAND AND CONTROL CONCEPT.

(a) **LIMITATION ON COMMAND AND CONTROL CONCEPT.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may not award a contract for engineering and manufacturing development for the ground-based strategic deterrent program that would result in a command and control concept for such program that consists of less than 15 fixed launch control centers per missile wing unless the Commander of the United States Strategic Command—

(1) determines that—

(A) the plans of the Secretary for a command and control concept consisting of less than 15 fixed launch control centers per missile wing are appropriate, meet requirements, and do not contain excessive risk;

(B) the risks to schedules and costs from such concept are minimized and manageable;

(C) the strategy and plan of the Secretary for addressing cyber threats for such concept are robust; and

(D) with respect to such concept, the Secretary has established an appropriate process for considering and managing trade-offs among requirements relating to survivability, long-term operations and sustainment costs, procurement costs, and military personnel needs; and

(2) submits, in writing, to the Secretary and the congressional defense committees such determination.

(b) **INABILITY TO MAKE DETERMINATION.**—If the Secretary proposes to award a contract spec-

ified in subsection (a) and the Commander is unable to make the determination under such subsection, the Commander shall submit, in writing, to the Secretary and the congressional defense committees the reasons for not making such determination.

(c) **NO EFFECT ON COMPETITION.**—Nothing in subsection (a) or (b) shall be construed to affect or prohibit the ability of the Secretary to use fair and open competition procedures in soliciting, evaluating, and awarding contracts for the ground-based strategic deterrent program.

SEC. 1669. PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN PARTS OF INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE FUZES.

(a) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Notwithstanding section 1502(a) of title 31, United States Code, of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 by section 101 and available for Missile Procurement, Air Force, as specified in the funding table in division D, \$6,334,000 shall be available for the procurement of covered parts pursuant to contracts entered into under section 1645(a) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3651).

(b) **COVERED PARTS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered parts” means commercially available off-the-shelf items as defined in section 104 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 1670. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPORTANCE OF INDEPENDENT NUCLEAR DETERRENT OF UNITED KINGDOM.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) nuclear deterrence is foundational to the defense and security of the United States and the security of the United States is enhanced by a nuclear-armed ally with common values and security priorities;

(2) the United States sees the nuclear deterrent of the United Kingdom as central to transatlantic security and welcomes the commitment of the United Kingdom to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to continue to spend two percent of gross domestic product on defense;

(3) in the face of increasing threats, the presence of credible nuclear deterrent forces of the United Kingdom is essential to international stability and for NATO;

(4) the commitment of the United Kingdom to sustaining an independent nuclear deterrent, deployed continuously at sea, provides a vital second decision-making point within the deterrent capability of NATO, creating essential uncertainty in the mind of any potential adversary;

(5) the United States Navy must continue to execute the Columbia-class submarine program on time and within budget to ensure that the sea-based leg of the nuclear triad of the United States is sustained and the program delivers a Common Missile Compartment, the Trident II (D5) Strategic Weapon System, and associated equipment and production capabilities, to support the successful development and deployment of the Dreadnought submarines of the United Kingdom;

(6) the support that the United Kingdom provides to deployments of strategic ships and aircraft of the United States at specialized facilities enables a vital part of the deterrence posture of the United States as well as mutual deterrence of adversaries and assurance to the allies and partners of the United States; and

(7) the collaboration of the United Kingdom with the United States on the military use of atomic energy ensures a peer in the technology and science of nuclear weapons and provides independent expert peer review of the nuclear programs of the United States, ensuring resilience, and cost effectiveness to the nuclear defense programs of both nations.

SEC. 1671. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR MOBILE VARIANT OF GROUND-BASED STRATEGIC DETERRENT MISSILE.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2017 through 2019 may be obligated or expended to retain the option for, or develop, a mobile variant of the ground-based strategic deterrent missile.

(b) **CONFORMING REPEAL.**—Section 1664 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2615) is repealed.

SEC. 1672. REPORT ON IMPACTS OF NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) nuclear proliferation continues to be a serious threat to the security of the United States;

(2) it is critical for the United States to understand the impacts of nuclear proliferation and ensure the necessary policies and resources are in place to prevent the proliferation of nuclear materials and weapons;

(3) effectively addressing the danger of states and non-state actors acquiring nuclear weapons or nuclear-weapons-usable material should be a clear priority for United States national security; and

(4) Secretary of Defense James Mattis testified before Congress on June 12, 2017, that “nuclear nonproliferation has not received enough attention over quite a few years”.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing—

(1) a description of the impacts of nuclear proliferation on the security of the United States;

(2) a description of how the Department of Defense is contributing to the current strategy to respond to the threat of nuclear proliferation, and what resources are being applied to this effort, including whether there are any funding gaps; and

(3) if and how nuclear proliferation is being addressed in the Nuclear Posture Review and other pertinent strategy reviews.

Subtitle F—Missile Defense Programs

SEC. 1681. ADMINISTRATION OF MISSILE DEFENSE AND DEFEAT PROGRAMS.

(a) **MAJOR FORCE PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 9 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§239a. Missile defense and defeat programs: major force program and budget assessment”

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF MAJOR FORCE PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a unified major force program for missile defense and defeat programs pursuant to section 222(b) of this title to prioritize missile defense and defeat programs in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Defense and national security.

“(b) BUDGET ASSESSMENT.—(1) The Secretary shall include with the defense budget materials for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023 a report on the budget for missile defense and defeat programs of the Department of Defense.

“(2) Each report on the budget for missile defense and defeat programs of the Department under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) An overview of the budget, including—
“(i) a comparison between that budget, the previous budget, the most recent and prior future-years defense program submitted to Congress under section 221 of this title (such comparison shall exclude the responsibility for research and development of the continuing improvement of such missile defense and defeat program), and the amounts appropriated for

such missile defense and defeat programs during the previous fiscal year; and

“(ii) the specific identification, as a budgetary line item, for the funding under such programs.

“(B) An assessment of the budget, including significant changes, priorities, challenges, and risks.

“(C) Any additional matters the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(3) Each report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘budget’, with respect to a fiscal year, means the budget for that fiscal year that is submitted to Congress by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31.

“(2) The term ‘defense budget materials’, with respect to a fiscal year, means the materials submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Defense in support of the budget for that fiscal year.

“(3) The term ‘missile defense and defeat programs’ means active and passive ballistic missile defense programs, cruise missile defense programs for the homeland, and missile defeat programs.”

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 239 the following new item:

“239a. Missile defense and defeat programs: major force program and budget assessment.”.

(b) **TRANSITION OF BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS TO MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than the date on which the budget of the President for fiscal year 2020 is submitted under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer the acquisition authority and the total obligational authority for each missile defense program described in paragraph (2) from the Missile Defense Agency to a military department.

(2) **MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM DESCRIBED.**—A missile defense program described in this paragraph is a missile defense program of the Missile Defense Agency that, as of the date specified in paragraph (1), has received Milestone C approval (as defined in section 2366 of title 10, United States Code).

(3) **REPORT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the plans of the Department of Defense for the transition of missile defense programs from the Missile Defense Agency to the military departments pursuant to paragraph (1).

(B) **SCOPE.**—The report under subparagraph (A) shall cover the period covered by the future-years defense program that is submitted under section 221 of title 10, United States Code, in the year in which such report is submitted.

(C) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—The report under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) An identification of—

(I) the missile defense programs planned to be transitioned from the Missile Defense Agency to the military departments; and

(II) the missile defense programs, if any, not planned for transition to the military departments.

(ii) The schedule for transition of each missile defense program planned to be transitioned to a military department, and an explanation of such schedule.

(iii) A description of—

(I) the status of the plans of the Missile Defense Agency and the military departments for the transition of missile defense programs from that agency to the military departments; and

(II) the status of any agreement between the Missile Defense Agency and one or more of the

military departments on the transition of any such program from that agency to the military departments, including any agreement on the operational test criteria that must be achieved before such transition.

(iv) An identification of the element of the Department of Defense (whether the Missile Defense Agency, a military department, or both) that will be responsible for funding each missile defense program to be transitioned to a military department, and at what date.

(v) A description of the type of funds that will be used (whether funds for research, development, test, and evaluation, procurement, military construction, or operation and maintenance) for each missile defense program to be transitioned to a military department.

(vi) An explanation of the number of systems planned for procurement for each missile defense program to be transitioned to a military department, and the schedule for procurement of each such system.

(vii) A description of how the Missile Defense Agency will continue the responsibility for the research and development of improvements to missile defense programs.

(c) **ROLE OF MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 8 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§205. Missile Defense Agency”

“(a) TERM OF DIRECTOR.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall be appointed for a six-year term.

“(b) REPORTING.—The Missile Defense Agency shall be under the authority, direction, and control of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“205. Missile Defense Agency.”.

(3) **APPLICATION.**—

(A) **TERMS.**—Subsection (a) of section 205 of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall apply the day following the date on which the present incumbent in the office of the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, ceases to serve as such.

(B) **REPORTING.**—Subsection (b) of such section 205 shall apply beginning on February 1, 2018. In carrying out such subsection, the Missile Defense Agency shall be under the authority, direction, and control of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering in the same manner as the Missile Defense Agency was under the authority, direction, and control of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics pursuant to Department of Defense Directive 5134.09. Any reference in such Instruction to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall be deemed to be a reference to the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, including with respect to the Under Secretary serving as the chairman of the Missile Defense Executive Board.

SEC. 1682. PRESERVATION OF THE BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE CAPACITY OF THE ARMY.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 or any fiscal year thereafter for the Army may be obligated or expended to demilitarize any GEM-T interceptor or remove any such interceptor from the operational inventory of the Army until the date on which the Secretary of the Army submits to the congressional defense committees the evaluation conducted under subsection (b).

(b) **EVALUATION.**—The Secretary and the Chief of Staff of the Army shall jointly conduct

an evaluation of the ability of the Army to meet warfighter requirements and operational needs if GEM-T interceptors are removed from the operational inventory of the Army. In conducting such evaluation, the Secretary and the Chief of Staff shall evaluate whether the Army can maintain an inventory of interceptors necessary to retain the capability provided by GEM-T interceptors and to meet such operational needs by either—

(1) recertifying GEM-T interceptors (either with or without modification); or

(2) developing, testing, and fielding a new low-cost interceptor that can be placed on the operational inventory of the Army prior to the retirement of GEM-T interceptors.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to activities that the Secretary determines are critical to the safety of GEM-T interceptors.

(d) GEM-T INTERCEPTOR DEFINED.—In this section, the term “GEM-T interceptor” means the Patriot guidance enhanced missile TBM.

SEC. 1683. MODERNIZATION OF ARMY LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SENSOR.

(a) APPROVAL OF ACQUISITION STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 15, 2018, the Secretary of the Army shall issue an acquisition strategy for a 360-degree lower tier air and missile defense sensor that achieves initial operating capability by not later than January 1, 2022.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The acquisition strategy under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) ensure the use of competitive procedures;

(B) clearly describe the open-architecture design to be used;

(C) provide a comprehensive fielding plan that provides 360-degree lower tier air and missile defense sensor capability to all units of the Army by not later than January 1, 2026;

(D) define the operation and sustainment cost savings of the acquisition strategy and other acquisition options of the Army;

(E) identify any programmatic cost avoidance that could be achieved through co-production, co-development, or foreign military sales;

(F) ensure the fielding of an interim gap-filler capability to the highest priority forces (consisting of not less than three battalions) for imminent threats; and

(G) identify the estimated cost to field both the 360-degree lower tier air and missile defense sensor capability and the interim capability pursuant to subparagraph (E).

(3) LIMITATION.—If the Secretary of the Army does not issue the acquisition strategy under subsection (a) by April 15, 2018, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the lower tier air and missile defense sensor of the Army that are unobligated as of such date may be obligated or expended.

(b) CONDITIONAL TRANSFER.—

(1) MDA.—If the Secretary of the Army does not issue the acquisition strategy under subsection (a) by April 15, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer from the Secretary of the Army to the Director of the Missile Defense Agency—

(A) the responsibility to issue the acquisition strategy described in subsection (a) by not later than December 15, 2018; and

(B) beginning on the date of such approval, the responsibility to implement such acquisition strategy to procure a 360-degree lower tier air and missile defense sensor.

(2) ARMY.—If the Secretary of Defense carries out the transfer under paragraph (1), after the 360-degree lower tier air and missile defense sensor achieves Milestone B approval (or equivalent), but before such sensor achieves Milestone C approval (or equivalent), the Secretary of De-

fense shall transfer from the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to the Secretary of the Army the responsibility to procure such sensor.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—The terms “Milestone B approval” and “Milestone C approval” have the meanings given those terms in section 2366 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 1684. ENHANCEMENT OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION OF BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of the Navy shall jointly ensure that—

(1) the test plans of the Integrated Master Test Plan of the ballistic missile defense system include planned tests activity of the lower tier ballistic missile defenses of the Army;

(2) such plans prioritize the integration of such defenses with elements of the ballistic missile defense system; and

(3) such plans are clearly described in such Integrated Master Test Plan.

SEC. 1685. DEFENSE OF HAWAII FROM NORTH KOREAN BALLISTIC MISSILE ATTACK.

(a) FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) The North Korean ballistic missile threat to the United States, including Hawaii, is growing rapidly.

(B) Since Kim Jong-un took power in 2012, North Korea has conducted 78 ballistic missile tests, of which 61 are considered to have been successful.

(C) The existing ballistic missile defense protection for Hawaii, including the ground-based midcourse defense system in Alaska, and the sea-based x-band radar, provide limited ballistic missile defense capabilities today.

(D) Through use of existing ballistic missile defense assets, including AN/TPY-2 radars and the Aegis Ashore Site located on the Pacific Missile Range Facility, the ballistic missile defense of Hawaii could benefit from a near-term improvement by adding a layer of defense.

(E) The proposed program of record for a medium range discriminating radar to be fully mission capable after 2023 would leave the defense of Hawaii dependent only on the ground-based midcourse defense system in Alaska, and the sea-based x-band radar until that time, while the threat to the United States, including Hawaii, from North Korean ballistic missiles continues to grow.

(F) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) required that the Missile Defense Agency plan to provide additional ballistic missile defense sensor coverage for the defense of Hawaii and “field such radar or equivalent sensor by not later than December 31, 2021”.

(G) When asked at a hearing of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on April 26, 2017, about the threat to Hawaii from North Korean ballistic missiles, the Commander of the United States Pacific Command, Admiral Harry Harris, testified that “Kim Jong-un is clearly in a position to threaten Hawaii today . . . I believe that our ballistic missile (defense) architecture is sufficient to protect Hawaii today. But it can be overwhelmed” and “I think that we would be better served, my personal opinion, is that we would be better served with a defensive Hawaii radar and interceptors in Hawaii. I know that is being discussed”.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress supports assessing the feasibility of improving the missile defense of Hawaii from the evolving ballistic missile threat, including from North Korea, through a permanent missile defense sensor capability and the

possible introduction of interim missile defense coverage.

(b) SEQUENCED APPROACH.—The Secretary of Defense shall protect the test and training operations of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, and assess the siting and functionality of a discrimination radar for homeland defense throughout the Hawaiian Islands before assessing the feasibility of improving the missile defense of Hawaii by using existing missile defense assets that could materially improve the defense of Hawaii.

(c) TEST.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall—

(1) not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, conduct a test to evaluate and demonstrate, if technologically feasible, the capability to defeat a simple intercontinental ballistic missile threat using the standard missile 3 block IIA missile interceptor; and

(2) as part of the integrated master test plan for the ballistic missile defense system, develop a plan to demonstrate a capability to defeat a complex intercontinental ballistic missile threat, including a complex threat posed by the intercontinental ballistic missiles of North Korea.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report—

(1) that indicates whether demonstrating an intercontinental ballistic missile defense capability against North Korean ballistic missiles by the standard missile 3 block IIA missile interceptor poses any risks to strategic stability; and

(2) if the Secretary determines under paragraph (1) that such demonstration poses such risks to strategic stability, a description of any plan developed and implemented by the Secretary to address and mitigate such risks, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

SEC. 1686. AEGIS ASHORE ANTI-AIR WARFARE CAPABILITY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Using funds authorized to be appropriated by sections 101 and 201 of this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for procurement and research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the funding tables in division D, the Secretary of Defense shall continue the development, procurement, and deployment of anti-air warfare capabilities at each Aegis Ashore site in Romania and Poland. The Secretary shall ensure the deployment of such capabilities—

(1) at such sites in Romania by not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) at such sites in Poland by not later than one year after the declaration of operational status for such sites.

(b) REPROGRAMMING AND TRANSFERS.—Any reprogramming or transfer made to carry out subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with established procedures for reprogramming or transfers.

SEC. 1687. IRON DOME SHORT-RANGE ROCKET DEFENSE SYSTEM, ISRAELI COOPERATIVE MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM CODEVELOPMENT AND COPRODUCTION, AND ARROW 3 TESTING.

(a) IRON DOME SHORT-RANGE ROCKET DEFENSE SYSTEM.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for procurement, Defense-wide, and available for the Missile Defense Agency, not more than \$92,000,000 may be provided to the Government of Israel to procure Tamir interceptors for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system through coproduction of such interceptors in the United States by industry of the United States.

(2) CONDITIONS.—

(A) AGREEMENT.—Funds described in paragraph (1) for the Iron Dome short-range rocket

defense program shall be available subject to the terms and conditions in the Agreement Between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the State of Israel Concerning Iron Dome Defense System Procurement, signed on March 5, 2014, subject to an amended bilateral international agreement for coproduction for Tamir interceptors. In negotiations by the Missile Defense Agency and the Missile Defense Organization of the Government of Israel regarding such production, the goal of the United States is to maximize opportunities for coproduction of the Tamir interceptors described in paragraph (1) in the United States by industry of the United States.

(B) **CERTIFICATION.**—Not later than 30 days prior to the initial obligation of funds described in paragraph (1), the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(i) a certification that the amended bilateral international agreement specified in subparagraph (A) is being implemented as provided in such agreement; and

(ii) an assessment detailing any risks relating to the implementation of such agreement.

(b) **ISRAELI COOPERATIVE MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM CODEVELOPMENT AND COPRODUCTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 for procurement, Defense-wide, and available for the Missile Defense Agency—

(A) not more than \$221,500,000 may be provided to the Government of Israel to procure the David's Sling Weapon System, including for coproduction of parts and components in the United States by United States industry; and

(B) not more than \$287,300,000 may be provided to the Government of Israel for the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor Program, including for coproduction of parts and components in the United States by United States industry.

(2) **CERTIFICATION.**—

(A) **CRITERIA.**—Except as provided by paragraph (3), the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that—

(i) the Government of Israel has demonstrated the successful completion of the knowledge points, technical milestones, and production readiness reviews required by the research, development, and technology agreements for the David's Sling Weapon System and the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Development Program, respectively;

(ii) funds specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) will be provided on the basis of a one-for-one cash match made by Israel for such respective systems or in another matching amount that otherwise meets best efforts (as mutually agreed to by the United States and Israel);

(iii) the United States has entered into a bilateral international agreement with Israel that establishes, with respect to the use of such funds—

(I) in accordance with clause (iv), the terms of coproduction of parts and components of such respective systems on the basis of the greatest practicable coproduction of parts, components, and all-up rounds (if appropriate) by United States industry and minimizes nonrecurring engineering and facilitation expenses to the costs needed for coproduction;

(II) complete transparency on the requirement of Israel for the number of interceptors and batteries of such respective systems that will be procured, including with respect to the procurement plans, acquisition strategy, and funding profiles of Israel;

(III) technical milestones for coproduction of parts and components and procurement of such respective systems; and

(IV) joint approval processes for third-party sales of such respective systems and the components of such respective systems;

(v) the level of coproduction described in clause (iii)(I) for the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor Program and the David's Sling Weapon System is not less than 50 percent; and

(v) there is a separate, clear plan for each of the David's Sling Weapon System and the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor Program for improving the affordability of the respective system, and each such plan is approved by a United States-Israeli joint working group on cost-reduction for such respective system.

(B) **NUMBER.**—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Under Secretary may submit—

(i) one certification covering both the David's Sling Weapon System and the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor Program; or

(ii) separate certifications for each respective system.

(C) **TIMING.**—The Under Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees the certification under subparagraph (A) by not later than 60 days before the funds specified in paragraph (1) for the respective system covered by the certification are provided to the Government of Israel.

(3) **WAIVER.**—The Under Secretary may waive the certification required by paragraph (2) if the Under Secretary certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Under Secretary has received sufficient data from the Government of Israel to demonstrate—

(A) the funds specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) are provided to Israel solely for funding the procurement of long-lead components and critical hardware in accordance with a production plan, including a funding profile detailing Israeli contributions for production, including long-lead production, of either David's Sling Weapon System or the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor Program;

(B) such long-lead components have successfully completed knowledge points, technical milestones, and production readiness reviews; and

(C) the long-lead procurement will be conducted in a manner that maximizes coproduction in the United States without incurring non-recurring engineering activity or cost other than such activity or cost required for suppliers of the United States to start or restart production in the United States.

(4) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which both plans described in paragraph (2)(A)(v) are completed, the Under Secretary shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a joint briefing on such plans.

(c) **LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING FOR CERTAIN ARROW 3 TESTING.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Missile Defense Agency, not more than \$105,000,000 may be obligated or expended for—

(1) testing of the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Development Program that is carried out at ranges located in the United States; and

(2) expenses relating to such testing that the Director determines to be required and appropriate.

(d) **CROSS REFERENCE.**—The amounts and purposes referred to in this section correspond to amounts specified for such purposes in the funding tables in division D.

(e) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the following:

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 1688. REVIEW OF PROPOSED GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SYSTEM CONTRACT.

(a) **LIMITATION ON CHANGES TO CONTRACTING STRATEGY.**—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency may not change the contracting strategy for the systems integration, operations, and test of the ground-based midcourse defense system until the date on which—

(1) the report under subsection (b)(3) is submitted to the congressional defense committees; and

(2) a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date of such submission.

(b) **REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall conduct a review of the contract for the systems integration, operations, and test of the ground-based midcourse defense system. Such review shall include the following:

(A) Contract performance of current industry-led prime contract approach, including with respect to—

(i) system readiness performance and reliability growth;

(ii) development, integration, and fielding of new homeland defense capabilities; and

(iii) cost performance against baseline contract.

(B) With respect to alternate contracting approaches—

(i) an enumeration and detailing of any specific benefits for each such alternate approach;

(ii) an identification of specific costs to switching to each such alternate approach; and

(iii) detailing of the specific risks of each such alternate approach to homeland defense, including regarding schedule, costs, and the sustainment, maintenance, development, and fielding, of integrated capabilities.

(C) With respect to contracting approaches that transition to Federal Government-led systems engineering integration and test—

(i) an enumeration of the processes, procedures, and command media that have been established by the Missile Defense Agency and proven to be effective for the execution of programs that are of the scale of the ground-based midcourse defense system; and

(ii) the manner in which a new contract will control for growth in the personnel and support contracts of the Federal Government to support cost growth and minimize the risk of schedule delay.

(D) A baseline for historical and current staffing of the ground-based midcourse defense system program, specifically with respect to personnel of the Federal Government, personnel of federally funded research and development centers, personnel of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and support contractors.

(E) Projections of the staffing categories specified in subparagraph (D) under a new contracting strategy and how such staffing categories will be limited to prevent significant cost growth and to minimize the risk of schedule delays.

(F) The views and recommendations of the Director for any changes the current ground-based midcourse defense system contract or a new contract, including the proposed contracting strategy of the Missile Defense Agency.

(G) Any other such matters the Director determines appropriate.

(2) **TRANSMISSION.**—The Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall transmit to the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering and the Missile Defense Executive Board the review under paragraph (1).

(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Under Secretary and the Missile Defense Executive Board receive the review under paragraph (1), the Under Secretary and

Board shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing—

(A) the review, without change; and
(B) any views and recommendations of the Under Secretary and the Board on such review.

SEC. 1689. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SPACE-BASED SENSOR LAYER FOR BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the defense of the homeland, the deployed members of the Armed Forces, and the allies of the United States against the threat of attack by ballistic and hypersonic missiles is the highest priority of the Missile Defense Agency;

(2) the Missile Defense Agency, and the Defense Agencies and combat support agencies, must prioritize the design, development, and deployment of the space-based missile defense sensor layer;

(3) a space-based missile defense sensor layer is essential for the future of the missile defense of the homeland, the deployed members of the Armed Forces, and the allies of the United States; and

(4) such a space-based layer can, and should, benefit a multitude of other important defense and intelligence requirements, including targeting and space situational awareness.

(b) DEVELOPMENT.—After the date on which the Director of the Missile Defense Agency submits the plan under subsection (c), the Director, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force and the heads of the Defense Agencies and combat support agencies that the Director determines appropriate, shall develop a space-based ballistic missile defense sensor layer that—

(1) provides missile defense engagement quality precision tracking data of the United States beginning in the boost phase and continuing throughout subsequent flight regimes; and

(2) serves other defense and intelligence requirements for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, including targeting and space situational awareness; and

(3) achieves an operational prototype payload at the earliest practicable date.

(c) SPACE-BASED MISSILE DEFENSE SENSOR LAYER PLAN.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan that includes—

(1) how the Director will carry out subsection (b), including with respect to the estimated costs—

(A) for the operational prototype payload specified in paragraph (3) of such subsection; and

(B) to develop, acquire, and deploy, and the lifecycle costs to operate and sustain, a space-based sensor layer and support systems to provide global missile defense coverage;

(2) an assessment of the maturity of critical technologies necessary to make operational such a space-based sensor layer, and recommendations for any research and development activities to rapidly mature such technologies;

(3) an assessment of what capabilities such a space-based sensor layer can contribute that other sensor layers do not contribute;

(4) how the Director will leverage the use of national technical means, commercially available space and terrestrial capabilities, hosted payloads, small satellites, and other capabilities to carry out subsection (b); and

(5) any other matters the Director determines appropriate.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and
(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term “combat support agency” has the meaning given that term in section 193(f) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term “Defense Agency” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(11) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 1690. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SPACE-BASED BALLISTIC MISSILE INTERCEPT LAYER.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a space-based missile defense layer will exploit the natural advantages of space systems and integrate them into the ballistic missile defense system; and

(2) these advantages include—

(A) a 24/7 global presence to defend against asymmetric threats;

(B) access to geographically denied areas;

(C) an ability to close a global fire control loop for such system;

(D) complementing existing terrestrial capabilities; and

(E) increasing the overall survivability and resilience of the entire national missile defense system.

(b) DEVELOPMENT.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall develop a space-based ballistic missile intercept layer to the ballistic missile defense system that is—

(1) regionally focused;

(2) capable of providing boost-phase defense; and

(3) achieves an operational capability at the earliest practicable date.

(c) SPACE-BASED BALLISTIC MISSILE INTERCEPT LAYER PLAN.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan to carry out subsection (b) during the five-year period following the date of the plan. Such plan shall include the following:

(1) A concept definition phase consisting of multiple awarded contracts to identify feasible solutions consistent with architectural principles, performance goals, and price points established by the Director, such as contracts relating to—

(A) refined requirements;

(B) conceptual designs;

(C) technology readiness assessments;

(D) critical technical and operational issues;

(E) cost, schedule, performance estimates; and
(F) risk reduction plans.

(2) A technology risk reduction phase consisting of up to three competitively awarded contracts focused on maturing, integrating, and characterizing key technologies, algorithms, components, and sub-systems, such as contracts relating to—

(A) refined concepts and designs;

(B) engineering trade studies;

(C) medium-to-high fidelity digital representations of the space-based ballistic missile intercept weapon system; and

(D) a proposed integration and test sequence that could potentially lead to a live-fire boost phase intercept during fiscal year 2022.

(3) During the technology risk reduction phase, contractors will define proposed demonstrations to a preliminary design review level prior to a technology development phase down-select.

(4) A technology development phase consisting of two competitively awarded contracts to mature the preferred space-based ballistic missile intercept weapon system concepts and to potentially conduct a live-fire boost phase intercept fly-off during fiscal year 2022 with brassboard hardware and prototype software on a path to the operational goal.

(5) A concurrent space-based ballistic missile intercept weapon system fire control test bed activity that incrementally incorporates modeling

and simulation elements, real-world data, hardware, algorithms, and systems to evaluate with increasing confidence the performance of evolving designs and concepts of such weapon system from target detection to intercept.

(6) Any other matters the Director determines appropriate.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF SPACE TEST BED.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall establish a space test bed to—

(1) conduct research and development regarding options for a space-based defensive layer, including with respect to space-based interceptors and directed energy platforms; and

(2) identify the most cost-efficient and promising technological solutions to implementing such layer.

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1691. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR GROUND-BASED MID-COURSE DEFENSE ELEMENT OF THE BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the ground-based midcourse defense element of the ballistic missile defense system, \$50,000,000 may not be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of Defense provides to the congressional defense committees—

(1) a written certification that the risk of mission failure of ground-based midcourse interceptor enhanced kill vehicles due to foreign object debris has been minimized; or

(2) if the certification under paragraph (1) cannot be made, a briefing on the corrective measures that will be carried out to minimize such risk, including—

(A) a timeline for the implementation of the measures; and

(B) the estimated cost of implementing the measures.

SEC. 1692. CONVENTIONAL PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE WEAPONS SYSTEM.

(a) EARLY OPERATIONAL CAPABILITY.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall plan to reach early operational capability for the conventional prompt strike weapon system by not later than September 30, 2022.

(b) LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, for the conventional prompt global strike weapons system, not more than 50 percent may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Commander of the United States European Command, the Commander of the United States Pacific Command, and the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, submits to the congressional defense committees, a report on—

(1) the required level of resources that is consistent with the level of priority assigned to the associated capability gap;

(2) the estimated period for the delivery of a medium-range early operational capability, the required level of resources necessary to field a medium-range conventional prompt global strike weapon within the United States (including the territories and possessions of the United States), and a detailed plan consistent with the urgency of the associated capability gap across multiple platforms;

(3) the joint performance requirements that—
(A) ensure interoperability, where appropriate, between and among joint military capabilities; and

(B) are necessary, as designated by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to fulfill capability gaps of more than one military department, Defense Agency, or other element of the Department; and

(4) in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, any plan (including policy options) considered appropriate to address any potential risks of ambiguity from the launch or employment of such a capability.

SEC. 1693. DETERMINATION OF LOCATION OF CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES INTERCEPTOR SITE.

(a) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Ballistic Missile Defense Review is issued, the Secretary of Defense shall determine the location of a potential additional continental United States interceptor site. In making such determination, the Secretary shall consider the full spectrum of contributing factors, including with respect to each of the following:

(1) Strategic and operational effectiveness, including with respect to the location that is the most advantageous site to the continental United States, including by having the capability to provide shoot-assess-shoot coverage to the entire continental United States.

(2) Existing infrastructure at the location.

(3) Economic impacts.

(4) Public support.

(5) Cost to construct and operate.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after making the determination described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing all of the contributing factors considered by the Secretary in making such determination, including any other factors that the Secretary considered, including any relevant recommendations of the Ballistic Missile Defense Review.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

SEC. 1695. PROTECTION OF CERTAIN FACILITIES AND ASSETS FROM UNMANNED AIRCRAFT.

Subparagraph (C) of section 130i(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(C)(i) relates to—

“(I) the nuclear deterrence mission of the Department of Defense, including with respect to nuclear command and control, integrated tactical warning and attack assessment, and continuity of government;

“(II) the missile defense mission of the Department; or

“(III) the national security space mission of the Department; or

“(ii) is part of a Major Range and Test Facility Base (as defined in section 196(i) of this title).”.

SEC. 1696. USE OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS IN DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the procurement process for each covered Distributed Common Ground System shall be carried out in accordance with section 2377 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Section 2377 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to the procurement of an item or service for a covered Distributed Common Ground System if the item or service—

(1) is used to integrate the capabilities of the system with another information system, in a case in which such integration is required; or

(2) is not available in an existing commercial product.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees; and
(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) COVERED DCGS SYSTEM.—The term “covered Distributed Common Ground System” includes the following:

(A) The Distributed Common Ground System of the Army.

(B) The Distributed Common Ground System of the Navy.

(C) The Distributed Common Ground System of the Marine Corps.

(D) The Distributed Common Ground System of the Air Force.

(E) The Distributed Common Ground System of the Special Operations Forces.

SEC. 1697. INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF COSTS RELATING TO AMMONIUM PERCHLORATE.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall seek to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to conduct an assessment of the costs to the Department of Defense relating to contractors and subcontractors of the Department using a new supplier of ammonium perchlorate for weapon systems.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) For each weapon system that must be requalified by reason of the new supplier of ammonium perchlorate as described in subsection (a), an estimate of the requalification costs.

(2) The types and number of tests that are needed for any such requalification, including whether any currently planned tests, as of the date of the assessment, may be leveraged, or testing across programs may be used, to decrease requalification costs while retaining and ensuring qualification standards.

(3) Estimates of any other costs relating to ammonium perchlorate that the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees the assessment under subsection (a), without change, together with any comments or views of the Secretary regarding the assessment.

SEC. 1698. LIMITATION AND BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS REGARDING AMMONIUM PERCHLORATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, shall conduct a business case analysis regarding the options of the Federal Government to ensure a robust domestic industrial base to supply ammonium perchlorate for use in solid rocket motors. Such analysis should include assessments of the near and long-term costs, program impacts, opportunities for competition, opportunities for redundant or complementary capabilities, and national security implications of—

(1) continuing to rely on one domestic provider;

(2) supporting development of a second domestic source;

(3) procuring ammonium perchlorate as Government-furnished material and providing it to all necessary programs; and

(4) such other options as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The analysis under subsection (a) shall, at minimum, include—

(1) an estimate of all associated costs, including development, procurement, and qualification costs, as applicable;

(2) an assessment of options, under various scenarios, for the quantity of ammonium per-

chlorate that would be required by the Department of Defense; and

(3) the assessment of the Secretary of how the requirements for ammonium perchlorate of other Federal agencies impact the requirements of the Department of Defense.

(c) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit the business case analysis required by subsection (a) to the Comptroller General of the United States and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives by March 1, 2018, along with any views of the Secretary.

(d) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the report submitted by the Secretary under subsection (c) and, not later than 30 days after receiving such report, provide a briefing on such review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

(e) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the development or construction of a new source for ammonium perchlorate until 45 days after the date on which the report under subsection (c) is submitted to the Comptroller General and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

(f) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation under subsection (e) if the Secretary—

(1) determines such waiver to be in the national security interest of the United States; and

(2) submits written notification of such determination to the congressional defense committees and waits 15 days.

SEC. 1699. INDUSTRIAL BASE FOR LARGE SOLID ROCKET MOTORS AND RELATED TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) PLAN.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, shall develop a plan to ensure a robust domestic industrial base for large solid rocket motors, including with respect to the critical technologies, subsystems, components, and materials within and relating to such rocket motors.

(b) SUSTAINMENT OF DOMESTIC SUPPLIERS.—The Secretary shall develop the plan under subsection (a) in a manner that, if carried out, sustains not less than two domestic suppliers for each of the following:

(1) Large solid rocket motors.

(2) Small liquid-fueled rocket engines.

(3) Aeroshells for reentry vehicles (or reentry bodies).

(4) Strategic radiation-hardened microelectronics.

(5) Any other critical technologies, subsystems, components, and materials within and relating to large solid rocket motors that the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) SUBMISSION.—Not later than February 1, 2018, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report that includes the plan under subsection (a).

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—With respect to the sustainment of domestic suppliers as described in subsection (b), the report under paragraph (1) shall include the views of the Secretary on the following:

(A) Such sustainment of not less than two domestic suppliers for each item specified in paragraphs (1) through (5) of such subsection.

(B) The risks within the industrial base for each such item.

(C) The estimated costs for such sustainment.

(D) The opportunities to ensure or promote competition within the industrial base for each such item.

SEC. 1699A. PILOT PROGRAM ON ENHANCING INFORMATION SHARING FOR SECURITY OF SUPPLY CHAIN.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than June 1, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a pilot program to enhance information sharing with cleared defense contractors to ensure all source information is appropriately, singularly, and exclusively shared for the purpose of ensuring the security of the supply chain of covered programs.

(b) **SELECTION.**—The Secretary shall select 10 acquisition or sustainment programs of the Department of Defense to participate in the pilot program under subsection (a), of which—

(1) not fewer than one program shall be related to nuclear weapons;

(2) not fewer than one program shall be related to nuclear command, control, and communications;

(3) not fewer than one program shall be related to continuity of government;

(4) not fewer than one program shall be related to ballistic missile defense;

(5) not fewer than one program shall be related to other command and control systems; and

(6) not fewer than one program shall be related to logistics.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes—

(1) details on how the Secretary will establish the pilot program under subsection (a) to ensure all source information is appropriately, singularly, and exclusively shared for the purpose of ensuring the security of the supply chain of covered programs; and

(2) the identification of any legislative action or administrative action required to provide the Secretary with specific additional authorities required to fully implement the pilot program.

(d) **CLEARED DEFENSE CONTRACTORS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “cleared defense contractors” means contractors of the Department of Defense who have a security clearance, including contractor facilities that have a security clearance.

SEC. 1699B. COMMISSION TO ASSESS THE THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES FROM ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE ATTACKS AND EVENTS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is hereby established a commission to be known as the “Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attacks and Events” (hereafter in this section referred to as the “Commission”). The purpose of the Commission is to assess and make recommendations with respect to the threat to the United States from electromagnetic pulse attacks and events.

(b) **COMPOSITION.**—

(1) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Commission shall be composed of 12 members appointed as follows:

(A) Three members appointed by the chair of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(B) Three members appointed by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(C) Three members appointed by the chair of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(D) Three members appointed by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(2) **CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.**—

(A) **CHAIR.**—The chair of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representative and the chair of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate shall jointly designate one member of the Commission to serve as chair of the Commission.

(B) **VICE CHAIR.**—The ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representative and the ranking minor-

ity member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate shall jointly designate one member of the Commission to serve as vice chair of the Commission.

(3) **SECURITY CLEARANCE REQUIRED.**—Each individual appointed as a member of the Commission shall possess (or have recently possessed before the date of such appointment) the appropriate security clearance necessary to carry out the duties of the Commission.

(4) **QUALIFICATION.**—Members of the Commission shall be appointed from among private United States citizens with knowledge and expertise in the scientific, technical, and defense aspects of electromagnetic pulse threats and vulnerabilities.

(5) **PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.**—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) **DUTIES.**—

(1) **REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT.**—The Commission shall review and assess—

(A) the nature, magnitude, and likelihood of potential electromagnetic pulse (hereafter in section referred to as “EMP”) attacks and events, both manmade and natural, that could be directed at or affect the United States within the next 20 years;

(B) the vulnerability of United States military and civilian systems to EMP attacks and events, including with respect to emergency preparedness and immediate response;

(C) the capability of the United States to repair and recover from damage inflicted on United States military and civilian systems by EMP attacks and events; and

(D) the feasibility and cost of hardening critical military and civilian systems against EMP attack and events.

(2) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The Commission shall recommend any actions it believes should be taken by the United States to better prepare, prevent, mitigate, or recover military and civilian systems with respect to EMP attacks and events.

(d) **COOPERATION FROM GOVERNMENT.**—

(1) **COOPERATION.**—In carrying out its duties, the Commission shall receive the full and timely cooperation of the Secretary of Defense and the pertinent heads of any other Federal agency in providing the Commission with analysis, briefings, and other information necessary for the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

(2) **LIAISON.**—The Secretary shall designate at least one officer or employee of the Department of Defense to serve as a liaison officer between the Department and the Commission.

(e) **REPORT.**—

(1) **FINAL REPORT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than December 1, 2018, the Commission shall submit to the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Commission.

(B) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report submitted to Congress under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(2) **VIEWS OF THE SECRETARY.**—Not later than 90 days after the submittal of the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report that contains the views of the Secretary with respect to the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Commission and any actions the Secretary intends to take as a result.

(3) **INTERIM BRIEFING.**—Not later than June 1, 2018, the Commission shall provide to the Com-

mittee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a briefing on the status of the activities of the Commission, including a discussion of any interim recommendations.

(f) **FUNDING.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act for the Department of Defense, \$3,000,000 is available to fund the activities of the Commission, as specified in the funding tables in division D.

(g) **APPLICATION OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall apply to the Commission.

(h) **TERMINATION.**—The Commission shall terminate three months after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the report under subsection (e)(2).

(i) **REPEAL.**—Title XIV of Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-398) is repealed.

SEC. 1699C. PILOT PROGRAM ON ELECTROMAGNETIC SPECTRUM MAPPING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a pilot program to assess the viability of space-based mapping of the electromagnetic spectrum used by the Department of Defense.

(b) **DURATION.**—The authority of the Secretary to carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **INTERIM BRIEFING.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate (and to any other congressional defense committee upon request) demonstrating how the Secretary plans to implement the pilot program under subsection (a).

(d) **FINAL BRIEFING.**—Not later than 90 days after the pilot program under subsection (a) is completed, the Secretary shall provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate (and to any other congressional defense committee upon request) on the utility, cost, and other considerations regarding the mapping of the electromagnetic spectrum used by the Department of Defense.

TITLE XVII—MATTERS RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT**Subtitle A—Improving Transparency and Clarity for Small Businesses****SEC. 1701. IMPROVING REPORTING ON SMALL BUSINESS GOALS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 15(h)(2)(E) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(h)(2)(E)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) in subclause (III), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subclauses:

“(V) that were purchased by another entity after the initial contract was awarded and as a result of the purchase, would no longer be deemed to be small business concerns for purposes of the initial contract; and

“(VI) that were awarded using a procurement method that restricted competition to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, small business concerns owned and controlled by women, or a subset of any such concerns;”;

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (IV), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subclauses:

“(VI) that were purchased by another entity after the initial contract was awarded and as a result of the purchase, would no longer be deemed to be small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans for purposes of the initial contract; and

“(VII) that were awarded using a procurement method that restricted competition to qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, small business concerns owned and controlled by women, or a subset of any such concerns;”;

(3) in clause (iii)—

(A) in subclause (V), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subclauses:

“(VII) that were purchased by another entity after the initial contract was awarded and as a result of the purchase, would no longer be deemed to be qualified HUBZone small business concerns for purposes of the initial contract; and

“(VIII) that were awarded using a procurement method that restricted competition to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, small business concerns owned and controlled by women, or a subset of any such concerns;”;

(4) in clause (iv)—

(A) in subclause (V), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subclauses:

“(VII) that were purchased by another entity after the initial contract was awarded and as a result of the purchase, would no longer be deemed to be small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals for purposes of the initial contract; and

“(VIII) that were awarded using a procurement method that restricted competition to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by women, or a subset of any such concerns;”;

(5) in clause (v)—

(A) in subclause (IV), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subclause (V), by inserting “and” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(VI) that were purchased by another entity after the initial contract was awarded and as a result of the purchase, would no longer be deemed to be small business concerns owned by an Indian tribe other than an Alaska Native Corporation for purposes of the initial contract;”;

(6) in clause (vi)—

(A) in subclause (IV), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subclause (V), by inserting “and” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(VI) that were purchased by another entity after the initial contract was awarded and as a result of the purchase, would no longer be deemed to be small business concerns owned by a Native Hawaiian Organization for purposes of the initial contract;”;

(7) in clause (vii)—

(A) in subclause (IV), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(VI) that were purchased by another entity after the initial contract was awarded and as a result of the purchase, would no longer be deemed to be small business concerns owned by an Alaska Native Corporation for purposes of the initial contract; and”;

(8) in clause (viii)—

(A) in subclause (VII), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subclause (VIII), by striking “and” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subclauses:

“(IX) that were purchased by another entity after the initial contract was awarded and as a result of the purchase, would no longer be deemed to be small business concerns owned and controlled by women for purposes of the initial contract; and

“(X) that were awarded using a procurement method that restricted competition to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, or a subset of any such concerns; and”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall be required to report on the information required by clauses (i)(V), (ii)(VI), (iii)(VII), (iv)(VII), (v)(VI), (vi)(VI), (vii)(VI), and (viii)(IX) of section 15(h)(2)(E) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(h)(2)(E)) beginning on the date that such information is available in the Federal Procurement Data System, the System for Award Management, or any new or successor system.

SEC. 1702. UNIFORMITY IN PROCUREMENT TERMINOLOGY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 15(j)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(j)(1)) is amended by striking “greater than \$2,500 but not greater than \$100,000” and inserting “greater than the micro-purchase threshold, but not greater than the simplified acquisition threshold”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—Section 3(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(m)) is amended to read as follows:

“(m) **DEFINITIONS RELATING TO CONTRACTING.**—In this Act:

“(1) **PRIME CONTRACT.**—The term ‘prime contract’ has the meaning given such term in section 8701(4) of title 41, United States Code.

“(2) **PRIME CONTRACTOR.**—The term ‘prime contractor’ has the meaning given such term in section 8701(5) of title 41, United States Code.

“(3) **SIMPLIFIED ACQUISITION THRESHOLD.**—The term ‘simplified acquisition threshold’ has the meaning given such term in section 134 of title 41, United States Code.

“(4) **MICRO-PURCHASE THRESHOLD.**—The term ‘micro-purchase threshold’ has the meaning given such term in section 1902 of title 41, United States Code.

“(5) **TOTAL PURCHASES AND CONTRACTS FOR PROPERTY AND SERVICES.**—The term ‘total purchases and contracts for property and services’ shall mean total number and total dollar amount of contracts and orders for property and services.”.

SEC. 1703. RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMERCIAL MARKET REPRESENTATIVES.

Section 4(h) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633(h)) is amended to read as follows:

“(h) **COMMERCIAL MARKET REPRESENTATIVES.**—

“(1) **DUTIES.**—The principal duties of a commercial market representative employed by the Administrator and reporting to the senior official appointed by the Administrator with responsibilities under sections 8, 15, 31, and 36 (or

the designee of such official) shall be to advance the policies established in section 8(d)(1) relating to subcontracting. Such duties shall include—

“(A) helping prime contractors to find small business concerns that are capable of performing subcontracts;

“(B) for contractors awarded contracts containing the clause described in section 8(d)(3), providing—

“(i) counseling on the contractor’s responsibility to maximize subcontracting opportunities for small business concerns;

“(ii) instruction on methods and tools to identify potential subcontractors that are small business concerns; and

“(iii) assistance to increase awards to subcontractors that are small business concerns through visits, training, and reviews of past performance;

“(C) providing counseling on how a small business concern may promote its capacity to contractors awarded contracts containing the clause described in section 8(d)(3); and

“(D) conducting periodic reviews of contractors awarded contracts containing the clause described in section 8(d)(3) to assess compliance with subcontracting plans required under section 8(d)(6).

“(2) **CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (B), a commercial market representative referred to in section 15(q)(3) shall have a Level I Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting (or any successor certification) or the equivalent Department of Defense certification.

“(B) **DELAY OF CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.**—The certification described in subparagraph (A) is not required—

“(i) for any person serving as a commercial market representative on the date of the enactment of this subsection, until the date that is one calendar year after the date such person was appointed as a commercial market representative; or

“(ii) for any person serving as a commercial market representative on or before November 25, 2015, until November 25, 2020.

“(3) **JOB POSTING REQUIREMENTS.**—The duties and certification requirements described in this subsection shall be included in any initial job posting for the position of a commercial market representative.”.

SEC. 1704. RESPONSIBILITIES OF BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY SPECIALISTS.

Section 4(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633(g)) is amended to read as follows:

“(g) **BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY SPECIALISTS.**—

“(1) **DUTIES.**—The exclusive duties of a Business Opportunity Specialist employed by the Administrator and reporting to the senior official appointed by the Administrator with responsibilities under sections 8, 15, 31, and 36 (or the designee of such official) shall be to implement sections 7, 8, and 45 and to complete other duties related to contracting programs under this Act. Such duties shall include—

“(A) with respect to small business concerns eligible to receive contracts and subcontracts pursuant to section 8(a)—

“(i) providing guidance, counseling, and referrals for assistance with technical, management, financial, or other matters that will improve the competitive viability of such concerns;

“(ii) identifying causes of success or failure of such concerns;

“(iii) providing comprehensive assessments of such concerns, including identifying the strengths and weaknesses of such concerns;

“(iv) monitoring and documenting compliance with the requirements of sections 7 and 8 and any regulations implementing those sections;

“(v) explaining the requirements of sections 7, 8, 15, 31, 36, and 45; and

“(vi) advising on compliance with contracting regulations (including the Federal Acquisition Regulation) after award of such a contract or subcontract;

“(B) reviewing and monitoring compliance with mentor-protége agreements under section 45;

“(C) representing the interests of the Administrator and small business concerns in the award, modification, and administration of contracts and subcontracts awarded pursuant to section 8(a); and

“(D) reporting fraud or abuse under section 7, 8, 15, 31, 36, or 45 or any regulations implementing such sections.

“(2) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (B), a Business Opportunity Specialist described under section 7(j)(10)(D) shall have a Level I Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting (or any successor certification) or the equivalent Department of Defense certification.

“(B) DELAY OF CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—The certification described in subparagraph (A) is not required—

“(i) for any person serving as a Business Opportunity Specialist on the date of the enactment of this subsection, until the date that is one calendar year after the date such person was appointed as a Business Opportunity Specialist; or

“(ii) for any person serving as a Business Opportunity Specialist on or before January 3, 2013, until January 3, 2020.

“(3) JOB POSTING REQUIREMENTS.—The duties and certification requirements described in this subsection shall be included in any initial job posting for the position of a Business Opportunity Specialist.”.

Subtitle B—Women’s Business Programs

SEC. 1711. OFFICE OF WOMEN’S BUSINESS OWNERSHIP.

Section 29(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting the following:

“(B) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the Assistant Administrator shall be to administer the programs and services of the Office of Women’s Business Ownership.

“(C) DUTIES.—The Assistant Administrator shall perform the following functions with respect to the Office of Women’s Business Ownership:

“(i) Recommend the annual administrative and program budgets of the Office and eligible entities receiving a grant under the Women’s Business Center Program.

“(ii) Review the annual budgets submitted by each eligible entity receiving a grant under the Women’s Business Center Program.

“(iii) Select applicants to receive grants to operate a women’s business center after reviewing information required by this section, including the budget of each applicant.

“(iv) Collaborate with other Federal departments and agencies, State and local governments, not-for-profit organizations, and for-profit enterprises to maximize utilization of taxpayer dollars and reduce (or eliminate) any duplication among the programs overseen by the Office of Women’s Business Ownership and those of other entities that provide similar services to women entrepreneurs.

“(v) Maintain a clearinghouse to provide for the dissemination and exchange of information between women’s business centers.

“(vi) Serve as the vice chairperson of the Interagency Committee on Women’s Business Enterprise and as the liaison for the National Women’s Business Council.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) MISSION.—The mission of the Office of Women’s Business Ownership shall be to assist

women entrepreneurs to start, grow, and compete in global markets by providing quality support with access to capital, access to markets, job creation, growth, and counseling by—

“(A) fostering participation of women entrepreneurs in the economy by overseeing a network of women’s business centers throughout States and territories;

“(B) creating public-private partnerships to support women entrepreneurs and conducting outreach and education to startup and existing small business concerns owned and controlled by women; and

“(C) working with other programs overseen by the Administrator to ensure women are well-represented and being served and identifying gaps where participation by women could be increased.

“(4) ACCREDITATION PROGRAM.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall establish standards for an accreditation program for accrediting eligible entities receiving a grant under this section.

“(B) TRANSITION PROVISION.—Before the date on which standards are established under subparagraph (A), the Administrator may not terminate a grant under this section absent evidence of fraud or other criminal misconduct by the recipient.

“(C) CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.—The Administrator may provide financial assistance, by contract or otherwise, to a relevant national women’s business center representative association to provide assistance in establishing the standards required under subparagraph (A) or for carrying out an accreditation program pursuant to such standards.”.

SEC. 1712. WOMEN’S BUSINESS CENTER PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 29(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (4);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) the term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) an organization described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code;

“(B) a State, regional, or local economic development organization, so long as the organization certifies that grant funds received under this section will not be commingled with other funds; or

“(C) an institution of higher education, unless such institution is currently receiving a grant under section 21;

“(D) a development, credit, or finance corporation chartered by a State, so long as the corporation certifies that grant funds received under this section will not be commingled with other funds; or

“(E) any combination of entities listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D);”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) the term ‘women’s business center’ means the location at which counseling and training on the management, operations (including manufacturing, services, and retail), access to capital, international trade, Government procurement opportunities, and any other matter is needed to start, maintain, or expand a small business concern owned and controlled by women.”.

(b) AUTHORITY.—Section 29(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) by striking “The Administration” and all that follows through “5-year projects” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established a Women’s Business Center Program under which the Administrator may provide a grant to any eligible entity to operate one or more women’s business centers”;

(3) by striking “The projects shall” and inserting the following:

“(2) USE OF FUNDS.—The women’s business centers shall be designed to provide counseling and training that meets the needs of women, especially socially or economically disadvantaged women, and shall”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of a grant provided under this subsection to an eligible entity per project year shall be not more than \$185,000 (as such amount is annually adjusted by the Administrator to reflect the change in inflation).

“(B) ADDITIONAL GRANTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), with respect to an eligible entity that has received \$185,000 under this subsection in a project year, the Administrator may award an additional grant under this subsection of up to \$65,000 during such project year if the Administrator determines that the eligible entity—

“(I) agrees to obtain, after its application has been approved and notice of award has been issued, cash contributions from non-Federal sources of 1 non-Federal dollar for each Federal dollar;

“(II) is in good standing with the Women’s Business Center Program; and

“(III) has met performance goals for the previous project year, if applicable.

“(ii) LIMITATIONS.—The Administrator may only award additional grants under clause (i)—

“(I) during the 3rd and 4th quarters of the fiscal year; and

“(II) from unobligated amounts made available to the Administrator to carry out this section.

“(4) NOTICE AND COMMENT REQUIRED.—The Administrator may only make a change to the standards by which an eligible entity obtains or maintains grants under this section, the standards for accreditation, or any other requirement for the operation of a women’s business center if the Administrator first provides notice and the opportunity for public comment, as set forth in section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code, without regard to any exceptions provided for under such section.”.

(c) CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION.—Section 29(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “the recipient organization” and inserting “an eligible entity”; and

(B) by striking “financial assistance” and inserting “a grant”;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “financial assistance authorized pursuant to this section may be made by grant, contract, or cooperative agreement and” and inserting “grants authorized pursuant to this section”; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “a recipient organization” and inserting “an eligible entity”;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “recipient of assistance” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(B) by striking “during any project, it shall not be eligible thereafter” and inserting “during any project for 2 consecutive years, the eligible entity shall not be eligible at any time after that 2-year period”;

(C) by striking “such organization” and inserting “the eligible entity”; and

(D) by striking “the recipient” and inserting “the eligible entity”; and

(4) by adding at end the following:

“(5) SEPARATION OF PROJECT AND FUNDS.—An eligible entity shall—

“(A) carry out a project under this section separately from other projects, if any, of the eligible entity; and

“(B) separately maintain and account for any grants under this section.

“(6) EXAMINATION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(A) REQUIRED SITE VISIT.—Each applicant, prior to receiving a grant under this section, shall have a site visit by an employee of the Administration, in order to ensure that the applicant has sufficient resources to provide the services for which the grant is being provided.

“(B) ANNUAL REVIEW.—An employee of the Administration shall—

“(i) conduct an annual review of the compliance of each eligible entity receiving a grant under this section with the grant agreement, including a financial examination; and

“(ii) provide such review to the eligible entity as required under subsection (l).

“(7) REMEDIATION OF PROBLEMS.—

“(A) PLAN OF ACTION.—If a review of an eligible entity under paragraph (6)(B) identifies any problems, the eligible entity shall, within 45 calendar days after receiving such review, provide the Assistant Administrator with a plan of action, including specific milestones, for correcting such problems.

“(B) PLAN OF ACTION REVIEW BY THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR.—The Assistant Administrator shall review each plan of action submitted under subparagraph (A) within 30 calendar days after receiving such plan and—

“(i) if the Assistant Administrator determines that such plan will bring the eligible entity into compliance with all the terms of the grant agreement, approve such plan; or

“(ii) if the Assistant Administrator determines that such plan is inadequate to remedy the problems identified in the annual review to which the plan of action relates, the Assistant Administrator shall set forth such reasons in writing and provide such determination to the eligible entity within 15 calendar days after such determination.

“(C) AMENDMENT TO PLAN OF ACTION.—An eligible entity receiving a determination under subparagraph (B)(ii) shall have 30 calendar days after the receipt of the determination to amend the plan of action to satisfy the problems identified by the Assistant Administrator and resubmit such plan to the Assistant Administrator.

“(D) AMENDED PLAN REVIEW BY THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR.—Within 15 calendar days after the receipt of an amended plan of action under subparagraph (C), the Assistant Administrator shall either approve or reject such plan and provide such approval or rejection in writing to the eligible entity.

“(E) APPEAL OF ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR DETERMINATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Assistant Administrator rejects an amended plan under subparagraph (D), the eligible entity shall have the opportunity to appeal such decision to the Administrator, who may delegate such appeal to an appropriate officer of the Administration.

“(ii) OPPORTUNITY FOR EXPLANATION.—Any appeal described under clause (i) shall provide an opportunity for the eligible entity to provide, in writing, an explanation of why the eligible entity’s plan remedies the problems identified in the annual review.

“(iii) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—The determination of the appeal shall be provided to the eligible entity, in writing, within 15 calendar days after the eligible entity’s filing of the appeal.

“(iv) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO ACT.—If the Administrator fails to act on an appeal made under

this subparagraph within the 15 calendar day period specified under clause (iii), the eligible entity’s amended plan of action submitted under subparagraph (C) shall be deemed to be approved.

“(8) TERMINATION OF GRANT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall require that, if an eligible entity fails to comply with a plan of action approved by the Assistant Administrator under paragraph (7)(B)(i) or an amended plan of action approved by the Assistant Administrator under paragraph (7)(D) or approved on appeal under paragraph (7)(E), the Assistant Administrator terminate the grant provided to the eligible entity under this section.

“(B) APPEAL OF TERMINATION.—An eligible entity that has a grant terminated under subparagraph (A) shall have the opportunity to challenge the termination on the record and after an opportunity for a hearing.

“(C) FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—The determination made pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall be considered final agency action for the purposes of chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.”

(d) SUBMISSION OF 5-YEAR PLAN.—Section 29(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking “applicant organization” and inserting “eligible entity”;

(2) by striking “a recipient organization” and inserting “an eligible entity”;

(3) by striking “financial assistance” and inserting “grants”; and

(4) by striking “site”.

(e) APPLICATIONS AND CRITERIA FOR INITIAL GRANT.—Subsection (f) of section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) APPLICATIONS AND CRITERIA FOR INITIAL GRANT.—

“(1) APPLICATION.—Each eligible entity desiring a grant under subsection (b) shall submit to the Administrator an application that contains—

“(A) a certification that the eligible entity—

“(i) has designated an executive director or program manager, who may be compensated using grant funds under subsection (b) or other sources, to manage the women’s business center for which a grant under subsection (b) is sought; and

“(ii) meets the accounting and reporting requirements established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

“(B) information demonstrating that the eligible entity has the ability and resources to meet the needs of the market to be served by the women’s business center, including the ability to obtain the non-Federal contribution required under subsection (c);

“(C) information relating to the assistance to be provided by the women’s business center in the area in which the women’s business center is located;

“(D) information demonstrating the experience and effectiveness of the eligible entity in—

“(i) conducting the services described under subsection (a)(5);

“(ii) providing training and services to a representative number of women who are socially or economically disadvantaged; and

“(iii) working with resource partners of the Administration and other entities, such as universities; and

“(E) a 5-year plan that describes the ability of the eligible entity to provide the services described under subsection (a)(3), including to a representative number of women who are socially or economically disadvantaged.

“(2) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS FOR INITIAL GRANTS.—

“(A) REVIEW AND SELECTION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall review applications to determine whether the applicant can meet obligations to perform the activities required by a grant under this section, including—

“(I) the experience of the applicant in conducting activities required by this section;

“(II) the amount of time needed for the applicant to commence operations should it be awarded a grant;

“(III) the capacity of the applicant to meet the accreditation standards established by the Administrator in a timely manner;

“(IV) the ability of the applicant to sustain operations for more than 5 years (including its ability to obtain sufficient non-Federal funds for that period);

“(V) the location of the women’s business center and its proximity to other grant recipients under this section; and

“(VI) the population density of the area to be served by the women’s business center.

“(ii) SELECTION CRITERIA.—

“(I) GUIDANCE.—The Administrator shall issue guidance (after providing an opportunity for notice and comment) to specify the criteria for review and selection of applicants under this subsection.

“(II) MODIFICATIONS PROHIBITED AFTER ANNOUNCEMENT.—With respect to a public announcement of any opportunity to be awarded a grant under this section made by the Administrator pursuant to subsection (l)(1), the Administrator may not modify guidance issued pursuant to subclause (I) with respect to such opportunity unless required to do so by an Act of Congress or an order of a Federal court.

“(III) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this clause may be construed as prohibiting the Administrator from modifying the guidance issued pursuant to subclause (I) (after providing an opportunity for notice and comment) as such guidance applies to an opportunity to be awarded a grant under this section that the Administrator has not yet publicly announced pursuant to subsection (l)(1).

“(B) RECORD RETENTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall maintain a copy of each application submitted under this subsection for not less than 5 years.

“(ii) PAPERWORK REDUCTION.—The Administrator shall take steps to reduce, to the maximum extent practicable, the paperwork burden associated with carrying out clause (i).”

(f) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE WOMEN’S BUSINESS CENTER PROGRAM.—Section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656) is amended by inserting after subsection (k) the following:

“(l) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE WOMEN’S BUSINESS CENTER PROGRAM.—The Administrator shall provide—

“(1) a public announcement of any opportunity to be awarded grants under this section, and such announcement shall include the standards by which such award will be made, including the guidance issued pursuant to subsection (f)(2)(A)(ii);

“(2) the opportunity for any applicant for a grant under this section that failed to obtain such a grant a debriefing with the Assistant Administrator to review the reasons for the applicant’s failure; and

“(3) with respect to any site visit or evaluation of an eligible entity receiving a grant under this section that is carried out by an officer or employee of the Administration (other than the Inspector General), a copy of the site visit report or evaluation, as applicable, within 30 calendar days after the completion of such visit or evaluation.”

(g) CONTINUED FUNDING FOR CENTERS.—Section 29(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(m)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) APPLICATION AND APPROVAL FOR CONTINUATION GRANTS.—

“(A) SOLICITATION OF APPLICATIONS.—The Administrator shall solicit applications and award continuation grants under this subsection for the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every third fiscal year thereafter.

“(B) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—Each eligible entity desiring a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Administrator an application that contains—

“(i) a certification that the applicant—

“(I) is an eligible entity;

“(II) has designated an executive director or program manager to manage the women’s business center operated by the applicant; and

“(III) as a condition of receiving a grant under this subsection, agrees—

“(aa) to receive a site visit as part of the final selection process, at the discretion of the Administrator; and

“(bb) to remedy any problem identified pursuant to the site visit under item (aa);

“(ii) information demonstrating that the applicant has the ability and resources to meet the needs of the market to be served by the women’s business center for which a grant under this subsection is sought, including the ability to obtain the non-Federal contribution required under paragraph (4)(C);

“(iii) information relating to assistance to be provided by the women’s business center in the geographic area served by the women’s business center for which a grant under this subsection is sought;

“(iv) information demonstrating that the applicant has worked with resource partners of the Administration and other entities;

“(v) a 3-year plan that describes the services provided by the women’s business center for which a grant under this subsection is sought—

“(I) to serve women who are business owners or potential business owners by conducting training and counseling activities; and

“(II) to provide training and services to a representative number of women who are socially or economically disadvantaged; and

“(vi) any additional information that the Administrator may reasonably require.

“(C) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator—

“(I) shall review each application submitted under subparagraph (B), based on the information described in such subparagraph and the criteria set forth under clause (ii) of this subparagraph; and

“(II) as part of the final selection process, may conduct a site visit to each women’s business center for which a grant under this subsection is sought to evaluate the women’s business center using the selection criteria described in clause (ii)(II).

“(ii) SELECTION CRITERIA.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall evaluate applicants for grants under this subsection in accordance with selection criteria that are—

“(aa) established before the date on which applicants are required to submit the applications;

“(bb) stated in terms of relative importance; and

“(cc) publicly available and stated in each solicitation for applications for grants under this subsection made by the Administrator.

“(II) REQUIRED CRITERIA.—The selection criteria for a grant under this subsection shall include—

“(aa) the total number of entrepreneurs served by the applicant;

“(bb) the total number of new startup companies assisted by the applicant;

“(cc) the percentage of clients of the applicant that are socially or economically disadvantaged;

“(dd) the percentage of individuals in the community served by the applicant who are socially or economically disadvantaged;

“(ee) the successful accreditation of the applicant under the accreditation program developed under subsection (g)(5); and

“(ff) any additional criteria that the Administrator may reasonably require.

“(iii) CONDITIONS FOR CONTINUED FUNDING.—In determining whether to make a grant under this subsection, the Administrator—

“(I) shall consider the results of the most recent evaluation of the women’s business center for which a grant under this subsection is sought, and, to a lesser extent, previous evaluations; and

“(II) may withhold a grant under this subsection, if the Administrator determines that the applicant has failed to provide the information required to be provided under this paragraph, or the information provided by the applicant is inadequate.

“(D) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 60 calendar days after the date of each deadline to submit applications under this paragraph, the Administrator shall approve or deny each submitted application and notify the applicant for each such application of the approval or denial.

“(E) RECORD RETENTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall maintain a copy of each application submitted under this paragraph for not less than 5 years.

“(ii) PAPERWORK REDUCTION.—The Administrator shall take steps to reduce, to the maximum extent practicable, the paperwork burden associated with carrying out clause (i).”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) AWARD TO PREVIOUS RECIPIENTS.—There shall be no limitation on the number of times the Administrator may award a grant to an applicant under this subsection.”.

(h) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656) is amended—

(1) in subsection (h)(2), by striking “to award a contract (as a sustainability grant) under subsection (l) or”;;

(2) in subsection (j)(1), by striking “The Administration” and inserting “Not later than November 1 of each year, the Administrator”;;

(3) in subsection (k)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1) and (4);

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2) the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration to carry out this section, to remain available until expended, \$21,750,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2021.”; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Of the amount made available under this subsection for a fiscal year, the following amounts shall be available for selection panel costs, costs associated with maintaining an accreditation program, and post-award conference costs:

“(i) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, 2.65 percent.

“(ii) For the second fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph and each fiscal year thereafter through fiscal year 2021, 2.5 percent.”; and

(4) in subsection (m)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “subsection (b) or (l)” and inserting “this subsection or subsection (b)”;

(B) in paragraph (4)(D), by striking “or subsection (l)”.

(i) EFFECT ON EXISTING GRANTS.—

(1) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A nonprofit organization receiving a grant under section 29(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(m)), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to receive the grant under the terms and conditions in effect for the grant on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, except that the nonprofit organization may not apply for a continuation of the grant under section 29(m)(5) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(m)(5)), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LENGTH OF CONTINUATION GRANT.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration may award a grant under section 29(m) of the Small Business Act to a nonprofit organization receiving a grant under section 29(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(m)), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, for the period—

(A) beginning on the day after the last day of the grant agreement under such section 29(m); and

(B) ending at the end of the third fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1713. MATCHING REQUIREMENTS UNDER WOMEN’S BUSINESS CENTER PROGRAM.

Section 29(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(c)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) WAIVER OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon request by an eligible entity, and in accordance with this paragraph, the Administrator may waive, in whole or in part, the requirement to obtain non-Federal funds under this subsection for counseling and training activities of the eligible entity carried out using a grant under this section for a fiscal year. The Administrator may not waive the requirement for an eligible entity to obtain non-Federal funds under this paragraph for more than a total of 2 consecutive fiscal years.

“(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining whether to waive the requirement to obtain non-Federal funds under this paragraph, the Administrator shall consider—

“(i) the economic conditions affecting the eligible entity;

“(ii) the impact a waiver under this paragraph would have on the credibility of the Women’s Business Center Program under this section;

“(iii) the demonstrated ability of the eligible entity to raise non-Federal funds; and

“(iv) the performance of the eligible entity.

“(C) LIMITATION.—The Administrator may not waive the requirement to obtain non-Federal funds under this paragraph if granting the waiver would undermine the credibility of the Women’s Business Center Program.

“(10) SOLICITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an eligible entity may—

“(A) solicit cash and in-kind contributions from private individuals and entities to be used to carry out the activities of the eligible entity under a project conducted under this section; and

“(B) use amounts made available by the Administrator under this section for the cost of such solicitation and management of the contributions received.

“(11) EXCESS NON-FEDERAL DOLLARS.—The amount of non-Federal dollars obtained by an eligible entity that is above the amount that is required to be obtained by the eligible entity under this subsection shall not be subject to the requirements of part 200 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, if such amount of non-Federal dollars—

“(A) is not used as matching funds for purposes of implementing the Women’s Business Center Program; and

“(B) was not obtained using funds from the Women’s Business Center Program.”.

Subtitle C—SCORE Program

SEC. 1721. SCORE REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 20 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (f); and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) SCORE PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out the SCORE program authorized by section 8(b)(1) such sums as may be necessary for the Administrator to make grants or enter into cooperative agreements in a total amount that does not exceed \$10,500,000 in each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019.”.

SEC. 1722. SCORE PROGRAM.

Section 8 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(B), by striking “a Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE)” and inserting “the SCORE program described in subsection (c)”; and

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(c) SCORE PROGRAM.—

“(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection:

“(A) SCORE ASSOCIATION.—The term ‘SCORE Association’ means the Service Corps of Retired Executives Association or any successor or other organization that receives a grant from the Administrator to operate the SCORE program under paragraph (2)(A).

“(B) SCORE PROGRAM.—The term ‘SCORE program’ means the SCORE program authorized by subsection (b)(1)(B).

“(2) MANAGEMENT AND VOLUNTEERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall provide a grant to the SCORE Association to manage the SCORE program.

“(B) VOLUNTEERS.—A volunteer participating in the SCORE program shall—

“(i) based on the business experience and knowledge of the volunteer—

“(I) provide at no cost to individuals who own, or aspire to own, small business concerns personal counseling, mentoring, and coaching relating to the process of starting, expanding, managing, buying, and selling a business; and

“(II) facilitate low-cost educational workshops for individuals who own, or aspire to own, small business concerns; and

“(ii) as appropriate, use tools, resources, and expertise of other organizations to carry out the SCORE program.

“(3) PLANS AND GOALS.—The Administrator, in consultation with the SCORE Association, shall ensure that the SCORE program and each chapter of the SCORE program develop and implement plans and goals to more effectively and efficiently provide services to individuals in rural areas, economically disadvantaged communities, and other traditionally underserved communities, including plans for electronic initiatives, web-based initiatives, chapter expansion, partnerships, and the development of new skills by volunteers participating in the SCORE program.

“(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The SCORE Association shall submit to the Administrator an annual report that contains—

“(A) the number of individuals counseled or trained under the SCORE program;

“(B) the number of hours of counseling provided under the SCORE program; and

“(C) to the extent possible—

“(i) the number of small business concerns formed with assistance from the SCORE program;

“(ii) the number of small business concerns expanded with assistance from the SCORE program; and

“(iii) the number of jobs created with assistance from the SCORE program.

“(5) PRIVACY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Neither the Administrator nor the SCORE Association may disclose the name, address, or telephone number of any individual or small business concern receiving assistance from the SCORE Association without the consent of such individual or small business concern, unless—

“(i) the Administrator is ordered to make such a disclosure by a court in any civil or criminal enforcement action initiated by a Federal or State agency; or

“(ii) the Administrator determines such a disclosure to be necessary for the purpose of conducting a financial audit of the SCORE program, in which case disclosure shall be limited to the information necessary for the audit.

“(B) ADMINISTRATOR USE OF INFORMATION.—This paragraph shall not—

“(i) restrict the access of the Administrator to program activity data; or

“(ii) prevent the Administrator from using client information to conduct client surveys.

“(C) STANDARDS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, after the opportunity for notice and comment, establish standards for—

“(I) disclosures with respect to financial audits under subparagraph (A)(ii); and

“(II) conducting client surveys, including standards for oversight of the surveys and for dissemination and use of client information.

“(ii) MAXIMUM PRIVACY PROTECTION.—The standards issued under this subparagraph shall, to the extent practicable, provide for the maximum amount of privacy protection.”.

SEC. 1723. ONLINE COMPONENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(c)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) ONLINE COMPONENT.—In carrying out this subsection, the SCORE Association shall make use of online counseling, including by developing and implementing webinars and an electronic mentoring platform to expand access to services provided under this subsection and to further support entrepreneurs.”.

(b) ONLINE COMPONENT REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2018, the SCORE Association shall issue a report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate on the effectiveness of the electronic mentoring and webinars required as part of the SCORE program, including—

(A) how the SCORE Association determines electronic mentoring and webinar needs, develops training for electronic mentoring, establishes webinar curricula, and evaluates webinar and electronic mentoring results;

(B) describing the internal controls that are used and a summary of the topics covered by the webinars; and

(C) performance metrics, including the number of small business concerns counseled by, the number of small business concerns created by, the number of jobs created and retained by, and the funding amounts directed towards such online counseling and webinars.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “SCORE Association” and “SCORE program” have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 8(c)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(c)(1)).

SEC. 1724. STUDY AND REPORT ON THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE SCORE PROGRAM.

(a) STUDY.—The SCORE Association shall carry out a study on the future role of the SCORE program and develop a strategic plan for how the SCORE program will evolve to meet the needs of small business concerns over the course of the 5 years following the date of en-

actment of this Act, with markers and specific objectives for the first, third, and final year of the 5-year period.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the SCORE Association shall submit a report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate containing—

(1) all findings and determination made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a);

(2) the strategic plan developed under subsection (a);

(3) an explanation of how the SCORE Association plans to achieve the strategic plan, assuming both stagnant and increased funding levels.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms “SCORE Association” and “SCORE program” have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 8(c)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(c)(1)).

SEC. 1725. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) SMALL BUSINESS ACT.—The Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 7 (15 U.S.C. 636)—

(A) in subsection (b)(12)(A), by striking “Service Corps of Retired Executives” and inserting “SCORE program”; and

(B) in subsection (m)(3)(A)(i)(VIII), by striking “Service Corps of Retired Executives” and inserting “SCORE program”;

(2) in section 22 (15 U.S.C. 649)—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “Service Corps of Retired Executives” and inserting “SCORE program”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking “Service Corps of Retired Executives” and inserting “SCORE program”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(12), by striking “Service Corps of Retired Executives” and inserting “SCORE program”.

(b) OTHER LAWS.—

(1) CHILDREN’S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2009.—Section 621 of the Children’s Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009 (15 U.S.C. 657p) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) the term ‘SCORE program’ means the SCORE program authorized by section 8(b)(1)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)(B));” and

(B) in subsection (b)(4)(A)(iv), by striking “Service Corps of Retired Executives” and inserting “SCORE program”.

(2) ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT.—Section 337(d)(2)(A) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6307(d)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE)” and inserting “SCORE program”.

Subtitle D—Small Business Development Centers Improvements

SEC. 1731. USE OF AUTHORIZED ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

The Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 47 as section 48; and

(2) by inserting after section 46 the following new section:

“SEC. 47. USE OF AUTHORIZED ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

“(a) EXPANDED SUPPORT FOR ENTREPRENEURS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall only use the programs authorized in sections 7(j),

7(m), 8(a), 8(b)(1), 21, 22, 29, and 32 of this Act, and sections 358 and 389 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to deliver entrepreneurial development services, entrepreneurial education, support for the development and maintenance of clusters, or business training.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to services provided to assist small business concerns owned by an Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 8(a)(13)).

“(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Beginning on the first December 1 after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate on all entrepreneurial development activities undertaken in the current fiscal year. This report shall include—

“(1) a description and operating details for each activity;

“(2) operating circulars, manuals, and standard operating procedures for each activity;

“(3) a description of the process used to award grants under each activity;

“(4) a list of all awardees, contractors, and vendors (including organization name and location) and the amount of awards for the current fiscal year for each activity;

“(5) the amount of funding obligated for the current fiscal year for each activity; and

“(6) the names and titles for those individuals responsible for each activity.”

SEC. 1732. MARKETING OF SERVICES.

Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(o) NO PROHIBITION OF MARKETING OF SERVICES.—The Administrator may not prohibit applicants receiving grants under this section from marketing and advertising their services to individuals and small business concerns.”

SEC. 1733. DATA COLLECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 21(a)(3)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(3)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “as provided in this section and” and inserting “as provided in this section.”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and (iv) governing data collection activities related to applicants receiving grants under this section”.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON DATA COLLECTION.—Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(p) ANNUAL REPORT ON DATA COLLECTION.—The Administrator shall report annually to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate on any data collection activities related to the Small Business Development Center Program.”

(c) WORKING GROUP TO IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND STUDY.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall establish a group to be known as the “Data Collection Working Group” consisting of members from entrepreneurial development grant recipient associations and organizations and Administration officials, to carry out a study to determine the best way to capture data collection and create or revise existing systems dedicated to data collection.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Data Collection Working Group shall submit a report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate con-

taining the findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under paragraph (1), including—

(A) recommendations for revising existing data collection practices; and

(B) a proposed plan for the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to implement such recommendations.

SEC. 1734. FEES FROM PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS AND COSPONSORSHIPS.

Section 21(a)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(3)(C)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) FEES FROM PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS AND COSPONSORSHIPS.—Participation in private partnerships and cosponsorships with the Administration shall not limit small business development centers from collecting fees or other income related to the operation of such private partnerships and cosponsorships.”

SEC. 1735. EQUITY FOR SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

Subclause (I) of section 21(a)(4)(C)(v) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(4)(C)(v)(I)) is amended to read as follows:

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts made available in any fiscal year to carry out this section, not more than \$600,000 may be used by the Administration to pay expenses described under subparagraphs (B) through (D) of section 20(a)(1).”

SEC. 1736. CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.

Section 21(a)(7)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(7)(A)) is amended by inserting after “under this section” the following: “to any State, local, or Federal agency, or to any third party”.

SEC. 1737. LIMITATION ON AWARD OF GRANTS TO SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “any women’s business center operating pursuant to section 29.”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(q) LIMITATION ON AWARD OF GRANTS.—Except for not-for-profit institutions of higher education, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator may not award grants (including contracts and cooperative agreements) under this section to any entity other than those that received grants (including contracts and cooperative agreements) under this section prior to the date of the enactment of this subsection, and that seek to renew such grants (including contracts and cooperative agreements) after such date.”

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by this section may not be construed as prohibiting a women’s business center from receiving a subgrant from an entity receiving a grant under section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648).

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous

SEC. 1741. MODIFICATION OF PAST PERFORMANCE PILOT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE CONSIDERATION OF PAST PERFORMANCE WITH ALLIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(d)(17) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(17)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G)—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting “and, set forth separately, the number of small business exporters,” after “small business concerns”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by inserting “, set forth separately by applications from small business concerns and from small business exporters,” after “applications”; and

(2) by amending subparagraph (H) to read as follows:

“(H) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘appropriate official’ means—

“(I) a commercial market representative;

“(II) another individual designated by the senior official appointed by the Administrator with responsibilities under sections 8, 15, 31, and 36; or

“(III) the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization of a Federal agency, if the head of the Federal agency and the Administrator agree;

“(ii) the term ‘defense item’ has the meaning given that term in section 38(j)(4)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(j)(4)(A));

“(iii) the term ‘major non-NATO ally’ means a country designated as a major non-NATO ally under section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321k);

“(iv) the term ‘past performance’ includes performance of a contract for a sale of defense items (under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778)) to the government of a member nation of North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the government of a major non-NATO ally, or the government of a country with which the United States has a defense cooperation agreement (as certified by the Secretary of State); and

“(v) the term ‘small business exporter’ means a small business concern that exports defense items under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) to the government of a member nation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the government of a major non-NATO ally, or the government of a country with which the United States has a defense cooperation agreement (as certified by the Secretary of State).”

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 8(d)(17)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(17)(A)) is amended by striking “paragraph 13(A)” and inserting “paragraph (13)(A)”.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018”.

SEC. 2002. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW.

(a) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AFTER THREE YEARS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), all authorizations contained in titles XXI through XXVII and title XXIX for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor) shall expire on the later of—

(1) October 1, 2020; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2021.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before the later of—

(1) October 1, 2020; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for fiscal year 2021 for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, or contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

SEC. 2003. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Titles XXI through XXVII and title XXIX shall take effect on the later of—

- (1) October 1, 2017; or
- (2) the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 2101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) *INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and

available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Inside the United States

| State | Installation | Amount |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Alabama | Fort Rucker | \$38,000,000 |
| Arizona | Davis-Monthan Air Force Base | \$22,000,000 |
| | Fort Huachuca | \$30,000,000 |
| California | Fort Irwin | \$3,000,000 |
| Colorado | Fort Carson | \$29,300,000 |
| Florida | Eglin Air Force Base | \$18,000,000 |
| Georgia | Fort Benning | \$38,800,000 |
| | Fort Gordon | \$51,500,000 |
| Indiana | Crane Army Ammunition Plant | \$24,000,000 |
| New York | U.S. Military Academy | \$22,000,000 |
| South Carolina | Fort Jackson | \$60,000,000 |
| | Shaw Air Force Base | \$25,000,000 |
| Texas | Camp Bullis | \$13,600,000 |
| | Fort Hood | \$70,000,000 |
| Virginia | Joint Base Langley-Eustis | \$34,000,000 |
| | Joint Base Myer-Henderson | \$20,000,000 |
| Washington | Joint Base Lewis-McChord | \$66,000,000 |
| | Yakima | \$19,500,000 |

(b) *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and available for military construction projects out-

side the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out the military construction project for the instal-

lations or locations outside the United States, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Army: Outside the United States

| Country | Installation | Amount |
|---------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Germany | Stuttgart | \$40,000,000 |
| | Weisbaden | \$43,000,000 |
| Korea | Kunsan Air Base | \$53,000,000 |

SEC. 2102. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) *CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and

available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may construct or acquire family housing units (including land ac-

quisition and supporting facilities) at the installations or locations, in the number of units, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

Army: Family Housing

| State/Country | Installation | Units | Amount |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|
| Georgia | Fort Gordon | Family Housing New Construction | \$6,100,000 |
| Germany | South Camp Vilseck | Family Housing New Construction | \$22,445,000 |
| Kwajalein | Kwajalein Atoll | Family Housing Replacement Construction | \$31,000,000 |
| Massachusetts | Natick | Family Housing Replacement Construction | \$21,000,000 |

(b) *PLANNING AND DESIGN.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$33,559,000.

SEC. 2103. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$34,156,000.

SEC. 2104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2017, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) *LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.*—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2101 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

SEC. 2105. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 986) for Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington, for construction of an airfield operations complex, the Secretary of the Army may construct stand-by generator capacity of 1,000 kilowatts.

SEC. 2106. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2015 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3670) for Fort Shafter, Hawaii, for construction of a command and control facility, the Secretary of

the Army may construct 15 megawatts of redundant power generation for a total project amount of \$370,000,000.

SEC. 2107. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECT.

(a) *EXTENSION.*—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 985), the authorization set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in sec-

tion 2101 of that Act (127 Stat. 986), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2018, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

(b) *TABLE.*—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Army: Extension of 2014 Project Authorization

| State or Country | Installation or Location | Project | Amount |
|------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|
| Japan | Kyogamisaki | Company Operations Complex | \$33,000,000 |

SEC. 2108. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2015 PROJECTS.

(a) *EXTENSION.*—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3669), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2101 of that Act (128 Stat. 3670), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2018, or the

date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

(b) *TABLE.*—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Army: Extension of 2015 Project Authorizations

| State/Country | Installation or Location | Project | Amount |
|------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------|
| California | Military Ocean Terminal Concord .. | Access Control Point | \$9,900,000 |
| Hawaii | Fort Shafter | Command and Control Facility (SCIF) | \$370,000,000 |
| Japan | Kadena Air Base | Missile Magazine | \$10,600,000 |
| Texas | Fort Hood | Simulation Center | \$46,000,000 |

SEC. 2109. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2000, 2005, 2006, AND 2007 PROJECTS.

(a) *PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.*—In connection with the authorizations contained in the tables in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 825), section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108–375; 118 Stat. 2101), section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (division B of Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3485), and section 2101(a) of

the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2445) for Fort Irwin, California, for Land Acquisition—National Training Center, Phases 1 through 4, the Secretary of the Army may carry out military construction projects to complete the land acquisitions within the initial scope of the projects.

(b) *CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.*—The Secretary of the Army shall provide information in accordance with section 2851(c) of title 10, United States Code, regarding the projects described in subsection (a).

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 2201. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) *INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Inside the United States

| State | Installation or Location | Amount |
|----------------------------|---|---------------|
| Arizona | Yuma | \$36,358,000 |
| California | Barstow | \$36,539,000 |
| | Camp Pendleton | \$61,139,000 |
| | Lemoore | \$60,828,000 |
| | Twentynine Palms | \$55,099,000 |
| | Miramar | \$47,600,000 |
| District of Columbia | Coronado | \$36,000,000 |
| | NSA Washington | \$14,810,000 |
| Florida | Mayport | \$84,818,000 |
| Georgia | Albany | \$43,300,000 |
| Guam | Joint Region Marianas | \$284,679,000 |
| Hawaii | Joint Base Pearl Harbor–Hickam | \$73,200,000 |
| | Wahiawa | \$65,864,000 |
| Maine | Kittery | \$61,692,000 |
| North Carolina | Camp Lejeune | \$103,767,000 |
| | Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station | \$15,671,000 |
| Virginia | Dam Neck | \$29,262,000 |
| | Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek–Story | \$2,596,000 |
| | Portsmouth | \$72,990,000 |
| | Yorktown | \$36,358,000 |
| Washington | Indian Island | \$44,440,000 |

(b) *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military construction projects out-

side the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installa-

tion or location outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Outside the United States

| Country | Installation or Location | Amount |
|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Greece | Souda Bay | \$22,045,000 |
| Japan | Iwakuni | \$21,860,000 |

SEC. 2202. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and

available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may construct or acquire family housing units (including land ac-

quisition and supporting facilities) at the installations or locations, in the number of units, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

Navy: Family Housing

| Country | Installation | Units | Amount |
|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| Bahrain Island | SW Asia | Construct On-Base GFOQ | \$2,138,000 |
| Mariana Islands | Guam | Replace Andersen Housing PH II | \$40,875,000 |

(b) PLANNING AND DESIGN.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$4,418,000.

SEC. 2203. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may improve existing military family

housing units in an amount not to exceed \$36,251,000.

SEC. 2204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2017, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy, as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2201 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

SEC. 2205. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS FOR CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 985), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2201 of that Act (127 Stat. 989) and extended by section 2207 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (division B of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2694), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2018, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Navy: Extension of 2014 Project Authorizations

| State | Installation or Location | Project | Amount |
|----------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|
| Illinois | Great Lakes | Unaccompanied Housing | \$35,851,000 |
| Nevada | Fallon | Wastewater Treatment Plant | \$11,334,000 |
| Virginia | Quantico | Fuller Road Improvements | \$9,013,000 |

SEC. 2206. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2015 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3669), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2201 of that Act (128 Stat. 3675), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2018, or the

date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Navy: Extension of 2015 Project Authorizations

| State/Country | Installation or Location | Project | Amount |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|
| District of Columbia | NSA Washington | Electronics Science and Technology Lab | \$31,735,000 |
| Maryland | Indian Head | Advanced Energetics Research Lab Complex Ph 2 | \$15,346,000 |

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 2301. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the author-

ization of appropriations in section 2304(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installa-

tions or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Inside the United States

| State | Installation or Location | Amount |
|------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| Alaska | Eielson Air Force Base | \$168,900,000 |
| California | Travis Air Force Base | \$122,500,000 |
| Colorado | Buckley Air Force Base | \$38,000,000 |
| | Fort Carson | \$13,000,000 |
| | U.S. Air Force Academy | \$30,000,000 |

Air Force: Inside the United States—Continued

| State | Installation or Location | Amount |
|--------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Florida | Eglin Air Force Base | \$90,700,000 |
| | MacDill Air Force Base | \$8,100,000 |
| | Tyndall Air Force Base | \$17,000,000 |
| Georgia | Robins Air Force Base | \$9,800,000 |
| Kansas | McConnell Air Force Base | \$17,500,000 |
| Maryland | Joint Base Andrews | \$271,500,000 |
| Nevada | Nellis Air Force Base | \$61,000,000 |
| | Cannon Air Force Base | \$42,000,000 |
| New Mexico | Holloman Air Force Base | \$4,250,000 |
| | Kirtland Air Force Base | \$9,300,000 |
| | McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | \$146,500,000 |
| New Jersey | Minot Air Force Base | \$27,000,000 |
| North Dakota | Altus Air Force Base | \$4,900,000 |
| Oklahoma | Joint Base San Antonio | \$156,630,000 |
| Texas | Hill Air Force Base | \$28,000,000 |
| Utah | F.E. Warren Air Force Base | \$62,000,000 |
| Wyoming | | |

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a) and available for military construction projects out-

side the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installa-

tion or location outside the United States, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Outside the United States

| Country | Installation or Location | Amount |
|----------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| Australia | Darwin | \$76,000,000 |
| United Kingdom | RAF Fairford | \$45,650,000 |
| | RAF Lakenheath | \$136,992,000 |

SEC. 2302. FAMILY HOUSING.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$4,445,000.

SEC. 2303. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$80,617,000.

SEC. 2304. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2017, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force, as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10,

United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2301 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

SEC. 2305. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2017 PROJECTS.

(a) HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE.—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (division B of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2696) for Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, for construction of a gate complex at the installation, the Secretary of the Air Force may construct a visitor control center of 187 square meters, a traffic check house of 294 square meters, and an emergency power generator system and transfer switch consistent with the Air Force's construction guidelines.

(b) MARIANA ISLANDS.—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2301(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (division B of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2697) for acquiring 142 hectares of land at an unspecified location in the Mariana Islands, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire 142 hectares of land on Tinian in the Northern Mariana Islands for a cost of \$21,900,000.

(c) CHABELLEY AIRFIELD.—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section

2902 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (division B of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2743) for Chabelley Airfield, Djibouti, for construction of a parking apron and taxiway at that location, the Secretary of the Air Force may construct 20,490 square meters of taxiway and apron, 8,230 square meters of paved shoulders, 10,650 square meters of hangar pads, and 3,900 square meters of cargo apron.

(d) SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE.—The table in section 4601 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (division B of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2877) is amended in the item relating to Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, by striking “Consolidated Corrosion Facility add/alter.” in the project title column and inserting “Consolidated Communication Facility add/alter.”

SEC. 2306. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2015 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3669), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2301 of that Act (128 Stat. 3679), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2018, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Air Force: Extension of 2015 Project Authorization

| State | Installation | Project | Amount |
|----------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Alaska | Clear Air Force Station | Emergency Power Plant Fuel Storage | \$11,500,000 |
| Oklahoma | Tinker Air Force Base | KC-46 Two-Bay Maintenance Hangar | \$63,000,000 |

**TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**

**SEC. 2401. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCIES
CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION
PROJECTS.**

(a) *INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the author-

ization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installa-

tions or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Inside the United States

| State | Installation or Location | Amount |
|-----------------------|---|---------------|
| California | Camp Pendleton | \$43,642,000 |
| | Coronado | \$258,735,000 |
| Colorado | Schriever Air Force Base | \$10,200,000 |
| Florida | Eglin Air Force Base | \$9,100,000 |
| | Hurlburt Field | \$46,400,000 |
| Georgia | Fort Gordon | \$10,350,000 |
| Guam | Andersen Air Force Base | \$23,900,000 |
| Hawaii | Kunua | \$5,000,000 |
| Missouri | Fort Leonard Wood | \$381,300,000 |
| | St. Louis | \$812,000,000 |
| New Mexico | Cannon Air Force Base | \$8,228,000 |
| North Carolina | Camp Lejeune | \$90,039,000 |
| | Fort Bragg | \$57,778,000 |
| | Seymour Johnson Air Force Base | \$20,000,000 |
| South Carolina | Shaw Air Force Base | \$22,900,000 |
| Utah | Hill Air Force Base | \$20,000,000 |
| Virginia | Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek-Story | \$23,000,000 |
| | Norfolk | \$18,500,000 |
| | Pentagon | \$50,100,000 |
| | Portsmouth | \$22,500,000 |
| Worldwide Unspecified | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | \$64,364,000 |

(b) *OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for military construction projects out-

side the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installa-

tions or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Outside the United States

| Country | Installation or Location | Amount |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Germany | Spangdahlem Air Base | \$79,141,000 |
| | Stuttgart | \$46,609,000 |
| Greece | Souda Bay | \$18,100,000 |
| Italy | Vicenza | \$62,406,000 |
| Japan | Iwakuni | \$30,800,000 |
| | Kadena Air Base | \$27,573,000 |
| | Okinawa | \$11,900,000 |
| | Sasebo | \$45,600,000 |
| | Torii Commo Station | \$25,323,000 |
| Puerto Rico | Punta Borinquen | \$61,071,000 |
| United Kingdom | Menwith Hill Station | \$11,000,000 |

**SEC. 2402. AUTHORIZED ENERGY RESILIENCY
AND CONSERVATION PROJECTS.**

(a) *INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.*—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and

available for energy resiliency and conservation projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may carry out energy resiliency and

conservation projects under chapter 173 of title 10, United States Code, for the installations or locations inside the United States, and the amounts set forth in the table:

Energy Resiliency and Conservation Projects: Inside the United States

| State | Installation or Location | Amount |
|----------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Colorado | Schriever Air Force Base | \$15,260,000 |
| Guam | Andersen Air Force Base | \$5,880,000 |
| | NAVBASE Guam | \$6,920,000 |
| Hawaii | MCBH Kaneohe Bay | \$6,185,000 |
| Illinois | MTC Marseilles | \$3,000,000 |
| Maryland | NSA South Potomac-Indian Head | \$10,790,000 |
| Missouri | Fort Leonard Wood | \$5,300,000 |
| Montana | Malmstrom AFB | \$6,086,000 |
| North Carolina | Fort Bragg | \$3,000,000 |
| | Lejeune/New River | \$9,750,000 |
| Utah | Tooele Army Depot | \$6,400,000 |
| | Dugway Proving Ground | \$8,700,000 |

Energy Resiliency and Conservation Projects: Inside the United States—Continued

| State | Installation or Location | Amount |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Wyoming | Hill Air Force Base | \$8,467,000 |
| | F.E. Warren | \$4,500,000 |
| Various Locations | Various Locations | \$12,232,000 |

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for energy resiliency and conservation

projects outside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may carry out energy resiliency and conservation projects under chapter 173 of title

10, United States Code, for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Energy Resiliency and Conservation Projects: Outside the United States

| Country | Installation or Location | Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Honduras | Soto Cano Air Base | \$12,600,000 |
| Italy | NSA Naples | \$2,700,000 |
| Japan | CFA Yokosuka | \$8,530,000 |
| Korea | Osan Air Base | \$13,700,000 |

SEC. 2403. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2017, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2401 of this Act may not exceed the total amount authorized

to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

SEC. 2404. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2017 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization in the table in section 2401(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2700) for Kaiserslautern, Germany, for construction of the Sembach Elementary/Middle School Replacement, the Secretary of Defense may construct an elementary school.

SEC. 2405. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 985), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2401 of that Act (127 Stat. 995) and extended by section 2406 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (division B of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2702), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2018, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Defense Agencies: Extension of 2014 Project Authorizations

| State/Country | Installation or Location | Project | Amount |
|----------------|----------------------------|---|--------------|
| United Kingdom | Royal Air Force Lakenheath | Lakenheath Middle/High School Replacement | \$69,638,000 |
| Virginia | Marine Corps Base Quantico | Quantico Middle/High School Replacement | \$40,586,000 |
| | Pentagon | PFPA Support Operations Center | \$14,800,000 |

SEC. 2406. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2015 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3669), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2401 of that Act (128 Stat. 3681), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2018, or the

date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Defense Agencies: Extension of 2015 Project Authorizations

| State/Country | Installation or Location | Project | Amount |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|---|--------------|
| Australia | Geraldton | Combined Communications Gateway Geraldton | \$9,600,000 |
| Belgium | Brussels | Brussels Elementary/High School Replacement | \$41,626,000 |
| Japan | Okinawa | Kubasaki High School Replacement/Renovation | \$99,420,000 |
| | Commander Fleet Activities Sasebo | E.J. King High School Replacement/Renovation | \$37,681,000 |
| Mississippi | Stennis | SOF Land Acquisition Western Maneuver Area | \$17,224,000 |
| New Mexico | Cannon Air Force Base | SOF Squadron Operations Facility (STS) | \$23,333,000 |
| Virginia | Defense Distribution Depot Richmond | Replace Access Control Point | \$5,700,000 |
| | Joint Base Langley-Eustis | Hospital Addition/Central Utility Plant Replacement | \$41,200,000 |
| | Pentagon | Redundant Chilled Water Loop | \$15,100,000 |

TITLE XXV—INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS
Subtitle A—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program

SEC. 2501. AUTHORIZED NATO CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an

amount not to exceed the sum of the amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose in section 2502 and the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

SEC. 2502. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2017, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment

Program authorized by section 2501 as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

Subtitle B—Host Country In-Kind Contributions

SEC. 2511. REPUBLIC OF KOREA FUNDED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.

Pursuant to agreement with the Republic of Korea for required in-kind contributions, the

Republic of Korea Funded Construction Projects

Secretary of Defense may accept military construction projects for the installations or locations, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

| Country | Component | Installation or Location | Project | Amount |
|---------|-----------|--------------------------|---|--------------|
| Korea | Army | Camp Humphreys | Unaccompanied Enlisted Personnel Housing, Phase 1 | \$76,000,000 |
| | Army | Camp Humphreys | Type I Aircraft Parking Apron | \$10,000,000 |
| | Air Force | Kunsan Air Base | Construct Airfield Damage Repair Warehouse | \$6,500,000 |
| | Air Force | Osan Air Base | Main Gate Entry Control Facilities | \$13,000,000 |

SEC. 2512. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2017 PROJECTS.

(a) **CAMP HUMPHREYS.**—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2511 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (division B of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2704) for Camp Humphreys, Republic of Korea, for construction of the 8th Army Correctional Facility, the Secretary of Defense may construct a level 1 correctional facility of 26,000 square feet and a utility and tool storage building of 400 square feet.

(b) **K-16 AIR BASE.**—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2511 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2017 (division B of Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2704) for the K–16 Air Base, Republic of Korea, for renovation of the Special Operations Forces (SOF) Operations Facility, B-606, the Secretary of Defense may renovate an operations administration area of 5,500 square meters.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorizations of Appropriations

SEC. 2601. AUTHORIZED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606

and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the Army National Guard locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army National Guard

| State | Location | Amount |
|------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Delaware | New Castle | \$36,000,000 |
| Idaho | Orchard Training Area | \$22,000,000 |
| | MTC Gowen | \$9,000,000 |
| | Presque Isle | \$17,500,000 |
| Maryland | Sykesville | \$19,000,000 |
| Minnesota | Arden Hills | \$39,000,000 |
| Missouri | Springfield | \$32,000,000 |
| New Mexico | Las Cruces | \$8,600,000 |
| Virginia | Fort Pickett | \$4,550,000 |
| | Fort Belvoir | \$15,000,000 |
| Washington | Tumwater | \$31,000,000 |

SEC. 2602. AUTHORIZED ARMY RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606

and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction

projects for the Army Reserve locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army Reserve

| State | Location | Amount |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| California | Fallbrook | \$36,000,000 |
| Washington | Lewis-McChord | \$30,000,000 |
| Wisconsin | Fort McCoy | \$13,000,000 |
| Puerto Rico | Fort Buchanan | \$26,000,000 |
| | Aguadilla | \$12,400,000 |

SEC. 2603. AUTHORIZED NAVY RESERVE AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606

and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps

Reserve locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve

| State | Location | Amount |
|------------|-------------|--------------|
| California | Lemoore | \$17,330,000 |
| Georgia | Fort Gordon | \$17,797,000 |

Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve—Continued

| State | Location | Amount |
|------------------|--|--------------|
| New Jersey | Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | \$11,573,000 |
| Texas | Fort Worth | \$12,637,000 |

SEC. 2604. AUTHORIZED AIR NATIONAL GUARD CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606

and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construc-

tion projects for the Air National Guard locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air National Guard

| State | Location | Amount |
|--------------------|--|--------------|
| California | March Air Force Base | \$15,000,000 |
| Colorado | Peterson Air Force Base | \$8,000,000 |
| Connecticut | Bradley IAP | \$7,000,000 |
| Indiana | Fort Wayne International Airport | \$1,900,000 |
| | Hulman Regional Airport | \$8,000,000 |
| Kentucky | Louisville IAP | \$9,000,000 |
| Mississippi | Jackson International Airport | \$8,000,000 |
| Missouri | Rosecrans Memorial Airport | \$10,000,000 |
| New York | Hancock Field | \$6,800,000 |
| Ohio | Toledo Express Airport | \$15,000,000 |
| | Rickenbacker International Airport | \$8,000,000 |
| Oklahoma | Tulsa International Airport | \$8,000,000 |
| Oregon | Klamath Falls IAP | \$18,500,000 |
| South Dakota | Joe Foss Field | \$12,000,000 |
| Tennessee | McGhee-Tyson Airport | \$25,000,000 |
| Wisconsin | Dane County Regional/Airport Truax Field | \$8,000,000 |

SEC. 2605. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606

and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construc-

tion projects for the Air Force Reserve locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force Reserve

| State | Location | Amount |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| Florida | Patrick Air Force Base | \$25,000,000 |
| Georgia | Robins Air Force Base | \$32,000,000 |
| Guam | Joint Region Marianas | \$5,200,000 |
| Hawaii | Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam | \$5,500,000 |
| Massachusetts | Westover ARB | \$10,000,000 |
| Minnesota | Minneapolis-St Paul IAP | \$9,000,000 |
| North Carolina | Seymour Johnson Air Force Base | \$6,400,000 |
| Texas | NAS JRB Fort Worth | \$3,100,000 |
| Utah | Hill Air Force Base | \$3,100,000 |

SEC. 2606. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2017, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

SEC. 2611. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2015 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2602 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3688) for Starkville, Mississippi, for construction of an Army Reserve Center at that location, the Secretary of the Army may acquire approximately fifteen acres (653,400 square feet) of land.

SEC. 2612. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 985), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in sections 2602, 2604, and 2605 of that Act (127 Stat. 1001, 1002), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2018 or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

National Guard and Reserve: Extension of 2014 Project Authorizations

| State | Installation or Location | Project | Amount |
|----------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|
| Florida | Homestead ARB | Entry Control Complex | \$9,800,000 |
| Maryland | Fort Meade | 175th Network Warfare Squadron Facility | \$4,000,000 |
| New York | Bullville | Army Reserve Center | \$14,500,000 |

SEC. 2613. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2015 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year

2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3669), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in sections 2602 and 2604 of that Act (128 Stat. 3688, 3689), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2018 or the date

of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

National Guard and Reserve: Extension of 2015 Project Authorizations

| State | Location | Project | Amount |
|---------------------|------------------|--|-------------|
| Mississippi | Starkville | Army Reserve Center | \$9,300,000 |
| New Hampshire | Pease | KC-46A ADAL Airfield Pavements and Hydrant Systems | \$7,100,000 |

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 2701. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES FUNDED THROUGH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2017, for base realignment and closure activities, including real property acquisition and military construction projects, as authorized by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) and funded through the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 2906 of such Act (as amended by section 2711 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2140)), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

SEC. 2702. PROHIBITION ON CONDUCTING ADDITIONAL BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE (BRAC) ROUND.

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

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing

SEC. 2801. ELIMINATION OF WRITTEN NOTICE REQUIREMENT FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES AND RELIANCE ON ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF NOTIFICATIONS AND REPORTS.

(a) MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITIES.—Subchapter I of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

- (1) Section 2803(b) is amended—
 - (A) by striking “in writing”;
 - (B) by striking “seven-day period” and inserting “five-day period”; and
 - (C) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the seven-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification is provided”.
- (2) Section 2804(b) is amended—
 - (A) by striking “in writing”;
 - (B) by striking “14-day period” and inserting “seven-day period; and”
 - (C) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the seven-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification is provided”.
- (3) Section 2805 is amended—
 - (A) in subsection (b)(2)—
 - (i) by striking “in writing”;
 - (ii) by striking “21-day period” and inserting “14-day period”; and
 - (iii) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification is provided”; and
 - (B) in subsection (d)(3)—
 - (i) by striking “in writing”;
 - (ii) by striking “21-day period” and inserting “14-day period”; and
 - (iii) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification is provided”.
- (4) Section 2806(c) is amended—

- (A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “of Defense” after “The Secretary”; and
- (B) by striking “(A)” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following: “, only after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress notice of the increase, including the reasons for the increase and the source of the funds to be used for the increase.”.
- (5) Section 2807 is amended—
 - (A) in subsection (b)—
 - (i) by striking “21-day period” and inserting “14-day period”; and
 - (ii) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the report is provided”; and
 - (B) in subsection (c), by striking “(1)” and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting the following: “only after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress notice of the need for the increase, including the source of funds to be used for the increase.”.
- (6) Section 2808(b) is amended by inserting after “notify” the following: “, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title.”.
- (7) Section 2809 is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following new subsection:
 - “(f) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary concerned may enter into a contract under this section only after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress a justification of the need for the facility covered by the proposed contract, including an economic analysis (based upon accepted life cycle costing procedures) which demonstrates that the proposed contract is cost effective when compared with alternative means of furnishing the same facility.”.
- (8) Section 2811(d) is amended by inserting after “submit” the following: “, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title.”.
- (9) Section 2812(c) is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:
 - “(1) The Secretary concerned may enter into a lease under this section only after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress a justification of the need for the facility covered by the proposed lease, including an economic analysis (based upon accepted life-cycle costing procedures) that demonstrates the cost effectiveness of the proposed lease compared with a military construction project for the same facility.”.
- (10) Section 2813(c) is amended—
 - (A) by striking “transmits to the appropriate committees of Congress a written notification” and inserting “notifies the appropriate committees of Congress”; and
 - (B) by striking “21-day period” and inserting “14-day period”; and

- (C) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the report is provided”.
- (11) Section 2814 is amended—
 - (A) in subsection (a); and
 - (B) by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following new subsection:
 - “(g) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of the Navy may carry out a transaction authorized by this section only after the end of the 20-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress notice of the transaction, including a detailed description of the transaction and a justification for the transaction specifying the manner in which the transaction will meet the purposes of this section.”.
- (b) MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING ACTIVITIES.—Subchapter II of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:
 - (1) Section 2825(b) is amended—
 - (A) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively;
 - (B) in paragraph (5), as redesignated—
 - (i) by striking “the first sentence of”; and
 - (ii) by striking “in that sentence” and inserting “in that paragraph”; and
 - (C) in paragraph (1)—
 - (i) in the second sentence, by striking “The Secretary concerned may waive the limitations contained in the preceding sentence” and inserting the following:
 - “(2) The Secretary concerned may waive the limitations contained in paragraph (1)”;
 - (ii) in the third sentence, by striking “the Secretary transmits” and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting the following: “the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress notice of the proposed waiver, together with an economic analysis demonstrating that the improvement will be cost effective.”.
 - (2) Section 2827 is amended—
 - (A) in subsection (a), by inserting “RELOCATION AUTHORITY.—” after “(a)”; and
 - (B) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection:
 - “(b) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS.—A contract to carry out a relocation of military family housing units under subsection (a) may be awarded only after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary concerned submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress notice of the proposed new locations of the housing units to be relocated and the estimated cost of and source of funds for the relocation.”.
 - (3) Section 2828(f) is amended by striking “may not be made” and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting “may be made under this section only after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary concerned submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress notice of the facts concerning the proposed lease.”.

(4) Section 2831(f) is amended by striking “until—” and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting the following: “until after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress a justification of the need for the maintenance or repair project, including an estimate of the cost of the project.”.

(5) Section 2835 is amended by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(g) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS.—A contract may be entered into for the lease of housing facilities under this section only after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress an economic analysis (based upon accepted life cycle costing procedures) which demonstrates that the proposed contract is cost-effective when compared with alternative means of furnishing the same housing facilities.”.

(6) Section 2835a(c) is amended by striking “until—” and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting the following: “until after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress a notice of the intent to undertake the conversion.”.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—Subchapter III of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2853(c) is amended—

(A) by striking “in writing” both places it appears;

(B) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) by striking “period of 21 days” and inserting “14-day period”; and

(ii) by striking “or, if over sooner, a period of 14 days has elapsed after the date on which a copy of the notification is provided”; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by inserting after “notifies” the following: “, using an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title.”.

(2) Section 2854(b) is amended—

(A) by striking “in writing”;

(B) by striking “21-day period” and inserting “14-day period”; and

(C) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the seven-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification is provided”.

(3) Section 2854a is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(c) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS.—(1) The Secretary concerned may enter into an agreement to convey a family housing facility under this section only after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress a notice containing a justification for the conveyance under the agreement.

“(2) A notice under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) an estimate of the consideration to be provided the United States under the agreement;

“(B) an estimate of the cost of repairing the family housing facility to be conveyed; and

“(C) an estimate of the cost of replacing the family housing facility to be conveyed.”.

(4) Section 2861(c) is amended—

(A) by striking “in writing”;

(B) by striking “21-day period” and inserting “14-day period”; and

(C) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification is provided”.

(5) Section 2866(c)(2) is amended—

(A) by striking “21-day period” and inserting “14-day period”; and

(B) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification is provided”.

(6) Section 2869(d)(3) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “after a period of 21 days” and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting the following: “after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date of the submission of the notice in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title.”; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “only after” and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting the following: “only after the end of the 45-day period beginning on the date of the submission of the notice in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title.”

(d) ALTERNATIVE AUTHORITY FOR ACQUISITION AND IMPROVEMENT OF MILITARY HOUSING.—Subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2881a(d)(2) is amended by inserting after “Congress” the following: “in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title”.

(2) Section 2883(f) is amended—

(A) by striking “30-day period” and inserting “14-day period”;

(B) by striking “written”; and

(C) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notice and justification is provided”.

(3) Section 2884(a) is amended by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(4) The report shall be submitted in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title not later than 21 days before the date on which the Secretary issues the contract solicitation or offers the conveyance or lease.”.

(4) Section 2885 is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(4)(B)—

(i) by inserting after “notify” the following: “, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title.”; and

(ii) by striking “, and shall provide” and inserting “and include”; and

(B) in subsection (d), by inserting after “submit” the following: “, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title.”.

(e) ENERGY SECURITY ACTIVITIES.—Chapter 173 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2914(b)(1) is amended—

(A) by striking “in writing”;

(B) by striking “21-day period” and inserting “14-day period”; and

(C) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification is provided”.

(2) Section 2916(c) is amended—

(A) by striking “in writing”;

(B) by striking “21-day period” and inserting “14-day period”; and

(C) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification is provided”.

(f) MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CARRIED OUT USING BURDEN SHARING CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 2350j(e)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “21-day period” and inserting “14-day period”; and

(2) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the report is provided”.

(g) ACQUISITION OF FACILITIES FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS BY EXCHANGE.—Section 18240(f)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “30-day period” and inserting “21-day period”; and

(2) by striking “or, if earlier, the end of the 21-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the report is provided”.

SEC. 2802. MODIFICATION OF THRESHOLDS APPLICABLE TO UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.

(a) INCREASE IN THRESHOLD; UNIFORM THRESHOLD FOR ALL PROJECTS.—Section 2805(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “\$3,000,000” and inserting “\$6,000,000”; and

(2) by striking the second sentence.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 2805(b)(1) of such title is amended by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$750,000”.

(c) USE OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS.—Section 2805(c) of such title is amended by striking “\$1,000,000” and inserting “\$2,000,000”.

SEC. 2803. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY, LIMITED AUTHORITY TO USE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (h) of section 2808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108-136; 117 Stat. 1723), as most recently amended by section 2804 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (division B of Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2713), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “fiscal year 2018” and inserting “fiscal year 2019”.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking “October 1, 2016” and inserting “October 1, 2017”; and

(2) by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”; and

(3) by striking “fiscal year 2018” and inserting “fiscal year 2019”.

SEC. 2804. USE OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS TO REPLACE FACILITIES DAMAGED OR DESTROYED BY NATURAL DISASTERS OR TERRORISM INCIDENTS.

(a) AUTHORIZING USE OF FUNDS.—Section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c)(1) In using the authority described in subsection (a) to carry out a military construction project to replace a facility, including a family housing facility, that has been damaged or destroyed, the Secretary concerned may use appropriations available for operation and maintenance if—

“(A) the damage or destruction to the facility was the result of a natural disaster or a terrorism incident; and

“(B) the Secretary submits a notification to the appropriate committees of Congress of the decision to carry out the replacement project, and includes in the notification—

“(i) the current estimate of the cost of the replacement project;

“(ii) the source of funds for the replacement project;

“(iii) in the case of damage to a facility rather than destruction, a certification that the replacement project is more cost-effective than repair or restoration; and

“(iv) a certification that deferral of the replacement project for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with national security or the protection of health, safety, or environmental quality, as the case may be.

“(2) A replacement project under this subsection may be carried out only after the end of the 7-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification described in paragraph (1) is provided in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title.

“(3) The maximum aggregate amount that the Secretary concerned may obligate from appropriations available for operation and maintenance in any fiscal year for replacement projects under the authority of this subsection is \$50,000,000.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b) of section 2854 of such title, as amended by section 2801(c)(2), is amended by striking “under this section” and inserting “under subsection (a)”.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

SEC. 2811. ELIMINATION OF WRITTEN NOTICE REQUIREMENT FOR MILITARY REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS AND RELIANCE ON ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF NOTIFICATIONS AND REPORTS.

(a) GENERAL REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTION REPORT.—Section 2662(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting a new paragraph:

“(3) The authority of the Secretary concerned to enter into a transaction described in paragraph (1) commences only after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the first day of the first month beginning on or after the date on which the report containing the facts concerning such transaction, and all other such proposed transactions for that month, is provided in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title.”.

(b) ACQUISITION OF INTERESTS IN LAND WHEN NEED IS URGENT.—Section 2663(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after “submit” the following: “, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title.”; and

(2) by striking “written notice” and inserting “a notice”.

(c) ACQUISITION OF LAND BY CONDEMNATION FOR CERTAIN MILITARY PURPOSES.—Section 2663(f)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “or, if over sooner, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the report is provided”.

(d) EXCEPTIONS TO LIMITATIONS ON LAND ACQUISITION REDUCTION IN SCOPE OR INCREASE IN COST.—Section 2664(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “written”;

(2) by striking “a period of 21 days elapses from” and inserting “the end of the 14-day period beginning on”;

(3) by striking “or, if over sooner, a period of 14 days elapses from the date on which a copy of that notification is provided”.

(e) LEASES OF NON-EXCESS DEFENSE PROPERTY.—Section 2667(d)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “provide to the congressional defense committees written notice” and inserting “submit, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the congressional defense committees a notice”.

(f) MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR AND JURISDICTION OVER FACILITIES FOR DEFENSE AGENCIES.—Section 2682(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “to the appropriate congressional committees written notification” and inserting “, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate congressional committees a notice”.

(g) AGREEMENTS TO LIMIT ENCROACHMENTS AND OTHER CONSTRAINTS ON MILITARY TRAINING, TESTING, AND OPERATIONS.—Section 2684a(d)(4)(D) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “provides written notice” and inserting “submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, a notice”; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “14 days” and all that follows through the end of the clause and inserting the following: “10 days after the date on which the notice is submitted under clause (i).”.

(h) CONVEYANCE OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY FOR NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION.—Section 2694a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(e) NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary concerned may not approve of the reconveyance of real property under subsection (c) or grant the release of a covenant under subsection (d) until after the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary submits, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, to the appropriate committees of Congress a notice of the proposed reconveyance or release.”.

SEC. 2812. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY OF FAIR MARKET VALUE CONSIDERATION IN GRANTS OF EASEMENTS ON MILITARY LANDS FOR RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

Section 2668(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “DISPOSITION OF” and inserting “CONDITIONS AND”;

(2) by striking “Subsections (c) and (e)” and inserting “Subsections (b)(4), (c), and (e)”.

SEC. 2813. CRITERIA FOR EXCHANGES OF PROPERTY AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

Paragraph (2) of section 2869(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) Paragraph (1) applies with respect to real property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned—

“(A) that is located on a military installation that is closed or realigned under a base closure law; or

“(B) that is located on a military installation not covered by subparagraph (A) and for which the Secretary concerned makes a determination that the conveyance under paragraph (1) is advantageous to the United States.”.

SEC. 2814. PROHIBITING USE OF UPDATED ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSTALLATIONS TO SUPERSEDE FUNDING OF CERTAIN PROJECTS.

(a) PROHIBITING USE OF UPDATED ASSESSMENT TO SUPERSEDE FUNDING OF CERTAIN PUBLIC SCHOOL PROJECTS.—Subsection (a) of section 2814 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2717) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) PROHIBITING USE OF UPDATED ASSESSMENT TO SUPERSEDE FUNDING OF CERTAIN REMAINING PROJECTS.—In determining which projects will be funded under the programs described in paragraph (2), the Secretary may not, on the basis of the updated assessment described in paragraph (1), supersede the funding of any of the remaining projects which were included among the 33 projects for which Secretary assigned the highest priority for receiving funds under the assessment of the capacity and facility condition deficiencies of elementary and secondary public schools on military installations conducted by the Secretary in July 2011 under section 8109 of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10; 125 Stat. 82).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

SEC. 2815. REQUIREMENTS FOR WINDOW FALL PREVENTION DEVICES IN MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2878 the following new section:

“§2879. Window fall prevention devices in military family housing units

“(a) REQUIRING USE OF DEVICES ON CERTAIN WINDOWS.—The Secretary concerned shall ensure that if a window in any military family housing unit acquired or constructed under this chapter is described in subsection (b), including a window designed for emergency escape or rescue, the window is equipped with fall prevention devices that protect against unintentional window falls by young children and that are in compliance with applicable International Building Code (IBC) standards.

“(b) WINDOWS DESCRIBED.—A window is described in this subsection if the bottom sill of the window is within 36 inches of the floor, as measured in the interior of the unit.”.

(b) BRIEFING ON IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of each military department shall brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on the implementation of section 2879 of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), and include in the briefing the following:

(1) The extent to which the Secretary is in compliance with the requirements of such section.

(2) A plan for the retrofitting of existing military family housing units to enable the units to meet the requirements of such section.

(3) The feasibility and cost-effectiveness of expanding the requirements of such section to apply to windows for which the bottom sill—

(A) is within 42 inches of the floor, as measured in the interior of the unit; or

(B) is 72 inches or more above the ground, as measured on the exterior of the unit.

(4) The feasibility and cost-effectiveness of modifying the requirements of such section to require windows to be equipped with fall prevention devices that meet the following requirements:

(A) The device attaches to the window frame and covers the entire opening with materials of sufficient strength to withstand 60 pounds (27 kg) of force.

(B) The device allows protection in case of a fully opened window.

(C) The device prohibits the passage of a 4 inch rigid sphere anywhere in the window opening.

(D) The device has a 2 step release mechanism that—

(i) allows the window to be fully opened for emergency escape or rescue with no more than 15 lb ft of force;

(ii) requires 2 distinct actions to operate;

(iii) is clearly identified for use in an emergency; and

(iv) is not designed in a manner which accommodates the use of locking devices which require special tools or knowledge to operate, such as combination locks or keyed locks.

(5) The feasibility and cost-effectiveness of extending the requirements of such section to private housing leased or otherwise used by military families.

(6) The feasibility and cost-effectiveness of other potential methods to protect against unintentional window falls by young children in military family housing units.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 169 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2878 the following new item:

“2879. Window fall prevention devices in military family housing units.”.

SEC. 2816. AUTHORIZING REIMBURSEMENT OF STATES FOR COSTS OF SUPPRESSING WILDFIRES CAUSED BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES ON STATE LANDS; RESTORATION OF LANDS OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE VEHICLE MISHAPS.

(a) **AUTHORITIES.**—Section 2691 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “or lease” each place it appears;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “or lease”;

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “lease,”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(d) **WILDLAND FIRES ON STATE LAND.**—The Secretary of Defense may, in any lease, permit, license, or other grant of access for use of lands owned by a State, agree to reimburse the State for the reasonable costs of the State in suppressing wildland fires caused by the activities of the Department of Defense under such lease, permit, license, or other grant of access.

“(e) **RESTORATION OF LAND DAMAGED BY MISHAP.**—(1) When land under the administrative jurisdiction of a Federal agency that is not a part of the Department of Defense is damaged as the result of a mishap involving a vessel, aircraft, or vehicle of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense may, with the consent of the Federal agency, restore the land.

“(2) When land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of Defense or a military department is damaged as the result of a mishap involving a vessel, aircraft, or vehicle of a Federal agency that is not a part of the Department of Defense, the head of the Federal agency under whose control the vessel, aircraft, or vehicle was operating may, with the consent of the Department of Defense, restore the land.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Such section is further amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “LEASE” and inserting “DAMAGED BY MISHAP; REIMBURSEMENT OF STATE COSTS OF FIGHTING WILDLAND FIRES”;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “(a) The Secretary” and inserting “(a) RESTORATION OF OTHER AGENCY LAND USED BY PERMIT.—The Secretary”;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “(b) Unless” and inserting “(b) SCREENING FOR USE OF IMPROVED LAND.—Unless”; and

(4) in subsection (c), by striking “(c)(1) As a condition” and inserting “(c) RESTORATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LAND USED BY OTHER AGENCY.—(1) As a condition”.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections of chapter 159 of such title is amended by amending the item relating to section 2691 to read as follows:

“2691. Restoration of land used by permit or damaged by mishap; reimbursement of State costs of fighting wildland fires.”

SEC. 2817. PROHIBITING COLLECTION OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS FROM MEMBERS LIVING IN UNITS UNDER MILITARY HOUSING PRIVATIZATION INITIATIVE.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2886. **Prohibiting collection of amounts in addition to rent from members assigned to units**

“(a) **PROHIBITION.**—An agreement for acquiring or constructing a military family housing unit or military unaccompanied housing unit under this subchapter which is entered into between the Secretary and an eligible entity shall prohibit the entity from imposing on a member

of the armed forces who occupies the unit a supplemental payment (such as an out-of-pocket fee) in addition to the amount of rent the eligible entity charges for a unit of similar size and composition, without regard to whether or not the amount of the member’s basic allowance for housing is less than the amount of the rent.

“(b) **PERMITTING CERTAIN ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit an eligible entity from imposing an additional payment for optional services provided to residents, such as access to a gym or a parking space, or an additional payment for non-essential utility services, as determined in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

“(c) **NO EFFECT ON RENTAL GUARANTEES OR DIFFERENTIAL LEASE PAYMENTS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or otherwise affect the authority of the Secretary to enter into rental guarantee agreements under section 2876 of this title or to make differential lease payments under section 2877 of this title, so long as such agreements or payments do not require a member of the armed forces who is assigned to a military family housing unit or military unaccompanied housing unit under this subchapter to pay an out-of-pocket fee or payment in addition to the member’s basic housing allowance.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for subchapter IV of chapter 169 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2886. Prohibiting collection of amounts in addition to rent from members assigned to units.”

Subtitle C—Land Conveyances

SEC. 2821. LAND EXCHANGE, NAVAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE ORDNANCE PLANT, SUNNYVALE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) **LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of the Navy may convey to an entity (in this section referred to as the “Exchange Entity”) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, comprising the Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant (NIROP) located in Sunnyvale, California in exchange for—

(1) real property, including improvements thereon, that will replace the NIROP and meet the readiness requirements of the Department of the Navy, as determined by the Secretary; and

(2) relocation of contractor and Government personnel and equipment from the NIROP to the replacement facilities.

(b) **LAND EXCHANGE AGREEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The exchange authorized under subsection (a) shall be governed by a land exchange agreement that identifies the property to be exchanged (including improvements thereon), the time period in which the exchange will occur, and the roles and responsibilities of the Secretary and the Exchange Entity in carrying out the exchange.

(2) **COMPLIANCE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect or limit the application of, or any obligation to comply with, any environmental law, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601).

(c) **VALUATION; CASH EQUALIZATION PAYMENT IF NIROP VALUE EXCEEDS VALUE OF EXCHANGED PROPERTY.**—

(1) **VALUATION.**—The values of the properties to be exchanged by the Secretary and the Exchange Entity under subsection (a) (including improvements thereon) shall be determined by an independent appraiser selected by the Secretary, and in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(2) **CASH EQUALIZATION PAYMENT.**—If, as determined in accordance with paragraph (1), the value of the NIROP is greater than the combination of the value of the property to be conveyed by the Exchange Entity under subsection (a) and the relocation costs covered by the Exchange Entity under such subsection, the Exchange Entity shall make a cash equalization payment to the Secretary to equalize the values. Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to require the Secretary to make a cash equalization payment to the Exchange Entity if the value of the property to be conveyed by the Exchange Entity and the relocation costs covered by the Exchange Entity are greater than the value of the NIROP.

(d) **PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—The Secretary shall require the Exchange Entity to pay costs incurred by the Department of the Navy to carry out the exchange authorized under subsection (a), including costs incurred for land surveys, environmental documentation, the review of replacement facilities design, real estate due diligence (including appraisals), preparing and executing the agreement described in subsection (b), and any other administrative costs related to the exchange. If amounts are collected from the Exchange Entity in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the exchange under subsection (a), the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the Exchange Entity.

(e) **TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.**—Amounts received under subsections (a), (c)(2), and (d) shall be used in accordance with section 2695(c) of title 10, United States Code.

(f) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The exact legal description of the property, including acreage, to be exchanged under subsection (a) shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary.

(g) **RELATION TO OTHER MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **EXCLUSION FROM TREATMENT AS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT.**—The acquisition or disposition of any property pursuant to the exchange authorized under subsection (a) shall not be treated as a military construction project for which an authorization is required by section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, or for which reporting is required by section 2662 of such title.

(2) **EXCLUSION OF REQUIREMENT FOR PRIOR SCREENING BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION FOR ADDITIONAL FEDERAL USE.**—Section 2696(b) of title 10, United States Code, does not apply to the conveyance of any real property pursuant to the exchange authorized under subsection (a).

(h) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the exchange authorized under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(i) **SUNSET.**—The authority provided to the Secretary to carry out the exchange under subsection (a) shall expire on October 1, 2023.

SEC. 2822. LAND CONVEYANCE, NAVAL SHIP REPAIR FACILITY, GUAM.

(a) **CONVEYANCE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall convey, without consideration, to the Guam Economic Development Authority (hereafter referred to as the “Authority”) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property (including improvements thereon and related personal property) consisting of the former Naval Ship Repair Facility in Guam, as identified under the base realignment and closure authority carried out under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public

Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), for purposes of providing support for ship repair and other military maintenance requirements.

(b) **REVERSIONARY INTEREST.**—If the Secretary of the Navy determines at any time that the property conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance specified in such subsection, all right, title, and interest in and to such property, including any improvements thereto, shall, at the option of the Secretary, revert to and become the property of the United States, and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto such real property. A determination by the Secretary under this subsection shall be made on the record after an opportunity for a hearing.

(c) **PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—The Secretary of the Navy shall be responsible for the costs of carrying out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation and remediation, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance.

(c) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined as set forth in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Relocation of U.S. Marine Corps Forces to Guam, as completed by the Secretary of the Navy in September 2010.

(d) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary of the Navy may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States and to ensure that the property conveyed is used in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance.

SEC. 2823. LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY ALUMNI ASSOCIATION AND NAVAL ACADEMY FOUNDATION AT UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY, ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of the Navy may lease approximately 3 acres at the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland to the United States Naval Academy Alumni Association Inc. and the United States Naval Academy Foundation Inc. (hereafter referred to as the “lessees”), for the purpose of enabling the lessees to construct, operate, and maintain the Alumni Association and Foundation Center.

(b) **DURATION OF LEASE.**—At the option of the Secretary of the Navy, the lease entered into under this section shall be in effect for 50 years. Upon the expiration of the lease, the Secretary may extend the lease for such additional period as the Secretary may determine.

(c) **PAYMENTS UNDER LEASE.**—

(1) **AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS BASED ON FAIR MARKET VALUE.**—The Secretary of the Navy shall require the lessees to make payments under the lease entered into under this section, in cash or in the form of in-kind consideration, in an amount and form that reflects the fair market value of the lease as determined by the Secretary.

(2) **PAYMENTS IN THE FORM OF IN-KIND CONSIDERATION.**—

(A) **TIMING.**—To the extent that the lessees make payments under the lease in the form of in-kind consideration, such consideration may be paid as a lump-sum payment for the entire lease term, or any part thereof, or in annual installments.

(B) **DESCRIPTION OF IN-KIND CONSIDERATION.**—The in-kind consideration paid under the lease—

(i) shall include the relocation of any Naval Support Activity Annapolis functions presently located on the land to be leased to alternate locations deemed sufficient by the Secretary; and

(ii) may include annual support (including cash, real property, or personal property) pro-

vided by the lessees after the date the lease is executed, to be used for the benefit of, or for use in connection with, the Naval Academy.

(d) **RETENTION AND USE OF FUNDS.**—Funds received under the lease entered into under this section may be retained for use in support of the Naval Academy and to cover expenses incurred by the Secretary of the Navy in managing the lease.

(e) **LEASEBACK PROHIBITED.**—During the period in which the lease entered into under this section is in effect, the Secretary of the Navy may not lease any of the space constructed by the lessees on the property leased under this section.

(f) **PAYMENT OF COSTS OF ENTERING INTO AND MANAGING LEASE.**—

(1) **PAYMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Navy shall require the lessees to cover the costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, in entering into and managing the lease under this section, including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation, and any other administrative costs related to the lease (as defined in section 2667 of title 10, United States Code). Any expenses incurred by the lessees pursuant to this provision may be considered in-kind consideration for purposes of subsection (c)(2) and may be credited against any payments due during the term of the lease.

(2) **TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.**—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in entering into and managing the lease. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account. If amounts are collected from the lessees in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary in entering into and managing the lease, the Secretary may refund the excess amount to the lessees.

(g) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be leased under this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy, and may include property currently used for public purposes.

(h) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary of the Navy may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the lease entered into under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2824. LAND CONVEYANCE, NATICK SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER, MASSACHUSETTS.

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

(b) **COMPETITIVE SALE REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary shall use competitive procedures for the sale authorized by subsection (a).

(c) **CONSIDERATION.**—

(1) **CONSIDERATION REQUIRED.**—The Secretary shall require as consideration for conveyance under subsection (a), tendered by cash payment, an amount equal to no less than the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, of the real property and any improvements thereon.

(2) **CASH PAYMENTS.**—

(A) **CASH PAYMENTS DEPOSITED IN A SPECIAL ACCOUNT.**—Cash payments provided as consider-

ation under this subsection shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury established for the Secretary.

(B) **USE OF FUNDS IN SPECIAL ACCOUNT.**—The Secretary is authorized to use funds deposited in the special account established under subparagraph (A) for—

(i) demolition of existing military family housing on the U.S. Army Natick Soldier Systems Center (other than housing on property conveyed under subsection (a)) that the Secretary determines necessary to accommodate construction of military family housing or unaccompanied soldier housing to support military personnel assigned to the U.S. Army Natick Soldier Systems Center;

(ii) construction or rehabilitation of military family housing or unaccompanied soldier housing to support military personnel assigned to the U.S. Army Natick Soldier Systems Center; or

(iii) construction of ancillary supporting facilities (as that term is defined in section 2871(1) of title 10, United States Code) to support military personnel assigned to the U.S. Army Natick Soldier Systems Center.

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

(d) **DESCRIPTION OF PARCELS.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the parcels to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the recipient of the parcels.

(e) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

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

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

SEC. 2825. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS ON LAND CONVEYANCE, CASTNER RANGE, FORT BLISS, TEXAS.

Section 2844 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2157) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS ON ANY CONVEYANCE OF CASTNER RANGE.**—

“(1) **CONDITIONS.**—The real property described in subsection (a) may not be conveyed to the Department or any other governmental, public, or private entity unless the recipient agrees—

“(A) to prohibit the commercial development of the real property; and

“(B) to conserve and protect the ecological, scenic, wildlife, recreational, cultural, historical, natural, educational, and scientific resources of the real property.

“(2) **RECONVEYANCE TO PUBLIC LAND TRUST.**—The conditions imposed by paragraph (1) do not prevent the recipient of real property described in subsection (a) from conveying all or a portion of the real property to a public land trust so long as the public land trust agrees to comply with such conditions.

“(3) **CONVEYANCE DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘convey’ includes any transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the real property described in subsection (a) to another Federal agency.”.

SEC. 2826. LAND CONVEYANCE, WASATCH-CACHE NATIONAL FOREST, RICH COUNTY, UTAH.

(a) **LAND CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey, without consideration, to the Utah State University Research Foundation (in this section referred to as the “Foundation”) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 80 acres, including improvements thereon, located outside of the boundaries of the Wasatch-Cache National Forest in Rich County, Utah, within Sections 19 and 30, Township 14 North, Range 5 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian for the purpose of permitting the Foundation to use the property for scientific and educational purposes.

(b) **REVERSIONARY INTEREST.**—If the Secretary of Agriculture determines at any time that the real property conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance specified in such subsection, all right, title, and interest in and to such real property, including any improvements thereto, shall, at the option of the Secretary, revert to and become the property of the United States, and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto such real property. A determination by the Secretary under this subsection shall be made on the record after an opportunity for a hearing.

(c) **PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—

(1) **PAYMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Agriculture shall require the Foundation to cover the costs (except any costs for environmental remediation of the property) to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the Foundation in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the Foundation.

(2) **TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.**—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(d) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture.

(e) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary of Agriculture may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2827. LAND CONVEYANCE, FORMER MISSILE ALERT FACILITY KNOWN AS QUEBEC-01, LARAMIE COUNTY, WYOMING.

(a) **CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey, without consideration, to the State of Wyoming (in this section referred to as the “State”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of the former Missile Alert Facility (MAF) known as “Quebec-01,” located in Laramie County, Wyoming, for the purpose of operating a historical site, interpretive center, or museum.

(b) **PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—

(1) **PAYMENT REQUIRED.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Air Force shall require the State to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the State in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the State.

(2) **LIMITATION ON PAYMENT OF COSTS BY STATE.**—

(A) **LIMITATION.**—Paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to the costs the State agrees to cover under the Programmatic Agreement described in subparagraph (B), as such Agreement is in effect at the time of the payment of the costs.

(B) **PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT DESCRIBED.**—The Programmatic Agreement described in this subparagraph is the Programmatic Agreement between Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, and the Wyoming State Historic Preservation Officer, Regarding the Implementation of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty at Francis E. Warren Air Force Base Cheyenne, Laramie County, Wyoming.

(3) **TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.**—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance, or if such fund or account has expired at the time of credit, to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available to the Secretary for the purposes for which the costs were paid. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such appropriation, fund, or account, and shall be available for the same purpose, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(c) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Air Force.

(d) **REVERSIONARY INTEREST.**—If the Secretary of the Air Force determines at any time that the real property conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance specified in subsection (a), all right, title, and interest in and to such real property, including any improvements thereto, shall, at the option of the Secretary, revert to and become the property of the United States, and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto such real property. A determination by the Secretary under this subsection shall be made on the record after an opportunity for a hearing.

(e) **ADDITIONAL TERMS.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Subtitle D—Military Land Withdrawals**SEC. 2831. INDEFINITE DURATION OF CERTAIN MILITARY LAND WITHDRAWALS AND RESERVATIONS AND IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF WITHDRAWN AND RESERVED LANDS.**

(a) **IMPROVING MANAGEMENT OF CURRENT STATUTORY LAND WITHDRAWALS AND RESERVATIONS AND MAKING MANAGEMENT MORE TRANSPARENT.**—

(1) **ROLE OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.**—Section 101(a)(2) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C.

670a(a)(2)) is amended by striking “, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.”.

(2) **ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS OF INTEGRATED NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—Section 101(b) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (I), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following new subparagraph:

“(J) procedures to ensure that each periodic review of the plan is conducted jointly by the Secretary of the military department and the Secretary of the Interior, and that affected States and Indian tribes, and the public, are provided a meaningful opportunity to comment upon any substantial revisions to the plan that may be proposed; and”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) shall contain a determination by the Secretary of the military department regarding whether there will be a continuing military need for the lands covered by the integrated natural resources management plan during the period of the plan;”.

(b) **EL CENTRO NAVAL AIR FACILITY RANGES.**—

(1) **ELIMINATION OF TERMINATION DATE AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—The El Centro Naval Air Facility Ranges Withdrawal Act (sub-title B of title XXIX of Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2813) is amended—

(A) in section 2921(b)(3), by striking “, before the termination date specified in section 2925,”;

(B) in section 2924(a), by striking the third sentence;

(C) by striking sections 2925 and 2927; and

(D) in section 2928(a), by striking “specified in section 2925”.

(2) **ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.**—The El Centro Naval Air Facility Ranges Withdrawal Act (sub-title B of title XXIX of Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2813) is further amended by inserting after section 2924 the following new section:

“SEC. 2925. INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.**—The Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior shall establish, by memorandum of understanding, an intergovernmental executive committee for the sole purpose of exchanging views, information, and advice relating to the management of the natural and cultural resources of the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle.

“(b) **COMPOSITION.**—

“(1) **REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—The Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior shall include representatives from interested Federal agencies as members of the intergovernmental executive committee.

“(2) **REPRESENTATIVES OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.**—The Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior shall invite to serve as members of the intergovernmental executive committee—

“(A) at least one elected officer (or other authorized representative) from the government of the State of California; and

“(B) at least one elected officer (or other authorized representative) from each local government and Indian tribal government in the vicinity of the withdrawn and reserved lands, as determined by the Secretaries.

“(c) **OPERATION.**—The intergovernmental executive committee shall operate in accordance

with the terms set forth in the memorandum of understanding under subsection (a).

“(d) PROCEDURES.—The memorandum of understanding under subsection (a) shall establish procedures for creating a forum for exchanging views, information, and advice relating to the management of natural and cultural resources on the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle, procedures for rotating the chair of the intergovernmental executive committee, and procedures for scheduling regular meetings, which shall occur no less frequently than twice a year.

“(e) COORDINATOR.—The Secretary of the Navy, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall appoint an individual to serve as coordinator of the intergovernmental executive committee. The duties of the coordinator shall be included in the memorandum of understanding under subsection (a). The coordinator shall not be a member of the committee.

“(f) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) does not apply to the intergovernmental executive committee.”

(3) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED FOR WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION AND PUBLIC REPORTS.—The El Centro Naval Air Facility Ranges Withdrawal Act (subtitle B of title XXIX of Public Law 104-201; 110 Stat. 2813) is further amended by inserting after section 2926 the following new section:

“SEC. 2927. DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED FOR WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION AND PUBLIC REPORTS.

“(a) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED.—Whenever an integrated natural resources management plan covering the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle is reviewed as to operation and effect as required by section 101(b)(3) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(2)), but not less often than every five years, the Secretary of the Navy shall include the Secretary’s determination regarding whether there will be a continuing military need for any or all of the withdrawn and reserved lands for the following five years.

“(b) PUBLIC REPORTS.—

“(1) CHANGES IN LAND CONDITIONS.—(A) Concurrent with each review of an integrated natural resources management plan described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly prepare and issue a report describing any changes in the condition of the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle since the later of the date of any previous report under this paragraph or the date of the environmental analysis prepared to support the actions that changed the condition of the lands.

“(B) A report under subparagraph (A) shall include a summary of current military use of the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle, any changes in military use of the lands since the previous report, and efforts related to the management of natural and cultural resources and environmental remediation of the lands during the previous five years.

“(2) COMBINATION WITH OTHER REPORTS.—A report under this subsection may be combined with, or incorporate by reference, any contemporary report required by any other provision of law regarding the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle.

“(3) PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT.—(A) Before the finalization of a report under this subsection, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior shall invite interested members of the public to review and comment on the report, and shall hold at least one public meeting concerning the report in a location or locations reasonably accessible to persons who may be affected by management of the lands withdrawn and reserved under this subtitle.

“(B) Each public meeting under subparagraph (A) shall be announced not less than 15 days be-

fore the date of the meeting by advertisements in local newspapers of general circulation, notices on the internet, including the website of El Centro, and any other means considered necessary or desirable by the Secretaries.

“(4) DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT.—The final version of a report under this subsection shall be made available to the public and submitted to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Armed Services and Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.”

(c) JUNIPER BUTTE RANGE.—

(1) ELIMINATION OF TERMINATION DATE AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Juniper Butte Range Withdrawal Act (title XXIX of Public Law 105-261; 112 Stat. 2226) is amended—

(A) in section 2915—

(i) in the section heading, by striking “**Duration**” and inserting “**Relinquishment**”;

(ii) in subsection (a), by striking “**TERMINATION**—” and all that follows through “**At the time of termination**” and inserting “**EFFECT OF RELINQUISHMENT ON OPERATION OF GENERAL LAND LAWS**—Upon relinquishment of Department of the Air Force jurisdiction over lands withdrawn and reserved by this title”;

(iii) in subsection (b)—

(I) in the subsection heading, by inserting “**PROCESS**” after “**RELINQUISHMENT**”;

(II) in paragraph (1), by striking “under subsection (c)”;

(III) in paragraph (3), by striking “before the date of termination, as provided for in subsection (a)(1)”;

(iv) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) in section 2916—

(i) in the section heading, by striking “**or upon termination of withdrawal**”;

(ii) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “and in all cases not later than 2 years before the date of termination of withdrawal and reservation,”;

(iii) in subsection (b), by striking “environmental remediation” and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting “environmental remediation before relinquishing, to the Secretary of the Interior, jurisdiction over any lands identified in a notice of intent to relinquish under section 2915(b).”; and

(iv) in subsection (d)—

(I) in the subsection heading, by striking “**TERMINATES**” and inserting “**RELINQUISHED**”;

(II) by striking “termination date” both places it appears and inserting “relinquishment date”;

(III) in paragraph (2), by striking “termination” and inserting “relinquishment”.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—Section 2910 of the Juniper Butte Range Withdrawal Act (title XXIX of Public Law 105-261; 112 Stat. 2231) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—The memorandum of understanding under subsection (a) shall be modified as provided in subsection (c) to establish an intergovernmental executive committee for the sole purpose of exchanging views, information, and advice relating to the management of the natural and cultural resources of the lands withdrawn and reserved by this title.

“(2) COMPOSITION.—(A) The Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Interior shall include representatives from interested Federal agencies as members of the intergovernmental executive committee.

“(B) The Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Interior shall invite to serve as members of the intergovernmental executive committee—

“(i) at least one elected officer (or other authorized representative) from the government of the State of Idaho; and

“(ii) at least one elected officer (or other authorized representative) from each local government and Indian tribal government in the vicinity of the withdrawn and reserved lands, as determined by the Secretaries.

“(3) OPERATION.—The intergovernmental executive committee shall operate in accordance with the terms set forth in the memorandum of understanding.

“(4) PROCEDURES.—The memorandum of understanding shall establish procedures for creating a forum for exchanging views, information, and advice relating to the management of natural and cultural resources on the lands withdrawn and reserved by this title, procedures for rotating the chair of the intergovernmental executive committee, and procedures for scheduling regular meetings, which shall occur no less frequently than twice a year.

“(5) COORDINATOR.—The Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall appoint an individual to serve as coordinator of the intergovernmental executive committee. The duties of the coordinator shall be included in the memorandum of understanding. The coordinator shall not be a member of the committee.

“(6) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) does not apply to the intergovernmental executive committee.”

(3) DETERMINATIONS OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED FOR WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION AND PUBLIC REPORTS.—Section 2909 of the Juniper Butte Range Withdrawal Act (title XXIX of Public Law 105-261; 112 Stat. 2230) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The review shall include the determination of the Secretary of the Air Force regarding whether there will be a continuing military need for any or all of the withdrawn and reserved lands for the following 5 years.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) PUBLIC REPORTS.—

“(1) CHANGES IN LAND CONDITIONS.—(A) Concurrent with each review of an integrated natural resources management plan developed under this section, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly prepare and issue a report describing any changes in the condition of the lands withdrawn and reserved by this title since the later of the date of any previous report under this paragraph or the date of the environmental analysis prepared to support the actions that changed the condition of the lands.

“(B) A report under subparagraph (A) shall include a summary of current military use of the lands withdrawn and reserved by this title, any changes in military use of the lands since the previous report, and efforts related to the management of natural and cultural resources and environmental remediation of the lands during the previous 5 years.

“(2) COMBINATION WITH OTHER REPORTS.—A report under this subsection may be combined with, or incorporate by reference, any contemporary report required by any other provision of law regarding the lands withdrawn and reserved by this title.

“(3) PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT.—(A) Before the finalization of a report under this subsection, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Interior shall invite interested members of the public to review and comment on the report, and shall hold at least one public meeting concerning the report in a location or locations reasonably accessible to persons who may be affected by management of the lands withdrawn and reserved by this title.

“(B) Each public meeting under subparagraph (A) shall be announced not less than 15 days before the date of the meeting by advertisements in

local newspapers of general circulation, notices on the internet, including the website of the Juniper Butte Range (if one exists), and any other means considered necessary or desirable by the Secretaries.

“(4) DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT.—The final version of a report under this subsection shall be made available to the public and submitted to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Armed Services and Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.”

(d) RANGES COVERED BY SUBTITLE A OF MILITARY LANDS WITHDRAWAL ACT OF 1999.—

(1) ELIMINATION OF TERMINATION DATE AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title XXX of Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 885) is amended—

(A) by striking section 3015;

(B) by striking section 3016 and inserting the following new section:

“SEC. 3016. RELINQUISHMENT.

“(a) NOTICE OF INTENT REGARDING RELINQUISHMENT.—If the Secretary of the military department concerned decides to relinquish all or any of the lands withdrawn and reserved by section 3011, such Secretary shall transmit a notice of intent to relinquish such lands to the Secretary of the Interior.

“(b) OPENING DATE.—On the date of relinquishment of the withdrawal and reservation of lands withdrawn and reserved by section 3011, such lands shall not be open to any form of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mineral laws and the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, until the Secretary of the Interior publishes in the Federal Register an appropriate order stating the date upon which such lands shall be restored to the public domain and opened.”; and

(C) in section 3017—

(i) by striking “section 3016(d)” each place it appears and inserting “section 3016”; and

(ii) in subsection (e)—

(I) by striking “If because” and everything that follows through “determines that” and inserting “If the Secretary of the Interior declines to accept jurisdiction over lands withdrawn by this subtitle which have been proposed for relinquishment because the Secretary determines that”; and

(II) in paragraph (2), by striking “the expiration of the withdrawal of such lands under this subtitle” and inserting “such determination”.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES.—Section 3014 of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title XXX of Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 890) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—For the lands withdrawn and reserved by section 3011, the Secretary of the military department concerned and the Secretary of the Interior shall establish, by memorandum of understanding, an intergovernmental executive committee for each range for the sole purpose of exchanging views, information, and advice relating to the management of the natural and cultural resources of the withdrawn and reserved lands.

“(2) COMPOSITION.—(A) The Secretary of the military department concerned and the Secretary of the Interior shall include representatives from interested Federal agencies as members of the intergovernmental executive committee for a range.

“(B) The Secretary of the military department concerned and the Secretary of the Interior shall invite to serve as members of the intergovernmental executive committee for a range—

“(i) at least one elected officer (or other authorized representative) from the government of

the State in which the withdrawn and reserved lands are located; and

“(ii) at least one elected officer (or other authorized representative) from each local government and Indian tribal government in the vicinity of the withdrawn and reserved lands, as determined by the Secretaries.

“(3) OPERATION.—The intergovernmental executive committee for a range shall operate in accordance with the terms set forth in the memorandum of understanding.

“(4) PROCEDURES.—The memorandum of understanding for a range shall establish procedures for creating a forum for exchanging views, information, and advice relating to the management of natural and cultural resources on the withdrawn and reserved lands, procedures for rotating the chair of the intergovernmental executive committee, and procedures for scheduling regular meetings, which shall occur no less frequently than twice a year.

“(5) COORDINATOR.—The Secretary of the military department concerned, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall appoint an individual to serve as coordinator of the intergovernmental executive committee for a range. The duties of the coordinator shall be included in the memorandum of understanding. The coordinator shall not be a member of the committee.

“(6) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) does not apply to an intergovernmental executive committee established under this subsection.”

(3) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED FOR WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION AND PUBLIC REPORTS.—The Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title XXX of Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 885) is further amended by inserting after section 3014 the following new section:

“SEC. 3015. DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED FOR WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION AND PUBLIC REPORTS.

“(a) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED.—Whenever an integrated natural resources management plan covering the lands withdrawn and reserved under section 3011 is reviewed as to operation and effect as required by section 101(b)(3) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(2)), but not less often than every five years, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall include the Secretary’s determination regarding whether there will be a continuing military need for any or all of the withdrawn and reserved lands for the following five years.

“(b) PUBLIC REPORTS.—

“(1) CHANGES IN LAND CONDITIONS.—(A) Concurrent with each review of an integrated natural resources management plan described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the military department concerned and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly prepare and issue a report describing any changes in the condition of the lands covered by the plan since the later of the date of any previous report under this paragraph or the date of the environmental analysis prepared to support the actions that changed the condition of the lands.

“(B) A report under subparagraph (A) shall include a summary of current military use of the lands covered by the plan, any changes in military use of the lands since the previous report, and efforts related to the management of natural and cultural resources and environmental remediation of the lands during the previous five years.

“(2) COMBINATION WITH OTHER REPORTS.—A report under this subsection may be combined with, or incorporate by reference, any contemporary report required by any other provision of law regarding the lands covered by the integrated natural resources management plan.

“(3) PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT.—(A) Before the finalization of a report under this subsection, the Secretary of the military department concerned and the Secretary of the Interior shall invite interested members of the public to review and comment on the report, and shall hold at least one public meeting concerning the report in a location or locations reasonably accessible to persons who may be affected by management of the lands addressed by the report.

“(B) Each public meeting under subparagraph (A) shall be announced not less than 15 days before the date of the meeting by advertisements in local newspapers of general circulation, notices on the internet, including the website of the affected military range (if one exists), and any other means considered necessary or desirable by the Secretaries.

“(4) DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT.—The final version of a report under this subsection shall be made available to the public and submitted to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Armed Services and Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.”

(e) BARRY M. GOLDWATER RANGE.—

(1) ELIMINATION OF TERMINATION DATE AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3031 of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title XXX of Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 897) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “, including the duration of any renewal or extension”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in the paragraph heading, by striking “OR TERMINATION”; and

(II) in subparagraph (C), by striking the last sentence; and

(iii) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “or termination”; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking “DURATION” and all that follows through “of the termination” and inserting “EFFECT OF RELINQUISHMENT ON OPERATION OF GENERAL LAND LAWS.—On the date of relinquishment”; and

(C) by striking subsection (e); and

(D) in subsection (f)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “TERMINATION AND”; and

(ii) in paragraph (1), by striking “but not later than three years before the termination of the withdrawal and reservation.”;

(iii) in paragraph (3), by striking “before the termination date of the withdrawal and reservation of such lands under this section”; and

(iv) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “Notwithstanding the termination date, unless” and inserting “Unless”.

(2) DETERMINATIONS OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED FOR WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION.—Section 3031 of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title XXX of Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 897) is further amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) PERIODIC DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED.—Whenever an integrated natural resources management plan covering the lands withdrawn and reserved under this section is reviewed as to operation and effect as required by section 101(b)(3) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(2)), but not less often than every five years, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force shall include the Secretary’s determination regarding whether there will be a continuing military need for any or all of the withdrawn and reserved lands for the following five years.”

(3) USE OF DEFINITIONS.—Section 3031(c)(5) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title XXX of Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 907) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) The term ‘military munitions’ has the meaning given that term in section 101(e)(4) of title 10, United States Code.

“(B) The term ‘unexploded ordnance’ has the meaning given that term in section 101(e)(5) of such title.”.

(f) NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER.—

(1) ELIMINATION OF TERMINATION DATE AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Fort Irwin Military Land Withdrawal Act of 2001 (title XXIX of Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1335) is amended—

(A) in section 2910, by striking the section heading and all that follows through “At the time of the termination” and inserting the following:

“**SEC. 2910. EFFECT OF RELINQUISHMENT ON OPERATION OF GENERAL LAND LAWS.**

“On the date of relinquishment”;

(B) by striking section 2911; and

(C) in section 2912—

(i) in the section heading, by striking “**Termination and**”;

(ii) in subsection (a), by striking “During the first 22 years of the withdrawal and reservation made by this title, if” and inserting “If”;

(iii) in subsection (c), by striking “before the termination date of the withdrawal and reservation”; and

(iv) in subsection (d), by striking “Notwithstanding the termination date specified in section 2910, unless” and inserting “Unless”.

(2) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED FOR WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION AND PUBLIC REPORTS.—The Fort Irwin Military Land Withdrawal Act of 2001 (title XXIX of Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1335) is further amended by inserting after section 2910 the following new section:

“**SEC. 2911. DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED FOR WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION AND PUBLIC REPORTS.**

“(a) PERIODIC DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING NEED.—Whenever an integrated natural resources management plan covering the lands withdrawn and reserved under this title is reviewed as to operation and effect as required by section 101(b)(3) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(2)), but not less often than every five years, the Secretary of the Army shall include in the plan the Secretary’s determination regarding whether there will be a continuing military need for any or all of the withdrawn and reserved lands for the following five years.

“(b) PUBLIC REPORTS.—

“(1) CHANGES IN LAND CONDITIONS.—(A) Concurrent with each review of an integrated natural resources management plan described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly prepare and issue a report describing any changes in the condition of the lands withdrawn and reserved by this title since the later of the date of any previous report under this paragraph or the date of the environmental analysis prepared to support the actions that changed the condition of the lands.

“(B) A report under subparagraph (A) shall include a summary of current military use of the lands withdrawn and reserved by this title, any changes in military use of the lands since the previous report, and efforts related to the management of natural and cultural resources and environmental remediation of the lands during the previous five years.

“(2) COMBINATION WITH OTHER REPORTS.—A report under this subsection may be combined with, or incorporate by reference, any contemporary report required by any other provision of law regarding the lands withdrawn and reserved by this title.

“(3) PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT.—(A) Before the finalization of a report under this subsection, the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior shall invite interested members of the public to review and comment on

the report, and shall hold at least one public meeting concerning the report in a location or locations reasonably accessible to persons who may be affected by management of the lands withdrawn and reserved by this title.

“(B) Each public meeting under subparagraph (A) shall be announced not less than 15 days before the date of the meeting by advertisements in local newspapers of general circulation, notices on the internet, including the website of National Training Range, and any other means considered necessary or desirable by the Secretaries.

“(4) DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT.—The final version of a report under this subsection shall be made available to the public and submitted to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Armed Services and Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.”.

(3) ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—The Fort Irwin Military Land Withdrawal Act of 2001 (title XXIX of Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1335) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“**SEC. 2914. INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.**

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior shall establish, by memorandum of understanding, an intergovernmental executive committee for the sole purpose of exchanging views, information, and advice relating to the management of the natural and cultural resources of the lands withdrawn and reserved by this title.

“(b) COMPOSITION.—

“(1) REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior shall include representatives from interested Federal agencies as members of the intergovernmental executive committee.

“(2) REPRESENTATIVES OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior shall invite to serve as members of the intergovernmental executive committee—

“(A) at least one elected officer (or other authorized representative) from the government of the State of California; and

“(B) at least one elected officer (or other authorized representative) from each local government and Indian tribal government in the vicinity of the withdrawn and reserved lands, as determined by the Secretaries.

“(c) OPERATION.—The intergovernmental executive committee shall operate in accordance with the terms set forth in the memorandum of understanding under subsection (a).

“(d) PROCEDURES.—The memorandum of understanding under subsection (a) shall establish procedures for creating a forum for exchanging views, information, and advice relating to the management of natural and cultural resources on the lands withdrawn and reserved by this title, procedures for rotating the chair of the intergovernmental executive committee, and procedures for scheduling regular meetings, which shall occur no less frequently than twice a year.

“(e) COORDINATOR.—The Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall appoint an individual to serve as coordinator of the intergovernmental executive committee. The duties of the coordinator shall be included in the memorandum of understanding under subsection (a). The coordinator shall not be a member of the committee.

“(f) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) does not apply to the intergovernmental executive committee.”.

(g) RANGES COVERED BY MILITARY LAND WITHDRAWALS ACT OF 2013.—

(1) ELIMINATION OF TERMINATION DATE AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Military Land Withdrawals Act of 2013 (title XXIX of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 1025) is amended—

(A) by striking sections 2919, 2920; 2936, 2946, and 2979;

(B) in section 2921, by striking “On the termination of” and inserting “On the relinquishment of”; and

(C) in section 2922(d)(3)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “ON TERMINATION” and inserting “UPON RELINQUISHMENT”; and

(ii) by striking “or if at the expiration of the withdrawal and reservation.”.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—The Military Land Withdrawals Act of 2013 (title XXIX of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 1025) is further amended by inserting after section 2918 the following new section:

“**SEC. 2919. INTERGOVERNMENTAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.**

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—For the lands withdrawn and reserved by sections 2931, 2941, and 2971, the Secretary concerned and the Secretary of the Interior shall establish, by memorandum of understanding, an intergovernmental executive committee for each location for the sole purpose of exchanging views, information, and advice relating to the management of the natural and cultural resources of the withdrawn and reserved lands.

“(b) COMPOSITION.—

“(1) REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Secretary concerned and the Secretary of the Interior shall include representatives from interested Federal agencies as members of the intergovernmental executive committee for a location covered by subsection (a).

“(2) REPRESENTATIVES OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—The Secretary concerned and the Secretary of the Interior shall invite to serve as members of the intergovernmental executive committee for a location covered by subsection (a)—

“(A) at least one elected officer (or other authorized representative) from the government of the State in which the withdrawn and reserved lands are located; and

“(B) at least one elected officer (or other authorized representative) from each local government and Indian tribal government in the vicinity of the withdrawn and reserved lands, as determined by the Secretaries.

“(c) OPERATION.—The intergovernmental executive committee for a location covered by subsection (a) shall operate in accordance with the terms set forth in the memorandum of understanding under subsection (a).

“(d) PROCEDURES.—The memorandum of understanding under subsection (a) shall establish procedures for creating a forum for exchanging views, information, and advice relating to the management of natural and cultural resources on the withdrawn and reserved lands, procedures for rotating the chair of the intergovernmental executive committee, and procedures for scheduling regular meetings, which shall occur no less frequently than twice a year.

“(e) COORDINATOR.—The Secretary concerned, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall appoint an individual to serve as coordinator of the intergovernmental executive committee for a location covered by subsection (a). The duties of the coordinator shall be included in the memorandum of understanding under subsection (a). The coordinator shall not be a member of the committee.

“(f) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) does not apply to a intergovernmental executive committee for a location covered by subsection (a).”.

(3) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED FOR WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION AND PUBLIC REPORTS.—The Military Land Withdrawals Act of 2013 (title XXIX of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 1025) is further amended by inserting after section 2919, as added by paragraph (2), the following new section:

“SEC. 2920. DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING MILITARY NEED FOR WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION AND PUBLIC REPORTS.

“(a) PERIODIC DETERMINATION OF CONTINUING NEED.—Whenever an integrated natural resources management plan covering the lands withdrawn and reserved under a subtitle of this title is reviewed as to operation and effect as required by section 101(b)(3) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(2)), but not less often than every five years, the Secretary concerned shall include in the plan the Secretary’s determination regarding whether there will be a continuing military need for any or all of the withdrawn and reserved lands for the following five years.

“(b) PUBLIC REPORTS.—

“(1) CHANGES IN LAND CONDITIONS.—(A) Concurrent with each review of an integrated natural resources management plan described in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly prepare and issue a report describing any changes in the condition of the lands covered by the plan since the later of the date of any previous report under this paragraph or the date of the environmental analysis prepared to support the actions that changed the condition of the lands.

“(B) A report under subparagraph (A) shall include a summary of current military use of the lands covered by the plan, any changes in military use of the lands since the previous report, and efforts related to the management of natural and cultural resources and environmental remediation of the lands during the previous five years.

“(2) COMBINATION WITH OTHER REPORTS.—A report under this subsection may be combined with, or incorporate by reference, any contemporary report required by any other provision of law regarding the lands addressed by the report.

“(3) PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT.—(A) Before the finalization of a report under this subsection, the Secretary concerned and the Secretary of the Interior shall invite interested members of the public to review and comment on the report, and shall hold at least one public meeting concerning the report in a location or locations reasonably accessible to persons who may be affected by management of the lands addressed by the report.

“(B) Each public meeting under subparagraph (A) shall be announced not less than 15 days before the date of the meeting by advertisements in local newspapers of general circulation, notices on the internet, including the website of the affected military range (if one exists), and any other means considered necessary or desirable by the Secretaries.

“(4) DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT.—The final version of a report under this subsection shall be made available to the public and submitted to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Armed Services and Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.”.

(h) EFFECT ON NEW LAND WITHDRAWALS AND RESERVATIONS.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed as changing the requirements imposed on the Department of Defense to obtain a new or expanded land withdrawal and reservation.

SEC. 2832. TEMPORARY SEGREGATION FROM PUBLIC LAND LAWS OF PROPERTY SUBJECT TO PROPOSED MILITARY LAND WITHDRAWAL; TEMPORARY USE PERMITS AND TRANSFERS OF SMALL PARCELS OF LAND BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS OF INTERIOR AND MILITARY DEPARTMENTS; MORE EFFICIENT SURVEYING OF LANDS.

(a) TEMPORARY SEGREGATION OF MILITARY LAND FROM PUBLIC LAND LAWS UNDER REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL MADE TO SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—Section 3 of the Act of February 28, 1958 (Public Law 85-337; 43 U.S.C. 157), is amended—

(1) by striking “Any application” and inserting “(a) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—Any application”;

(2) by striking “shall specify” and inserting “shall be filed with the Secretary of the Interior and shall specify”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) TEMPORARY SEGREGATION FROM PUBLIC LAND LAWS.—

“(1) PUBLIC NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the receipt of an application under subsection (a) for a withdrawal or reservation, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish a notice in the Federal Register stating that the application has been submitted, identifying the land that is the subject of the application, and stating the extent to which the land is to be segregated in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(2) SEGREGATION FROM PUBLIC LAND LAWS.—Upon publication of a notice under paragraph (1), the land identified in the notice shall be segregated from the operation of the public land laws to the extent specified in the notice. The segregation of such land pursuant to such notice shall terminate upon the earlier of—

“(A) the enactment of some or all of the withdrawal or reservation by Congress; or

“(B) the expiration of the 7-year period which begins on the date of the publication of the notice.

“(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘public land laws’ includes the mining laws, the mineral leasing laws, and the geothermal leasing laws.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR USE AND TRANSFER OF LANDS UNDER JURISDICTION OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—Such Act (43 U.S.C. 155 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

“SEC. 7. SHORT-TERM PERMITS FOR USE OF DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR LANDS FOR MILITARY TRAINING AND TESTING.

“(a) AUTHORITY.—In addition to any other authority to grant permits for the use of land, the Secretary of the Interior may grant a permit to the Secretary of Defense to use land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. Any such permit—

“(1) shall be issued consistent with section 2691 of title 10, United States Code;

“(2) shall allow the Department of Defense to use the land only for purposes of training and testing that are consistent with the purposes for which the Secretary of the Interior manages the land; and

“(3) may contain such other requirements as the Secretary of the Interior considers appropriate.

“(b) DURATION OF PERMIT.—A permit granted under this section shall be in effect for such period as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, except that such period may not exceed 30 days.

“SEC. 8. TRANSFERS OF SMALL PARCELS OF LAND BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENTS OF DEFENSE AND INTERIOR.

“(a) TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.—Subject to any valid existing rights, upon mutual agreement,

and without cost for the value of the land or any improvements thereon—

“(1) the Secretary of the Interior may transfer administrative jurisdiction over land that meets the requirements of subsection (b) to the Secretary of a military department; and

“(2) the Secretary of a military department may transfer administrative jurisdiction over land that meets the requirements of subsection (b) to the Secretary of the Interior.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR LAND ELIGIBLE FOR TRANSFER.—The requirements of this subsection are as follows:

“(1) CONTIGUITY.—The land is contiguous to land already under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary to whom such jurisdiction is transferred.

“(2) LIMITATION ON ACREAGE.—No single parcel of the land is larger than 5,000 acres of contiguous area.

“(3) NO RECENT PRIOR TRANSFER OF CONTIGUOUS LAND.—The land is not contiguous to any other land for which administrative jurisdiction has been transferred under the authority of this section during the previous 5 years.

“(4) PRIOR USE FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES.—In the case of land transferred to the Department of Defense, the land was used for defense purposes immediately prior to the date of transfer.

“(c) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

“(1) PREPARATION AND PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall—

“(A) publish in the Federal Register a notice containing the legal description of any land transferred under subsection (a);

“(B) file maps and legal descriptions of the land with—

“(i) the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and

“(ii) the Committees on Armed Services and Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

“(C) make copies of such maps and legal descriptions available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

“(2) FORCE OF LAW.—For purposes of any transfer of administrative jurisdiction over land under this section, the legal description and map for the land shall be the legal description of the land filed under paragraph (1)(B), except that the Secretary of the Interior may correct clerical and typographical errors in the legal description or map.

“(d) TREATMENT AND USE OF LAND TRANSFERRED TO THE SECRETARY OF A MILITARY DEPARTMENT.—Upon a transfer of administrative jurisdiction over land to the Secretary of a military department under subsection (a)—

“(1) the land shall be treated as property (as defined in section 102(9) of title 40, United States Code) under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the military department; and

“(2) the land shall be withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, the mineral leasing laws, and the geothermal leasing laws, for as long as the land is under the administrative jurisdiction of a Secretary of a military department.

“(e) TREATMENT AND USE OF LAND TRANSFERRED TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—Upon a transfer of administrative jurisdiction over land to the Secretary of the Interior under subsection (a)—

“(1) the land shall become public land; and

“(2) the land shall be administered for the same purposes and be subject to the same conditions of use as the adjacent public land.

“(f) EFFECT ON OTHER AUTHORITIES.—The authority provided by this section is in addition to, and not subject to, any other authority relating to transfers of land.”.

(c) **SHORT TITLE.**—Section 1 of such Act (43 U.S.C. 155) is amended—

(1) by striking “Notwithstanding” and inserting “(a) **WITHDRAWAL, RESERVATION, OR RESTRICTION OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES.**—Notwithstanding”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the ‘Engle Act’.”

(d) **PROMOTING MORE EFFICIENT SURVEYING OF LANDS.**—In fixing the original corner position in an official survey of unsurveyed land, when applicable and feasible, Cadastral Surveys may, instead of using physical monuments, use geographic coordinates correlated to the National Spatial Reference System geodetic datum, in accordance with the Manual of Surveying Instructions.

Subtitle E—Military Memorials, Monuments, and Museums

SEC. 2841. MODIFICATION OF PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER OF VETERANS MEMORIAL OBJECTS TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS WITHOUT SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION IN LAW.

(a) **DESCRIPTION OF OBJECTS.**—Paragraph (2)(B)(iii) of section 2572(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “from abroad” and inserting “from abroad before 1907”.

(b) **EXTENSION OF PROHIBITION.**—Paragraph (3)(B) of section 2572(e) of such title is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “September 30, 2022”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect October 1, 2017.

SEC. 2842. RECOGNITION OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF WORLD WAR II AVIATION.

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

(1) World War II was one of the most important events in the history of the Nation, a time of common purpose that remains today as an inspiration to all people in the United States.

(2) The role of aviation was a critical factor in the success of winning World War II and defeating the enemies worldwide.

(3) The bravery, courage, dedication, and heroism of World War II aviators and support personnel were decisive in winning World War II.

(4) The National Museum of World War II Aviation in Colorado Springs, Colorado, is the only museum in the United States that exists to exclusively preserve and promote an understanding of the role of aviation in winning World War II.

(5) The National Museum of World War II Aviation is dedicated to celebrating the spirit of the United States, recognizing the teamwork, collaboration, patriotism, and courage of the men and women who fought, as well as those on the homefront who mobilized and supported the national aviation effort.

(b) **RECOGNITION.**—The National Museum of World War II Aviation in Colorado Springs, Colorado, is recognized as America’s National World War II Aviation Museum.

(c) **EFFECT OF RECOGNITION.**—The National Museum recognized by this section is not a unit of the National Park System, and the recognition of the National Museum shall not be construed to require or permit Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to the National Museum.

SEC. 2843. PRINCIPAL OFFICE OF AVIATION HALL OF FAME.

Section 23107 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking “Dayton,” and all that follows through “trustees” and inserting “Ohio”.

Subtitle F—Shiloh National Military Park

SEC. 2851. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Shiloh National Military Park Boundary Adjustment and Parker’s Crossroads Battlefield Designation Act”.

SEC. 2852. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle, the following definitions apply:

(1) **AFFILIATED AREA.**—The term “affiliated area” means the Parker’s Crossroads Battlefield established as an affiliated area of the National Park System under section 2854.

(2) **PARK.**—The term “Park” means Shiloh National Military Park, a unit of the National Park System.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2853. AREAS TO BE ADDED TO SHILOH NATIONAL MILITARY PARK.

(a) **ADDITIONAL AREAS.**—The boundary of Shiloh National Military Park is modified to include the areas that are generally depicted on the map entitled “Shiloh National Military Park, Proposed Boundary Adjustment”, numbered 304/80,011, and dated July 2014, as follows:

(1) Fallen Timbers Battlefield.

(2) Russell House Battlefield.

(3) Davis Bridge Battlefield.

(b) **ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may acquire lands described in subsection (a) by donation, purchase from willing sellers with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange.

(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Any lands acquired under this section shall be administered as part of the Park.

SEC. 2854. ESTABLISHMENT OF AFFILIATED AREA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Parker’s Crossroads Battlefield in the State of Tennessee is hereby established as an affiliated area of the National Park System.

(b) **DESCRIPTION.**—The affiliated area shall consist of the area generally depicted within the “Proposed Boundary” on the map entitled “Parker’s Crossroads Battlefield, Proposed Boundary”, numbered 903/80,073, and dated July 2014.

(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The affiliated area shall be managed in accordance with this subtitle and all laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System.

(d) **MANAGEMENT ENTITY.**—The City of Parkers Crossroads and the Tennessee Historical Commission shall jointly be the management entity for the affiliated area.

(e) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary may provide technical assistance and enter into cooperative agreements with the management entity for the purpose of providing financial assistance with marketing, marking, interpretation, and preservation of the affiliated area.

(f) **LIMITED ROLE OF THE SECRETARY.**—Nothing in this Act authorizes the Secretary to acquire property at the affiliated area or to assume overall financial responsibility for the operation, maintenance, or management of the affiliated area.

(g) **GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the management entity, shall develop a general management plan for the affiliated area. The plan shall be prepared in accordance with section 100502 of title 54, United States Code.

(2) **TRANSMITTAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date that funds are made available for this subtitle, the Secretary shall provide a copy of the completed general management plan to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

SEC. 2855. PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.

(a) **NO USE OF CONDEMNATION.**—The Secretary of the Interior may not acquire by condemnation any land or interests in land under this subtitle or for the purposes of this subtitle.

(b) **WRITTEN CONSENT OF OWNER.**—No non-Federal property may be included in the Shiloh National Military Park without the written consent of the owner.

(c) **NO BUFFER ZONE CREATED.**—Nothing in this subtitle, the establishment of the Shiloh National Military Park, or the management plan for the Shiloh National Military Park shall be construed to create buffer zones outside of the Park. That activities or uses can be seen, heard, or detected from areas within the Shiloh National Military Park shall not preclude, limit, control, regulate, or determine the conduct or management of activities or uses outside of the Park.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

SEC. 2861. MODIFICATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE GUIDANCE ON USE OF AIRFIELD PAVEMENT MARKINGS.

(a) **MODIFICATION REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall require such modifications of Unified Facilities Guide Specifications for pavement markings (UFGS 32 17 24.00 10 Pavement Markings, UFGS 32 17 24.00 20 Pavement Markings), Air Force Engineering Technical Letter ETL 97-18 (Guide Specification for Airfield and Roadway Marking), and any other Department of Defense guidance on airfield pavement markings as may be necessary to prohibit the use of Type I glass beads or any glass beads with a 1.6 refractive index or less from use on airfield markings on airfields under the control of the Secretary.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The modifications required under subsection (a) shall apply with respect to procurements occurring after September 30, 2018.

SEC. 2862. AUTHORITY OF CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER OF ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME TO ACQUIRE AND LEASE PROPERTY.

(a) **ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY.**—Section 1511(e) of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 (24 U.S.C. 411(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “Secretary of Defense may acquire,” and inserting “Chief Operating Officer may acquire,”; and

(B) by striking “Secretary may acquire” and inserting “Chief Operating Officer may acquire”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “Secretary of Defense determines” and inserting “Chief Operating Officer determines”; and

(B) by striking “Secretary shall dispose” and inserting “Chief Operating Officer shall dispose”.

(b) **LEASING OF NON-EXCESS PROPERTY.**—Subsection (i) of section 1511 of such Act (24 U.S.C. 411(i)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “Secretary of Defense (acting on behalf of the Chief Operating Officer)” and inserting “Chief Operating Officer”; and

(B) by striking “Secretary considers” and inserting “Chief Operating Officer considers”; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking “the Secretary of Defense may not enter into the lease on behalf of the Chief Operating Officer” and inserting “the Chief Operating Officer may not enter into the lease”; and

(3) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (6), by striking “Secretary of Defense” and inserting “Chief Operating Officer”.

TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 2901. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out the military construction projects for the installations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Outside the United States

| Country | Installation | Amount |
|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| Cuba | Guantanamo | \$115,000,000 |
| Turkey | Various Locations | \$6,400,000 |

SEC. 2902. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT. project for the installation outside the United States, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:
 The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out the military construction

Navy: Outside the United States

| Country | Installation | Amount |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Djibouti | Camp Lemonnier | \$13,390,000 |

SEC. 2903. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS. construction projects for the installations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:
 The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out the military construction

Air Force: Outside the United States

| Country | Installation | Amount |
|------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| Estonia | Amari Air Base | \$13,900,000 |
| Hungary | Kecskemet Air Base | \$55,400,000 |
| Iceland | Keflavik | \$14,400,000 |
| Italy | Aviano AB | \$27,325,000 |
| Jordan | Azraq | \$143,000,000 |
| Latvia | Lielvarde Air Base | \$3,850,000 |
| Luxembourg | Sanem | \$67,400,000 |
| Norway | Rygge | \$10,300,000 |
| Qatar | Al Udeid | \$15,000,000 |
| Romania | Campia Turzii | \$2,950,000 |
| Slovakia | Malacky | \$24,000,000 |
| | Sliac Airport | \$22,000,000 |
| Turkey | Incirlık Air Base | \$48,697,000 |

SEC. 2904. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCIES CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT. project for the installation outside the United States, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:
 The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out the military construction

Defense Agencies: Outside the United States

| Country | Installation | Amount |
|-------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Italy | Sigonella | \$22,400,000 |

SEC. 2905. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2017, for the military construction projects outside the United States authorized by this title as specified in the funding table in section 4602.

SEC. 2906. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2015 PROJECTS. (a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3669), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2902 of that Act (128 Stat. 3717), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2018, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Extension of 2015 Air Force OCO Project Authorizations

| Country | Installation | Project | Amount |
|--------------|---------------------|---|--------------|
| Italy | Camp Darby | ERI: Improve Weapons Storage Facility | \$44,450,000 |
| Poland | Lask Air Base | ERI: Improve Support Infrastructure | \$22,400,000 |

**DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS
AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**

**TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

**Subtitle A—National Security Programs
Authorizations**

SEC. 3101. NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2018 for the activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in carrying out programs as specified in the funding table in division D.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF NEW PLANT PROJECTS.**—From funds referred to in subsection (a) that are available for carrying out plant projects, the Secretary of Energy may carry out new plant projects for the National Nuclear Security Administration as follows:

Project 18–D–150, Surplus Plutonium Disposition, Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina, \$9,000,000.

Project 18–D–620, Exascale Computing Facility Modernization Project, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, \$3,000,000.

Project 18–D–650, Tritium Production Capability, Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina, \$6,800,000.

Project 18–D–660, Fire Station, Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, \$28,000,000.

Project 18–D–670, Exascale Class Computer Cooling Equipment, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, \$22,000,000.

Project 18–D–680, Material Staging Facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, \$5,200,000.

Project 18–D–920, KL Fuel Development Laboratory, Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Schenectady, New York, \$1,000,000.

Project 18–D–921, KS Overhead Piping, Kesselring Site, West Milton, New York, \$6,688,000.

Project 18–D–922, BL Component Test Complex, Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory, West Mifflin, Pennsylvania, \$3,000,000.

SEC. 3102. DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2018 for defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out programs as specified in the funding table in division D.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF NEW PLANT PROJECTS.**—From funds referred to in subsection (a) that are available for carrying out plant projects, the Secretary of Energy may carry out new plant projects for the National Nuclear Security Administration as follows:

Project 18–D–401, Saltstone Disposal Units #8 and #9, Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina, \$500,000.

Project 18–D–402, Emergency Operations Center Replacement, Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina, \$500,000.

Project 18–D–404, Modification of Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington, \$6,500,000.

SEC. 3103. OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2018 for other defense activities in carrying out programs as specified in the funding table in division D.

SEC. 3104. NUCLEAR ENERGY.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2018 for nuclear energy as specified in the funding table in division D.

**Subtitle B—Program Authorizations,
Restrictions, and Limitations**

SEC. 3111. NUCLEAR SECURITY ENTERPRISE INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION AND REPAIR.

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

(1) On September 7, 2016, during testimony before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives—

(A) the Administrator for Nuclear Security, Frank Klotz, said—

(i) “Our infrastructure is extensive, complex, and, in many critical areas, several decades old. More than half of NNSA’s approximately 6,000 real property assets are over 40 years old, and nearly 30 percent date back to the Manhattan Project era. Many of the enterprise’s critical utility, safety, and support systems are failing at an increasing and unpredictable rate, which poses both programmatic and safety risk.”; and

(ii) “I can think of no greater threat to the nuclear security enterprise than the state of NNSA’s infrastructure.”;

(B) the President and Chief Executive Officer of Consolidated Nuclear Security, Morgan Smith, said, “Many key facilities at both [Pantex and Y–12] were constructed in the 1940s and were intended to operate for as little as one decade. Many facilities and their supporting infrastructure have exceeded or far exceeded their expected life, and major systems within the facilities are beginning to fail.”; and

(C) the Director of Los Alamos National Laboratory, Dr. Charlie McMillan, said, “One of the things that keeps me up at night is the realization that essential capabilities are held at risk by the possibility of such failures; in many cases, our enterprise has a single point of failure.”.

(2) In a letter sent on December 23, 2015, by the Secretary of Energy, Ernest Moniz, to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Shaun Donovan, the Secretary said, “A majority of the National Nuclear Security Administration’s (NNSA) facilities and systems are well beyond end-of-life . . . Infrastructure problems such as falling ceilings are increasing in frequency and severity, unacceptably risking the safety and security of both personnel and material at NNSA facilities, as well as in some instances, potential offsite risks. The entire complex could be placed at risk if there is a single failure where a single point would disrupt a critical link in infrastructure.”.

(3) The Nuclear Posture Review published in April 2010 stated that “In order to sustain a safe, secure, and effective U.S. nuclear stockpile as long as nuclear weapons exist, the United States must possess a modern physical infrastructure . . . Today’s nuclear complex, however, has fallen into neglect. Although substantial science, technology, and engineering investments were made over the last decade under the auspices of the Stockpile Stewardship Program, the complex still includes many oversized and costly-to-maintain facilities built during the 1940s and 1950s. Some facilities needed for working with plutonium and uranium date back to the Manhattan Project. Safety, security, and environmental issues associated with these aging facilities are mounting, as are the costs of addressing them.”.

(4) In 2009, the bipartisan Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States established by section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 319) stated, with regards to key production facilities, that “existing facilities are genuinely decrepit and are maintained in a safe and secure manner only at high cost”.

(5) Previous efforts to address the deferred maintenance and repair challenges within the

nuclear security enterprise, such as the Facilities Infrastructure and Recapitalization Program and the recent halt in the growth of backlog metrics, are laudable but insufficient for the magnitude of the problem.

(6) Recent figures provided by the Administrator for Nuclear Security estimate the backlog of deferred maintenance and repair needs of the nuclear security enterprise to be approximately \$3,700,000,000.

(b) **FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION AND REPAIR PROGRAM.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall establish and carry out a program known as the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization and Repair Program to reduce the backlog of deferred maintenance and repair needs of the nuclear security enterprise (as defined in section 4002(6) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501(6))). The Administrator shall ensure that, by not later than five years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the program achieves the goal of reducing such backlog of deferred maintenance and repair needs by 50 percent.

(2) **AUTHORITIES.**—

(A) **PROCESS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Energy shall provide to the Administrator a process that will enhance or streamline the ability of the Administrator to carry out the program under paragraph (1) in an efficient and effective manner, including with respect to—

(I) the demolition or construction of non-nuclear facilities of the Administration that have a total estimated project cost of less than \$100,000,000; and

(II) the decontamination, decommissioning, and demolition (to be performed in accordance with applicable health and safety standards used by the Defense Environmental Cleanup Program) of process-contaminated facilities of the Administration that have a total estimated project cost of less than \$50,000,000.

(ii) **FUNDING.**—Clause (i) may be carried out using amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018 or any subsequent fiscal year.

(B) **APPLICATION OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.**—For purposes of the Management Procedures Memorandum 2015–01 of the Office of Management and Budget, or such successor memorandum, in carrying out the program under paragraph (1), the Administrator may—

(i) perform new construction during a fiscal year that differs from the fiscal year of corresponding facility demolition;

(ii) perform demolition of different facility category codes and have that demolition credit count towards the construction of new facilities with a different facility category code; and

(iii) have the net reduction in infrastructure footprint for the five fiscal years prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, and the demolition during the five fiscal years following such date of enactment, considered as a factor for the purpose of meeting the intent of such memorandum.

(3) **PLAN.**—Together with the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2019, the Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a plan to carry out the program under paragraph (1) to achieve the goal specified in such paragraph. Such plan shall include—

(A) the funding required to carry out the program during the period covered by the future-years nuclear security program under section 3253 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2453);

(B) the criteria for selecting and prioritizing projects within the program under paragraph (1);

(C) mechanisms for ensuring the robust management and oversight of such projects;

(D) a description of the process provided to the Administrator to carry out the program pursuant to paragraph (2)(A);

(E) a description of any legislative actions the Secretary recommends to further enhance or streamline authorities or processes relating to the program; and

(F) a certification by the Secretary that such budget will enable the program to meet the goal specified in paragraph (1).

(4) **TERMINATION.**—The Administrator shall terminate the program under paragraph (1) on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **INCLUSION IN BIENNIAL DETAILED REPORT.**—Section 4203(d)(4) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2523) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D)(i) a description of—

“(I) the metrics (based on industry best practices) used by the Administrator to determine the infrastructure deferred maintenance and repair needs of the nuclear security enterprise; and

“(II) the percentage of replacement plant value being spent on maintenance and repair needs of the nuclear security enterprise; and

“(ii) an explanation of whether the annual spending on such needs complies with the recommendation of the National Research Council of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine that such spending be in an amount equal to four percent of the replacement plant value, and, if not, the reasons for such noncompliance and a plan for how the Administrator will ensure facilities of the nuclear security enterprise are being properly sustained.”.

(d) **REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CRITICAL DECISIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle A of title XLVII of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“**SEC. 4715. MATTERS RELATING TO CRITICAL DECISIONS.**

“(a) **POST-CRITICAL DECISION 2 CHANGES.**—After the date on which a plant project specifically authorized by law achieves critical decision 2, the Administrator may not change the requirements for such project if such change increases the scope, schedule, or budget of such project unless—

“(1) the Administrator submits to the congressional defense committees—

“(A) a certification that the Administrator, without delegation, authorizes such proposed change; and

“(B) a cost-benefit and risk analysis of such proposed change, including with respect to—

“(i) the effects of such proposed change on the project cost and schedule; and

“(ii) any mission risks and operational risks from making such change or not making such change; and

“(2) a period of 15 days elapses following the date of such submission.

“(b) **REVIEW AND APPROVAL.**—The Administrator shall ensure that critical decision packages are timely reviewed and either approved or disapproved.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents at the beginning of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4714 the following new item:

“Sec. 4715. Matters relating to critical decisions.”.

(e) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the nuclear security enterprise, comprised of the infrastructure and capabilities of the laboratories and plants coupled with the dedicated and talented scientists, engineers, technicians, and administrators who form the backbone of the enterprise, are a central component of the nuclear deterrent of the United States;

(2) if left unaddressed, the state of the infrastructure within the nuclear security enterprise represents a direct, long-term threat to the credibility of the nuclear deterrent of the United States;

(3) both Congress and the President must take strong, sustained action to recapitalize and repair this infrastructure;

(4) the Administrator must continue to carry out expeditious demolition of old facilities of the Administration to reduce long-term costs and improve safety; and

(5) each budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter during the life of the program established pursuant to subsection (b)(1) should include funding in an amount sufficient to carry out the program to achieve the goal specified in such subsection.

SEC. 3112. INCORPORATION OF INTEGRATED SURETY ARCHITECTURE IN TRANSPORTATION.

(a) **INCORPORATION.**—Subtitle A of title XLII of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“**SEC. 4222. INCORPORATION OF INTEGRATED SURETY ARCHITECTURE.**

“(a) **SHIPMENTS.**—(1) The Administrator shall ensure that shipments described in paragraph (2) incorporate surety technologies relating to transportation and shipping developed by the Integrated Surety Architecture program of the Administration.

“(2) A shipment described in this paragraph is an over-the-road shipment of the Administration that involves any nuclear weapon planned to be in the active stockpile after 2025.

“(b) **CERTAIN PROGRAMS.**—(1) The Administrator, in coordination with the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council, shall ensure that each program described in paragraph (2) incorporate integrated designs compatible with the Integrated Surety Architecture program.

“(2) A program described in this subsection is a program of the Administration that is a warhead development program, a life extension program, or a warhead major alteration program.

“(c) **DETERMINATION.**—(1) If, on a case-by-case basis, the Administrator determines that a shipment under subsection (a) will not incorporate some or all of the surety technologies described in such subsection, or that a program under subsection (b) will not incorporate some or all of the integrated designs described in such subsection, the Administrator shall submit such determination to the congressional defense committees, including the results of an analysis conducted pursuant to paragraph (2).

“(2) Each determination made under paragraph (1) shall be based on a documented, system risk analysis that considers security risk reduction, operational impacts, and technical risk.

“(e) **TERMINATION.**—The requirements of subsections (a) and (b) shall terminate on December 31, 2029.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4221 the following new item:

“Sec. 4222. Incorporation of integrated surety architecture.”.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION OF CERTAIN DIRECTION.**—The Administrator shall implement the direction

relating to this section contained in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

SEC. 3113. COST ESTIMATES FOR LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM AND MAJOR ALTERATION PROJECTS.

Subsection (b) of section 4217 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2537(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **INDEPENDENT COST ESTIMATES AND REVIEWS.**—(1) The Secretary, acting through the Administrator, shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the Nuclear Weapons Council the following:

“(A) An independent cost estimate of the following:

“(i) Each nuclear weapon system undergoing life extension at the completion of phase 6.2A, relating to design definition and cost study.

“(ii) Each nuclear weapon system undergoing life extension at the completion of phase 6.3, relating to development engineering.

“(iii) Each nuclear weapon system undergoing life extension at the completion of phase 6.4, relating to production engineering, and before the initiation of phase 6.5, relating to first production.

“(iv) Each new nuclear facility within the nuclear security enterprise that is estimated to cost more than \$500,000,000 before such facility achieves critical decision 1 and before such facility achieves critical decision 2 in the acquisition process.

“(v) Each nuclear weapons system undergoing a major alteration project (as defined in section 2753(a)(2) of this title).

“(B) An independent cost review of each nuclear weapon system undergoing life extension at the completion of phase 6.2, relating to study of feasibility and down-select.

“(2) Each independent cost estimate and independent cost review under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) whether the cost baseline or the budget estimate for the period covered by the future-years nuclear security program has changed, and the rationale for any such change; and

“(B) any views of the Secretary or the Administrator regarding such estimate or review.

“(3) The Administrator shall review and consider the results of any independent cost estimate or independent cost review of a nuclear weapon system or a nuclear facility, as the case may be, under this subsection before entering the next phase of the development process of such system or the acquisition process of such facility.

“(4) Each independent cost estimate or independent cost review of a nuclear weapon system or a nuclear facility, as the case may be, under this subsection shall be submitted not later than 30 days after the date on which—

“(A) such system completes a phase specified in paragraph (1); or

“(B) such facility achieves critical decision 1 as specified in subparagraph (A)(iv) of such paragraph.

“(5) Each independent cost estimate or independent cost review submitted under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex if necessary.”.

SEC. 3114. BUDGET REQUESTS AND CERTIFICATION REGARDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS DISMANTLEMENT.

Section 3125 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

“(d) **BUDGET REQUESTS.**—The Administrator for Nuclear Security shall ensure that the budget of the President submitted to Congress under

section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2021 includes amounts for the nuclear weapons dismantlement and disposition activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in accordance with the limitation in subsection (a).

“(e) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than February 1, 2018, the Administrator shall certify to the congressional defense committees that the Administrator is carrying out the nuclear weapons dismantlement and disposition activities of the Administration in accordance with the limitations in subsections (a) and (b).”

SEC. 3115. IMPROVED INFORMATION RELATING TO DEFENSE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IMPROVED INFORMATION.—Title XLIII of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2563 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 4310. INFORMATION RELATING TO DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AND ARMS CONTROL PROGRAM.

“(a) TECHNOLOGIES AND CAPABILITIES.—The Administrator shall document, for efforts that are not focused on basic research, the technologies and capabilities of the defense nuclear nonproliferation research and development program—

“(1) that are transitioned to end users for further development or deployment; and

“(2) that are deployed.

“(b) ASSESSMENTS OF STATUS.—(1) In assessing projects under the defense nuclear nonproliferation research and development program or the defense nuclear nonproliferation and arms control program, the Administrator shall compare the status of each such project, including with respect to the final results of such project, to the baseline targets and goals established in the initial project plan of such project.

“(2) The Administrator may carry out paragraph (1) using a common template or such other means as the Administrator determines appropriate.”

(b) INCLUSION IN PLAN.—Section 4309(b) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2575(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (16) as paragraph (18); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (15) the following new paragraphs:

“(16) A summary of the technologies and capabilities documented under section 4310(a).

“(17) A summary of the assessments conducted under section 4310(b)(1).”

SEC. 3116. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF ADVANCED NAVAL REACTOR FUEL BASED ON LOW-ENRICHED URANIUM.

(a) PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.—

(1) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Except as provided by paragraph (2), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Energy or the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to plan or carry out research and development of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on low-enriched uranium.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for defense nuclear nonproliferation, as specified in the funding table in division D—

(A) \$5,000,000 shall be made available to the Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors of the National Nuclear Security Administration for low-enriched uranium activities (including downblending of high-enriched uranium fuel into low-enriched uranium fuel, research and development using low-enriched uranium fuel,

or the modification or procurement of equipment and infrastructure related to such activities) to develop an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on low-enriched uranium; and

(B) if the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Navy determine under section 3118(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92; 129 Stat. 1196) that such low-enriched uranium activities and research and development should continue, an additional \$30,000,000 may be made available to the Deputy Administrator for such purpose.

(b) PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS REGARDING CERTAIN ACCOUNTS AND PURPOSES.—

(1) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND PROCUREMENT.—Chapter 633 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 7319. Requirements for availability of funds relating to advanced naval nuclear fuel systems based on low-enriched uranium

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Low-enriched uranium activities may only be carried out using funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Energy for atomic energy defense activities for defense nuclear nonproliferation.

“(b) PROHIBITION REGARDING CERTAIN ACCOUNTS.—(1) None of the funds described in paragraph (2) may be obligated or expended to carry out low-enriched uranium activities.

“(2) The funds described in this paragraph are funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for any fiscal year for any of the following accounts:

“(A) Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, or any other account of the Department of Defense.

“(B) Any account within the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy other than defense nuclear nonproliferation, as specified in subsection (a).

“(3) The prohibition in paragraph (1) may not be superseded except by a provision of law that specifically supersedes, repeals, or modifies this section. A provision of law, including a table incorporated into an Act, that appropriates funds described in paragraph (2) for low-enriched uranium activities may not be treated as specifically superseding this section unless such provision specifically cites to this section.

“(c) LOW-ENRICHED URANIUM ACTIVITIES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘low-enriched uranium activities’ means the following:

“(1) Planning or carrying out research and development of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on low-enriched uranium.

“(2) Procuring ships that use low-enriched uranium in naval nuclear propulsion reactors.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“7319. Requirements for availability of funds relating to advanced naval nuclear fuel systems based on low-enriched uranium”.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) SSN(X) SUBMARINE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy and the Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors shall jointly submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the cost and timeline required to assess the feasibility, costs, and requirements for a design of the Virginia-class replacement nuclear attack submarine that would allow for the use of a low-enriched uranium fueled reactor, if technically feasible, without changing the diameter of the submarine.

(2) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of

this Act, the Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on—

(A) the planned research and development activities on low-enriched uranium and highly enriched uranium fuel that could apply to the development of a low-enriched uranium fuel or an advanced highly enriched uranium fuel; and

(B) with respect to such activities for each such fuel—

(i) the costs associated with such activities; and

(ii) a detailed proposal for funding such activities.

SEC. 3117. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR PROGRAMS IN RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for atomic energy defense activities may be obligated or expended to enter into a contract with, or otherwise provide assistance to, the Russian Federation.

(b) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Energy, without delegation, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) only if—

(1) the Secretary determines, in writing, that a nuclear-related threat arising in the Russian Federation must be addressed urgently and it is necessary to waive the prohibition to address that threat;

(2) the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense concur in the determination under paragraph (1);

(3) the Secretary of Energy submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing—

(A) a notification that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States;

(B) justification for the waiver, including the determination under paragraph (1); and

(C) a description of the activities to be carried out pursuant to the waiver, including the expected cost and timeframe for such activities; and

(4) a period of seven days elapses following the date on which the Secretary submits the report under paragraph (3).

(c) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under subsection (a) and the requirements under subsection (b) to waive that prohibition shall not apply to an amount, not to exceed \$3,000,000, that the Secretary may make available for the Department of Energy Russian Health Studies Program.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means the following:

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3118. NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PAY AND PERFORMANCE SYSTEM.

(a) PAY BANDING AND PERFORMANCE-BASED PAY ADJUSTMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

(1) EXTENSION.—The Administrator for Nuclear Security shall carry out the demonstration project until the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Administrator shall carry out such project in accordance with the demonstration project plan, including with respect to the authority of the Administrator to modify such system pursuant to such plan and waiving certain authorities or requirements under such plan.

(2) NAVAL NUCLEAR PROPULSION PROGRAM.—The Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors may carry out the demonstration project with respect to the employees of the Naval Nuclear

Propulsion Program in positions in the competitive service.

(3) **ROTATIONS.**—In carrying out the demonstration project, the Administrator shall authorize, and establish incentives for, employees of the National Nuclear Security Administration to have rotational assignments among different programs of the Administration, the headquarters and field offices of the Administration, and the management and operating contractors of the Administration.

(4) **REQUIREMENTS FOR SENIOR-LEVEL POSITIONS.**—The Administrator shall establish requirements for employees of the Administration who are in the demonstration project to be promoted to senior-level positions in the Administration, including requirements with respect to—

(A) professional training and continuing education; and

(B) a certain number and types of rotational assignments under paragraph (3), as determined by the Administrator.

(5) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) The term “demonstration project” means the National Nuclear Security Administration Pay Banding and Performance-Based Pay Adjustment Demonstration Project that is carried out—

(i) pursuant to section 4703 of title 5, United States Code; and

(ii) in accordance with the demonstration project plan and this subsection.

(B) The term “demonstration project plan” means the demonstration project plan published in the Federal Register on December 21, 2007 (72 Fed. Reg. 72,776).

(b) **ROTATIONS FOR CERTAIN CONTRACTORS.**—

(1) **INCREASED USE.**—The Administrator for Nuclear Security shall increase the use of rotational assignments of employees of the management and operating contractors of the National Nuclear Security Administration to the headquarters of the Administration, the Department of Defense and the military departments, the intelligence community, and other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(2) **METHODS.**—The Administrator shall carry out paragraph (1) by—

(A) establishing incentives for—

(i) the management and operating contractors of the Administration and the employees of such contractors to participate in rotational assignments; and

(ii) the departments and agencies of the Federal Government specified in such paragraph to facilitate such assignments;

(B) providing professional and leadership development opportunities during such assignments;

(C) using details and other applicable authorities and programs, including the mobility program under subchapter VI of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Intergovernmental Personnel Act Mobility Program”); and

(D) taking such other actions as the Administrator determines appropriate to increase the use of such rotational assignments.

(c) **RED-TEAM ANALYSIS.**—

(1) **ANALYSIS.**—The Director for Cost Estimating and Program Evaluation of the National Nuclear Security Administration shall carry out a red-team analysis of the Federal employee staffing structure of the Administration with respect to the Administrator for Nuclear Security meeting the authorized personnel levels under section 3241A of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2241a).

(2) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—The analysis under paragraph (1) shall include assessments of—

(A) the number of Federal employees within each program of the Administration, and whether such numbers are appropriately balanced with respect to the size, scope, functions, budgets, and risks, of the program; and

(B) the number of Senior Executive Service positions within the Administration, including a comparison of such number to other comparable departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and whether such number is appropriate.

(d) **BRIEFINGS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on the implementation of—

(i) section 3248 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act, as added by subsection (a); and

(ii) subsection (b); and

(B) the Director for Cost Estimating and Program Evaluation shall provide to such committees a briefing on the analysis under subsection (c).

(2) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(D) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3119. DISPOSITION OF WEAPONS-USABLE PLUTONIUM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of Energy shall carry out construction and project support activities relating to the MOX facility using funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the National Nuclear Security Administration for the MOX facility for construction and project support activities.

(b) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary of Energy may waive the requirement in subsection (a) if the Secretary submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate the following:

(1) The matters required by section 3116(b)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2761).

(2) Notification that the Secretary has sought to enter into consultations with any relevant State necessary to pursue an alternative option for carrying out the plutonium disposition program.

(3) Notification that the Secretary has been unable to enter into a fixed-price contract with the prime contractor of the MOX facility (for construction and project support activities under subsection (a)) that the Secretary determines sufficiently minimizes risk and cost to the Department of Energy.

(4) Certification that—

(A) an alternative option for carrying out the plutonium disposition program exists;

(B) the total lifecycle cost of such alternative option would be less than approximately half of the estimated remaining total lifecycle cost of the mixed-oxide fuel program; and

(C) pursuing such alternative option is in the best interest of the Federal Government.

(5) The commitment of the Secretary to—

(A) remove plutonium from South Carolina; and

(B) ensure a sustainable future for the Savannah River Site.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “MOX facility” means the mixed-oxide fuel fabrication facility at the Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina.

(2) The term “project support activities” means activities that support the design, long-

lead equipment procurement, and site preparation of the MOX facility.

SEC. 3120. MODIFICATION OF MINOR CONSTRUCTION THRESHOLD FOR PLANT PROJECTS.

Section 4701 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2741) is amended—

(1) by striking “In this subtitle:” and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In this subtitle:”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$20,000,000, subject to adjustment under subsection (b)”;

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) **ADJUSTMENT OF MINOR CONSTRUCTION THRESHOLD FOR INFLATION.**—(1) The Secretary of Energy shall adjust the amount of the minor construction threshold on October 1, 2017, and at the beginning of each fiscal year thereafter, to reflect the percentage (if any) of the increase in the average of the Consumer Price Index for the preceding 12-month period compared to the Consumer Price Index for fiscal year 2016.

“(2) In adjusting the amount of the minor construction threshold under paragraph (1), the Secretary—

“(A) shall round the amount of any increase in the Consumer Price Index to the nearest dollar; and

“(B) may ignore any such increase of less than 1 percent.

“(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘Consumer Price Index’ means the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.”

SEC. 3121. DESIGN COMPETITION.

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

(1) In January 2016, the co-chairs of a congressionally-mandated study panel from the National Academies of Science testified before the House Committee on Armed Services that:

(A) “The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) complex must engage in robust design competitions in order to exercise the design and production skills that underpin stockpile stewardship and are necessary to meet evolving threats.”

(B) “To exercise the full set of design skills necessary for an effective nuclear deterrent, the NNSA should develop and conduct the first in what the committee envisions to be a series of design competitions that integrate the full end-to-end process from novel design conception through engineering, building, and non-nuclear testing of a prototype.”

(2) In March 2016 testimony before the House Committee on Armed Services regarding a December 2016 Defense Science Board (DSB) report titled, “Seven Defense Priorities for the New Administration”, members of the DSB said:

(A) “A key contributor to nuclear deterrence is the continuous, adaptable exercise of the development, design, and production functions for nuclear weapons in both the DOD and DOE... Yet the DOE laboratories and DOD contractor community have done little integrated design and development work outside of life extension for 25 years, let alone concept development that could serve as a hedge to surprise.”

(B) “The Defense Science Board believes that the triad’s complementary features remain robust tenets for the design of a future force. Replacing our current, aging force is essential, but not sufficient in the more complex nuclear environment we now face to provide the adaptability or flexibility to confidently hold at risk what adversaries value. In particular, if the threat evolves in ways that favorably change the cost/benefit calculus in the view of an adversary’s leadership, then we should be in a position to quickly restore a credible deterrence posture.”

(3) In a memorandum dated May 9, 2014, then-Secretary of Energy Ernie Moniz said:

(A) “If nuclear military capabilities are to provide deterrence for the nation they need to be relevant to the emerging global strategic environment. The current stockpile was designed to meet the needs of a bipolar world with roots in the Cold War era. A more complex, chaotic, and dynamic security environment is emerging. In order to uphold the Department’s mission to ensure an effective nuclear deterrent . . . we must ensure our nuclear capabilities meet the challenges of known and potential geopolitical and technological trends. Therefore we must look ahead, using the expertise of our laboratories, to how the capabilities that may be employed by other nations could impact deterrence over the next several decades.”

(B) “We must challenge our thinking about our programs of record in order to permit foresighted actions that may reduce, in the coming decades, the chances for surprise and that buttress deterrence.”

(b) DESIGN COMPETITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with paragraph (2), the Administrator for Nuclear Security, in coordination with the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council, shall carry out a new and comprehensive design competition for a nuclear warhead that could be employed on ballistic missiles of the United States by 2030. Such competition shall—

(A) examine options for warhead design and related delivery system requirements in the 2030s, including—

(i) life extension of existing weapons; (ii) new capabilities; and (iii) such other concepts that the Administrator and Chairman determine necessary to fully exercise and create responsive design capabilities in the enterprise and ensure a robust nuclear deterrent into the 2030s;

(B) assess how the capabilities and defenses that may be employed by other nations could impact deterrence in 2030 and beyond and how such threats could be addressed or mitigated in the warhead and related delivery systems;

(C) exercise the full set of design skills necessary for an effective nuclear deterrent and responsive enterprise through production of conceptual designs and, as the Administrator determines appropriate, production of non-nuclear prototypes of components or subsystems; and

(D) examine and recommend actions for significantly shortening timelines and significantly reducing costs associated with design, development, certification, and production of the warhead, without reducing worker or public health and safety.

(2) TIMING.—The Administrator shall—

(A) during fiscal year 2018 develop a plan to carry out paragraph (1); and

(B) during fiscal year 2019 implement such plan.

(c) BRIEFING.—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Administrator, in coordination with the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council, shall provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on the plan of the Administrator to carry out the warhead design competition under subsection (b). Such briefing shall include an assessment of the costs, benefits, risks, and opportunities of such plan, particularly impacts to ongoing life extension programs and infrastructure projects.

SEC. 3122. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY COUNTER-INTELLIGENCE POLYGRAPH PROGRAM.

Section 4504(b) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2654(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall ensure that the persons subject to the counterintelligence polygraph program required by subsection (a) include any person who is—

“(A) a United States national who also has the nationality of a foreign state; and

“(B) seeking employment with the National Nuclear Security Administration.”.

SEC. 3123. SECURITY CLEARANCE FOR DUAL-NATIONALS EMPLOYED BY NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY AGENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 3236 the following new section:

“SEC. 3237. SECURITY CLEARANCE FOR DUAL NATIONALS OF HIGH THREAT FOREIGN STATES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is a United States national who also has the nationality of a foreign state that is on the list maintained by the Secretary of Energy under subsection (a) and who is appointed to or hired for a position designated by the Office of Personnel Management as critical sensitive or special sensitive, the Secretary shall provide additional review before approving a security clearance for such individual.

“(b) WAIVER.—

“(1) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—In the case of a person who is a United States national who also has the nationality of a foreign state identified under paragraph (2), the Secretary may waive the requirement under subsection (a).

“(2) FOREIGN STATES.—The Director of National Intelligence shall identify foreign states that permit citizens or nationals of the United States to serve in positions of trust equivalent to positions identified by the Office of Personnel Management as critical sensitive or special sensitive.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents at the beginning of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3236 the following new item:

“Sec. 3237. Security clearance for dual nationals of high threat foreign states.”.

Subtitle C—Plans and Reports

SEC. 3131. MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) STATUS OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS PROTECTION, CONTROL, AND ACCOUNTING PROGRAM.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 4303 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2563) is repealed.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Atomic Energy Defense Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 4303.

(b) STATUS OF SECURITY OF ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE FACILITIES.—Section 4506 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2657) is amended by striking “of each year” each place it appears and inserting “of each even-numbered year”.

(c) SECURITY RISKS POSED TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS COMPLEX.—

(1) INCLUDED IN SSMP.—Section 4203 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2523) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph (7):

“(7) A summary of the status of the plan regarding the research and development, deployment, and lifecycle sustainment of technologies described in subsection (d)(7).”; and

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph (7):

“(7) A plan for the research and development, deployment, and lifecycle sustainment of the technologies employed within the nuclear security enterprise to address physical and cybersecurity threats during the five-fiscal-year period following the date of the plan, together with—

“(A) for each site in the nuclear security enterprise, a description of the technologies deployed to address the physical and cybersecurity threats posed to that site;

“(B) for each site and for the nuclear security enterprise, the methods used by the Administration to establish priorities among investments in physical and cybersecurity technologies; and

“(C) a detailed description of how the funds identified for each program element specified pursuant to paragraph (1) in the budget for the Administration for each fiscal year during that five-fiscal-year period will help carry out that plan.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3253(b) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2453) is amended by striking paragraph (5).

(d) SELECTED ACQUISITION REPORTS.—Section 4217(a) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2537(a)) is amended by striking “fiscal-year quarter” each place it appears and inserting “fiscal year”.

(e) LONG-TERM PLAN FOR MEETING NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR UNENCUMBERED URANIUM.—Section 4221(a) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2538(a)) is amended by striking “Concurrent with the submission to Congress of the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, in” and inserting “Not later than December 31 of”.

(f) DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Section 4309 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2575) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “IN GENERAL.—Concurrent with the submission to Congress of the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, in each fiscal year” and inserting “PLAN.—Not later than March 31 of each odd-numbered year”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) UPDATED SUMMARY.—Not later than March 31 of each even-numbered year, the Administrator shall submit to the congressional defense committees an updated summary of the plan submitted under subsection (a) during the previous year.”; and

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by inserting “and the updated summary required by subsection (c)” before “shall be submitted”.

SEC. 3132. ASSESSMENT OF MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING CONTRACTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY LABORATORIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall seek to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to conduct an assessment of the benefits, costs, challenges, risks, efficiency, and effectiveness of the strategy of the Administrator with respect to management and operating contracts for national security laboratories. The Administrator may not award such contract to a federally funded research and development center for which the Department of Energy or the National Nuclear Security Administration is the primary sponsor.

(b) COOPERATION.—The Administrator, and the director of each national security laboratory, shall provide to the federally funded research and development center conducting the assessment under subsection (a) the information the center requires to conduct such assessment.

(c) SUBMISSION.—

(1) NNSA.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Administrator and a federally funded research and development center enter into the contract under subsection (a), the center shall submit to the Administrator a report on

the assessment conducted under such subsection. Such report shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the acquisition strategy and the contract oversight process of the Administrator, and of the use of for-profit management and operating contractors at national security laboratories, and whether such strategy, process, and contractors provide the best outcomes to the Federal Government with respect to performance, cost, efficiency, and effectiveness.

(B) An assessment of the total costs, for each national security laboratory, that are incurred because of using a for-profit model for the management and operating contract that would not be incurred under a nonprofit model, and whether performance, costs, efficiency, and effectiveness would be expected to increase or decrease under a nonprofit model.

(C) An assessment of whether the Administrator is appropriately using, managing, and overseeing the national security laboratories with respect to the nature of the laboratories as federally funded research and development centers.

(2) CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Administrator receives the report under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate such report, without change, together with any comments the Administrator determines appropriate.

(3) LIMITATION.—

(A) AWARD OR EXTENSION OF CONTRACT.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the National Nuclear Security Administration may be obligated or expended to award, or to extend, a management and operating contract for a national security laboratory until the date on which the Administrator submits to the congressional defense committees the report under paragraph (2).

(B) WAIVER FOR EXTENSION.—The Secretary of Energy may waive the limitation in subparagraph (A) with respect to the extension of a management and operating contract for a national security laboratory if the Secretary—

(i) determines such waiver is required in the interest of national security; and

(ii) notifies the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate of such determination.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that nothing in this section should be construed to mandate or encourage an extension of an existing management and operating contract for a national security laboratory.

(e) NATIONAL SECURITY LABORATORY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “national security laboratory” has the meaning given that term in section 4002(7) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501(7)).

SEC. 3133. EVALUATION OF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE.

(a) EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Energy shall conduct an evaluation of the feasibility, costs, and cost savings of classifying certain defense nuclear waste as other than high-level radioactive waste, without decreasing environmental, health, or public safety requirements.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—In conducting the evaluation under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider—

(1) the estimated quantities and locations of certain defense nuclear waste;

(2) the potential disposal path for such waste;

(3) the estimated disposal timeline for such waste;

(4) the estimated costs for disposal of such waste, and potential cost savings;

(5) the potential effect on existing consent orders, permits, and agreements;

(6) the basis by which the Secretary would make a decision on whether to reclassify such waste; and

(7) any such other matters relating to defense nuclear waste that the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than February 1, 2018, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the evaluation under subsection (a), including a description of—

(1) the consideration by the Secretary of the matters under subsection (b);

(2) any actions the Secretary has taken or plans to take to change the processes, rules, regulations, orders, or directives, relating to defense nuclear waste, as appropriate;

(3) any recommendations for legislative action the Secretary determines appropriate; and

(4) the assessment of the Secretary regarding the benefits and risks of the actions and recommendations of the Secretary under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

(A) The congressional defense committees.

(B) The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(C) The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) The term “certain defense nuclear waste” means radioactive waste that—

(A) resulted from the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel that was generated from atomic energy defense activities; and

(B) contains more than 100 nCi/g of alpha-emitting transuranic isotopes with half-lives greater than 20 years.

SEC. 3134. REPORT ON CRITICAL DECISION-1 ON MATERIAL STAGING FACILITY PROJECT.

Not later than October 31, 2017, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the following:

(1) The decision memorandum of the Administrator with respect to Critical Decision-1 on the Material Staging Facility project at the Pantex Plant.

(2) The preferred alternative approved by the Administrator for such Critical Decision-1.

(3) The cost-range estimates, including a description of the costs saved or avoided from not carrying out recapitalization and sustainment of Area 4 at the Pantex Plant.

(4) The schedule-range estimates that include completion of the Material Staging Facility by 2024.

(5) The risk factors and risk mitigation and management options relating to the Material Staging Facility.

(6) The expected improvements to operations and security provided by the Material Staging Facility, once operational, including the potential annual cost savings.

(7) Such other matters as the Administrator considers appropriate.

SEC. 3135. MODIFICATION TO STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND RESPONSIVENESS PLAN.

Section 4203 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2523), as amended by section 3131, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph (8):

“(8) A summary of the assessment under subsection (d)(8) regarding the execution of the programs with current and projected budgets and any associated risks.”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph (8):

“(8) An assessment of whether the programs described by the report can be executed with current and projected budgets and any associated risks.”.

SEC. 3136. IMPROVED REPORTING FOR ANTI-SMUGGLING RADIATION DETECTION SYSTEMS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Together with the submission to Congress of the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2021, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding any anti-smuggling radiation detection systems that the Administrator proposes to deploy during the fiscal year covered by the budget.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The probability of detection for the anti-smuggling radiation detection systems covered by the report against realistic potential smuggling threats, including shielded and unshielded uranium, plutonium, and other special nuclear material.

(2) The costs associated with the deployments of such systems, including costs to the United States and costs to any host nation.

(3) Options for technological advances that would make radiation detection less expensive or more effective.

(4) The benefits to the national security of the United States resulting from the deployments of such systems.

SEC. 3137. ANNUAL SELECTED ACQUISITION REPORTS ON CERTAIN HARDWARE RELATING TO DEFENSE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION.

(a) ANNUAL SELECTED ACQUISITION REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the end of each fiscal year, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on each covered hardware project. The reports shall be known as Selected Acquisition Reports for the covered hardware program concerned.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The information contained in the Selected Acquisition Report for a fiscal year for a covered hardware project shall be the information contained in the Selected Acquisition Report for such fiscal year for a major defense acquisition program under section 2432 of title 10, United States Code, expressed in terms of the covered hardware project.

(b) COVERED HARDWARE PROJECT DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered hardware project” means projects carried out under the defense nuclear nonproliferation research and development program that—

(1) are focused on the production and deployment of hardware, including with respect to the development and deployment of satellites or satellite payloads; and

(2) exceed \$500,000,000 in total program cost over the course of five years.

SEC. 3138. ASSESSMENT OF DESIGN TRADE OPTIONS OF W80-4 WARHEAD.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Director for Cost Estimating and Program Evaluation shall conduct an assessment of the design trade options, and the associated cost and benefit analyses for each such option, for the W80-4 warhead relating to the down-select options to be contained in the final Phase 6.2 study report. Such assessment shall include a review of the cost and schedule estimates of each such option.

(b) ASSESSMENT AND BRIEFING.—

(1) NNSA.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the Administrator for Nuclear Security the assessment under subsection (a).

(2) CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall provide to the congressional

defense committees a briefing containing a copy of the assessment under subsection (a), without change, and any views of the Administrator.

(3) FORM.—The assessment submitted under paragraph (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SEC. 3201. AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2018, \$30,600,000 for the operation of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board under chapter 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286 et seq.).

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

SEC. 3401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AMOUNT.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy \$4,900,000 for fiscal year 2018 for the purpose of carrying out activities under chapter 641 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the naval petroleum reserves.

(b) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3501. AUTHORIZATION OF THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 2018, to be available without fiscal year limitation if so provided in appropriations Acts, for programs associated with maintaining the United States merchant marine, the following amounts:

(1) For expenses necessary for operations of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, \$84,400,000, of which—

(A) \$66,400,000 shall be for Academy operations; and

(B) \$18,000,000 shall remain available until expended for capital asset management at the Academy.

(2) For expenses necessary to support the State maritime academies, \$27,400,000, of which—

(A) \$2,400,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019, for the Student Incentive Program;

(B) \$3,000,000 shall remain available until expended for direct payments to such academies; and

(C) \$22,000,000 shall remain available until expended for maintenance and repair of State maritime academy training vessels.

(3) For expenses necessary to support the National Security Multi-Mission Vessel Program, \$36,000,000, which shall remain available until expended.

(4) For expenses necessary to support Maritime Administration operations and programs, \$60,020,000.

(5) For expenses necessary to maintain and preserve a United States flag merchant marine to serve the national security needs of the United States under chapter 531 of title 46, United States Code, \$300,000,000.

(6) For expenses necessary to provide assistance for small shippers and maritime communities under section 54101 of title 46, United States Code, \$30,000,000, which shall remain available until expended for capital and related improvements.

(7) For the cost (as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a(5))) of loan guarantees under the program authorized by chapter 537 of title 46, United States Code, \$40,000,000.

SEC. 3502. MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—The Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. 4401 et seq.) is amended by—

(1) repealing the first section and sections 2, 3, 5, 12, and 14;

(2) in section 8, redesignating subsection (d) as section 56308 of title 46, United States Code, transferring it to appear after section 56307 of such title; and

(3) redesignating section 11 as section 57100 of title 46, United States Code, and transferring it to appear before section 57101 of such title.

(b) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 2218 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744)” each place it appears and inserting “section 57100 of title 46”.

(2) Section 3134 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “31,” and inserting “31 or”; and

(B) by striking “or the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 App. U.S.C. 1735 et seq.)”.

(3) Section 3703a(b)(6) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 App. U.S.C. 1744)” and inserting “section 57100”.

(4) Section 52101(c)(1)(A)(i) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 App. U.S.C. 1744)” and inserting “section 57100”.

(5) Section 56308 of title 46, United States Code, as redesignated and transferred by subsection (a)(2) of this section, is amended—

(A) by striking so much as precedes “vessel constructed” and inserting the following:

“§56308. Transfer of substitute vessels

“In the case of any”;

(B) by inserting “of Transportation” after “Secretary”; and

(C) by striking “adjustments with respect to the retained vessels as provided for in section 9, and”.

(6) Section 57100 of title 46, United States Code, as redesignated and transferred by subsection (a)(3) of this section, is amended—

(A) by striking so much as precedes the text of subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“§57100. National Defense Reserve Fleet

“(a) FLEET COMPONENTS.—”;

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting before the first sentence the following: “PERMITTED USES.—”; and

(C) in subsection (e)—

(i) by inserting before the first sentence the following: “EXEMPTION FROM TANK VESSEL CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS.—”; and

(ii) by striking “of title 46, United States Code”.

(7) Section 57101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “maintained under section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 App. 1744)”.

(8) The analysis for chapter 563 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 56307 the following:

“56308. Transfer of substitute vessels.”.

(9) The analysis for chapter 571 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 57101 the following:

“57100. National Defense Reserve Fleet.”.

SEC. 3503. MARITIME SECURITY FLEET PROGRAM; RESTRICTION ON OPERATION FOR NEW ENTRANTS.

(a) RESTRICTION.—Section 53105(a) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “, except as provided in paragraph (2),” after “in the foreign commerce or”;

(2) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) in the case of a vessel, other than a replacement vessel under subsection (f), first covered by an operating agreement after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the vessel shall not be operated in the transportation of cargo between points in the United States and its territories either directly or via a foreign port; and”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 53106 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “section 53105(a)(1)” and inserting “paragraph (1) and (2) of section 53105(a), as otherwise applicable with respect to such vessel,”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(3), by striking “section 53105(a)(1)” and inserting “paragraph (1) and (2) of section 53105(a), as otherwise applicable with respect to such vessel”.

SEC. 3504. CODIFICATION OF SECTIONS RELATING TO ACQUISITION, CHARTER, AND REQUISITION OF VESSELS.

(a) EMERGENCY FOREIGN VESSEL ACQUISITION; PURCHASE OR REQUISITION OF VESSELS LYING IDLE IN UNITED STATES WATERS.—The first section of the Act of August 9, 1954 (ch. 659; 50 U.S.C. 196)—

(1) is redesignated as section 56309 of title 46, United States Code, and transferred to appear at the end of chapter 563 of such title, as otherwise amended by this title; and

(2) is amended—

(A) by striking “That during” and inserting the following:

“§56309. Emergency foreign vessel acquisition; purchase or requisition of vessels lying idle in United States waters

“During”;

(B) by striking “section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended” each place it appears and inserting “this chapter”; and

(C) by striking “the second paragraph of subsection (d) of such section 902, as amended” and inserting “section 56305”.

(b) VOLUNTARY PURCHASE OR CHARTER AGREEMENTS.—Section 2 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 197)—

(1) is redesignated as section 56310 of title 46, United States Code, and transferred to appear after section 56309 of such title (as amended by subsection (a)); and

(2) is amended—

(A) by striking so much as proceeds “During” and inserting the following:

“§56310. Voluntary purchase or charter agreements”; and

(B) by striking “section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936,” and inserting “this chapter”.

(c) REQUISITIONED VESSELS.—Section 3 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 198)—

(1) is redesignated as section 56311 of title 46, United States Code, and transferred to appear after section 56310 of such title (as amended by subsections (a) and (b));

(2) is amended by striking so much as precedes subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“§56311. Requisitioned vessels”; and

(3) is amended—

(A) except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), by striking “this Act” each place it appears and inserting “section 56309 or 56310, as applicable”;;

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “this Act” and inserting “section 56309 or 56310, as applicable,”; and

(ii) by striking “The second paragraph of section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended,” and inserting “Section 57109”; and

(C) in subsection (d)—

(i) in the first sentence by striking “provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes” and inserting “section 6101 of title 41”;

(ii) in the second sentence—
(I) by striking “this Act” and inserting “section 56309 or 56310, as applicable.”; and

(II) by striking “said section 3709” and inserting “section 6101 of title 41”;

(iii) by striking “title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936” and inserting “chapter 575”; and

(iv) by striking subsection (f).

(d) DOCUMENTED DEFINED.—Chapter 563 of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“§56312. Documented defined

“In sections 56309 through 56311, the term ‘documented’ means, with respect to a vessel, that a certificate of documentation has been issued for the vessel under chapter 121.”

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 563 of title 46, United States Code, as otherwise amended by this title, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“56309. Emergency foreign vessel acquisition; purchase or requisition of vessels lying idle in United States waters

“56310. Voluntary purchase or charter agreements

“56311. Requisitioned vessels

“56312. Documented defined”.

(f) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to a section that is redesignated and transferred by this section is deemed to refer to such section as so redesignated and transferred.

SEC. 3505. ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL SHIPYARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 54101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “and maritime communities”;

(2) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “in communities” and all that follows through the period and inserting “relating to shipbuilding, ship repair, and associated industries.”;

(3) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) consider projects that foster—
“(A) efficiency, competitive operations, and quality ship construction, repair, and reconfiguration; and

“(B) employee skills and enhanced productivity related to shipbuilding, ship repair, and associated industries; and”;

(4) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by inserting “to” after “may be used”;

and
(B) by striking subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting the following:

“(A) make capital and related improvements in small shipyards; and

“(B) provide training for workers in shipbuilding, ship repair, and associated industries.”;

(5) in subsection (d), by striking “unless” and all that follows before the period;

(6) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(C) in paragraph (1) by striking “Except as provided in paragraph (2).”; and

(7) in subsection (i), by striking “2015” and all that follows before the period and inserting “2018 and 2019 to carry out this section \$30,000,000”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 541 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 54101 and inserting the following:

“54101. Assistance for small shipyards.”.

SEC. 3506. REPORT ON SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIM RECOVERY IN THE COAST GUARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on sexual assault prevention and response policies of the Coast Guard and strategic goals related to sexual assault victim recovery.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report shall—

(1) describe Coast Guard strategic goals relating to sexual assault climate, prevention, response, and accountability, and actions taken by the Coast Guard to promote sexual assault victim recovery;

(2) explain how victim recovery is being incorporated into Coast Guard strategic and programmatic guidance related to sexual assault prevention and response;

(3) examine current Coast Guard sexual assault prevention and response policy with respect to—

(A) Coast Guard criteria for what comprises sexual assault victim recovery;

(B) alignment of Coast Guard personnel policies to enhance—

(i) an approach to sexual assault response that gives priority to victim recovery;

(ii) upholding individual privacy and dignity; and

(iii) the opportunity for the continuation of Coast Guard service by sexual assault victims; and

(C) sexual harassment response, including a description of the circumstances under which sexual harassment is considered a criminal offense; and

(4) to ensure victims and supervisors understand the full scope of resources available to aid in long-term recovery, explain how the Coast Guard informs its workforce about changes to sexual assault prevention and response policies related to victim recovery.

SEC. 3507. CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 541 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§54102. Centers of excellence for domestic maritime workforce training and education

“(a) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary of Transportation may designate a center of excellence for domestic maritime workforce training and education a covered training entity located in a State that borders on the—

“(1) Gulf of Mexico;

“(2) Atlantic Ocean;

“(3) Long Island Sound;

“(4) Pacific Ocean;

“(5) Great Lakes; or

“(6) Mississippi River System.

“(b) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement (as that term is

used in section 6305 of title 31) with a center of excellence designated under subsection (a) to support maritime workforce training and education at the center of excellence, including efforts of the center of excellence to—

“(1) admit additional students;

“(2) recruit and train faculty;

“(3) expand facilities;

“(4) create new maritime career pathways; or

“(5) award students credit for prior experience, including military service.

“(c) COVERED TRAINING ENTITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘covered training entity’ means an entity that is—

“(1) a community or technical college; or

“(2) a maritime training center—

“(A) operated by, or under the supervision of, a State; and

“(B) with a maritime training program in operation on the date of enactment of this section.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 541 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 54101 the following:

“54102. Centers of excellence for domestic maritime workforce training and education.”.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

SEC. 4001. AUTHORIZATION OF AMOUNTS IN FUNDING TABLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever a funding table in this division specifies a dollar amount authorized for a project, program, or activity, the obligation and expenditure of the specified dollar amount for the project, program, or activity is hereby authorized, subject to the availability of appropriations.

(b) MERIT-BASED DECISIONS.—A decision to commit, obligate, or expend funds with or to a specific entity on the basis of a dollar amount authorized pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(1) be based on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of sections 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, or on competitive procedures; and

(2) comply with other applicable provisions of law.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO TRANSFER AND PROGRAMMING AUTHORITY.—An amount specified in the funding tables in this division may be transferred or reprogrammed under a transfer or reprogramming authority provided by another provision of this Act or by other law. The transfer or reprogramming of an amount specified in such funding tables shall not count against a ceiling on such transfers or reprogrammings under section 1001 or section 1512 of this Act or any other provision of law, unless such transfer or reprogramming would move funds between appropriation accounts.

(d) APPLICABILITY TO CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—This section applies to any classified annex that accompanies this Act.

(e) ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.—No oral or written communication concerning any amount specified in the funding tables in this division shall supersede the requirements of this section.

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY FIXED WING | | | |
| 002 | UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT | 75,115 | 75,115 |
| 004 | MQ-1 UAV | 30,206 | 90,206 |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|------------------|------------------|
| | Unfunded requirement | | [60,000] |
| | ROTARY | | |
| 005 | HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH) | 108,383 | 108,383 |
| 006 | AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN | 725,976 | 725,976 |
| 007 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 170,910 | 170,910 |
| 008 | AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIB NEW BUILD | 374,100 | 648,500 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [274,400] |
| 009 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 71,900 | 71,900 |
| 010 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP) | 938,308 | 1,224,710 |
| | Unfunded requirement—additional 5 for ARNG | | [100,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement—UH-60M ECPs | | [186,402] |
| 011 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 86,295 | 86,295 |
| 012 | UH-60 BLACK HAWK A AND L MODELS | 76,516 | 93,216 |
| | Unfunded requirement—UH-60Vs | | [16,700] |
| 013 | CH-47 HELICOPTER | 202,576 | 557,076 |
| | Emergent requirements—additional 4 CH-47F Block I | | [108,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement—additional 4 MH-47Gs | | [246,500] |
| 014 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 17,820 | 17,820 |
| | MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT | | |
| 015 | MQ-1 PAYLOAD (MIP) | 5,910 | 29,910 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [8,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [16,000] |
| 016 | UNIVERSAL GROUND CONTROL EQUIPMENT (UAS) | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| 017 | GRAY EAGLE MODS2 | 74,291 | 74,291 |
| 018 | MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP) | 68,812 | 127,762 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [29,475] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [29,475] |
| 019 | AH-64 MODS | 238,141 | 382,941 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [144,800] |
| 020 | CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP) | 20,166 | 81,166 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [61,000] |
| 021 | GRCS SEMA MODS (MIP) | 5,514 | 5,514 |
| 022 | ARL SEMA MODS (MIP) | 11,650 | 11,650 |
| 023 | EMARSS SEMA MODS (MIP) | 15,279 | 15,279 |
| 024 | UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS | 57,737 | 57,737 |
| 025 | UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS | 5,900 | 5,900 |
| 026 | NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN | 142,102 | 142,102 |
| 027 | COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE | 166,050 | 207,630 |
| | Unfunded requirement—ARC-201D encrypted radios | | [41,580] |
| 028 | GATM ROLLUP | 37,403 | 37,403 |
| 029 | RQ-7 UAV MODS | 83,160 | 194,160 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [111,000] |
| 030 | UAS MODS | 26,109 | 26,429 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [320] |
| | GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS | | |
| 031 | AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT | 70,913 | 70,913 |
| 032 | SURVIVABILITY CM | 5,884 | 5,884 |
| 033 | CMWS | 26,825 | 26,825 |
| 034 | COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM) | 6,337 | 6,337 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT | | |
| 035 | AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 7,038 | 7,038 |
| 036 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | 47,404 | 56,304 |
| | Unfunded requirement—grow the Army | | [1,800] |
| | Unfunded requirement—Non destructive test equip | | [7,100] |
| 037 | AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS | 47,066 | 47,066 |
| 038 | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | 83,790 | 84,905 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [1,115] |
| 039 | INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 1,397 | 1,397 |
| 040 | LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET | 1,911 | 1,911 |
| | TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY | 4,149,894 | 5,593,561 |
| | MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | |
| | SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM | | |
| 001 | LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) | 140,826 | 140,826 |
| 002 | MSE MISSILE | 459,040 | 459,040 |
| 003 | INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INC 2-1 | 57,742 | 57,742 |
| | AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM | | |
| 005 | HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY | 94,790 | 94,790 |
| 006 | JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MSLS (JAGM) | 178,432 | 173,432 |
| | Program decrease | | [-5,000] |
| | ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS | | |
| 008 | JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY | 110,123 | 118,235 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [8,112] |
| 009 | TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY | 85,851 | 89,758 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [3,907] |
| 010 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 19,949 | 19,949 |
| 011 | GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) | 595,182 | 593,882 |
| | Program reduction—unit cost savings | | [-2,800] |
| | Unfunded requirement—training devices | | [1,500] |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|------------------|------------------|
| 012 | MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR) | 28,321 | 28,321 |
| 013 | HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMARS) | | 476,728 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [41,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement—ERI | | [197,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement—grow the Army | | [238,728] |
| | MODIFICATIONS | | |
| 015 | PATRIOT MODS | 329,073 | 329,073 |
| 016 | ATACMS MODS | 116,040 | 116,040 |
| 017 | GMLRS MOD | 531 | 531 |
| 018 | STINGER MODS | 63,090 | 91,090 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [28,000] |
| 019 | AVENGER MODS | 62,931 | 62,931 |
| 020 | ITAS/TOW MODS | 3,500 | 3,500 |
| 021 | MLRS MODS | 138,235 | 187,035 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [48,800] |
| 022 | HIMARS MODIFICATIONS | 9,566 | 9,566 |
| | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | |
| 023 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 18,915 | 18,915 |
| | SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES | | |
| 024 | AIR DEFENSE TARGETS | 5,728 | 5,728 |
| 026 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | 1,189 | 1,189 |
| | TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY | 2,519,054 | 3,078,301 |
| | PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY | | |
| | TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES | | |
| 001 | BRADLEY PROGRAM | | 200,000 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [200,000] |
| 002 | ARMORED MULTI PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV) | 193,715 | 447,618 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [253,903] |
| | MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES | | |
| 004 | STRYKER (MOD) | 97,552 | 97,552 |
| 005 | STRYKER UPGRADE | | 348,000 |
| | Unfunded requirement – completes 4th DVH SBCT | | [348,000] |
| 006 | BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD) | 444,851 | 585,851 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [30,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [111,000] |
| 007 | M109 FOV MODIFICATIONS | 64,230 | 64,230 |
| 008 | PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM) | 646,413 | 772,149 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [125,736] |
| 009 | IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES) | 72,402 | 194,402 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [122,000] |
| 010 | ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD) | 5,855 | 5,855 |
| 011 | ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE | 34,221 | 64,221 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [30,000] |
| 012 | M88 FOV MODS | 4,826 | 4,826 |
| 013 | JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE | 128,350 | 128,350 |
| 014 | M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD) | 248,826 | 558,526 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [138,700] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [171,000] |
| 015 | ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM | 275,000 | 1,092,800 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [442,800] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [375,000] |
| | WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES | | |
| 018 | M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM) | 1,992 | 3,292 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [1,300] |
| 019 | MULTI-ROLE ANTI-ARMOR ANTI-PERSONNEL WEAPON S | 6,520 | 58,520 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [52,000] |
| 020 | MORTAR SYSTEMS | 21,452 | 34,552 |
| | Unfunded requirement—120mm mortars | | [13,100] |
| 021 | XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM) | 4,524 | 5,324 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [800] |
| 023 | CARBINE | 43,150 | 51,150 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [5,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement—grow the Army | | [3,000] |
| 024 | COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION | 750 | 10,750 |
| | Unfunded requirement—modifications | | [10,000] |
| 025 | HANDGUN | 8,326 | 8,726 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [400] |
| | MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH | | |
| 026 | MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| 027 | M777 MODS | 3,985 | 89,785 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [85,800] |
| 028 | M4 CARBINE MODS | 31,315 | 31,315 |
| 029 | M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS | 47,414 | 52,414 |
| | Unfunded requirement—accessories | | [2,600] |
| | Unfunded requirement—M2A1 machine guns | | [2,400] |
| 030 | M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS | 3,339 | 3,339 |
| 031 | M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS | 4,577 | 11,177 |
| | Unfunded requirement—accessories | | [1,000] |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| <i>Line</i> | <i>Item</i> | <i>FY 2018 Request</i> | <i>House Authorized</i> |
|-------------|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Unfunded requirement—M240Ls | | [5,600] |
| 032 | SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS | 1,488 | 1,488 |
| 033 | M119 MODIFICATIONS | 12,678 | 12,678 |
| 034 | MORTAR MODIFICATION | 3,998 | 3,998 |
| 035 | MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | 2,219 | 2,219 |
| | SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES | | |
| 036 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | 5,075 | 7,775 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [2,700] |
| 037 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV) | 992 | 992 |
| 039 | SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG) | 1,573 | 1,573 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 042 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | 1,200 |
| | Security Force Assistance Brigade | | [1,200] |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY | 2,423,608 | 4,958,647 |
| | PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY | | |
| | SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION | | |
| 001 | CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES | 39,767 | 39,767 |
| 002 | CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES | 46,804 | 46,804 |
| 003 | CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES | 10,413 | 10,418 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [5] |
| 004 | CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES | 62,837 | 62,958 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [121] |
| 005 | CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES | 8,208 | 8,208 |
| 006 | CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES | 8,640 | 8,640 |
| 007 | CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES | 76,850 | 101,850 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [25,000] |
| 008 | CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES | 108,189 | 108,189 |
| | MORTAR AMMUNITION | | |
| 009 | 60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | 57,359 | 57,359 |
| 010 | 81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | 49,471 | 49,471 |
| 011 | 120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | 91,528 | 91,528 |
| | TANK AMMUNITION | | |
| 012 | CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES | 133,500 | 133,500 |
| | ARTILLERY AMMUNITION | | |
| 013 | ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES | 44,200 | 44,200 |
| 014 | ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES | 187,149 | 187,149 |
| 015 | PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982 | 49,000 | 251,545 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [19,045] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [183,500] |
| 016 | ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL | 83,046 | 99,724 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [16,678] |
| | MINES | | |
| 017 | MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES | 3,942 | 15,557 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [11,615] |
| | ROCKETS | | |
| 019 | SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 020 | ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES | 161,155 | 161,155 |
| | OTHER AMMUNITION | | |
| 021 | CAD/PAD, ALL TYPES | 7,441 | 7,441 |
| 022 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | 19,345 | 19,345 |
| 023 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | 22,759 | 22,759 |
| 024 | SIGNALS, ALL TYPES | 2,583 | 2,583 |
| 025 | SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES | 13,084 | 13,084 |
| | MISCELLANEOUS | | |
| 026 | AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES | 12,237 | 12,237 |
| 027 | NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| 028 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION (AMMO) | 10,730 | 10,730 |
| 029 | AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT | 16,425 | 16,425 |
| 030 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO) | 15,221 | 15,221 |
| | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | | |
| 032 | INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 329,356 | 429,356 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [100,000] |
| 033 | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION | 197,825 | 197,825 |
| 034 | ARMS INITIATIVE | 3,719 | 3,719 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY | 1,879,283 | 2,235,247 |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | |
| | TACTICAL VEHICLES | | |
| 001 | TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS | 9,716 | 9,716 |
| 002 | SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED: | 14,151 | 36,151 |
| | Unfunded requirement—additional M872s | | [22,000] |
| 003 | AMBULANCE, 4 LITTER, 5/4 TON, 4X4 | 53,000 | 87,792 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [34,792] |
| 004 | GROUND MOBILITY VEHICLES (GMV) | 40,935 | 40,935 |
| 006 | JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE | 804,440 | 804,440 |
| 007 | TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE) | 967 | 967 |
| 008 | FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) | 78,650 | 241,944 |
| | Unfunded requirement—FMTVs | | [154,100] |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|--|-----------------|------------------|
| | Unfunded requirement—trailers | | [9,194] |
| 009 | FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP | 19,404 | 19,404 |
| 010 | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) | 81,656 | 114,658 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [25,874] |
| | Unfunded requirement—forward repair systems | | [7,128] |
| 011 | PLS ESP | 7,129 | 59,729 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [52,600] |
| 012 | HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV | | 150,878 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [38,628] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [112,250] |
| 013 | TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS | 43,040 | 43,040 |
| 014 | MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP | 83,940 | 89,470 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [2,599] |
| | Unfunded requirement—CTE equipment | | [2,931] |
| | NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES | | |
| 016 | HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN | 269 | 269 |
| 017 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | 1,320 | 1,320 |
| 018 | NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER | 6,964 | 6,964 |
| | COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 019 | WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK | 420,492 | 420,492 |
| 020 | SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 92,718 | 92,718 |
| 021 | TACTICAL NETWORK TECHNOLOGY MOD IN SVC | 150,497 | 227,997 |
| | Program reduction | | [-10,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [87,500] |
| 022 | JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY | 6,065 | 6,065 |
| 023 | JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM) | 5,051 | 5,051 |
| | COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 024 | DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS | 161,383 | 161,383 |
| 025 | TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS | 62,600 | 62,600 |
| 026 | SHF TERM | 11,622 | 11,622 |
| 028 | SMART-T (SPACE) | 6,799 | 6,799 |
| 029 | GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS | 7,065 | 7,065 |
| 031 | ENROUTE MISSION COMMAND (EMC) | 21,667 | 21,667 |
| | COMM—COMBAT SUPPORT COMM | | |
| 033 | MOD-IN-SERVICE PROFILER | 70 | 70 |
| | COMM—C3 SYSTEM | | |
| 034 | ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS) | 2,658 | 2,658 |
| | COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 036 | HANDHELD MANPACK SMALL FORM FIT (HMS) | 355,351 | 363,760 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [8,409] |
| 037 | MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR) | 25,100 | 25,100 |
| 038 | RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2) | 11,160 | 11,160 |
| 040 | TRACTOR DESK | 2,041 | 2,041 |
| 041 | TRACTOR RIDE | 5,534 | 13,734 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [8,200] |
| 042 | SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT | 996 | 996 |
| 043 | SPIDER FAMILY OF NETWORKED MUNITIONS INCR | 4,500 | 6,858 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [2,358] |
| 045 | TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM | 4,411 | 4,411 |
| 046 | UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE | 15,275 | 15,275 |
| 047 | FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE | 15,964 | 16,725 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [761] |
| | COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM | | |
| 049 | CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE | 9,560 | 9,560 |
| 050 | DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION INITIATIVE | 4,030 | 4,030 |
| | INFORMATION SECURITY | | |
| 054 | COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC) | 107,804 | 130,667 |
| | Unfunded Requirement | | [22,863] |
| 055 | DEFENSIVE CYBER OPERATIONS | 53,436 | 61,436 |
| | Unfunded Requirement | | [8,000] |
| 056 | INSIDER THREAT PROGRAM—UNIT ACTIVITY MONITO | 690 | 690 |
| 057 | PERSISTENT CYBER TRAINING ENVIRONMENT | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| | COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 058 | BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS | 43,751 | 51,290 |
| | Unfunded requirement—first responder communication equipment | | [7,539] |
| | COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 059 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS | 118,101 | 118,101 |
| 060 | EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 4,490 | 4,490 |
| 061 | HOME STATION MISSION COMMAND CENTERS (HSMCC) | 20,050 | 20,050 |
| 062 | INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM | 186,251 | 188,751 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [2,500] |
| | ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA) | | |
| 065 | JTT/CIBS-M | 12,154 | 19,754 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [7,600] |
| 068 | DCGS-A (MIP) | 274,782 | 295,494 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [20,712] |
| 070 | TROJAN (MIP) | 16,052 | 35,212 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [6,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [13,160] |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|-------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| 071 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP) | 51,034 | 51,034 |
| 072 | CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS) | 7,815 | 7,815 |
| 073 | CLOSE ACCESS TARGET RECONNAISSANCE (CATR) | 8,050 | 8,050 |
| 074 | MACHINE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEM-M | 567 | 567 |
| | ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) | | |
| 076 | LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR | 20,459 | 20,459 |
| 077 | EW PLANNING & MANAGEMENT TOOLS (EWPMT) | 5,805 | 5,805 |
| 078 | AIR VIGILANCE (AV) | 5,348 | 5,348 |
| 081 | COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES | 469 | 6,369 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [5,900] |
| 082 | CI MODERNIZATION | 285 | 285 |
| | ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV) | | |
| 083 | SENTINEL MODS | 28,491 | 100,491 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [72,000] |
| 084 | NIGHT VISION DEVICES | 166,493 | 229,389 |
| | Unfunded requirement—grow the Army | | [47,147] |
| | Unfunded requirement—LTLM enhancement | | [15,749] |
| 085 | SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF | 13,947 | 13,947 |
| 087 | INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS | 21,380 | 456,003 |
| | Unfunded requirement—Air and Missile Defense (SHORAD) | | [434,623] |
| 088 | FAMILY OF WEAPON SIGHTS (FWS) | 59,105 | 59,105 |
| 089 | ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP | 2,129 | 2,129 |
| 091 | JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P) | 282,549 | 344,949 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [2,300] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [60,100] |
| 092 | JOINT EFFECTS TARGETING SYSTEM (JETS) | 48,664 | 48,664 |
| 093 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR) | 5,198 | 9,172 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [3,974] |
| 094 | COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMCB XM32 | 8,117 | 8,117 |
| 095 | MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM | 31,813 | 47,588 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [75] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [15,700] |
| 096 | COUNTERFIRE RADARS | 329,057 | 393,257 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [64,200] |
| | ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS | | |
| 097 | FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY | 8,700 | 13,458 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [4,758] |
| 098 | AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS | 26,635 | 132,713 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [9,100] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [96,978] |
| 100 | LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS) | 1,992 | 1,992 |
| 101 | NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE | 15,179 | 15,179 |
| 102 | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS) | 132,572 | 137,174 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [4,602] |
| 103 | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY (GCSS-A) | 37,201 | 37,201 |
| 104 | INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPP) | 16,140 | 16,140 |
| 105 | RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET | 6,093 | 20,848 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [14,755] |
| 106 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (ENFIRE) | 1,134 | 1,134 |
| | ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION | | |
| 107 | ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION | 11,575 | 11,575 |
| 108 | AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP | 91,983 | 91,983 |
| 109 | GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEMS FAM | 4,465 | 4,465 |
| 110 | HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PGM (HPCMP) | 66,363 | 66,363 |
| 111 | CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM | 1,001 | 1,001 |
| 112 | RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS) | 26,183 | 26,183 |
| | ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V) | | |
| 113 | TACTICAL DIGITAL MEDIA | 4,441 | 4,441 |
| 114 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT) | 3,414 | 16,414 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [10,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement—global positioning system | | [3,000] |
| | ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT | | |
| 115 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E) | 499 | 499 |
| 116 | BCT EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES | 25,050 | 25,050 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | |
| 116.A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 4,819 | 4,819 |
| | CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT | | |
| 117 | PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS | 1,613 | 1,613 |
| 118 | FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE) | 9,696 | 23,696 |
| | Unfunded Requirement | | [14,000] |
| 120 | CBRN DEFENSE | 11,110 | 11,110 |
| | BRIDGING EQUIPMENT | | |
| 121 | TACTICAL BRIDGING | 16,610 | 16,610 |
| 122 | TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON | 21,761 | 43,761 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [22,000] |
| 124 | COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER (CBT) RECAP | 21,046 | 61,446 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [40,400] |
| | ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT | | |
| 125 | HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-HST | 5,000 | 17,800 |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| | Unfunded requirement—grow the Army | | [5,600] |
| | Unfunded requirement—PSS-14Cs | | [7,200] |
| 126 | GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS) | 32,442 | 32,442 |
| 127 | AREA MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (AMDS) | 10,571 | 10,571 |
| 128 | HUSKY MOUNTED DETECTION SYSTEM (HMDS) | 21,695 | 21,695 |
| 129 | ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS) | 4,516 | 19,616 |
| | Unfunded requirement—M160s | | [15,100] |
| 130 | EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION | 10,073 | 15,073 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [5,000] |
| 131 | ROBOTICS AND APPLIQUE SYSTEMS | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| 133 | REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS | 5,847 | 7,039 |
| | Unfunded requirement—radio frequency remote activated munitions | | [1,192] |
| 134 | < \$5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT | 1,530 | 1,530 |
| 135 | FAMILY OF BOATS AND MOTORS | 4,302 | 12,302 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [8,000] |
| | COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 136 | HEATERS AND ECU'S | 7,405 | 16,461 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [9,056] |
| 137 | SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT | 1,095 | 1,095 |
| 138 | PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS) | 5,390 | 5,390 |
| 139 | GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM | 38,219 | 42,808 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [4,589] |
| 140 | MOBILE SOLDIER POWER | 10,456 | 12,018 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [1,562] |
| 141 | FORCE PROVIDER | | 13,850 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [13,850] |
| 142 | FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT | 15,340 | 29,740 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [14,400] |
| 143 | CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM | 30,607 | 30,607 |
| 144 | FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS | 10,426 | 18,900 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [8,474] |
| | PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT | | |
| 146 | QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT | 6,903 | 6,903 |
| 147 | DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER | 47,597 | 47,597 |
| | MEDICAL EQUIPMENT | | |
| 148 | COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL | 43,343 | 66,262 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [21,122] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [1,797] |
| | MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT | | |
| 149 | MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS | 33,774 | 48,194 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [1,124] |
| | Unfunded requirement—metal working and machine shop sets | | [13,296] |
| 150 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MAINT EQ) | 2,728 | 3,682 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [954] |
| | CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | | |
| 151 | GRADER, ROAD MTZD, Hvy, 6X4 (CCE) | 989 | 15,719 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [14,730] |
| 152 | SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING | 11,180 | 11,180 |
| 154 | TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED | | 48,679 |
| | Unfunded requirement—T9 Dozers | | [48,679] |
| 155 | ALL TERRAIN CRANES | 8,935 | 11,935 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [3,000] |
| 157 | HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) | 64,339 | 84,899 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [20,560] |
| 158 | ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPAP | 2,563 | 2,563 |
| 160 | CONST EQUIP ESP | 19,032 | 26,032 |
| | Unfunded requirement—Engineer Mission Modules and Vibratory Rollers | | [7,000] |
| 161 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CONST EQUIP) | 6,899 | 11,911 |
| | Unfunded requirement—water well drill systems | | [5,012] |
| | RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT | | |
| 162 | ARMY WATERCRAFT ESP | 20,110 | 20,110 |
| 163 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL) | 2,877 | 2,877 |
| | GENERATORS | | |
| 164 | GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP | 115,635 | 132,845 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [17,210] |
| 165 | TACTICAL ELECTRIC POWER RECAPITALIZATION | 7,436 | 7,436 |
| | MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT | | |
| 166 | FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS | 9,000 | 10,635 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [1,635] |
| | TRAINING EQUIPMENT | | |
| 167 | COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT | 88,888 | 126,638 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [37,750] |
| 168 | TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM | 285,989 | 288,689 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [2,700] |
| 169 | CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER | 45,718 | 45,718 |
| 170 | AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER | 30,568 | 30,568 |
| 171 | GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING | 5,406 | 16,906 |
| | Unfunded requirement—SVCT systems | | [11,500] |
| | TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD) | | |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|------------------|------------------|
| 172 | CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT | 5,564 | 5,564 |
| 173 | INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE) | 30,144 | 37,644 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [7,500] |
| 174 | TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD) | 7,771 | 7,771 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 175 | M25 STABILIZED BINOCULAR | 3,956 | 3,956 |
| 176 | RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 177 | PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3) | 60,047 | 60,047 |
| 178 | BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT | 13,239 | 13,239 |
| 179 | MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3) | 60,192 | 99,432 |
| | Unfunded requirement—EOD Technician Tool Kits | | [29,240] |
| | Unfunded requirement—Rapidly Emplaced Bridge System Arctic Kit Technical Manual (TM) update | | [2,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement—Service Life Extension Program for the VOLCANO system | | [8,000] |
| 180 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH) | 2,271 | 2,271 |
| 181 | SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING | 5,319 | 5,319 |
| 182 | TRACTOR YARD | 5,935 | 5,935 |
| | OPA2 | | |
| 184 | INITIAL SPARES—C&E | 38,269 | 38,269 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 185 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | 56,000 |
| | Security Force Assistance Brigade | | [56,000] |
| | TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY | 6,469,331 | 8,463,222 |
| | JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND | | |
| | NETWORK ATTACK | | |
| 001 | RAPID ACQUISITION AND THREAT RESPONSE | 14,442 | 14,442 |
| | TOTAL JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT DEFEAT FUND | 14,442 | 14,442 |
| | AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | |
| | COMBAT AIRCRAFT | | |
| 002 | F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET | 1,200,146 | 1,791,346 |
| | Unfunded Requirement | | [591,200] |
| 003 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 52,971 | 52,971 |
| 004 | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV | 582,324 | 1,102,324 |
| | Unfunded Requirement—Marine Corps | | [260,000] |
| | Unfunded Requirement—Navy | | [260,000] |
| 005 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 263,112 | 263,112 |
| 006 | JSF STOVL | 2,398,139 | 2,860,739 |
| | Unfunded Requirement | | [462,600] |
| 007 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 413,450 | 413,450 |
| 008 | CH-53K (HEAVY LIFT) | 567,605 | 567,605 |
| 009 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 147,046 | 147,046 |
| 010 | V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) | 677,404 | 1,028,904 |
| | Multiyear procurement contract savings | | [-25,000] |
| | Unfunded Requirement | | [376,500] |
| 011 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 27,422 | 27,422 |
| 012 | H-1 UPGRADES (UH-1Y/AH-1Z) | 678,429 | 829,429 |
| | Unfunded requirement - additional AH-1Zs | | [157,500] |
| | Unit cost savings | | [-6,500] |
| 013 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 42,082 | 42,082 |
| 016 | P-8A POSEIDON | 1,245,251 | 1,751,751 |
| | P-8A | | [506,500] |
| 017 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 140,333 | 123,333 |
| | Excess to need | | [-17,000] |
| 018 | E-2D ADV HAWKEYE | 733,910 | 925,710 |
| | E-2D | | [201,800] |
| | Excessive growth | | [-10,000] |
| 019 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 102,026 | 102,026 |
| | OTHER AIRCRAFT | | |
| 022 | KC-130J | 129,577 | 484,877 |
| | KC-130J | | [355,300] |
| 023 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 25,497 | 25,497 |
| 024 | MQ-4 TRITON | 522,126 | 517,126 |
| | Excess cost growth | | [-5,000] |
| 025 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 57,266 | 57,266 |
| 026 | MQ-8 UAV | 49,472 | 49,472 |
| 027 | STUASLO UAV | 880 | 880 |
| | MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT | | |
| 030 | AEA SYSTEMS | 52,960 | 52,960 |
| 031 | AV-8 SERIES | 43,555 | 43,555 |
| 032 | ADVERSARY | 2,565 | 2,565 |
| 033 | F-18 SERIES | 1,043,661 | 1,076,211 |
| | Unfunded requirement—ALQ-214 Retrofits | | [32,550] |
| 034 | H-53 SERIES | 38,712 | 38,712 |
| 035 | SH-60 SERIES | 95,333 | 95,333 |
| 036 | H-1 SERIES | 101,886 | 101,886 |
| 037 | EP-3 SERIES | 7,231 | 7,231 |
| 038 | P-3 SERIES | 700 | 700 |
| 039 | E-2 SERIES | 97,563 | 97,563 |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| 040 | TRAINER A/C SERIES | 8,184 | 8,184 |
| 041 | C-2A | 18,673 | 18,673 |
| 042 | C-130 SERIES | 83,541 | 83,541 |
| 043 | FEWSG | 630 | 630 |
| 044 | CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES | 10,075 | 10,075 |
| 045 | E-6 SERIES | 223,508 | 223,508 |
| 046 | EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES | 38,787 | 38,787 |
| 047 | SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT | 8,304 | 8,304 |
| 048 | T-45 SERIES | 148,071 | 148,071 |
| 049 | POWER PLANT CHANGES | 19,827 | 19,827 |
| 050 | JPATS SERIES | 27,007 | 27,007 |
| 051 | COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | 146,642 | 146,642 |
| 052 | COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES | 123,507 | 123,507 |
| 053 | COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM | 2,317 | 2,317 |
| 054 | ID SYSTEMS | 49,524 | 49,524 |
| 055 | P-8 SERIES | 18,665 | 18,665 |
| 056 | MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION | 10,111 | 10,111 |
| 057 | MQ-8 SERIES | 32,361 | 32,361 |
| 059 | V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY | 228,321 | 228,321 |
| 060 | F-35 STOVL SERIES | 34,963 | 34,963 |
| 061 | F-35 CV SERIES | 31,689 | 31,689 |
| 062 | QRC | 24,766 | 24,766 |
| 063 | MQ-4 SERIES | 39,996 | 39,996 |
| | AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | |
| 064 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 1,681,914 | 1,882,514 |
| | Additional F-35 Initial Spares | | [32,600] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [168,000] |
| | AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES | | |
| 065 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | 388,052 | 405,552 |
| | Unfunded requirement—F-18C/D H12C Training Systems for USMC | | [17,500] |
| 066 | AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 24,613 | 24,613 |
| 067 | WAR CONSUMABLES | 39,614 | 39,614 |
| 068 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | 1,463 | 1,463 |
| 069 | SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 48,500 | 48,500 |
| 070 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | 1,976 | 1,976 |
| | TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY | 15,056,235 | 18,414,785 |
| | WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | |
| | MODIFICATION OF MISSILES | | |
| 001 | TRIDENT II MODS | 1,143,595 | 1,143,595 |
| | SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES | | |
| 002 | MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 7,086 | 7,086 |
| | STRATEGIC MISSILES | | |
| 003 | TOMAHAWK | 134,375 | 134,375 |
| | TACTICAL MISSILES | | |
| 004 | AMRAAM | 197,109 | 197,109 |
| 005 | SIDEWINDER | 79,692 | 79,692 |
| 006 | JSOW | 5,487 | 5,487 |
| 007 | STANDARD MISSILE | 510,875 | 510,875 |
| 008 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB II | 20,968 | 20,968 |
| 009 | RAM | 58,587 | 106,587 |
| | RAM BLK II | | [48,000] |
| 010 | JOINT AIR GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) | 3,789 | 3,789 |
| 013 | STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM) | 3,122 | 3,122 |
| 014 | AERIAL TARGETS | 124,757 | 124,757 |
| 015 | OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT | 3,420 | 3,420 |
| 016 | LRASM | 74,733 | 74,733 |
| | MODIFICATION OF MISSILES | | |
| 017 | ESSM | 74,524 | 74,524 |
| 019 | HARPOON MODS | 17,300 | 17,300 |
| 020 | HARM MODS | 183,368 | 183,368 |
| 021 | STANDARD MISSILES MODS | 11,729 | 11,729 |
| | SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES | | |
| 022 | WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 4,021 | 4,021 |
| 023 | FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON | 46,357 | 46,357 |
| | ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 025 | ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 47,159 | 47,159 |
| | TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP | | |
| 026 | SSTD | 5,240 | 5,240 |
| 027 | MK-48 TORPEDO | 44,771 | 70,971 |
| | MK 48 HWT | | [26,200] |
| 028 | ASW TARGETS | 12,399 | 12,399 |
| | MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP | | |
| 029 | MK-54 TORPEDO MODS | 104,044 | 104,044 |
| 030 | MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS | 38,954 | 38,954 |
| 031 | QUICKSTRIKE MINE | 10,337 | 10,337 |
| | SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 032 | TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 70,383 | 70,383 |
| 033 | ASW RANGE SUPPORT | 3,864 | 3,864 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | | | |
| 034 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | 3,961 | 3,961 |
| GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS | | | |
| 035 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | 11,332 | 11,332 |
| MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS | | | |
| 036 | CIWS MODS | 72,698 | 72,698 |
| 037 | COAST GUARD WEAPONS | 38,931 | 38,931 |
| 038 | GUN MOUNT MODS | 76,025 | 76,025 |
| 039 | LCS MODULE WEAPONS | 13,110 | 13,110 |
| 040 | CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS | 34,825 | 34,825 |
| 041 | AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS | 16,925 | 16,925 |
| SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | | |
| 043 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 110,255 | 110,255 |
| | TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY | 3,420,107 | 3,494,307 |
| PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC | | | |
| NAVY AMMUNITION | | | |
| 001 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | 34,882 | 34,882 |
| 002 | JDAM | 57,343 | 57,343 |
| 003 | AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | 79,318 | 79,318 |
| 004 | MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION | 14,112 | 14,112 |
| 005 | PRACTICE BOMBS | 47,027 | 47,027 |
| 006 | CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES | 57,718 | 57,718 |
| 007 | AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES | 65,908 | 65,908 |
| 008 | JATOS | 2,895 | 2,895 |
| 010 | 5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION | 22,112 | 22,112 |
| 011 | INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION | 12,804 | 12,804 |
| 012 | OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | 41,594 | 41,594 |
| 013 | SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO | 49,401 | 49,401 |
| 014 | PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | 9,495 | 9,495 |
| 016 | AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 3,080 | 3,080 |
| MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION | | | |
| 020 | MORTARS | 24,118 | 24,118 |
| 023 | DIRECT SUPPORT MUNITIONS | 64,045 | 64,045 |
| 024 | INFANTRY WEAPONS AMMUNITION | 91,456 | 91,456 |
| 029 | COMBAT SUPPORT MUNITIONS | 11,788 | 11,788 |
| 032 | AMMO MODERNIZATION | 17,862 | 17,862 |
| 033 | ARTILLERY MUNITIONS | 79,427 | 79,427 |
| 034 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 5,960 | 5,960 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC | 792,345 | 792,345 |
| SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY | | | |
| FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SHIPS | | | |
| 001 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 842,853 | 842,853 |
| OTHER WARSHIPS | | | |
| 002 | CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM | 4,441,772 | 3,741,772 |
| | Early to need | | [-700,000] |
| 004 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | 3,305,315 | 3,305,315 |
| 005 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 1,920,596 | 2,863,596 |
| | VA Class AP | | [693,000] |
| | VA Class EOQ | | [250,000] |
| 006 | CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS | 1,604,890 | 1,181,590 |
| | CVN 73 MQ-25 integration | | [26,700] |
| | Early to need | | [-450,000] |
| 007 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 75,897 | 75,897 |
| 008 | DDG 1000 | 223,968 | 223,968 |
| 009 | DDG-51 | 3,499,079 | 3,499,079 |
| 010 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 90,336 | 90,336 |
| 011 | LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP | 636,146 | 636,146 |
| AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS | | | |
| 015 | LHA REPLACEMENT | 1,710,927 | 1,210,927 |
| | Early to need | | [-500,000] |
| AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST | | | |
| 018 | TAO FLEET OILER | 465,988 | 465,988 |
| 019 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 75,068 | 75,068 |
| 020 | TOWING, SALVAGE, AND RESCUE SHIP (ATS) | 76,204 | 76,204 |
| 023 | LCU 1700 | 31,850 | 31,850 |
| 024 | OUTFITTING | 548,703 | 548,703 |
| 025 | SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR | 212,554 | 212,554 |
| 026 | SERVICE CRAFT | 23,994 | 23,994 |
| 029 | COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS | 117,542 | 117,542 |
| | TOTAL SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY | 19,903,682 | 19,223,382 |
| OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | | |
| SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT | | | |
| 003 | SURFACE POWER EQUIPMENT | 41,910 | 41,910 |
| 004 | HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED) | 6,331 | 6,331 |
| GENERATORS | | | |
| 005 | SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E | 27,392 | 27,392 |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| | NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT | | |
| 006 | OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT | 65,943 | 65,943 |
| | PERISCOPES | | |
| 007 | SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP | | 76,000 |
| | Submarine Warfare Federated Tactical Systems | | [76,000] |
| | OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT | | |
| 008 | SUB PERISCOPE, IMAGING AND SUPT EQUIP PROG | 151,240 | 151,240 |
| 009 | DDG MOD | 603,355 | 702,355 |
| | CEC IFF Mode 5 Acceleration | | [4,000] |
| | Destroyer modernization | | [65,000] |
| | SPY-1 refurbishment | | [30,000] |
| 010 | FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT | 15,887 | 15,887 |
| 011 | COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD | 2,240 | 2,240 |
| 012 | LHA/LHD MIDLIFE | 30,287 | 30,287 |
| 014 | POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | 17,293 | 17,293 |
| 015 | SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 27,990 | 27,990 |
| 016 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 46,610 | 46,610 |
| 017 | LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 47,955 | 47,955 |
| 018 | SUBMARINE BATTERIES | 17,594 | 17,594 |
| 019 | LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 61,908 | 61,908 |
| 021 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP | 15,812 | 15,812 |
| 022 | DSSP EQUIPMENT | 4,178 | 4,178 |
| 023 | CG MODERNIZATION | 306,050 | 306,050 |
| 024 | LCAC | 5,507 | 5,507 |
| 025 | UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS | 55,922 | 59,938 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [4,016] |
| 026 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 96,909 | 96,909 |
| 027 | CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS | 3,036 | 3,036 |
| 028 | SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 10,364 | 10,364 |
| | REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 029 | REACTOR POWER UNITS | 324,925 | 324,925 |
| 030 | REACTOR COMPONENTS | 534,468 | 534,468 |
| | OCEAN ENGINEERING | | |
| 031 | DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT | 10,619 | 10,619 |
| | SMALL BOATS | | |
| 032 | STANDARD BOATS | 46,094 | 46,094 |
| | PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT | | |
| 034 | OPERATING FORCES IPE | 191,541 | 191,541 |
| | OTHER SHIP SUPPORT | | |
| 036 | LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT | 34,666 | 68,666 |
| | MCM-USV | | [34,000] |
| 037 | LCS MCM MISSION MODULES | 55,870 | 55,870 |
| 039 | LCS SUW MISSION MODULES | 52,960 | 52,960 |
| 040 | LCS IN-SERVICE MODERNIZATION | 74,426 | 158,426 |
| | LCS Modernization | | [84,000] |
| | LOGISTIC SUPPORT | | |
| 042 | LSD MIDLIFE & MODERNIZATION | 89,536 | 89,536 |
| | SHIP SONARS | | |
| 043 | SPQ-9B RADAR | 30,086 | 30,086 |
| 044 | AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM | 102,222 | 102,222 |
| 046 | SSN ACOUSTIC EQUIPMENT | 287,553 | 331,053 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [43,500] |
| 047 | UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 13,653 | 13,653 |
| | ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | |
| 049 | SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM | 21,449 | 21,449 |
| 050 | SSTD | 12,867 | 12,867 |
| 051 | FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 300,102 | 300,102 |
| 052 | SURTASS | 30,180 | 40,180 |
| | SURTASS Array | | [10,000] |
| | ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT | | |
| 054 | AN/SLQ-32 | 240,433 | 240,433 |
| | RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT | | |
| 055 | SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT | 187,007 | 227,007 |
| | Ship Signal Exploitation Equipment | | [40,000] |
| 056 | AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS) | 510 | 510 |
| | OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | |
| 058 | COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY | 23,892 | 23,892 |
| 060 | NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS) | 10,741 | 10,741 |
| 061 | ATDLS | 38,016 | 38,016 |
| 062 | NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS) | 4,512 | 4,512 |
| 063 | MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT | 31,531 | 31,531 |
| 064 | SHALLOW WATER MCM | 8,796 | 8,796 |
| 065 | NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE) | 15,923 | 15,923 |
| 066 | AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE | 2,730 | 2,730 |
| 067 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP | 6,889 | 6,889 |
| | AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | |
| 070 | ASHORE ATC EQUIPMENT | 71,882 | 71,882 |
| 071 | AFLOAT ATC EQUIPMENT | 44,611 | 44,611 |
| 077 | ID SYSTEMS | 21,239 | 21,239 |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| <i>Line</i> | <i>Item</i> | <i>FY 2018 Request</i> | <i>House Authorized</i> |
|-------------|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 078 | NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS | 11,976 | 11,976 |
| | OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | |
| 080 | TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS | 32,425 | 40,325 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [7,900] |
| 081 | DCGS-N | 13,790 | 15,690 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [1,900] |
| 082 | CANES | 322,754 | 322,754 |
| 083 | RADIAC | 10,718 | 10,718 |
| 084 | CANES-INTELL | 48,028 | 48,028 |
| 085 | GPETE | 6,861 | 6,861 |
| 086 | MASF | 8,081 | 8,081 |
| 087 | INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY | 5,019 | 5,019 |
| 088 | EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION | 4,188 | 4,188 |
| 089 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 105,292 | 105,292 |
| | SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 090 | SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS | 23,695 | 23,695 |
| 091 | SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION | 103,990 | 103,990 |
| 092 | COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER \$5M | 18,577 | 18,577 |
| | SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 093 | SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT | 29,669 | 29,669 |
| 094 | SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT | 86,204 | 86,204 |
| | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 095 | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 14,654 | 14,654 |
| 096 | NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT) | 69,764 | 69,764 |
| | SHORE COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 097 | JOINT COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT ELEMENT (JCSE) | 4,256 | 4,256 |
| | CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT | | |
| 099 | INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) | 89,663 | 89,663 |
| 100 | MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM | 961 | 961 |
| | CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT | | |
| 101 | CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP | 11,287 | 11,287 |
| | OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT | | |
| 110 | COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT | 36,584 | 36,584 |
| | SONOBUOYS | | |
| 112 | SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES | 173,616 | 198,516 |
| | Sonobuoys | | [24,900] |
| | AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 113 | WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 72,110 | 72,110 |
| 114 | AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 108,482 | 115,982 |
| | EMALS initial spares | | [7,500] |
| 115 | ADVANCED ARRESTING GEAR (AAG) | 10,900 | 10,900 |
| 116 | METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT | 21,137 | 21,137 |
| 117 | DCRS/DPL | 660 | 660 |
| 118 | AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES | 20,605 | 20,605 |
| 119 | AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 34,032 | 34,032 |
| | SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT | | |
| 120 | SHIP GUN SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT | 5,277 | 5,277 |
| | SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT | | |
| 121 | SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 272,359 | 272,359 |
| 122 | TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 73,184 | 73,184 |
| | FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 123 | STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP | 246,221 | 246,221 |
| | ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 124 | SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS | 129,972 | 129,972 |
| 125 | ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 23,209 | 23,209 |
| | OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 126 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP | 15,596 | 15,596 |
| 127 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 5,981 | 5,981 |
| | OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE | | |
| 128 | SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS | 74,550 | 74,550 |
| 130 | SURFACE TRAINING EQUIPMENT | 83,022 | 83,022 |
| | CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 131 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | 5,299 | 5,299 |
| 132 | GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS | 2,946 | 3,052 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [106] |
| 133 | CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP | 34,970 | 34,970 |
| 134 | FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT | 2,541 | 2,541 |
| 135 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | 19,699 | 19,699 |
| 136 | AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT | 12,162 | 12,162 |
| 137 | POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | 2,748 | 2,748 |
| 138 | ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION | 18,084 | 18,084 |
| 139 | PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES | 1,170 | 1,170 |
| | SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 141 | SUPPLY EQUIPMENT | 21,797 | 21,961 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [164] |
| 143 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | 5,572 | 5,572 |
| 144 | SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS | 482,916 | 482,916 |
| | TRAINING DEVICES | | |
| 146 | TRAINING AND EDUCATION EQUIPMENT | 25,624 | 25,624 |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|------------------|------------------|
| | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 147 | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 59,076 | 59,076 |
| 149 | MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 4,383 | 4,383 |
| 151 | NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 2,030 | 2,030 |
| 152 | OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| 153 | C4ISR EQUIPMENT | 4,010 | 4,010 |
| 154 | ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 23,644 | 24,644 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [1,000] |
| 155 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 101,982 | 101,982 |
| 156 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY | 19,789 | 19,789 |
| | OTHER | | |
| 160 | NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE SERVICE | 104,584 | 104,584 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | |
| 161A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 23,707 | 23,707 |
| | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | |
| 161 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 278,565 | 290,565 |
| | E-2D AHE | | [12,000] |
| | TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY | 8,277,789 | 8,723,775 |
| | PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS | | |
| | TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES | | |
| 001 | AAV7A1 PIP | 107,665 | 107,665 |
| 002 | AMPHIBIOUS COMBAT VEHICLE 1.1 | 161,511 | 161,511 |
| 003 | LAV PIP | 17,244 | 17,244 |
| | ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS | | |
| 004 | EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 626 | 626 |
| 005 | 155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER | 20,259 | 20,259 |
| 006 | HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM | 59,943 | 59,943 |
| 007 | WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER \$5 MILLION | 19,616 | 19,616 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT | | |
| 008 | MODIFICATION KITS | 17,778 | 17,778 |
| | GUIDED MISSILES | | |
| 010 | GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE | 9,432 | 9,432 |
| 011 | JAVELIN | 41,159 | 41,159 |
| 012 | FOLLOW ON TO SMAW | 25,125 | 25,125 |
| 013 | ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H) | 51,553 | 51,553 |
| | COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS | | |
| 016 | COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (C) | 44,928 | 44,928 |
| | REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT | | |
| 017 | REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT | 33,056 | 33,056 |
| | COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL) | | |
| 020 | ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) | 17,644 | 17,644 |
| 021 | AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS | 18,393 | 18,393 |
| | RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL) | | |
| 022 | RADAR SYSTEMS | 12,411 | 12,411 |
| 023 | GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR) | 139,167 | 139,167 |
| 024 | RQ-21 UAS | 77,841 | 77,841 |
| | INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL) | | |
| 025 | GCSS-MC | 1,990 | 1,990 |
| 026 | FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 22,260 | 22,260 |
| 027 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 55,759 | 55,759 |
| 029 | UNMANNED AIR SYSTEMS (INTEL) | 10,154 | 10,154 |
| 030 | DCGS-MC | 13,462 | 13,462 |
| 031 | UAS PAYLOADS | 14,193 | 14,193 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL) | | |
| 035 | NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORK (NGEN) | 98,511 | 98,511 |
| 036 | COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES | 66,894 | 66,894 |
| 037 | COMMAND POST SYSTEMS | 186,912 | 186,912 |
| 038 | RADIO SYSTEMS | 34,361 | 34,361 |
| 039 | COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS | 54,615 | 54,615 |
| 040 | COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT | 44,455 | 44,455 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | |
| 040A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 4,214 | 4,214 |
| | ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES | | |
| 042 | COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES | 66,951 | 66,951 |
| | TACTICAL VEHICLES | | |
| 043 | MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS | 21,824 | 21,824 |
| 044 | JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE | 233,639 | 233,639 |
| 045 | FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS | 1,938 | 1,938 |
| 046 | TRAILERS | 10,282 | 10,282 |
| | ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT | | |
| 048 | ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT | 1,405 | 1,405 |
| 050 | TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS | 1,788 | 1,788 |
| 051 | POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED | 9,910 | 9,910 |
| 052 | AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 5,830 | 5,830 |
| 053 | EOD SYSTEMS | 27,240 | 27,240 |
| | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | | |
| 054 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 53,477 | 53,477 |
| | GENERAL PROPERTY | | |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|-------------|--|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 056 | TRAINING DEVICES | 76,185 | 85,064 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [8,879] |
| 058 | FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | 26,286 | 26,286 |
| 059 | FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV) | 1,583 | 1,583 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT | | |
| 060 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 7,716 | 7,716 |
| | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | |
| 062 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 35,640 | 35,640 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS | 2,064,825 | 2,073,704 |
| | AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | |
| | TACTICAL FORCES | | |
| 001 | F-35 | 4,544,684 | 5,804,684 |
| | Additional Tooling in Support of Unfunded Priority | | [60,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [1,200,000] |
| 002 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 780,300 | 780,300 |
| | TACTICAL AIRLIFT | | |
| 003 | KC-46A TANKER | 2,545,674 | 2,945,674 |
| | KC-46A | | [400,000] |
| | OTHER AIRLIFT | | |
| 004 | C-130J | 57,708 | 57,708 |
| 006 | HC-130J | 198,502 | 298,502 |
| | HC-130J | | [100,000] |
| 008 | MC-130J | 379,373 | 979,373 |
| | MC-130J | | [600,000] |
| 009 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| | MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT | | |
| 012 | CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C | 2,695 | 2,695 |
| | OTHER AIRCRAFT | | |
| 014 | TARGET DRONES | 109,841 | 109,841 |
| 017 | MQ-9 | 117,141 | 117,141 |
| | STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT | | |
| 018 | B-2A | 96,727 | 105,727 |
| | B-2 Rotary Launcher assembly | | [9,000] |
| 019 | B-1B | 155,634 | 121,634 |
| | Duplicate funding of F101 engine kits | | [-34,000] |
| 020 | B-52 | 109,295 | 109,295 |
| 021 | LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES | 4,046 | 122,991 |
| | C-130 LAIRCM | | [18,900] |
| | C-17 LAIRCM | | [76,145] |
| | C-5 LAIRCM | | [23,900] |
| | TACTICAL AIRCRAFT | | |
| 022 | A-10 | 6,010 | 109,010 |
| | Unfunded Requirement | | [103,000] |
| 023 | F-15 | 417,193 | 417,193 |
| 024 | F-16 | 203,864 | 203,864 |
| 025 | F-22A | 161,630 | 161,630 |
| 026 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| 027 | F-35 MODIFICATIONS | 68,270 | 68,270 |
| 028 | INCREMENT 3.2B | 105,756 | 105,756 |
| 030 | KC-46A TANKER | 6,213 | 6,213 |
| | AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT | | |
| 031 | C-5 | 36,592 | 36,592 |
| 032 | C-5M | 6,817 | 6,817 |
| 033 | C-17A | 125,522 | 125,522 |
| 034 | C-21 | 13,253 | 13,253 |
| 035 | C-32A | 79,449 | 79,449 |
| 036 | C-37A | 15,423 | 15,423 |
| 037 | C-130J | 10,727 | 10,727 |
| | TRAINER AIRCRAFT | | |
| 038 | GLIDER MODS | 136 | 136 |
| 039 | T-6 | 35,706 | 35,706 |
| 040 | T-1 | 21,477 | 21,477 |
| 041 | T-38 | 51,641 | 51,641 |
| | OTHER AIRCRAFT | | |
| 042 | U-2 MODS | 36,406 | 36,406 |
| 043 | KC-10A (ATCA) | 4,243 | 4,243 |
| 044 | C-12 | 5,846 | 70,846 |
| | MC-12W upgrades for Air National Guard | | [65,000] |
| 045 | VC-25A MOD | 52,107 | 52,107 |
| 046 | C-40 | 31,119 | 31,119 |
| 047 | C-130 | 66,310 | 213,310 |
| | C-130H Inflight rebalance system | | [18,000] |
| | C-130H NP2000 Prop | | [55,000] |
| | C-130H T56 3.5 | | [74,000] |
| 048 | C-130J MODS | 171,230 | 171,230 |
| 049 | C-135 | 69,428 | 69,428 |
| 050 | OC-135B | 23,091 | 23,091 |
| 051 | COMPASS CALL MODS | 166,541 | 166,541 |

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| 052 | COMBAT FLIGHT INSPECTION (CFIN) | 495 | 495 |
| 053 | RC-135 | 201,559 | 201,559 |
| 054 | E-3 | 189,772 | 189,772 |
| 055 | E-4 | 30,493 | 30,493 |
| 056 | E-8 | 13,232 | 13,232 |
| 057 | AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 164,786 | 164,786 |
| 058 | FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS | 24,716 | 24,716 |
| 059 | H-1 | 3,730 | 3,730 |
| 060 | H-60 | 75,989 | 92,089 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [16,100] |
| 061 | RQ-4 MODS | 43,968 | 62,268 |
| | HA-ISR Payload Adapters | | [18,300] |
| 062 | HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS | 67,674 | 67,674 |
| 063 | OTHER AIRCRAFT | 59,068 | 59,068 |
| 065 | MQ-9 MODS | 264,740 | 269,940 |
| | FY17 10th Pod Set Procurement Shortfall | | [5,200] |
| 066 | CV-22 MODS | 60,990 | 60,990 |
| | AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | |
| 067 | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | 1,041,569 | 1,121,169 |
| | Additional F-35 Initial Spares | | [79,600] |
| | COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 068 | AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP | 75,846 | 101,263 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [25,417] |
| 069 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | 8,524 | 8,524 |
| 071 | T-53A TRAINER | 501 | 501 |
| | POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT | | |
| 072 | B-2A | 447 | 447 |
| 073 | B-2A | 38,509 | 38,509 |
| 074 | B-52 | 199 | 199 |
| 075 | C-17A | 12,028 | 12,028 |
| 078 | RC-135 | 29,700 | 29,700 |
| 079 | F-15 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| 080 | F-15 | 2,524 | 2,524 |
| 081 | F-16 | 18,051 | 5,651 |
| | Program reduction | | [-12,400] |
| 082 | F-22A | 119,566 | 119,566 |
| 083 | OTHER AIRCRAFT | 85,000 | 85,000 |
| 085 | RQ-4 POST PRODUCTION CHARGES | 86,695 | 86,695 |
| 086 | CV-22 MODS | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | | |
| 087 | INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS | 14,739 | 30,739 |
| | Program increase | | [16,000] |
| 088 | C-130J | 102,000 | 102,000 |
| | WAR CONSUMABLES | | |
| 089 | WAR CONSUMABLES | 37,647 | 37,647 |
| | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | | |
| 090 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | 1,339,160 | 1,339,160 |
| 092 | OTHER AIRCRAFT | 600 | 600 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | |
| 092A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 53,212 | 53,212 |
| | TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 15,430,849 | 18,348,011 |
| | MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | |
| | MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC | | |
| 001 | MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC | 99,098 | 99,098 |
| | TACTICAL | | |
| 002 | JOINT AIR-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE | 441,367 | 441,367 |
| 003 | LRASM0 | 44,728 | 61,728 |
| | LRASM | | [17,000] |
| 004 | SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X) | 125,350 | 125,350 |
| 005 | AMRAAM | 304,327 | 304,327 |
| 006 | PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE | 34,867 | 34,867 |
| 007 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB | 266,030 | 266,030 |
| | INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | |
| 008 | INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION | 926 | 926 |
| | CLASS IV | | |
| 009 | ICBM FUZE MOD | 6,334 | 6,334 |
| 010 | MM III MODIFICATIONS | 80,109 | 80,109 |
| 011 | AGM-65D MAVERICK | 289 | 289 |
| 013 | AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM) | 36,425 | 36,425 |
| 014 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB | 14,086 | 14,086 |
| | MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | |
| 015 | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | 101,153 | 101,153 |
| | SPECIAL PROGRAMS | | |
| 020 | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS | 32,917 | 32,917 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | |
| 020A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 708,176 | 708,176 |
| | TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 2,296,182 | 2,313,182 |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|---|------------------|------------------|
| SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | | |
| SPACE PROGRAMS | | | |
| 001 | ADVANCED EHF | 56,974 | 56,974 |
| 002 | AF SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM | 57,516 | 57,516 |
| 003 | COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS | 28,798 | 28,798 |
| 004 | FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS | 146,972 | 146,972 |
| 005 | WIDEBAND GAFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE) | 80,849 | 180,849 |
| | Long-lead procurement for protecting supply chain and schedule for WGS communications | | [100,000] |
| 006 | GPS III SPACE SEGMENT | 85,894 | 85,894 |
| 007 | GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) | 2,198 | 2,198 |
| 008 | SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC) | 25,048 | 25,048 |
| 010 | MILSATCOM | 33,033 | 33,033 |
| 011 | EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH CAPABILITY | 957,420 | 957,420 |
| 012 | EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE) | 606,488 | 606,488 |
| 013 | SBIR HIGH (SPACE) | 981,009 | 1,057,359 |
| | AF UPL—fully fund emerging cyber security requirement | | [44,900] |
| | AF UPL—procure commercially available antenna | | [15,450] |
| | AF UPL upgrades ground antenna | | [16,000] |
| 014 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 132,420 | 132,420 |
| 015 | NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM | 6,370 | 6,370 |
| 016 | SPACE MODS | 37,203 | 37,203 |
| 017 | SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE | 113,874 | 113,874 |
| SSPARES | | | |
| 018 | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | 18,709 | 18,709 |
| | TOTAL SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 3,370,775 | 3,547,125 |
| PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE | | | |
| ROCKETS | | | |
| 001 | ROCKETS | 147,454 | 147,454 |
| CARTRIDGES | | | |
| 002 | CARTRIDGES | 161,744 | 161,744 |
| BOMBS | | | |
| 003 | PRACTICE BOMBS | 28,509 | 28,509 |
| 004 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | 329,501 | 329,501 |
| 005 | MASSIVE ORDNANCE PENETRATOR (MOP) | 38,382 | 38,382 |
| 006 | JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION | 319,525 | 319,525 |
| 007 | B61 | 77,068 | 77,068 |
| 008 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 11,239 | 11,239 |
| OTHER ITEMS | | | |
| 009 | CAD/PAD | 53,469 | 53,469 |
| 010 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD) | 5,921 | 5,921 |
| 011 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 678 | 678 |
| 012 | MODIFICATIONS | 1,409 | 1,409 |
| 013 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 5,047 | 5,047 |
| FLARES | | | |
| 015 | FLARES | 143,983 | 143,983 |
| FUZES | | | |
| 016 | FUZES | 24,062 | 24,062 |
| SMALL ARMS | | | |
| 017 | SMALL ARMS | 28,611 | 28,611 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE | 1,376,602 | 1,376,602 |
| OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | | |
| PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | | | |
| 001 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | 15,651 | 17,001 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [1,350] |
| CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES | | | |
| 002 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE | 54,607 | 54,607 |
| 003 | CAP VEHICLES | 1,011 | 1,011 |
| 004 | CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES | 28,670 | 28,670 |
| SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES | | | |
| 005 | SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES | 59,398 | 59,398 |
| 006 | SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES | 19,784 | 51,605 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [31,821] |
| FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT | | | |
| 007 | FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES | 14,768 | 37,351 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [22,583] |
| MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | | | |
| 008 | MATERIALS HANDLING VEHICLES | 13,561 | 17,587 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [4,026] |
| BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT | | | |
| 009 | RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP | 3,429 | 12,590 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [9,161] |
| 010 | BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT VEHICLES | 60,075 | 99,767 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [39,692] |
| COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC) | | | |
| 011 | COMSEC EQUIPMENT | 115,000 | 123,000 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [8,000] |
| INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS | | | |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|-------------|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 013 | INTERNATIONAL INTEL TECH & ARCHITECTURES | 22,335 | 22,335 |
| 014 | INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT | 5,892 | 5,892 |
| 015 | INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT | 34,072 | 34,072 |
| | ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS | | |
| 016 | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS | 66,143 | 66,143 |
| 017 | NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM | 12,641 | 12,641 |
| 018 | BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED | 6,415 | 6,415 |
| 019 | THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS | 23,233 | 23,233 |
| 020 | WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST | 40,116 | 40,116 |
| 021 | STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL | 72,810 | 72,810 |
| 022 | CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX | 9,864 | 9,864 |
| 023 | MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS | 15,486 | 15,486 |
| 025 | INTEGRATED STRAT PLAN & ANALY NETWORK (ISPAN) | 9,187 | 9,187 |
| | SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS | | |
| 026 | GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY | 51,826 | 51,826 |
| 027 | AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS | 3,634 | 3,634 |
| 028 | MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL | 10,083 | 10,083 |
| 029 | AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM | 201,866 | 201,866 |
| 030 | COMBAT TRAINING RANGES | 115,198 | 115,198 |
| 031 | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N | 292 | 292 |
| 032 | WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE (WAS) | 62,087 | 62,087 |
| 033 | C3 COUNTERMEASURES | 37,764 | 37,764 |
| 034 | GCSS-AF FOS | 2,826 | 2,826 |
| 035 | DEFENSE ENTERPRISE ACCOUNTING AND MGMT SYSTEM | 1,514 | 1,514 |
| 036 | THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM | 9,646 | 9,646 |
| 037 | AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS | 25,533 | 25,533 |
| | AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 040 | BASE INFORMATION TRANSPRT INFRAST (BITI) WIRED | 28,159 | 28,159 |
| 041 | AFNET | 160,820 | 186,820 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [26,000] |
| 042 | JOINT COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT ELEMENT (JCSE) | 5,135 | 5,135 |
| 043 | USCENTCOM | 18,719 | 18,719 |
| | ORGANIZATION AND BASE | | |
| 044 | TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT | 123,206 | 123,206 |
| 045 | COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER | 3,004 | 3,004 |
| 046 | RADIO EQUIPMENT | 15,736 | 15,736 |
| 047 | CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT | 5,480 | 5,480 |
| 048 | BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE | 130,539 | 185,539 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [55,000] |
| | MODIFICATIONS | | |
| 049 | COMM ELECT MODS | 70,798 | 70,798 |
| | PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP | | |
| 051 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 52,964 | 53,464 |
| | Unfunded requirement—Instructor Training Parachutes | | [500] |
| | DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ | | |
| 052 | MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP | 10,381 | 10,381 |
| | BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 053 | BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT | 15,038 | 27,538 |
| | Program increase—Civil Engineers Construction, Surveying, and Mapping Equipment | | [5,000] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [7,500] |
| 054 | ENGINEERING AND EOD EQUIPMENT | 26,287 | 26,287 |
| 055 | MOBILITY EQUIPMENT | 8,470 | 8,470 |
| 056 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 28,768 | 132,783 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [104,015] |
| | SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS | | |
| 058 | DARP RC135 | 25,985 | 25,985 |
| 059 | DCGS-AF | 178,423 | 178,423 |
| 061 | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM | 840,980 | 840,980 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | |
| 062A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 16,601,513 | 16,601,513 |
| | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | |
| 064 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 26,675 | 26,675 |
| | TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 19,603,497 | 19,918,145 |
| | PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE | | |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD | | |
| 042 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD | 36,999 | 36,999 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA | | |
| 041 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) | 5,938 | 5,938 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS | | |
| 045 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS | 10,529 | 10,529 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA | | |
| 007 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY | 24,805 | 24,805 |
| 008 | TELEPORT PROGRAM | 46,638 | 46,638 |
| 009 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 15,541 | 15,541 |
| 010 | NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES) | 1,161 | 1,161 |
| 011 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK | 126,345 | 126,345 |
| 012 | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 1,817 | 1,817 |
| 013 | WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATION AGENCY | 45,243 | 45,243 |

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|--------------------|--------------------|
| 014 | SENIOR LEADERSHIP ENTERPRISE | 294,139 | 294,139 |
| 016 | JOINT REGIONAL SECURITY STACKS (JRSS) | 188,483 | 188,483 |
| 017 | JOINT SERVICE PROVIDER | 100,783 | 100,783 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA | | |
| 019 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 2,951 | 2,951 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS | | |
| 023 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 1,073 | 1,073 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA | | |
| 001 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 1,475 | 1,475 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS | | |
| 043 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS | 9,341 | 9,341 |
| 044 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS—CE2T2 | 903 | 903 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY | | |
| 027 | THAAD | 451,592 | 770,992 |
| | Procure additional THAAD interceptors | | [319,400] |
| 028 | AEGIS BMD | 425,018 | 583,018 |
| | Additional SM-3 Block 1B | | [158,000] |
| 029 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | 38,738 | 38,738 |
| 030 | BMDS AN/TPY-2 RADARS | 947 | 947 |
| 033 | AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III | 59,739 | 59,739 |
| 034 | IRON DOME | 42,000 | 42,000 |
| 035 | AEGIS BMD HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE | 160,330 | 160,330 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA | | |
| 003 | PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION | 14,588 | 14,588 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY | | |
| 025 | VEHICLES | 204 | 204 |
| 026 | OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 12,363 | 12,363 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA | | |
| 021 | AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS | 1,910 | 1,910 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA | | |
| 002 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 4,347 | 4,347 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT | | |
| 020 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 13,464 | 13,464 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | |
| 045A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 657,759 | 657,759 |
| | AVIATION PROGRAMS | | |
| 049 | ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT | 158,988 | 151,488 |
| | Per SOCOM requested realignment | | [-7,500] |
| 050 | UNMANNED ISR | 13,295 | 13,295 |
| 051 | NON-STANDARD AVIATION | 4,892 | 4,892 |
| 052 | U-28 | 5,769 | 5,769 |
| 053 | MH-47 CHINOOK | 87,345 | 87,345 |
| 055 | CV-22 MODIFICATION | 42,178 | 42,178 |
| 057 | MQ-9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE | 21,660 | 21,660 |
| 059 | PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE | 229,728 | 229,728 |
| 060 | AC/MC-130J | 179,934 | 179,934 |
| 061 | C-130 MODIFICATIONS | 28,059 | 28,059 |
| | SHIPBUILDING | | |
| 062 | UNDERWATER SYSTEMS | 92,606 | 79,806 |
| | Per SOCOM requested realignment | | [-12,800] |
| | AMMUNITION PROGRAMS | | |
| 063 | ORDNANCE ITEMS <\$5M | 112,331 | 112,331 |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS | | |
| 064 | INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS | 82,538 | 82,538 |
| 065 | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 11,042 | 11,042 |
| 066 | OTHER ITEMS <\$5M | 54,592 | 54,592 |
| 067 | COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS | 23,272 | 23,272 |
| 068 | SPECIAL PROGRAMS | 16,053 | 16,053 |
| 069 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | 63,304 | 63,304 |
| 070 | WARRIOR SYSTEMS <\$5M | 252,070 | 252,070 |
| 071 | COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS | 19,570 | 19,570 |
| 072 | GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES | 3,589 | 3,589 |
| 073 | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE | 17,953 | 17,953 |
| 075 | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | 241,429 | 241,429 |
| | CBDP | | |
| 076 | CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL SITUATIONAL AWARENESS | 135,031 | 135,031 |
| 077 | CB PROTECTION & HAZARD MITIGATION | 141,027 | 141,027 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE | 4,835,418 | 5,292,518 |
| | JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND | | |
| | JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND | | |
| 001 | JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND | 99,795 | 0 |
| | Program reduction | | [-99,795] |
| | TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND | 99,795 | 0 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT | 113,983,713 | 127,861,301 |

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|---|------------------|------------------|
| AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | | |
| FIXED WING | | | |
| 004 | MQ-1 UAV | 87,300 | 87,300 |
| ROTARY | | | |
| 006 | AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN | 39,040 | 78,040 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [39,000] |
| MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT | | | |
| 015 | MQ-1 PAYLOAD (MIP) | 41,400 | 33,400 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-8,000] |
| 018 | MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP) | 33,475 | 4,000 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-29,475] |
| 023 | EMARSS SEMA MODS (MIP) | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| 025 | UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS | | 34,809 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [34,809] |
| 027 | COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE | 4,289 | 4,289 |
| GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS | | | |
| 033 | CMWS | 139,742 | 201,542 |
| | Unfunded requirement—B kits | | [61,800] |
| 034 | COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM) | 43,440 | 43,440 |
| OTHER SUPPORT | | | |
| 037 | AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS | | 12,100 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [12,100] |
| | TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY | 424,686 | 534,920 |
| MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | | |
| SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM | | | |
| 002 | MSE MISSILE | | 633,570 |
| | Meet inventory requirements for COCOMS | | [633,570] |
| AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM | | | |
| 005 | HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY | 278,073 | 288,073 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [10,000] |
| ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS | | | |
| 008 | JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY | 8,112 | 147,300 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-8,112] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [147,300] |
| 009 | TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY | 3,907 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-3,907] |
| 011 | GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) | 191,522 | 204,522 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [13,000] |
| 012 | MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR) | | 6,330 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [6,330] |
| 013 | HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMARS) | 41,000 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-41,000] |
| 014 | LETHAL MINIATURE AERIAL MISSILE SYSTEM (LMAMS) | 8,669 | 55,269 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [46,600] |
| MODIFICATIONS | | | |
| 016 | ATACMS MODS | | 69,400 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [69,400] |
| 018 | STINGER MODS | 28,000 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-28,000] |
| | TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY | 559,283 | 1,404,464 |
| PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY | | | |
| TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES | | | |
| 001 | BRADLEY PROGRAM | 200,000 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-200,000] |
| 002 | ARMORED MULTI PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV) | 253,903 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-253,903] |
| MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES | | | |
| 004 | STRYKER (MOD) | | 177,000 |
| | Unfunded requirement – lethality upgrades | | [177,000] |
| 006 | BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD) | 30,000 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-30,000] |
| 008 | PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM) | 125,736 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-125,736] |
| 014 | MI ABRAMS TANK (MOD) | 138,700 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-138,700] |
| 015 | ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM | 442,800 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-442,800] |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY | 1,191,139 | 177,000 |
| PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY | | | |
| SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION | | | |
| 001 | CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES | | 7,100 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [7,100] |
| 002 | CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES | | 14,900 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [14,900] |

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|--|-----------------|------------------|
| 003 | CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES | 5 | 90 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-5] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [90] |
| 004 | CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES | 121 | 8,890 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-121] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [8,890] |
| 005 | CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES | 1,605 | 1,605 |
| 006 | CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES | | 31,862 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [31,862] |
| 007 | CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES | 35,000 | 12,150 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-25,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [2,150] |
| 008 | CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES | | 17,191 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [17,191] |
| | MORTAR AMMUNITION | | |
| 009 | 60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | | 2,500 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [2,500] |
| 010 | 81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | | 3,109 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [3,109] |
| 011 | 120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | | 18,192 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [18,192] |
| | TANK AMMUNITION | | |
| 012 | CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES | | 40,300 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [40,300] |
| | ARTILLERY AMMUNITION | | |
| 014 | ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES | | 159,181 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [159,181] |
| 015 | PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982 | 23,234 | 4,189 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-19,045] |
| 016 | ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL | 20,023 | 84,067 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-16,678] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [80,722] |
| | MINES | | |
| 017 | MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES | 11,615 | 3,000 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-11,615] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [3,000] |
| | ROCKETS | | |
| 019 | SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | 25,000 | 86,881 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [61,881] |
| 020 | ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES | 75,820 | 163,820 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [20,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement—APKWS and M282 warheads | | [68,000] |
| | OTHER AMMUNITION | | |
| 022 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | | 2,261 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [2,261] |
| 023 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | | 25,361 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [25,361] |
| 024 | SIGNALS, ALL TYPES | 1,013 | 1,842 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [829] |
| 025 | SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES | | 450 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [450] |
| | MISCELLANEOUS | | |
| 027 | NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES | | 150 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [150] |
| 028 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION (AMMO) | | 3,665 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [3,665] |
| | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | | |
| 033 | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION | | 53,000 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [53,000] |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY | 193,436 | 745,756 |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY | | |
| | TACTICAL VEHICLES | | |
| 010 | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) | 25,874 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-25,874] |
| 012 | HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV | 38,628 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-38,628] |
| 014 | MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP | 64,647 | 135,900 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-2,599] |
| | Unfunded requirement—route clearance and mine protected vehicles | | [73,852] |
| 015 | MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS | 17,508 | 17,508 |
| | COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 020 | SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 4,900 | 4,900 |
| | COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 041 | TRACTOR RIDE | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| | COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 062 | INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM | 2,500 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-2,500] |
| | ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA) | | |

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|--|-----------------|------------------|
| 068 | DCGS-A (MIP) | 39,515 | 52,515 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [13,000] |
| 070 | TROJAN (MIP) | 21,310 | 15,310 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-6,000] |
| 071 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP) | 2,300 | 2,300 |
| 072 | CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS) | 14,460 | 14,460 |
| 075 | BIOMETRIC TACTICAL COLLECTION DEVICES (MIP) | 5,180 | 5,180 |
| | ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) | | |
| 079 | CREW | | 17,500 |
| | Unfunded requirement—EOD DR SKOs | | [17,500] |
| 080 | FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE | 16,935 | 21,935 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [5,000] |
| 081 | COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES | 18,874 | 12,974 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-5,900] |
| | ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV) | | |
| 084 | NIGHT VISION DEVICES | 377 | 377 |
| 085 | SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF | 60 | 2,210 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [2,150] |
| 086 | BASE EXPEDITIARY TARGETING AND SURV SYS | | 29,462 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [29,462] |
| 087 | INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS | 57,500 | 200,110 |
| | Unfunded requirement—Air and Missile Defense (SHORAD) | | [142,610] |
| 091 | JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P) | | -2,300 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-2,300] |
| 093 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR) | 3,974 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-3,974] |
| 095 | MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM | 2,947 | 2,872 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-75] |
| | ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS | | |
| 098 | AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS | 9,100 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-9,100] |
| | CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT | | |
| 119 | BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS) | 3,726 | 3,726 |
| | ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT | | |
| 126 | GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS) | | 10,800 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [10,800] |
| 128 | HUSKY MOUNTED DETECTION SYSTEM (HMDS) | | 2,400 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [2,400] |
| | COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 136 | HEATERS AND ECU'S | 270 | 270 |
| 142 | FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT | 145 | 145 |
| 143 | CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM | 1,980 | 1,980 |
| | MEDICAL EQUIPMENT | | |
| 148 | COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL | 25,690 | 4,568 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-21,122] |
| | MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT | | |
| 149 | MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS | 1,124 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-1,124] |
| | CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | | |
| 153 | HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR | 3,850 | 3,850 |
| 157 | HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) | 1,932 | 1,932 |
| | GENERATORS | | |
| 164 | GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP | 569 | 569 |
| | TRAINING EQUIPMENT | | |
| 163 | TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM | 2,700 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-2,700] |
| | TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD) | | |
| 173 | INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE) | 7,500 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-7,500] |
| | OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 176 | RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 8,500 | 13,500 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [5,000] |
| | TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY | 405,575 | 577,953 |
| | JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND | | |
| | NETWORK ATTACK | | |
| 001 | RAPID ACQUISITION AND THREAT RESPONSE | 483,058 | 483,058 |
| | TOTAL JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT DEFEAT FUND | 483,058 | 483,058 |
| | AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | |
| | OTHER AIRCRAFT | | |
| 027 | STUASL0 UAV | 3,900 | 3,900 |
| | MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT | | |
| 033 | F-18 SERIES | | 16,000 |
| | Unfunded requirement -ALR-67(V)3 Retrofit A and B Kits | | [16,000] |
| 034 | H-53 SERIES | 950 | 950 |
| 035 | SH-60 SERIES | 15,382 | 15,382 |
| 037 | EP-3 SERIES | 7,220 | 7,220 |
| 047 | SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT | 19,855 | 19,855 |

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|--|-----------------|------------------|
| 051 | COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | 75,530 | 75,530 |
| 062 | QRC | 15,150 | 15,150 |
| | AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | |
| 064 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 18,850 | 18,850 |
| | AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES | | |
| 066 | AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | 463 | 463 |
| | TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY | 157,300 | 173,300 |
| | WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | |
| | STRATEGIC MISSILES | | |
| 003 | TOMAHAWK | 100,086 | 100,086 |
| | TACTICAL MISSILES | | |
| 004 | AMRAAM | | 12,000 |
| | Unfunded requirement—AIM-120 Captive Air Training Missiles Guidance sections | | [12,000] |
| 007 | STANDARD MISSILE | 35,208 | 35,208 |
| 011 | HELLFIRE | 8,771 | 8,771 |
| 012 | LASER MAVERICK | 5,040 | 5,040 |
| | MODIFICATION OF MISSILES | | |
| 017 | ESSM | 1,768 | 1,768 |
| | GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS | | |
| 035 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| | TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY | 152,373 | 164,373 |
| | PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC | | |
| | NAVY AMMUNITION | | |
| 001 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | 74,021 | 74,021 |
| 002 | JDAM | 106,941 | 106,941 |
| 003 | AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | 1,184 | 1,184 |
| 007 | AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES | 15,700 | 15,700 |
| 008 | JATOS | 540 | 540 |
| 012 | OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | 13,789 | 13,789 |
| 013 | SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO | 1,963 | 1,963 |
| 014 | PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | 765 | 765 |
| 016 | AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 866 | 866 |
| | MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION | | |
| 019 | 60MM, ALL TYPES | | 11,000 |
| | Unfunded requirement—Full range practice rounds | | [11,000] |
| 020 | MORTARS | 1,290 | 1,290 |
| 021 | 81MM, ALL TYPES | | 14,500 |
| | Unfunded requirement—Full range practice rounds | | [14,500] |
| 023 | DIRECT SUPPORT MUNITIONS | 1,355 | 1,355 |
| 024 | INFANTRY WEAPONS AMMUNITION | 1,854 | 1,854 |
| 027 | ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES | | 17,000 |
| | Unfunded requirement—HE Training Rounds | | [17,000] |
| 033 | ARTILLERY MUNITIONS | 5,319 | 5,319 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC | 225,587 | 268,087 |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY | | |
| | OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT | | |
| 025 | UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS | 12,348 | 8,332 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-4,016] |
| | SMALL BOATS | | |
| 032 | STANDARD BOATS | 18,000 | 18,000 |
| | SHIP SONARS | | |
| 046 | SSN ACOUSTIC EQUIPMENT | 43,500 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-43,500] |
| | AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | |
| 078 | NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS | 2,550 | 2,550 |
| | OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT | | |
| 080 | TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS | 7,900 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-7,900] |
| 081 | DCGS-N | 6,392 | 4,492 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-1,900] |
| | CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT | | |
| 101 | CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP | 2,280 | 2,280 |
| | AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 119 | AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 29,245 | 29,245 |
| | SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT | | |
| 121 | SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 2,436 | 2,436 |
| | OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 126 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP | 31,970 | 31,970 |
| | CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 132 | GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS | 496 | 390 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-106] |
| 134 | FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT | 2,304 | 2,304 |
| 135 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | 2,336 | 2,336 |
| | SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 141 | SUPPLY EQUIPMENT | 164 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-164] |

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| 143 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | 420 | 420 |
| | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 147 | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 21,650 | 21,650 |
| 152 | OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 15,800 | 15,800 |
| 154 | ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 1,000 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-1,000] |
| 155 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 15,890 | 15,890 |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | |
| 161A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 2,200 | 2,200 |
| | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | |
| 161 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | 1,178 | 1,178 |
| | TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY | 220,059 | 161,473 |
| | PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS | | |
| | ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS | | |
| 006 | HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM | 5,360 | 5,360 |
| | GUIDED MISSILES | | |
| 011 | JAVELIN | 2,833 | 2,833 |
| 012 | FOLLOW ON TO SMAW | 49 | 49 |
| 013 | ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H) | 5,024 | 5,024 |
| | REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT | | |
| 017 | REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT | 8,241 | 8,241 |
| | OTHER SUPPORT (TEL) | | |
| 019 | MODIFICATION KITS | 750 | 750 |
| | COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL) | | |
| 020 | ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) | 200 | 20,400 |
| | Unfunded requirement—night optics for sniper rifles | | [20,200] |
| | RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL) | | |
| 023 | GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR) | | 39,200 |
| | Unfunded requirement—CEG Shelters | | [1,500] |
| | Unfunded requirement—G/ATOR acceleration | | [37,700] |
| 024 | RQ-21 UAS | 8,400 | 8,400 |
| | INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL) | | |
| 026 | FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 50 | 50 |
| 027 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| 029 | UNMANNED AIR SYSTEMS (INTEL) | | 16,600 |
| | Unfunded requirement - UUNS for long endurance small UAS | | [16,600] |
| | OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL) | | |
| 037 | COMMAND POST SYSTEMS | 5,777 | 75,777 |
| | Additional NOTM-A Systems for emerging operational requirements | | [70,000] |
| 038 | RADIO SYSTEMS | 4,590 | 4,590 |
| | ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT | | |
| 053 | EOD SYSTEMS | 21,000 | 21,000 |
| | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | |
| 062 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 3,129 |
| | Unfunded requirement—G/ATOR spares | | [3,129] |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS | 65,274 | 214,403 |
| | AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | |
| | OTHER AIRCRAFT | | |
| 017 | MQ-9 | 271,080 | 271,080 |
| | AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT | | |
| 033 | C-17A | 26,850 | 26,850 |
| | OTHER AIRCRAFT | | |
| 048 | C-130J MODS | 8,400 | 8,400 |
| 051 | COMPASS CALL MODS | 56,720 | 56,720 |
| 056 | E-8 | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| 061 | RQ-4 MODS | | 39,600 |
| | Unfunded requirement—Tactical Field Terminal Antennas | | [39,600] |
| 062 | HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS | 153,080 | 153,080 |
| 063 | OTHER AIRCRAFT | 10,381 | 10,381 |
| 065 | MQ-9 MODS | 56,400 | 56,400 |
| | AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | |
| 067 | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | 129,450 | 129,450 |
| | COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 068 | AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP | 25,417 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-25,417] |
| | TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 740,778 | 754,961 |
| | MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | |
| | TACTICAL | | |
| 006 | PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE | 294,480 | 294,480 |
| 007 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB | 90,920 | 90,920 |
| | CLASS IV | | |
| 011 | AGM-65D MAVERICK | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| | TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 395,400 | 395,400 |
| | SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | |
| | SPACE PROGRAMS | | |

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| 010 | MILSATCOM | 2,256 | 2,256 |
| | TOTAL SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 2,256 | 2,256 |
| | PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE | | |
| | ROCKETS | | |
| 001 | ROCKETS | 49,050 | 49,050 |
| | CARTRIDGES | | |
| 002 | CARTRIDGES | 11,384 | 11,384 |
| | BOMBS | | |
| 006 | JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION | 390,577 | 390,577 |
| | FLARES | | |
| 015 | FLARES | 3,498 | 3,498 |
| | FUZES | | |
| 016 | FUZES | 47,000 | 47,000 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE | 501,509 | 501,509 |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | | |
| | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | | |
| 001 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | 3,855 | 8,377 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-1,350] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [5,872] |
| | CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES | | |
| 002 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE | | 13,300 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [13,300] |
| 004 | CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES | 1,882 | 100,678 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [98,796] |
| | SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES | | |
| 005 | SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES | 1,100 | 11,064 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [9,964] |
| 006 | SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES | 32,479 | 11,265 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-31,821] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [10,607] |
| | FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT | | |
| 007 | FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES | 22,583 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-22,583] |
| | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | | |
| 008 | MATERIALS HANDLING VEHICLES | 5,353 | 80,384 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-4,026] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [79,057] |
| | BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT | | |
| 009 | RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP | 11,315 | 10,275 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-9,161] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [8,121] |
| 010 | BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT VEHICLES | 40,451 | 13,989 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-39,692] |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [13,230] |
| | INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS | | |
| 013 | INTERNATIONAL INTEL TECH & ARCHITECTURES | 8,873 | 8,873 |
| 015 | INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| | ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS | | |
| 016 | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS | 56,500 | 95,200 |
| | Unfunded requirement—deployable RAPCON systems | | [16,500] |
| | Unfunded requirement—digital air traffic control radios | | [6,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement—D-ILS | | [16,200] |
| 018 | BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED | | 1,400 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [1,400] |
| 019 | THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS | 4,970 | 4,970 |
| | SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS | | |
| 029 | AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM | 3,000 | 37,500 |
| | Unfunded requirement—Intrusion Detection Systems | | [18,000] |
| | Unfunded requirement—PL2 BPSS systems | | [16,500] |
| | ORGANIZATION AND BASE | | |
| 048 | BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE | 55,000 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-55,000] |
| | PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP | | |
| 051 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 8,469 | 71,869 |
| | Unfunded requirement—battlefield airman combat equipment | | [59,400] |
| | Unfunded requirements | | [4,000] |
| | BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | |
| 053 | BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT | 7,500 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-7,500] |
| 054 | ENGINEERING AND EOD EQUIPMENT | 80,427 | 112,977 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [32,550] |
| 055 | MOBILITY EQUIPMENT | | 37,000 |
| | Unfunded requirement—Basic Expeditionary Airfield Resources | | [37,000] |
| 056 | ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION | 110,405 | 6,390 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-104,015] |
| | SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS | | |
| 058 | DARP RCI35 | 700 | 700 |

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| 059 | DCGS-AF | 9,200 | 100,400 |
| | Unfunded requirement | | [91,200] |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | |
| 062A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 3,542,825 | 3,542,825 |
| | TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 4,008,887 | 4,271,436 |
| | PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE | | |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA | | |
| 008 | TELEPORT PROGRAM | 1,979 | 1,979 |
| 018 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS NETWORK | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY | | |
| 034 | IRON DOME | | 50,000 |
| | Additional funds for Iron Dome Tamir interceptors | | [50,000] |
| | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | |
| 045A | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 43,653 | 43,653 |
| | AVIATION PROGRAMS | | |
| 046 | MANNED ISR | 15,900 | 15,900 |
| 047 | MC-12 | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| 050 | UNMANNED ISR | 38,933 | 38,933 |
| 051 | NON-STANDARD AVIATION | 9,600 | 9,600 |
| 052 | U-28 | 8,100 | 8,100 |
| 053 | MH-47 CHINOOK | 10,270 | 10,270 |
| 057 | MQ-9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE | 19,780 | 19,780 |
| 061 | C-130 MODIFICATIONS | 3,750 | 3,750 |
| | AMMUNITION PROGRAMS | | |
| 063 | ORDNANCE ITEMS <\$5M | 62,643 | 62,643 |
| | OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS | | |
| 064 | INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| 069 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | 38,527 | 38,527 |
| 070 | WARRIOR SYSTEMS <\$5M | 20,215 | 20,215 |
| 073 | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE | 7,134 | 7,134 |
| 075 | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | 193,542 | 211,067 |
| | Unfunded requirement- Joint Task Force Platform Expansion | | [15,900] |
| | Unfunded requirement- Publicly Available Information (PAI) Capability Acceleration | | [1,625] |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE | 518,026 | 585,551 |
| | NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT | | |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 007 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | 500,000 |
| | Program increase | | [500,000] |
| | TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT | | 500,000 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT | 10,244,626 | 11,915,900 |

SEC. 4103. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.

SEC. 4103. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|--|-----------------|------------------|
| | SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY | | |
| | OTHER WARSHIPS | | |
| 003 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 200,000 |
| | CVN 81 AP | | [200,000] |
| 009 | DDG-51 | | 1,896,800 |
| | DDG | | [1,862,800] |
| | Ship Signal Exploitation Equipment | | [34,000] |
| 010 | ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 45,000 |
| | DDG AP | | [45,000] |
| 011 | LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP | | 1,033,000 |
| | LCS | | [1,033,000] |
| | AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS | | |
| 012A | AMPHIBIOUS SHIP REPLACEMENT LX(R) ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 100,000 |
| | Program increase | | [100,000] |
| 013 | LPD-17 | | 1,786,000 |
| | LPD-30 | | [1,786,000] |
| 014 | EXPEDITIONARY SEA BASE (ESB) | | 635,000 |
| | ESB | | [635,000] |
| | AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST | | |
| 025 | SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR | | 312,000 |
| | SSC | | [312,000] |
| 026 | SERVICE CRAFT | | 39,000 |
| | Berthing Barge | | [39,000] |
| | TOTAL SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY | | 6,046,800 |
| | TOTAL PROCUREMENT | | 6,046,800 |

**TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT,
TEST, AND EVALUATION**

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION.**

**SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)**

| <i>Line</i> | <i>Program Element</i> | <i>Item</i> | <i>FY 2018 Request</i> | <i>House Authorized</i> |
|--|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY | | | | |
| BASIC RESEARCH | | | | |
| 001 | 0601101A | IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH | 12,010 | 12,010 |
| 002 | 0601102A | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 263,590 | 263,590 |
| 003 | 0601103A | UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 67,027 | 67,027 |
| 004 | 0601104A | UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS | 87,395 | 87,395 |
| | | SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH | 430,022 | 430,022 |
| APPLIED RESEARCH | | | | |
| 005 | 0602105A | MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY | 29,640 | 29,640 |
| 006 | 0602120A | SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY | 35,730 | 35,730 |
| 007 | 0602122A | TRACTOR HIP | 8,627 | 8,627 |
| 008 | 0602211A | AVIATION TECHNOLOGY | 66,086 | 66,086 |
| 009 | 0602270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY | 27,144 | 27,144 |
| 010 | 0602303A | MISSILE TECHNOLOGY | 43,742 | 43,742 |
| 011 | 0602307A | ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY | 22,785 | 22,785 |
| 012 | 0602308A | ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION | 28,650 | 28,650 |
| 013 | 0602601A | COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY | 67,232 | 67,232 |
| 014 | 0602618A | BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY | 85,309 | 85,309 |
| 015 | 0602622A | CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY | 4,004 | 4,004 |
| 016 | 0602623A | JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM | 5,615 | 5,615 |
| 017 | 0602624A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY | 41,455 | 41,455 |
| 018 | 0602705A | ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES | 58,352 | 58,352 |
| 019 | 0602709A | NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY | 34,723 | 34,723 |
| 020 | 0602712A | COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS | 26,190 | 26,190 |
| 021 | 0602716A | HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY | 24,127 | 24,127 |
| 022 | 0602720A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY | 21,678 | 21,678 |
| 023 | 0602782A | COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY | 33,123 | 33,123 |
| 024 | 0602783A | COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY | 14,041 | 14,041 |
| 025 | 0602784A | MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY | 67,720 | 67,720 |
| 026 | 0602785A | MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY | 20,216 | 20,216 |
| 027 | 0602786A | WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY | 39,559 | 44,559 |
| | | Program increase | | [5,000] |
| 028 | 0602787A | MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY | 83,434 | 83,434 |
| | | SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH | 889,182 | 894,182 |
| ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | | | |
| 029 | 0603001A | WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 44,863 | 44,863 |
| 030 | 0603002A | MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 67,780 | 67,780 |
| 031 | 0603003A | AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 160,746 | 160,746 |
| 032 | 0603004A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 84,079 | 84,079 |
| 033 | 0603005A | COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 125,537 | 125,537 |
| 034 | 0603006A | SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 12,231 | 12,231 |
| 035 | 0603007A | MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 6,466 | 6,466 |
| 036 | 0603009A | TRACTOR HIKE | 28,552 | 28,552 |
| 037 | 0603015A | NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS | 16,434 | 16,434 |
| 039 | 0603125A | COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 26,903 | 26,903 |
| 040 | 0603130A | TRACTOR NAIL | 4,880 | 4,880 |
| 041 | 0603131A | TRACTOR EGGS | 4,326 | 4,326 |
| 042 | 0603270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY | 31,296 | 31,296 |
| 043 | 0603313A | MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 62,850 | 72,850 |
| | | Simulation upgrades for land based anti-ship missile development | | [10,000] |
| 044 | 0603322A | TRACTOR CAGE | 12,323 | 12,323 |
| 045 | 0603461A | HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 182,331 | 182,331 |
| 046 | 0603606A | LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 17,948 | 17,948 |
| 047 | 0603607A | JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM | 5,796 | 5,796 |
| 048 | 0603710A | NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 47,135 | 47,135 |
| 049 | 0603728A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | 10,421 | 10,421 |
| 050 | 0603734A | MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 32,448 | 32,448 |
| 051 | 0603772A | ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY | 52,206 | 52,206 |
| 052 | 0603794A | C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 33,426 | 33,426 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 1,070,977 | 1,080,977 |
| ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | | |
| 053 | 0603305A | ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION | 9,634 | 9,634 |
| 055 | 0603327A | AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING | 33,949 | 48,949 |
| | | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [15,000] |
| 056 | 0603619A | LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER—ADV DEV | 72,909 | 72,909 |
| 057 | 0603627A | SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV | 7,135 | 7,135 |
| 058 | 0603639A | TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION | 41,452 | 43,902 |
| | | Unfunded requirement—RF countermeasures | | [2,450] |
| 059 | 0603645A | ARMORED SYSTEM MODERNIZATION—ADV DEV | 32,739 | 54,739 |
| | | Unfunded requirement | | [22,000] |
| 060 | 0603747A | SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY | 10,157 | 10,157 |
| 061 | 0603766A | TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV | 27,733 | 29,353 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| | | <i>Unfunded requirement</i> | | [1,620] |
| 062 | 0603774A | NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 12,347 | 12,347 |
| 063 | 0603779A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL | 10,456 | 10,456 |
| 064 | 0603790A | NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 2,588 | 2,588 |
| 065 | 0603801A | AVIATION—ADV DEV | 14,055 | 14,055 |
| 066 | 0603804A | LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV | 35,333 | 35,333 |
| 067 | 0603807A | MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV | 33,491 | 33,491 |
| 068 | 0603827A | SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 20,239 | 45,239 |
| | | <i>Enhanced lightweight body armor and combat helmets technology</i> | | [25,000] |
| 069 | 0604017A | ROBOTICS DEVELOPMENT | 39,608 | 39,608 |
| 070 | 0604100A | ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES | 9,921 | 9,921 |
| 071 | 0604114A | LOWER TIER AIR MISSILE DEFENSE (LTAMD) SENSOR | 76,728 | 76,728 |
| 072 | 0604115A | TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES | 115,221 | 100,221 |
| | | <i>Program Reduction</i> | | [-15,000] |
| 073 | 0604117A | MANEUVER—SHORT RANGE AIR DEFENSE (M-SHORAD) | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| 074 | 0604118A | TRACTOR BEAM | 10,400 | 10,400 |
| 075 | 0604120A | ASSURED POSITIONING, NAVIGATION AND TIMING (PNT) | 164,967 | 164,967 |
| 076 | 0604121A | SYNTHETIC TRAINING ENVIRONMENT REFINEMENT & PROTOTYPING | 1,600 | 1,600 |
| 077 | 0604319A | INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2-INTERCEPT (IFPC2) | 11,303 | 11,303 |
| 078 | 0305251A | CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS FORCES AND FORCE SUPPORT | 56,492 | 56,492 |
| 079 | 1206308A | ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION | 20,432 | 20,432 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 890,889 | 941,959 |
| | | SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | | |
| 080 | 0604201A | AIRCRAFT AVIONICS | 30,153 | 30,153 |
| 081 | 0604270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 71,671 | 71,671 |
| 083 | 0604290A | MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVF) | 10,589 | 10,589 |
| 084 | 0604321A | ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM | 4,774 | 4,774 |
| 085 | 0604328A | TRACTOR CAGE | 17,252 | 17,252 |
| 086 | 0604601A | INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS | 87,643 | 89,243 |
| | | <i>Program increase—soldier enhancement program</i> | | [3,000] |
| | | <i>Program reduction- obligation delays</i> | | [-5,000] |
| | | <i>Unfunded requirement—air soldier system</i> | | [3,600] |
| 087 | 0604604A | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES | 6,039 | 6,039 |
| 088 | 0604611A | JAVELIN | 21,095 | 21,095 |
| 089 | 0604622A | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES | 10,507 | 10,507 |
| 090 | 0604633A | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | 3,536 | 3,536 |
| 092 | 0604642A | LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| 093 | 0604645A | ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)—ENG DEV | 36,242 | 36,242 |
| 094 | 0604710A | NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV | 108,504 | 128,004 |
| | | <i>Unfunded requirement</i> | | [17,500] |
| 095 | 0604713A | COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT | 3,702 | 3,702 |
| 096 | 0604715A | NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV | 43,575 | 43,575 |
| 097 | 0604741A | AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV | 28,726 | 28,726 |
| 098 | 0604742A | CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 18,562 | 18,562 |
| 099 | 0604746A | AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT | 8,344 | 8,344 |
| 100 | 0604760A | DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV | 11,270 | 11,270 |
| 101 | 0604768A | BRILLIANT ANTI-ARMOR SUBMUNITION (BAT) | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 102 | 0604780A | COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE | 18,566 | 18,566 |
| 103 | 0604798A | BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION | 145,360 | 145,360 |
| 104 | 0604802A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV | 145,232 | 157,410 |
| | | <i>Unfunded requirement</i> | | [8,000] |
| | | <i>Unfunded requirement—40mm low velocity M320 cartridge</i> | | [4,178] |
| 105 | 0604804A | LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV | 90,965 | 92,965 |
| | | <i>Next generation vehicle camouflage technology</i> | | [2,000] |
| 106 | 0604805A | COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV | 9,910 | 9,910 |
| 107 | 0604807A | MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV | 39,238 | 39,238 |
| 108 | 0604808A | LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV | 34,684 | 34,684 |
| 109 | 0604818A | ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE | 164,409 | 188,409 |
| | | <i>Unfunded requirement</i> | | [5,000] |
| | | <i>Unfunded requirement—Assured Communications</i> | | [19,000] |
| 110 | 0604820A | RADAR DEVELOPMENT | 32,968 | 32,968 |
| 111 | 0604822A | GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBs) | 49,554 | 49,554 |
| 112 | 0604823A | FIREFINDER | 45,605 | 45,605 |
| 113 | 0604827A | SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL | 16,127 | 23,127 |
| | | <i>Program increase- soldier power development initiatives</i> | | [7,000] |
| 114 | 0604852A | SUITE OF SURVIVABILITY ENHANCEMENT SYSTEMS—EMD | 98,600 | 133,600 |
| | | <i>Unfunded requirements</i> | | [35,000] |
| 115 | 0604854A | ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD | 1,972 | 3,972 |
| | | <i>Unfunded requirement—IT3 demonstrator</i> | | [2,000] |
| 116 | 0605013A | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 81,776 | 81,776 |
| 117 | 0605018A | INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A) | 172,361 | 172,361 |
| 118 | 0605028A | ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV) | 199,778 | 199,778 |
| 119 | 0605029A | INTEGRATED GROUND SECURITY SURVEILLANCE RESPONSE CAPABILITY (IGSSR-C) | 4,418 | 4,418 |
| 120 | 0605030A | JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC) | 15,877 | 15,877 |
| 121 | 0605031A | JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK (JTN) | 44,150 | 44,150 |
| 122 | 0605032A | TRACTOR TIRE | 34,670 | 113,570 |
| | | <i>Unfunded requirement</i> | | [78,900] |
| 123 | 0605033A | GROUND-BASED OPERATIONAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—EXPEDITIONARY (GBOSS-E) | 5,207 | 5,207 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
| 124 | 0605034A | TACTICAL SECURITY SYSTEM (TSS) | 4,727 | 4,727 |
| 125 | 0605035A | COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM) | 105,778 | 105,778 |
| 126 | 0605036A | COMBATING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION (CWMD) | 6,927 | 6,927 |
| 127 | 0605037A | EVIDENCE COLLECTION AND DETAINEE PROCESSING | 214 | 214 |
| 128 | 0605038A | NUCLEAR BIOLOGICAL CHEMICAL RECONNAISSANCE VEHICLE (NBCRV) SENSOR SUITE | 16,125 | 16,125 |
| 129 | 0605041A | DEFENSIVE CYBER TOOL DEVELOPMENT | 55,165 | 55,165 |
| 130 | 0605042A | TACTICAL NETWORK RADIO SYSTEMS (LOW-TIER) | 20,076 | 20,076 |
| 131 | 0605047A | CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM | 20,322 | 20,322 |
| 132 | 0605049A | MISSILE WARNING SYSTEM MODERNIZATION (MWSM) | 55,810 | 55,810 |
| 133 | 0605051A | AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT | 30,879 | 30,879 |
| 134 | 0605052A | INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INC 2—BLOCK 1 | 175,069 | 175,069 |
| 135 | 0605053A | GROUND ROBOTICS | 70,760 | 70,760 |
| 137 | 0605380A | AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS) | 8,965 | 8,965 |
| 138 | 0605450A | JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) | 34,626 | 34,626 |
| 140 | 0605457A | ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD) | 336,420 | 252,320 |
| | | Program Reduction | | [-84,100] |
| 143 | 0605766A | NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION (MIP) | 6,882 | 9,382 |
| | | Unfunded requirement | | [2,500] |
| 144 | 0605812A | JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH | 23,467 | 23,467 |
| 145 | 0605830A | AVIATION GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | 6,930 | 6,930 |
| 146 | 0210609A | PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM) | 6,112 | 6,112 |
| 147 | 0303032A | TROJAN—RH12 | 4,431 | 4,431 |
| 150 | 0304270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 14,616 | 14,616 |
| 151 | 1205117A | TRACTOR BEARS | 17,928 | 17,928 |
| | | SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 3,012,840 | 3,111,418 |
| | | RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | |
| 152 | 0604256A | THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT | 22,862 | 22,862 |
| 153 | 0604258A | TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 13,902 | 13,902 |
| 154 | 0604759A | MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT | 102,901 | 102,901 |
| 155 | 0605103A | RAND ARROYO CENTER | 20,140 | 20,140 |
| 156 | 0605301A | ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL | 246,663 | 246,663 |
| 157 | 0605326A | CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM | 29,820 | 29,820 |
| 159 | 0605601A | ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES | 307,588 | 307,588 |
| 160 | 0605602A | ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS | 49,242 | 49,242 |
| 161 | 0605604A | SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS | 41,843 | 41,843 |
| 162 | 0605606A | AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION | 4,804 | 4,804 |
| 163 | 0605702A | METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES | 7,238 | 7,238 |
| 164 | 0605706A | MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS | 21,890 | 21,890 |
| 165 | 0605709A | EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS | 12,684 | 12,684 |
| 166 | 0605712A | SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING | 51,040 | 51,040 |
| 167 | 0605716A | ARMY EVALUATION CENTER | 56,246 | 56,246 |
| 168 | 0605718A | ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG | 1,829 | 1,829 |
| 169 | 0605801A | PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES | 55,060 | 55,060 |
| 170 | 0605803A | TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES | 33,934 | 33,934 |
| 171 | 0605805A | MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY | 43,444 | 43,444 |
| 172 | 0605857A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT | 5,087 | 5,087 |
| 173 | 0605898A | ARMY DIRECT REPORT HEADQUARTERS—R&D - MHA | 54,679 | 54,679 |
| 174 | 0606001A | MILITARY GROUND-BASED CREW TECHNOLOGY | 7,916 | 7,916 |
| 175 | 0606002A | RONALD REAGAN BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST SITE | 61,254 | 61,254 |
| 176 | 0303260A | DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION INITIATIVE | 1,779 | 1,779 |
| | | SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 1,253,845 | 1,253,845 |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | |
| 178 | 0603778A | MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 8,929 | 8,929 |
| 179 | 0603813A | TRACTOR PULL | 4,014 | 4,014 |
| 180 | 0605024A | ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT | 4,094 | 4,094 |
| 181 | 0607131A | WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | 15,738 | 15,738 |
| 182 | 0607133A | TRACTOR SMOKE | 4,513 | 4,513 |
| 183 | 0607134A | LONG RANGE PRECISION FIRES (LRPF) | 102,014 | 102,014 |
| 184 | 0607135A | APACHE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 59,977 | 59,977 |
| 185 | 0607136A | BLACKHAWK PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 34,416 | 43,716 |
| | | Unfunded requirement—UH-60V development | | [9,300] |
| 186 | 0607137A | CHINOOK PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 194,567 | 194,567 |
| 187 | 0607138A | FIXED WING PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 9,981 | 9,981 |
| 188 | 0607139A | IMPROVED TURBINE ENGINE PROGRAM | 204,304 | 204,304 |
| 189 | 0607140A | EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES FROM NIE | 1,023 | 1,023 |
| 190 | 0607141A | LOGISTICS AUTOMATION | 1,504 | 1,504 |
| 191 | 0607142A | AVIATION ROCKET SYSTEM PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT | 10,064 | 10,064 |
| 192 | 0607143A | UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM UNIVERSAL PRODUCTS | 38,463 | 38,463 |
| 193 | 0607665A | FAMILY OF BIOMETRICS | 6,159 | 6,159 |
| 194 | 0607865A | PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT | 90,217 | 90,217 |
| 195 | 020429A | AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT—COCOM EXERCISE | 6,749 | 6,749 |
| 196 | 0203728A | JOINT AUTOMATED DEEP OPERATION COORDINATION SYSTEM (JADOCs) | 33,520 | 33,520 |
| 197 | 0203735A | COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | 343,175 | 351,175 |
| | | Unfunded requirement—M88A2E1 | | [8,000] |
| 198 | 0203740A | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM | 6,639 | 6,639 |
| 199 | 0203743A | 155MM SELF-PROPELLED HOWITZER IMPROVEMENTS | 40,784 | 40,784 |
| 200 | 0203744A | AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | 39,358 | 39,358 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
| 201 | 0203752A | AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 145 | 145 |
| 202 | 0203758A | DIGITIZATION | 4,803 | 4,803 |
| 203 | 0203801A | MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 2,723 | 17,723 |
| | | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [15,000] |
| 204 | 0203802A | OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 205 | 0203808A | TRACTOR CARD | 37,883 | 37,883 |
| 206 | 0205402A | INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV | | 4,500 |
| | | Unfunded requirement—modal passive detection system | | [4,500] |
| 207 | 0205410A | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | 1,582 | 1,582 |
| 208 | 0205412A | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV | 195 | 195 |
| 209 | 0205456A | LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) SYSTEM | 78,926 | 78,926 |
| 210 | 0205778A | GUIDED MULTIPLE-LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (GMLRS) | 102,807 | 102,807 |
| 213 | 0303028A | SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 13,807 | 13,807 |
| 214 | 0303140A | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 132,438 | 132,438 |
| 215 | 0303141A | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 64,370 | 64,370 |
| 217 | 0303150A | WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 10,475 | 10,475 |
| 220 | 0305172A | COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS | 1,100 | 1,100 |
| 222 | 0305204A | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 9,433 | 16,925 |
| | | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [7,492] |
| 223 | 0305206A | AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 5,080 | 20,080 |
| | | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [15,000] |
| 224 | 0305208A | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 24,700 | 24,700 |
| 225 | 0305219A | MQ-1C GRAY EAGLE UAS | 9,574 | 9,574 |
| 226 | 0305232A | RQ-11 UAV | 2,191 | 2,191 |
| 227 | 0305233A | RQ-7 UAV | 12,773 | 12,773 |
| 228 | 0307665A | BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE | 2,537 | 2,537 |
| 229 | 0310349A | WIN-T INCREMENT 2—INITIAL NETWORKING | 4,723 | 4,723 |
| 230 | 0708045A | END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES | 60,877 | 65,877 |
| | | Development of improved manufacturing technology for separation, extraction, smelter, sintering, leaching, processing, beneficiation, or production of specialty metals such as lanthanide elements, yttrium or scandium. | | [5,000] |
| 231 | 1203142A | SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE) | 11,959 | 11,959 |
| 232 | 1208053A | JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM | 10,228 | 10,228 |
| 232A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 7,154 | 7,154 |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 1,877,685 | 1,941,977 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY | 9,425,440 | 9,654,380 |
| | | RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY | | |
| | | BASIC RESEARCH | | |
| 001 | 0601103N | UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 118,130 | 138,130 |
| | | Defense University Research Instrumentation Program | | [20,000] |
| 002 | 0601152N | IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH | 19,438 | 19,438 |
| 003 | 0601153N | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 458,333 | 458,333 |
| | | SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH | 595,901 | 615,901 |
| | | APPLIED RESEARCH | | |
| 004 | 0602114N | POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH | 13,553 | 13,553 |
| 005 | 0602123N | FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH | 125,557 | 125,557 |
| 006 | 0602131M | MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY | 53,936 | 53,936 |
| 007 | 0602235N | COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH | 36,450 | 36,450 |
| 008 | 0602236N | WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH | 48,649 | 48,649 |
| 009 | 0602271N | ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH | 79,598 | 79,598 |
| 010 | 0602435N | OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH | 42,411 | 42,411 |
| 011 | 0602651M | JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH | 6,425 | 6,425 |
| 012 | 0602747N | UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH | 56,094 | 56,094 |
| 013 | 0602750N | FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH | 156,805 | 156,805 |
| 014 | 0602782N | MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH | 32,733 | 32,733 |
| 015 | 0602792N | INNOVATIVE NAVAL PROTOTYPES (INP) APPLIED RESEARCH | 171,146 | 171,146 |
| 016 | 0602861N | SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT—ONR FIELD ACITIVITIES | 62,722 | 62,722 |
| | | SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH | 886,079 | 886,079 |
| | | ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | |
| 019 | 0603123N | FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 26,342 | 26,342 |
| 020 | 0603271N | ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 9,360 | 9,360 |
| 021 | 0603640M | USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD) | 154,407 | 154,407 |
| 022 | 0603651M | JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 13,448 | 13,448 |
| 023 | 0603673N | FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 231,772 | 231,772 |
| 024 | 0603680N | MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 57,797 | 67,797 |
| | | Program increase for manufacturing capability industrial partnerships for undersea vehicles | | [10,000] |
| 025 | 0603729N | WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 4,878 | 4,878 |
| 027 | 0603758N | NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS | 64,889 | 64,889 |
| 028 | 0603782N | MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 15,164 | 15,164 |
| 029 | 0603801N | INNOVATIVE NAVAL PROTOTYPES (INP) ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 108,285 | 132,285 |
| | | Program increase for railgun tactical demonstrator | | [24,000] |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 686,342 | 720,342 |
| | | ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | |
| 030 | 0603207N | AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS | 48,365 | 48,365 |
| 031 | 0603216N | AVIATION SURVIVABILITY | 5,566 | 5,566 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|---|------------------|------------------|
| 033 | 0603251N | AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS | 695 | 695 |
| 034 | 0603254N | ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 7,661 | 7,661 |
| 035 | 0603261N | TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE | 3,707 | 3,707 |
| 036 | 0603382N | ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY | 61,381 | 61,381 |
| 037 | 0603502N | SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES | 154,117 | 177,117 |
| | | LDUUV | | [23,000] |
| 038 | 0603506N | SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE | 14,974 | 14,974 |
| 039 | 0603512N | CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 9,296 | 9,296 |
| 040 | 0603525N | PILOT FISH | 132,083 | 132,083 |
| 041 | 0603527N | RETRACT LARCH | 15,407 | 15,407 |
| 042 | 0603536N | RETRACT JUNIPER | 122,413 | 122,413 |
| 043 | 0603542N | RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL | 745 | 745 |
| 044 | 0603553N | SURFACE ASW | 1,136 | 1,136 |
| 045 | 0603561N | ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT | 100,955 | 100,955 |
| 046 | 0603562N | SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS | 13,834 | 13,834 |
| 047 | 0603563N | SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN | 36,891 | 36,891 |
| 048 | 0603564N | SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES | 12,012 | 12,012 |
| 049 | 0603570N | ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS | 329,500 | 329,500 |
| 050 | 0603573N | ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS | 29,953 | 29,953 |
| 051 | 0603576N | CHALK EAGLE | 191,610 | 191,610 |
| 052 | 0603581N | LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS) | 40,991 | 40,991 |
| 053 | 0603582N | COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION | 24,674 | 24,674 |
| 054 | 0603595N | OHIO REPLACEMENT | 776,158 | 776,158 |
| 055 | 0603596N | LCS MISSION MODULES | 116,871 | 116,871 |
| 056 | 0603597N | AUTOMATED TEST AND ANALYSIS | 8,052 | 8,052 |
| 057 | 0603599N | FRIGATE DEVELOPMENT | 143,450 | 143,450 |
| 058 | 0603609N | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS | 8,909 | 8,909 |
| 060 | 0603635M | MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM | 1,428 | 1,428 |
| 061 | 0603654N | JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 53,367 | 53,367 |
| 063 | 0603713N | OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 8,212 | 8,212 |
| 064 | 0603721N | ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION | 20,214 | 20,214 |
| 065 | 0603724N | NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM | 50,623 | 50,623 |
| 066 | 0603725N | FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT | 2,837 | 2,837 |
| 067 | 0603734N | CHALK CORAL | 245,143 | 245,143 |
| 068 | 0603739N | NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY | 2,995 | 2,995 |
| 069 | 0603746N | RETRACT MAPLE | 306,101 | 306,101 |
| 070 | 0603748N | LINK PLUMERIA | 253,675 | 253,675 |
| 071 | 0603751N | RETRACT ELM | 55,691 | 55,691 |
| 072 | 0603764N | LINK EVERGREEN | 48,982 | 48,982 |
| 074 | 0603790N | NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 9,099 | 9,099 |
| 075 | 0603795N | LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY | 33,568 | 33,568 |
| 076 | 0603851M | JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING | 29,873 | 29,873 |
| 077 | 0603860N | JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL | 106,391 | 106,391 |
| 078 | 0603925N | DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS | 107,310 | 133,310 |
| | | Program increase for railgun tactical demonstrator | | [26,000] |
| 079 | 0604112N | GERALD R. FORD CLASS NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER (CVN 78—80) | 83,935 | 83,935 |
| 081 | 0604272N | TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM) | 46,844 | 46,844 |
| 083 | 0604286M | MARINE CORPS ADDITIVE MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 6,200 | 6,200 |
| 085 | 0604320M | RAPID TECHNOLOGY CAPABILITY PROTOTYPE | 7,055 | 7,055 |
| 086 | 0604454N | LX (R) | 9,578 | 9,578 |
| 087 | 0604536N | ADVANCED UNDERSEA PROTOTYPING | 66,543 | 76,543 |
| | | XLUVU | | [10,000] |
| 089 | 0604659N | PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM | 31,315 | 31,315 |
| 090 | 0604707N | SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT | 42,851 | 42,851 |
| 091 | 0604786N | OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT | 160,694 | 160,694 |
| 093 | 0303354N | ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP | 8,278 | 8,278 |
| 094 | 0304240M | ADVANCED TACTICAL UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM | 7,979 | 7,979 |
| 095 | 0304270N | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP | 527 | 527 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 4,218,714 | 4,277,714 |
| | | SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | | |
| 096 | 0603208N | TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT | 16,945 | 16,945 |
| 097 | 0604212N | OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT | 26,786 | 26,786 |
| 098 | 0604214N | AV—8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV | 48,780 | 48,780 |
| 099 | 0604215N | STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT | 2,722 | 2,722 |
| 100 | 0604216N | MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT | 5,371 | 5,371 |
| 101 | 0604218N | AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING | 782 | 782 |
| 102 | 0604221N | P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 1,361 | 1,361 |
| 103 | 0604230N | WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 14,167 | 14,167 |
| 104 | 0604231N | TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM | 55,695 | 55,695 |
| 105 | 0604234N | ADVANCED HAWKEYE | 292,535 | 292,535 |
| 106 | 0604245N | H-1 UPGRADES | 61,288 | 61,288 |
| 107 | 0604261N | ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS | 37,167 | 37,167 |
| 108 | 0604262N | V-22A | 171,386 | 186,386 |
| | | Unfunded requirement | | [15,000] |
| 109 | 0604264N | AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 13,235 | 23,235 |
| | | Air Crew Sensor Improvements | | [10,000] |
| 110 | 0604269N | EA-18 | 173,488 | 173,488 |
| 111 | 0604270N | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 54,055 | 83,055 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
| | | Unfunded requirement—EWSA | | [5,500] |
| | | Unfunded requirement—Intrepid Tiger II (V)3 UH-1Y jettison capability | | [3,000] |
| | | Unfunded requirements—range improvements and upgrades | | [20,500] |
| 112 | 0604273N | EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT | 451,938 | 451,938 |
| 113 | 0604274N | NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ) | 632,936 | 624,136 |
| | | Unjustified cost growth | | [-8,800] |
| 114 | 0604280N | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY) | 4,310 | 4,310 |
| 115 | 0604282N | NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ) INCREMENT II | 66,686 | 66,686 |
| 116 | 0604307N | SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING | 390,238 | 390,238 |
| 117 | 0604311N | LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION | 689 | 689 |
| 118 | 0604329N | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB) | 112,846 | 112,846 |
| 119 | 0604366N | STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS | 158,578 | 158,578 |
| 120 | 0604373N | AIRBORNE MCM | 15,734 | 15,734 |
| 122 | 0604378N | NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING | 25,445 | 25,445 |
| 124 | 0604501N | ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS | 87,233 | 92,233 |
| | | SPY-1 Solid State Advancement | | [5,000] |
| 125 | 0604503N | SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION | 130,981 | 130,981 |
| 126 | 0604504N | AIR CONTROL | 75,186 | 75,186 |
| 127 | 0604512N | SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS | 177,926 | 177,926 |
| 128 | 0604518N | COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION | 8,062 | 8,062 |
| 129 | 0604522N | AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR (AMDR) SYSTEM | 32,090 | 32,090 |
| 130 | 0604558N | NEW DESIGN SSN | 120,087 | 120,087 |
| 131 | 0604562N | SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM | 50,850 | 50,850 |
| 132 | 0604567N | SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E | 67,166 | 87,166 |
| | | CVN 80 DFA | | [20,000] |
| 133 | 0604574N | NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES | 4,817 | 4,817 |
| 134 | 0604580N | VIRGINIA PAYLOAD MODULE (VPM) | 72,861 | 72,861 |
| 135 | 0604601N | MINE DEVELOPMENT | 25,635 | 25,635 |
| 136 | 0604610N | LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT | 28,076 | 28,076 |
| 137 | 0604654N | JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 7,561 | 7,561 |
| 138 | 0604703N | PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS | 40,828 | 40,828 |
| 139 | 0604727N | JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS | 435 | 435 |
| 140 | 0604755N | SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL) | 161,713 | 161,713 |
| 141 | 0604756N | SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL) | 212,412 | 243,412 |
| | | OTH Weapon Development | | [31,000] |
| 142 | 0604757N | SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW) | 103,391 | 103,391 |
| 143 | 0604761N | INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING | 34,855 | 34,855 |
| 144 | 0604771N | MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT | 9,353 | 9,353 |
| 145 | 0604777N | NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM | 92,546 | 101,546 |
| | | Program increase | | [9,000] |
| 146 | 0604800M | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD | 152,934 | 152,934 |
| 147 | 0604800N | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD | 108,931 | 108,931 |
| 148 | 0604810M | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW ON MODERNIZATION (FOM)—MARINE CORPS | 144,958 | 144,958 |
| 149 | 0604810N | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW ON MODERNIZATION (FOM)—NAVY | 143,855 | 143,855 |
| 150 | 0605013M | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 14,865 | 14,865 |
| 151 | 0605013N | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 152,977 | 152,977 |
| 152 | 0605024N | ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT | 3,410 | 3,410 |
| 153 | 0605212N | CH-53K RDTE | 340,758 | 340,758 |
| 154 | 0605215N | MISSION PLANNING | 33,430 | 33,430 |
| 155 | 0605217N | COMMON AVIONICS | 58,163 | 58,163 |
| 156 | 0605220N | SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR (SSC) | 22,410 | 22,410 |
| 157 | 0605327N | T-AO 205 CLASS | 1,961 | 1,961 |
| 158 | 0605414N | UNMANNED CARRIER AVIATION (UCA) | 222,208 | 222,208 |
| 159 | 0605450N | JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) | 15,473 | 15,473 |
| 160 | 0605500N | MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA) | 11,795 | 11,795 |
| 161 | 0605504N | MULTI-MISSION MARITIME (MMA) INCREMENT III | 181,731 | 181,731 |
| 162 | 0605611M | MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 178,993 | 178,993 |
| 163 | 0605813M | JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 20,710 | 20,710 |
| 164 | 0204202N | DDG-1000 | 140,500 | 140,500 |
| 168 | 0304785N | TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS | 28,311 | 28,311 |
| 170 | 0306250M | CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 4,502 | 4,502 |
| | | SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 6,362,102 | 6,472,302 |
| | | MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | |
| 171 | 0604256N | THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT | 91,819 | 91,819 |
| 172 | 0604258N | TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 23,053 | 23,053 |
| 173 | 0604759N | MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT | 52,634 | 59,634 |
| | | Program increase | | [7,000] |
| 174 | 0605126N | JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION | 141 | 141 |
| 175 | 0605152N | STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY | 3,917 | 3,917 |
| 176 | 0605154N | CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES | 50,432 | 50,432 |
| 179 | 0605804N | TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES | 782 | 782 |
| 180 | 0605853N | MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT | 94,562 | 94,562 |
| 181 | 0605856N | STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT | 4,313 | 4,313 |
| 182 | 0605861N | RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT | 1,104 | 1,104 |
| 183 | 0605863N | RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT | 105,666 | 105,666 |
| 184 | 0605864N | TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 373,667 | 413,667 |
| | | Program increase | | [40,000] |
| 185 | 0605865N | OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY | 20,298 | 20,298 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| 186 | 0605866N | NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT | 17,341 | 17,341 |
| 188 | 0605873M | MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT | 21,751 | 21,751 |
| 189 | 0605898N | MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D | 44,279 | 44,279 |
| 190 | 0606355N | WARFARE INNOVATION MANAGEMENT | 28,841 | 28,841 |
| 191 | 0902498N | MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (DEPARTMENTAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES) | 1,749 | 1,749 |
| 194 | 1206867N | SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT | 9,408 | 9,408 |
| | | SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 945,757 | 992,757 |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | |
| 196 | 0607658N | COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY (CEC) | 92,571 | 103,571 |
| | | CEC IFF Mode 5 Acceleration | | [11,000] |
| 197 | 0607700N | DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL | 3,137 | 3,137 |
| 198 | 0101221N | STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT | 135,219 | 135,219 |
| 199 | 0101224N | SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 36,242 | 36,242 |
| 200 | 0101226N | SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 12,053 | 12,053 |
| 201 | 0101402N | NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS | 18,221 | 18,221 |
| 203 | 0204136N | F/A-18 SQUADRONS | 224,470 | 213,470 |
| | | Program reduction- delayed procurement rates | | [-11,000] |
| 204 | 0204163N | FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL) | 33,525 | 33,525 |
| 205 | 0204228N | SURFACE SUPPORT | 24,829 | 24,829 |
| 206 | 0204229N | TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC) | 133,617 | 142,617 |
| | | Tomahawk Modernization | | [9,000] |
| 207 | 0204311N | INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 38,972 | 50,572 |
| | | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [11,600] |
| 208 | 0204413N | AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT) | 3,940 | 3,940 |
| 209 | 0204460M | GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR) | 54,645 | 54,645 |
| 210 | 0204571N | CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 66,518 | 76,518 |
| | | Modernization of Barking Sands Tactical Underwater Range | | [10,000] |
| 211 | 0204574N | CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT | 1,155 | 1,155 |
| 212 | 0204575N | ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT | 51,040 | 51,040 |
| 213 | 0205601N | HARM IMPROVEMENT | 87,989 | 87,989 |
| | | Unfunded requirement—AARGM Derivative Program | | [10,000] |
| 214 | 0205604N | TACTICAL DATA LINKS | 89,852 | 89,852 |
| 215 | 0205620N | SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION | 29,351 | 29,351 |
| 216 | 0205632N | MK-48 ADCAP | 68,553 | 68,553 |
| 217 | 0205633N | AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS | 119,099 | 119,099 |
| 218 | 0205675N | OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS | 127,445 | 127,445 |
| 219 | 0206313M | MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 123,825 | 120,325 |
| | | Excess growth—tactical radio systems | | [-3,500] |
| 220 | 0206335M | COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (CAC2S) | 7,343 | 7,343 |
| 221 | 0206623M | MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS | 66,009 | 66,009 |
| 222 | 0206624M | MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT | 25,258 | 25,258 |
| 223 | 0206625M | USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP) | 30,886 | 30,886 |
| 224 | 0206629M | AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT VEHICLE | 58,728 | 58,728 |
| 225 | 0207161N | TACTICAL AIM MISSILES | 42,884 | 51,884 |
| | | Unfunded requirement—AIM-9X Blk II Systems Improvement program | | [9,000] |
| 226 | 0207163N | ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM) | 25,364 | 25,364 |
| 232 | 0303138N | CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES) | 24,271 | 24,271 |
| 233 | 0303140N | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 50,269 | 50,269 |
| 236 | 0305192N | MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES | 6,352 | 6,352 |
| 237 | 0305204N | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 7,770 | 7,770 |
| 238 | 0305205N | UAS INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY | 39,736 | 39,736 |
| 239 | 0305208M | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 12,867 | 12,867 |
| 240 | 0305208N | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 46,150 | 46,150 |
| 241 | 0305220N | MQ-4C TRITON | 84,115 | 84,115 |
| 242 | 0305231N | MQ-8 UAV | 62,656 | 62,656 |
| 243 | 0305232M | RQ-11 UAV | 2,022 | 2,022 |
| 245 | 0305234N | SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0) | 4,835 | 4,835 |
| 246 | 0305239M | RQ-21A | 8,899 | 8,899 |
| 247 | 0305241N | MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT | 99,020 | 99,020 |
| 248 | 0305242M | UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP) | 18,578 | 11,478 |
| | | Program reduction | | [-7,100] |
| 249 | 0305421N | RQ-4 MODERNIZATION | 229,404 | 229,404 |
| 250 | 0308601N | MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT | 5,238 | 5,238 |
| 251 | 0702207N | DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF) | 38,227 | 38,227 |
| 252 | 0708730N | MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH) | 4,808 | 4,808 |
| 253 | 1203109N | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE) | 37,836 | 37,836 |
| 253A | 999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 1,364,347 | 1,364,347 |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 3,980,140 | 4,019,140 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY | 17,675,035 | 17,984,235 |
| | | RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF | | |
| | | BASIC RESEARCH | | |
| 001 | 0601102F | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 342,919 | 342,919 |
| 002 | 0601103F | UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 147,923 | 147,923 |
| 003 | 0601108F | HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 14,417 | 14,417 |
| | | SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH | 505,259 | 505,259 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|-----------------|---|------------------|------------------|
| APPLIED RESEARCH | | | | |
| 004 | 0602102F | MATERIALS | 124,264 | 124,264 |
| 005 | 0602201F | AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES | 124,678 | 129,678 |
| | | Program increase | | [5,000] |
| 006 | 0602202F | HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH | 108,784 | 108,784 |
| 007 | 0602203F | AEROSPACE PROPULSION | 192,695 | 197,695 |
| | | Educational Partnership Agreements | | [5,000] |
| 008 | 0602204F | AEROSPACE SENSORS | 152,782 | 152,782 |
| 009 | 0602298F | SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT— MAJOR HEADQUARTERS ACTIVITIES | 8,353 | 8,353 |
| 010 | 0602601F | SPACE TECHNOLOGY | 116,503 | 116,503 |
| 011 | 0602602F | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS | 112,195 | 112,195 |
| 012 | 0602605F | DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY | 132,993 | 132,993 |
| 013 | 0602788F | DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS | 167,818 | 167,818 |
| 014 | 0602890F | HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH | 43,049 | 43,049 |
| | | SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH | 1,284,114 | 1,294,114 |
| ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | | | |
| 015 | 0603112F | ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS | 37,856 | 47,856 |
| | | Metals affordability research | | [10,000] |
| 016 | 0603199F | SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T) | 22,811 | 22,811 |
| 017 | 0603203F | ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS | 40,978 | 40,978 |
| 018 | 0603211F | AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO | 115,966 | 115,966 |
| 019 | 0603216F | AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY | 104,499 | 109,499 |
| | | Program Increase for Robust Electrical Power System | | [5,000] |
| 020 | 0603270F | ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY | 60,551 | 60,551 |
| 021 | 0603401F | ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY | 58,910 | 58,910 |
| 022 | 0603444F | MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS) | 10,433 | 10,433 |
| 023 | 0603456F | HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 33,635 | 33,635 |
| 024 | 0603601F | CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY | 167,415 | 167,415 |
| 025 | 0603605F | ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY | 45,502 | 45,502 |
| 026 | 0603680F | MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 46,450 | 46,450 |
| 027 | 0603788F | BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION | 49,011 | 49,011 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 794,017 | 809,017 |
| ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | | |
| 028 | 0603260F | INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 5,652 | 8,352 |
| | | Unfunded requirement—OSINT exploitation and fusion | | [1,200] |
| | | Unfunded requirement—SIGINT Tactical Analysis Reporting Gateway | | [1,500] |
| 030 | 0603742F | COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY | 24,397 | 24,397 |
| 031 | 0603790F | NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 3,851 | 3,851 |
| 033 | 0603851F | INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL | 10,736 | 10,736 |
| 034 | 0603859F | POLLUTION PREVENTION—DEM/VAL | 2 | 2 |
| 035 | 0604015F | LONG RANGE STRIKE—BOMBER | 2,003,580 | 2,003,580 |
| 036 | 0604201F | INTEGRATED AVIONICS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | 65,458 | 65,458 |
| 037 | 0604257F | ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY AND SENSORS | 68,719 | 94,919 |
| | | Unfunded requirement—ASARS-2B | | [11,500] |
| | | Unfunded requirement—Hyperspectral Chip Development | | [14,700] |
| 038 | 0604288F | NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPS CENTER (NAOC) RECAP | 7,850 | 7,850 |
| 039 | 0604317F | TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER | 3,295 | 3,295 |
| 040 | 0604327F | HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM | 17,365 | 17,365 |
| 041 | 0604414F | CYBER RESILIENCY OF WEAPON SYSTEMS-ACS | 32,253 | 32,253 |
| 044 | 0604776F | DEPLOYMENT & DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE R&D | 26,222 | 26,222 |
| 046 | 0604858F | TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM | 840,650 | 935,650 |
| | | Program Increase | | [10,000] |
| | | Unfunded Requirement | | [70,000] |
| | | Unfunded requirement—Long-Endurance Aerial Platform(LEAP) Ahead Prototyping | | [15,000] |
| 047 | 0605230F | GROUND BASED STRATEGIC DETERRENT | 215,721 | 215,721 |
| 049 | 0207110F | NEXT GENERATION AIR DOMINANCE | 294,746 | 421,746 |
| | | Unfunded Requirement | | [127,000] |
| 050 | 0207455F | THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR (3DELRR) | 10,645 | 10,645 |
| 052 | 0305236F | COMMON DATA LINK EXECUTIVE AGENT (CDL EA) | 41,509 | 41,509 |
| 053 | 0306250F | CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 226,287 | 226,287 |
| 054 | 0306415F | ENABLED CYBER ACTIVITIES | 16,687 | 16,687 |
| 055 | 0408011F | SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| 056 | 0901410F | CONTRACTING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM | 15,867 | 15,867 |
| 057 | 1203164F | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE) | 253,939 | 263,939 |
| | | Demonstration of Backup and Complementary PNT Capabilities of GPS | | [10,000] |
| 058 | 1203710F | EO/IR WEATHER SYSTEMS | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 059 | 1206422F | WEATHER SYSTEM FOLLOW-ON | 112,088 | 112,088 |
| 060 | 1206425F | SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS | 34,764 | 34,764 |
| 061 | 1206434F | MIDTERM POLAR MILSATCOM SYSTEM | 63,092 | 63,092 |
| 062 | 1206438F | SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY | 7,842 | 7,842 |
| 063 | 1206730F | SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM | 41,385 | 41,385 |
| 064 | 1206760F | PROTECTED TACTICAL ENTERPRISE SERVICE (PTES) | 18,150 | 18,150 |
| 065 | 1206761F | PROTECTED TACTICAL SERVICE (PTS) | 24,201 | 24,201 |
| 066 | 1206855F | PROTECTED SATCOM SERVICES (PSCS)—AGGREGATED | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| 067 | 1206857F | OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE | 87,577 | 117,577 |
| | | Responsive Launch vehicles, infrastructure, and small sats | | [30,000] |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 4,605,030 | 4,895,930 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|-----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
| SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | | | | |
| 068 | 0604200F | FUTURE ADVANCED WEAPON ANALYSIS & PROGRAMS | 5,100 | 5,100 |
| 069 | 0604201F | INTEGRATED AVIONICS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | 101,203 | 101,203 |
| 070 | 0604222F | NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT | 3,009 | 3,009 |
| 071 | 0604270F | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 2,241 | 2,241 |
| 072 | 0604281F | TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE | 38,250 | 38,250 |
| 073 | 0604287F | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | 19,739 | 19,739 |
| 074 | 0604329F | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD | 38,979 | 38,979 |
| 078 | 0604429F | AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK | 7,091 | 7,091 |
| 080 | 0604602F | ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 46,540 | 46,540 |
| 081 | 0604604F | SUBMUNITIONS | 2,705 | 2,705 |
| 082 | 0604617F | AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT | 31,240 | 34,240 |
| | | Joint Expeditionary Airfield Damage Repair | | [3,000] |
| 084 | 0604706F | LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS | 9,060 | 9,060 |
| 085 | 0604735F | COMBAT TRAINING RANGES | 87,350 | 87,350 |
| 086 | 0604800F | F-35—EMD | 292,947 | 292,947 |
| 088 | 0604932F | LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON | 451,290 | 451,290 |
| 089 | 0604933F | ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION | 178,991 | 178,991 |
| 090 | 0605030F | JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC) | 12,736 | 12,736 |
| 091 | 0605031F | JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK (JTN) | 9,319 | 9,319 |
| 092 | 0605213F | F-22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B | 13,600 | 13,600 |
| 094 | 0605221F | KC-46 | 93,845 | 0 |
| | | Under execution | | [-93,845] |
| 095 | 0605223F | ADVANCED PILOT TRAINING | 105,999 | 105,999 |
| 096 | 0605229F | COMBAT RESCUE HELICOPTER | 354,485 | 354,485 |
| 100 | 0605458F | AIR & SPACE OPS CENTER 10.2 RDT&E | 119,745 | 49,745 |
| | | Program reduction | | [-70,000] |
| 101 | 0605931F | B-2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM | 194,570 | 194,570 |
| 102 | 0101125F | NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION | 91,237 | 91,237 |
| 103 | 0207171F | F-15 EPAWSS | 209,847 | 209,847 |
| 104 | 0207328F | STAND IN ATTACK WEAPON | 3,400 | 3,400 |
| 105 | 0207701F | FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING | 16,727 | 16,727 |
| 109 | 0307581F | JSTARS RECAP | 417,201 | 417,201 |
| 110 | 0401310F | C-32 EXECUTIVE TRANSPORT RECAPITALIZATION | 6,017 | 6,017 |
| 111 | 0401319F | PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT RECAPITALIZATION (PAR) | 434,069 | 434,069 |
| 112 | 0701212F | AUTOMATED TEST SYSTEMS | 18,528 | 18,528 |
| 113 | 1203176F | COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR | 24,967 | 24,967 |
| 114 | 1203940F | SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS | 10,029 | 10,029 |
| 115 | 1206421F | COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS | 66,370 | 66,370 |
| 116 | 1206425F | SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS | 48,448 | 48,448 |
| 117 | 1206426F | SPACE FENCE | 35,937 | 35,937 |
| 118 | 1206431F | ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE) | 145,610 | 145,610 |
| 119 | 1206432F | POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE) | 33,644 | 33,644 |
| 120 | 1206433F | WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE) | 14,263 | 14,263 |
| 121 | 1206441F | SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD | 311,844 | 311,844 |
| 122 | 1206442F | EVOLVED SBIRS | 71,018 | 71,018 |
| 123 | 1206853F | EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE) – EMD | 297,572 | 297,572 |
| | | SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 4,476,762 | 4,315,917 |
| MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | | | |
| 124 | 0604256F | THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT | 35,405 | 35,405 |
| 125 | 0604759F | MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT | 82,874 | 87,874 |
| | | Unfunded requirement | | [5,000] |
| 126 | 0605101F | RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE | 34,346 | 34,346 |
| 128 | 0605712F | INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION | 15,523 | 15,523 |
| 129 | 0605807F | TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 678,289 | 739,089 |
| | | Program Increase | | [32,400] |
| | | Testing, evaluation, and certification of additional suppliers for arresting gear systems for fighter aircraft | | [1,000] |
| | | Unfunded requirement | | [27,400] |
| 130 | 0605826F | ACQ WORKFORCE- GLOBAL POWER | 219,809 | 219,809 |
| 131 | 0605827F | ACQ WORKFORCE- GLOBAL VIG & COMBAT SYS | 223,179 | 223,179 |
| 132 | 0605828F | ACQ WORKFORCE- GLOBAL REACH | 138,556 | 138,556 |
| 133 | 0605829F | ACQ WORKFORCE- CYBER, NETWORK, & BUS SYS | 221,393 | 221,393 |
| 134 | 0605830F | ACQ WORKFORCE- GLOBAL BATTLE MGMT | 152,577 | 152,577 |
| 135 | 0605831F | ACQ WORKFORCE- CAPABILITY INTEGRATION | 196,561 | 196,561 |
| 136 | 0605832F | ACQ WORKFORCE- ADVANCED PRGM TECHNOLOGY | 28,322 | 28,322 |
| 137 | 0605833F | ACQ WORKFORCE- NUCLEAR SYSTEMS | 126,611 | 126,611 |
| 140 | 0605898F | MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D | 9,154 | 9,154 |
| 141 | 0605976F | FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 135,507 | 135,507 |
| 142 | 0605978F | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 28,720 | 28,720 |
| 143 | 0606017F | REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION | 35,453 | 110,453 |
| | | Unfunded requirement | | [50,000] |
| | | Unfunded requirement—Penetrating Counter air (PCA) Risk Reduction | | [25,000] |
| 146 | 0308602F | ENTEPRISE INFORMATION SERVICES (EIS) | 29,049 | 29,049 |
| 147 | 0702806F | ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 14,980 | 14,980 |
| 148 | 0804731F | GENERAL SKILL TRAINING | 1,434 | 1,434 |
| 150 | 1001004F | INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES | 4,569 | 4,569 |
| 151 | 1206116F | SPACE TEST AND TRAINING RANGE DEVELOPMENT | 25,773 | 25,773 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|---|------------------|------------------|
| 152 | 1206392F | SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE | 169,887 | 169,887 |
| 153 | 1206398F | SPACE & MISSILE SYSTEMS CENTER—MHA | 9,531 | 9,531 |
| 154 | 1206860F | ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE) | 20,975 | 20,975 |
| 155 | 1206864F | SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP) | 25,398 | 25,398 |
| | | SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 2,663,875 | 2,804,675 |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | |
| 157 | 0604222F | NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT | 27,579 | 27,579 |
| 158 | 0604233F | SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING | 5,776 | 5,776 |
| 159 | 0604445F | WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE | 16,247 | 16,247 |
| 161 | 0605018F | AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS) | 21,915 | 21,915 |
| 162 | 0605024F | ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY | 33,150 | 33,150 |
| 163 | 0605117F | FOREIGN MATERIEL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION | 66,653 | 66,653 |
| 164 | 0605278F | HC/MC-130 RECAP RDT&E | 38,579 | 38,579 |
| 165 | 0606018F | NC3 INTEGRATION | 12,636 | 12,636 |
| 166 | 0101113F | B-52 SQUADRONS | 111,910 | 111,910 |
| 167 | 0101122F | AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM) | 463 | 463 |
| 168 | 0101126F | B-1B SQUADRONS | 62,471 | 62,471 |
| 169 | 0101127F | B-2 SQUADRONS | 193,108 | 193,108 |
| 170 | 0101213F | MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS | 210,845 | 210,845 |
| | | Increase ICBM Cryptography Upgrade II | | [20,000] |
| | | Reduce MM Ground and Communications Equipment | | [-10,000] |
| | | Reduce MM Support Equipment | | [-10,000] |
| 171 | 0101313F | INTEGRATED STRATEGIC PLANNING AND ANALYSIS NETWORK (ISPAN)—USSTRATCOM | 25,736 | 25,736 |
| 173 | 0101316F | WORLDWIDE JOINT STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS | 6,272 | 70,272 |
| | | Enhances E-4B cyber security | | [64,000] |
| 174 | 0101324F | INTEGRATED STRATEGIC PLANNING & ANALYSIS NETWORK | 11,032 | 11,032 |
| 176 | 0102110F | UH-1N REPLACEMENT PROGRAM | 108,617 | 108,617 |
| 177 | 0102326F | REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 3,347 | 3,347 |
| 179 | 0205219F | MQ-9 UAV | 201,394 | 201,394 |
| 182 | 0207131F | A-10 SQUADRONS | 17,459 | 17,459 |
| 183 | 0207133F | F-16 SQUADRONS | 246,578 | 271,578 |
| | | Unfunded requirement—MIDS-JTRS software changes | | [25,000] |
| 184 | 0207134F | F-15E SQUADRONS | 320,271 | 320,271 |
| 185 | 0207136F | MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION | 15,106 | 35,106 |
| | | HTS pod block upgrade program | | [20,000] |
| 186 | 0207138F | F-22A SQUADRONS | 610,942 | 610,942 |
| 187 | 0207142F | F-35 SQUADRONS | 334,530 | 334,530 |
| 188 | 0207161F | TACTICAL AIM MISSILES | 34,952 | 34,952 |
| 189 | 0207163F | ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM) | 61,322 | 61,322 |
| 191 | 0207227F | COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE | 693 | 693 |
| 193 | 0207249F | PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT | 1,714 | 1,714 |
| 194 | 0207253F | COMPASS CALL | 14,040 | 14,040 |
| 195 | 0207268F | AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 109,243 | 109,243 |
| 197 | 0207325F | JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM) | 29,932 | 29,932 |
| 198 | 0207410F | AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC) | 26,956 | 26,956 |
| 199 | 0207412F | CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC) | 2,450 | 2,450 |
| 200 | 0207417F | AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) | 151,726 | 151,726 |
| 201 | 0207418F | TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 3,656 | 3,656 |
| 203 | 0207431F | COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES | 13,420 | 13,420 |
| 204 | 0207444F | TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD | 10,623 | 10,623 |
| 205 | 0207448F | C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK | 1,754 | 1,754 |
| 206 | 0207452F | DCAPES | 17,382 | 17,382 |
| 207 | 0207573F | NATIONAL TECHNICAL NUCLEAR FORENSICS | 2,307 | 2,307 |
| 208 | 0207590F | SEEK EAGLE | 25,397 | 25,397 |
| 209 | 0207601F | USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION | 10,175 | 10,175 |
| 210 | 0207605F | WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS | 12,839 | 12,839 |
| 211 | 0207697F | DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES | 4,190 | 4,190 |
| 212 | 0208006F | MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS | 85,531 | 85,531 |
| 213 | 0208007F | TACTICAL DECEPTION | 3,761 | 3,761 |
| 214 | 0208087F | AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS | 35,693 | 35,693 |
| 215 | 0208088F | AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS | 20,964 | 20,964 |
| 218 | 0301017F | GLOBAL SENSOR INTEGRATED ON NETWORK (GSIN) | 3,549 | 3,549 |
| 219 | 0301112F | NUCLEAR PLANNING AND EXECUTION SYSTEM (NPES) | 4,371 | 4,371 |
| 227 | 0301401F | AIR FORCE SPACE AND CYBER NON-TRADITIONAL ISR FOR BATTLESPACE AWARENESS | 3,721 | 3,721 |
| 228 | 0302015F | E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC) | 35,467 | 35,467 |
| 230 | 0303131F | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN) | 48,841 | 48,841 |
| 231 | 0303140F | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 42,973 | 42,973 |
| 232 | 0303141F | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 105 | 105 |
| 233 | 0303142F | GLOBAL FORCE MANAGEMENT—DATA INITIATIVE | 2,147 | 2,147 |
| 236 | 0304260F | AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE | 121,948 | 121,948 |
| 237 | 0304310F | COMMERCIAL ECONOMIC ANALYSIS | 3,544 | 3,544 |
| 240 | 0305020F | CCMD INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY | 1,542 | 1,542 |
| 241 | 0305099F | GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM) | 4,453 | 4,453 |
| 243 | 0305111F | WEATHER SERVICE | 26,654 | 31,654 |
| | | Commercial weather pilot program | | [5,000] |
| 244 | 0305114F | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS) | 6,306 | 7,806 |
| | | Unfunded requirement—ground based sense and avoid | | [1,500] |
| 245 | 0305116F | AERIAL TARGETS | 21,295 | 21,295 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| 248 | 0305128F | SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES | 415 | 415 |
| 250 | 0305146F | DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | 3,867 | 3,867 |
| 257 | 0305202F | DRAGON U-2 | 34,486 | 34,486 |
| 259 | 0305206F | AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 4,450 | 17,250 |
| | | WAMI Technology Upgrades | | [12,800] |
| 260 | 0305207F | MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 14,269 | 14,269 |
| 261 | 0305208F | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 27,501 | 39,001 |
| | | Unfunded requirement | | [11,500] |
| 262 | 0305220F | RQ-4 UAV | 214,849 | 214,849 |
| 263 | 0305221F | NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING | 18,842 | 18,842 |
| 265 | 0305238F | NATO AGS | 44,729 | 44,729 |
| 266 | 0305240F | SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE | 26,349 | 26,349 |
| 269 | 0305600F | INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURES | 3,491 | 3,491 |
| 271 | 0305881F | RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION | 4,899 | 4,899 |
| 275 | 0305984F | PERSONNEL RECOVERY COMMAND & CTRL (PRC2) | 2,445 | 2,445 |
| 276 | 0307577F | INTELLIGENCE MISSION DATA (IMD) | 8,684 | 8,684 |
| 278 | 0401115F | C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON | 10,219 | 10,219 |
| 279 | 0401119F | C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (1F) | 22,758 | 22,758 |
| 280 | 0401130F | C-17 AIRCRAFT (1F) | 34,287 | 34,287 |
| 281 | 0401132F | C-130J PROGRAM | 26,821 | 26,821 |
| 282 | 0401134F | LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM) | 5,283 | 5,283 |
| 283 | 0401218F | KC-135S | 9,942 | 9,942 |
| 284 | 0401219F | KC-10S | 7,933 | 7,933 |
| 285 | 0401314F | OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT | 6,681 | 6,681 |
| 286 | 0401318F | CV-22 | 22,519 | 22,519 |
| 287 | 0401840F | AMC COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 3,510 | 3,510 |
| 288 | 0408011F | SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL | 8,090 | 8,090 |
| 289 | 0702207F | DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-1F) | 1,528 | 1,528 |
| 290 | 0708055F | MAINTENANCE, REPAIR & OVERHAUL SYSTEM | 31,677 | 31,677 |
| 291 | 0708610F | LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT) | 33,344 | 33,344 |
| 292 | 0708611F | SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 9,362 | 9,362 |
| 293 | 0804743F | OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING | 2,074 | 2,074 |
| 294 | 0808716F | OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES | 107 | 107 |
| 295 | 0901202F | JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY | 2,006 | 2,006 |
| 296 | 0901218F | CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM | 3,780 | 3,780 |
| 297 | 0901220F | PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION | 7,472 | 7,472 |
| 298 | 0901226F | AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY | 1,563 | 1,563 |
| 299 | 0901538F | FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 91,211 | 91,211 |
| 300 | 1201921F | SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM—SPACE ACTIVITIES | 14,255 | 14,255 |
| 301 | 1202247F | AF TENCAP | 31,914 | 31,914 |
| 302 | 1203001F | FAMILY OF ADVANCED BLOS TERMINALS (FAB-T) | 32,426 | 32,426 |
| 303 | 1203110F | SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE) | 18,808 | 21,308 |
| | | Program increase | | [2,500] |
| 305 | 1203165F | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS) | 10,029 | 10,029 |
| 306 | 1203173F | SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER | 25,051 | 25,051 |
| 307 | 1203174F | SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 11,390 | 11,390 |
| 308 | 1203179F | INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS) | 8,747 | 8,747 |
| 309 | 1203182F | SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE) | 10,549 | 10,549 |
| 310 | 1203265F | GPS III SPACE SEGMENT | 243,435 | 243,435 |
| 311 | 1203400F | SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE | 12,691 | 12,691 |
| 312 | 1203614F | JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM | 99,455 | 99,455 |
| 313 | 1203620F | NATIONAL SPACE DEFENSE CENTER | 18,052 | 18,052 |
| 314 | 1203699F | SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW) | 1,373 | 1,373 |
| 315 | 1203906F | NCMC—TWAA SYSTEM | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 316 | 1203913F | NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE) | 31,508 | 31,508 |
| 317 | 1203940F | SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS | 99,984 | 99,984 |
| 318 | 1206423F | GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT | 510,938 | 510,938 |
| 318A | 999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 14,938,002 | 14,974,002 |
| | | Program increase | | [36,000] |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 20,585,302 | 20,763,602 |
| | | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 319 | 0901560F | UNDISTRIBUTED | | -195,900 |
| | | Bomber Modernization—Excess to Need | | [-195,900] |
| | | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | -195,900 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF | 34,914,359 | 35,192,614 |
| | | RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW | | |
| | | BASIC RESEARCH | | |
| 001 | 0601000BR | DTRA BASIC RESEARCH | 37,201 | 37,201 |
| 002 | 0601101E | DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES | 432,347 | 432,347 |
| 003 | 0601110D8Z | BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES | 40,612 | 40,612 |
| 004 | 0601117E | BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE | 43,126 | 43,126 |
| 005 | 0601120D8Z | NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM | 74,298 | 74,298 |
| 006 | 0601228D8Z | HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTITUTIONS | 25,865 | 35,865 |
| | | Program Increase | | [10,000] |
| 007 | 0601384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 43,898 | 43,898 |
| | | SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH | 697,347 | 707,347 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|-----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
| APPLIED RESEARCH | | | | |
| 008 | 0602000D8Z | JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY | 19,111 | 19,111 |
| 009 | 0602115E | BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY | 109,360 | 109,360 |
| 011 | 0602234D8Z | LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM | 49,748 | 49,748 |
| 012 | 0602251D8Z | APPLIED RESEARCH FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF S&T PRIORITIES | 49,226 | 49,226 |
| 013 | 0602303E | INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY | 392,784 | 392,784 |
| 014 | 0602383E | BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE | 13,014 | 13,014 |
| 015 | 0602384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 201,053 | 201,053 |
| 016 | 0602668D8Z | CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH | 14,775 | 14,775 |
| 017 | 0602702E | TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY | 343,776 | 343,776 |
| 018 | 0602715E | MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY | 224,440 | 224,440 |
| 019 | 0602716E | ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY | 295,447 | 295,447 |
| 020 | 0602718BR | COUNTER WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION APPLIED RESEARCH | 157,908 | 157,908 |
| 021 | 0602751D8Z | SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE (SEI) APPLIED RESEARCH | 8,955 | 8,955 |
| 022 | 1160401BB | SOF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 34,493 | 34,493 |
| | | SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH | 1,914,090 | 1,914,090 |
| ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | | | |
| 023 | 0603000D8Z | JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 25,627 | 25,627 |
| 024 | 0603122D8Z | COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT | 76,230 | 81,230 |
| | | Program increase—conventional EOD equipment | | [5,000] |
| 025 | 0603133D8Z | FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING | 24,199 | 24,199 |
| 026 | 0603160BR | COUNTER WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 268,607 | 268,607 |
| 027 | 0603176C | ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT | 12,996 | 12,996 |
| 029 | 0603178C | WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY | 5,495 | 60,595 |
| | | Restore funding for directed energy prioritization in DoD's BMD efforts | | [55,100] |
| 031 | 0603180C | ADVANCED RESEARCH | 20,184 | 20,184 |
| 032 | 0603225D8Z | JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 18,662 | 18,662 |
| 035 | 0603286E | ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS | 155,406 | 155,406 |
| 036 | 0603287E | SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY | 247,435 | 247,435 |
| 037 | 0603288D8Z | ANALYTIC ASSESSMENTS | 13,154 | 13,154 |
| 038 | 0603289D8Z | ADVANCED INNOVATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCEPTS | 37,674 | 30,674 |
| | | Program decrease | | [-7,000] |
| 039 | 0603291D8Z | ADVANCED INNOVATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCEPTS—MHA | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| 040 | 0603294C | COMMON KILL VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY | 252,879 | 252,879 |
| 041 | 0603342D8W | DEFENSE INNOVATION UNIT EXPERIMENTAL (DIUX) | 29,594 | 29,594 |
| 042 | 0603375D8Z | TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION | 59,863 | 24,863 |
| | | Unjustified growth | | [-35,000] |
| 043 | 0603384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 145,359 | 145,359 |
| 044 | 0603527D8Z | RETRACT LARCH | 171,120 | 171,120 |
| 045 | 0603618D8Z | JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 14,389 | 14,389 |
| 046 | 0603648D8Z | JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | 105,871 | 105,871 |
| 047 | 0603662D8Z | NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES | 12,661 | 12,661 |
| 048 | 0603680D8Z | DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 136,159 | 136,159 |
| 049 | 0603680S | MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 40,511 | 40,511 |
| 050 | 0603699D8Z | EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 57,876 | 49,876 |
| | | SOCOM ATL effort | | [-8,000] |
| 051 | 0603712S | GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | 10,611 | 10,611 |
| 053 | 0603716D8Z | STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM | 71,832 | 81,832 |
| | | Environmental resiliency | | [10,000] |
| 054 | 0603720S | MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT | 219,803 | 219,803 |
| 055 | 0603727D8Z | JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM | 6,349 | 6,349 |
| 056 | 0603739E | ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES | 79,173 | 79,173 |
| 057 | 0603760E | COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 106,787 | 106,787 |
| 058 | 0603766E | NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY | 439,386 | 439,386 |
| 059 | 0603767E | SENSOR TECHNOLOGY | 210,123 | 210,123 |
| 060 | 0603769D8Z | DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 11,211 | 11,211 |
| 062 | 0603781D8Z | SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE | 15,047 | 15,047 |
| 063 | 0603826D8Z | QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS | 69,203 | 69,203 |
| 064 | 0603833D8Z | ENGINEERING SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY | 25,395 | 25,395 |
| 065 | 0603941D8Z | TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY | 89,586 | 89,586 |
| 066 | 0604055D8Z | OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT | 38,403 | 38,403 |
| 067 | 0303310D8Z | CWMD SYSTEMS | 33,382 | 33,382 |
| 068 | 1160402BB | SOF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 72,605 | 72,605 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 3,445,847 | 3,465,947 |
| ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES | | | | |
| 069 | 0603161D8Z | NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P | 32,937 | 32,937 |
| 070 | 0603600D8Z | WALKOFF | 101,714 | 101,714 |
| 072 | 0603821D8Z | ACQUISITION ENTERPRISE DATA & INFORMATION SERVICES | 2,198 | 2,198 |
| 073 | 0603851D8Z | ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM | 54,583 | 54,583 |
| 074 | 0603881C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT | 230,162 | 230,162 |
| 075 | 0603882C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT | 828,097 | 850,093 |
| | | Improve Discrimination Capability for GMD | | [21,996] |
| 076 | 0603884BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL | 148,518 | 148,518 |
| 077 | 0603884C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS | 247,345 | 326,207 |
| | | Funding increase to accelerate development and deployment of interim and perm MD enhancements for HI | | [21,000] |
| | | Improve Discrimination Capability for GMD | | [57,862] |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
| 078 | 0603890C | BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS | 449,442 | 478,884 |
| | | GMD Discrimination | | [23,342] |
| | | Improve High Fidelity Modeling and Simulation for GMD | | [6,100] |
| 079 | 0603891C | SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA | 320,190 | 320,190 |
| 080 | 0603892C | AEGIS BMD | 852,052 | 852,052 |
| 083 | 0603896C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI | 430,115 | 430,115 |
| 084 | 0603898C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT | 48,954 | 48,954 |
| 085 | 0603904C | MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC) | 53,265 | 53,265 |
| 086 | 0603906C | REGARDING TRENCH | 9,113 | 9,113 |
| 087 | 0603907C | SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX) | 130,695 | 130,695 |
| 088 | 0603913C | ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS | 105,354 | 105,354 |
| 089 | 0603914C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST | 305,791 | 305,791 |
| 090 | 0603915C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS | 410,425 | 410,425 |
| 091 | 0603920D8Z | HUMANITARIAN DEMINING | 10,837 | 10,837 |
| 092 | 0603923D8Z | COALITION WARFARE | 10,740 | 10,740 |
| 093 | 0604161D8Z | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM | 3,837 | 3,837 |
| 094 | 0604115C | TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES | 128,406 | 258,406 |
| | | Acceleration of kinetic and nonkinetic boost phase BMD | | [100,000] |
| | | Program increase | | [30,000] |
| 095 | 0604132D8Z | MISSILE DEFEAT PROJECT | 98,369 | 98,369 |
| 096 | 0604181C | HYPERSONIC DEFENSE | 75,300 | 75,300 |
| 097 | 0604250D8Z | ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES | 1,175,832 | 1,153,832 |
| | | Program decrease | | [-22,000] |
| 098 | 0604294D8Z | TRUSTED & ASSURED MICROELECTRONICS | 83,626 | 83,626 |
| 099 | 0604331D8Z | RAPID PROTOTYPING PROGRAM | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| 101 | 0604400D8Z | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED SYSTEM COMMON DEVELOPMENT | 3,967 | 3,967 |
| 102 | 0604682D8Z | WARGAMING AND SUPPORT FOR STRATEGIC ANALYSIS (SSA) | 3,833 | 3,833 |
| 104 | 0604826J | JOINT C5 CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT, INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY ASSESSMENTS | 23,638 | 23,638 |
| 105 | 0604873C | LONG RANGE DISCRIMINATION RADAR (LRDR) | 357,659 | 357,659 |
| 106 | 0604874C | IMPROVED HOMELAND DEFENSE INTERCEPTORS | 465,530 | 545,530 |
| | | C3 Booster Development | | [80,000] |
| 107 | 0604876C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT TEST | 36,239 | 36,239 |
| 108 | 0604878C | AEGIS BMD TEST | 134,468 | 160,819 |
| | | To provide AAW at Aegis Ashore sites, consistent w/ FY16 and FY17 NDAAs | | [26,351] |
| 109 | 0604879C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSOR TEST | 84,239 | 84,239 |
| 110 | 0604880C | LAND-BASED SM-3 (LBSM3) | 30,486 | 97,761 |
| | | To provide AAW at Aegis Ashore sites, consistent w/ FY16 and FY17 NDAAs | | [67,275] |
| 111 | 0604881C | AEGIS SM-3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT | 9,739 | 9,739 |
| 112 | 0604887C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE SEGMENT TEST | 76,757 | 76,757 |
| 113 | 0604894C | MULTI-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE | 6,500 | 6,500 |
| 114 | 0303191D8Z | JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM | 2,902 | 2,902 |
| 115 | 0305103C | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 986 | 986 |
| 116 | 1206893C | SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 34,907 | 34,907 |
| 117 | 1206895C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS | 16,994 | 16,994 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES | 7,736,741 | 8,148,667 |
| | | SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION | | |
| 118 | 0604161D8Z | NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD | 12,536 | 12,536 |
| 119 | 0604165D8Z | PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT | 201,749 | 201,749 |
| 120 | 0604384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD | 406,789 | 406,789 |
| 122 | 0604771D8Z | JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS) | 15,358 | 15,358 |
| 123 | 0605000BR | COUNTER WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 6,241 | 6,241 |
| 124 | 0605013BL | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 12,322 | 12,322 |
| 125 | 0605021SE | HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE | 4,893 | 4,893 |
| 126 | 0605022D8Z | DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM | 3,162 | 3,162 |
| 127 | 0605027D8Z | OUS(D) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES | 21,353 | 21,353 |
| 128 | 0605070S | DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION | 6,266 | 6,266 |
| 129 | 0605075D8Z | DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION | 2,810 | 2,810 |
| 130 | 0605080S | DEFENSE AGENCY INITIATIVES (DAI)—FINANCIAL SYSTEM | 24,436 | 24,436 |
| 131 | 0605090S | DEFENSE RETIRED AND ANNUITANT PAY SYSTEM (DRAS) | 13,475 | 13,475 |
| 133 | 0605210D8Z | DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES | 11,870 | 11,870 |
| 134 | 0605294D8Z | TRUSTED & ASSURED MICROELECTRONICS | 61,084 | 61,084 |
| 135 | 0303141K | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 2,576 | 2,576 |
| 136 | 0305304D8Z | DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEIM) | 3,669 | 3,669 |
| 137 | 0305310D8Z | CWMD SYSTEMS: SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION | 8,230 | 8,230 |
| | | SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION | 818,819 | 818,819 |
| | | MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | |
| 138 | 0604774D8Z | DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS) | 6,941 | 6,941 |
| 139 | 0604875D8Z | JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT | 4,851 | 4,851 |
| 140 | 0604940D8Z | CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP) | 211,325 | 211,325 |
| 141 | 0604942D8Z | ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS | 30,144 | 50,144 |
| | | Program increase for cyber vulnerability assessments and hardening | | [20,000] |
| 142 | 0605001E | MISSION SUPPORT | 63,769 | 63,769 |
| 143 | 0605100D8Z | JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETS) | 91,057 | 91,057 |
| 144 | 0605104D8Z | TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS | 22,386 | 22,386 |
| 145 | 0605126J | JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO) | 36,581 | 36,581 |
| 147 | 0605142D8Z | SYSTEMS ENGINEERING | 37,622 | 37,622 |
| 148 | 0605151D8Z | STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD | 5,200 | 5,200 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|--|------------------|------------------|
| 149 | 0605161D8Z | NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY | 5,232 | 5,232 |
| 150 | 0605170D8Z | SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION | 12,583 | 12,583 |
| 151 | 0605200D8Z | GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE) | 31,451 | 31,451 |
| 152 | 0605384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | 104,348 | 104,348 |
| 161 | 0605790D8Z | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER | 2,372 | 2,372 |
| 162 | 0605798D8Z | DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS | 24,365 | 24,365 |
| 163 | 0605801KA | DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC) | 54,145 | 54,145 |
| 164 | 0605803SE | R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION | 30,356 | 30,356 |
| 165 | 0605804D8Z | DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION | 20,571 | 20,571 |
| 166 | 0605898E | MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D | 14,017 | 14,017 |
| 167 | 0605998KA | MANAGEMENT HQ—DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC) | 4,187 | 4,187 |
| 168 | 0606100D8Z | BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS | 3,992 | 3,992 |
| 169 | 0606225D8Z | ODNA TECHNOLOGY AND RESOURCE ANALYSIS | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| 170 | 0203345D8Z | DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI) | 2,551 | 2,551 |
| 171 | 0204571J | JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT | 7,712 | 7,712 |
| 174 | 0303166J | SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES | 673 | 673 |
| 175 | 0303260D8Z | DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO) | 1,006 | 1,006 |
| 177 | 0305172K | COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS | 16,998 | 16,998 |
| 180 | 0305245D8Z | INTELLIGENCE CAPABILITIES AND INNOVATION INVESTMENTS | 18,992 | 18,992 |
| 181 | 0306310D8Z | CWMD SYSTEMS: RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 1,231 | 1,231 |
| 183 | 0804767J | COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)—MHA | 44,500 | 44,500 |
| 184 | 0901598C | MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA | 29,947 | 29,947 |
| 187 | 0903235K | JOINT SERVICE PROVIDER (JSP) | 5,113 | 5,113 |
| 187A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 63,312 | 63,312 |
| | | SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 1,010,530 | 1,030,530 |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT | | |
| 188 | 0604130V | ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS) | 4,565 | 4,565 |
| 189 | 0605127T | REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA | 1,871 | 1,871 |
| 190 | 0605147T | OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS) | 298 | 298 |
| 191 | 0607210D8Z | INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT | 10,882 | 15,882 |
| | | Program increase for increase analytical support | | [5,000] |
| 192 | 0607310D8Z | CWMD SYSTEMS: OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 7,222 | 7,222 |
| 193 | 0607327T | GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (G-TSCMIS) | 14,450 | 14,450 |
| 194 | 0607384BP | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT) | 45,677 | 45,677 |
| 195 | 0208043J | PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS) | 3,037 | 3,037 |
| 196 | 0208045K | C4I INTEROPERABILITY | 59,490 | 59,490 |
| 198 | 0301144K | JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING | 6,104 | 6,104 |
| 202 | 0302016K | NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT | 1,863 | 1,863 |
| 203 | 0302019K | DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION | 21,564 | 21,564 |
| 204 | 0303126K | LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS | 15,428 | 15,428 |
| 205 | 0303131K | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN) | 15,855 | 15,855 |
| 206 | 0303135G | PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI) | 4,811 | 4,811 |
| 207 | 0303136G | KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI) | 33,746 | 33,746 |
| 208 | 0303140D8Z | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 9,415 | 19,415 |
| | | Cyber Scholarship Program | | [10,000] |
| 209 | 0303140G | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 227,652 | 235,652 |
| | | Program increase to support cyber defense education of reservists and the National Guard | | [8,000] |
| 210 | 0303150K | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 42,687 | 42,687 |
| 211 | 0303153K | DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION | 8,750 | 8,750 |
| 214 | 0303228K | JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT (JIE) | 4,689 | 4,689 |
| 216 | 0303430K | FEDERAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| 222 | 0305103K | CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE | 1,686 | 1,686 |
| 227 | 0305186D8Z | POLICY R&D PROGRAMS | 6,526 | 6,526 |
| 228 | 0305199D8Z | NET CENTRICITY | 18,455 | 18,455 |
| 230 | 0305208BB | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 5,496 | 5,496 |
| 233 | 0305208K | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | 3,049 | 3,049 |
| 236 | 0305327V | INSIDER THREAT | 5,365 | 5,365 |
| 237 | 0305387D8Z | HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM | 2,071 | 2,071 |
| 243 | 0307577D8Z | INTELLIGENCE MISSION DATA (IMD) | 13,111 | 13,111 |
| 245 | 0708012S | PACIFIC DISASTER CENTERS | 1,770 | 1,770 |
| 246 | 0708047S | DEFENSE PROPERTY ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM | 2,924 | 2,924 |
| 248 | 1105219BB | MQ-9 UAV | 37,863 | 37,863 |
| 251 | 1160403BB | AVIATION SYSTEMS | 259,886 | 267,386 |
| | | Per SOCOM requested realignment | | [7,500] |
| 252 | 1160405BB | INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 8,245 | 8,245 |
| 253 | 1160408BB | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | 79,455 | 79,455 |
| 254 | 1160431BB | WARRIOR SYSTEMS | 45,935 | 45,935 |
| 255 | 1160432BB | SPECIAL PROGRAMS | 1,978 | 1,978 |
| 256 | 1160434BB | UNMANNED ISR | 31,766 | 31,766 |
| 257 | 1160480BB | SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES | 2,578 | 2,578 |
| 258 | 1160483BB | MARITIME SYSTEMS | 42,315 | 55,115 |
| | | Per SOCOM requested realignment | | [12,800] |
| 259 | 1160489BB | GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES | 4,661 | 4,661 |
| 260 | 1160490BB | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE | 12,049 | 12,049 |
| 261 | 1203610K | TELEPORT PROGRAM | 642 | 642 |
| 261A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 3,689,646 | 3,689,646 |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT | 4,867,528 | 4,910,828 |

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|-----------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW | | | 20,490,902 | 20,996,228 |
| OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | | | |
| 001 | 0605118OTE | OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION | 83,503 | 83,503 |
| 002 | 0605131OTE | LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION | 59,500 | 59,500 |
| 003 | 0605814OTE | OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES | 67,897 | 67,897 |
| SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | | 210,900 | 210,900 |
| TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE | | | 210,900 | 210,900 |
| TOTAL RDT&E | | | 82,716,636 | 84,038,357 |

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|-----------------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| 006 | 0602120A | SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY | | v |
| ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | | |
| 055 | 0603327A | AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING | 15,000 | 0 |
| Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | | | [-15,000] |
| 058 | 0603639A | TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION | | 4,000 |
| Unfunded requirement—JLTV lethality 30mm upgrade | | | | [4,000] |
| 060 | 0603747A | SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | 18,000 | 7,000 |
| SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | | | | |
| 080 | 0604201A | AIRCRAFT AVIONICS | | 12,000 |
| Unfunded requirement—A-PNT measures | | | | [12,000] |
| 122 | 0605032A | TRACTOR TIRE | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 125 | 0605035A | COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM) | 21,540 | 21,540 |
| 132 | 0605049A | MISSILE WARNING SYSTEM MODERNIZATION (MWSM) | | 155,000 |
| Unfunded requirements—LIMWS | | | | [155,000] |
| 133 | 0605051A | AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT | 30,100 | 30,100 |
| 147 | 0303032A | TROJAN—RHI2 | 1,200 | 1,200 |
| SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | | | 57,840 | 224,840 |
| OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | | | |
| 183 | 0607134A | LONG RANGE PRECISION FIRES (LRPF) | | 56,731 |
| Unfunded requirement | | | | [42,731] |
| Unfunded requirement—CDAEM Bridging Strategy | | | | [14,000] |
| 191 | 0607142A | AVIATION ROCKET SYSTEM PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT | | 8,000 |
| Unfunded requirement—M282 warhead qualification | | | | [8,000] |
| 203 | 0203801A | MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 15,000 | 0 |
| Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | | | [-15,000] |
| 222 | 0305204A | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 7,492 | 0 |
| Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | | | [-7,492] |
| 223 | 0305206A | AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 15,000 | 0 |
| Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | | | [-15,000] |
| 228 | 0307665A | BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE | 6,036 | 6,036 |
| SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | | 43,528 | 70,767 |
| TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY | | | 119,368 | 302,607 |
| ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | | |
| 041 | 0603527N | RETRACT LARCH | 22,000 | 22,000 |
| 081 | 0604272N | TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM) | 5,710 | 5,710 |
| SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | 27,710 | 27,710 |
| OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | | | |
| 207 | 0204311N | INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 11,600 | 0 |
| Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | | | [-11,600] |
| 211 | 0204574N | CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT | 1,200 | 1,200 |
| 253A | 9999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 89,855 | 89,855 |
| SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | | 102,655 | 91,055 |
| TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY | | | 130,365 | 118,765 |
| ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | | |
| 029 | 0603438F | SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY | 7,800 | 7,800 |
| 053 | 0306250F | CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 5,400 | 5,400 |
| SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | | 13,200 | 13,200 |

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|-----------------|--|-----------------|------------------|
| OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | | | |
| 196 | 0207277F | ISR INNOVATIONS | 5,750 | 5,750 |
| 214 | 0208087F | AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| 286 | 0401318F | CV-22 | | 14,000 |
| | | Unfunded requirement—common electrical interface | | [7,000] |
| | | Unfunded requirement—intelligence broadcast system | | [7,000] |
| 318A | 999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 112,408 | 112,408 |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 122,158 | 136,158 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF | 135,358 | 149,358 |
| ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | | | |
| 024 | 0603122D8Z | COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES | | | | |
| 088 | 0603913C | ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS | | 507,646 |
| | | Additional Cooperative funds, consistent with Title XVI authorizations | | [507,646] |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES | | 507,646 |
| OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT | | | | |
| 253 | 1160408BB | OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | 1,920 | 3,920 |
| | | Unfunded Requirement- Publicly Available Information (PAI) Capability Acceleration | | [2,000] |
| 256 | 1160434BB | UNMANNED ISR | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| 261A | 999999999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 196,176 | 196,176 |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT | 201,096 | 203,096 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW | 226,096 | 735,742 |
| | | TOTAL RDT&E | 611,187 | 1,306,472 |

SEC. 4203. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.

SEC. 4203. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|-----------------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY | | | | |
| ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | | | |
| 042 | 0603270A | ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY | | 3,000 |
| | | Multi-Domain Battle Exercise Capability | | [3,000] |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | 3,000 |
| SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | | | | |
| 085 | 0604328A | TRACTOR CAGE | | 13,000 |
| | | Unfunded Requirement | | [13,000] |
| 117 | 0605018A | INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A) | | 15,000 |
| | | Unfunded Requirement | | [15,000] |
| | | SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | | 28,000 |
| OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | | | |
| 203 | 0203801A | MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | | 26,000 |
| | | Unfunded requirement—Stinger PIP | | [26,000] |
| 213 | 0303028A | SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES | | 21,845 |
| | | Unfunded Requirement | | [21,845] |
| 214 | 0303140A | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | | 7,021 |
| | | Unfunded Requirement | | [7,021] |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | 54,866 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY | | 85,866 |
| RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY | | | | |
| APPLIED RESEARCH | | | | |
| 010 | 0602435N | OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH | | 15,000 |
| | | AGOR SLEP | | [15,000] |
| 014 | 0602782N | MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH | | 23,500 |
| | | MS-177A Maritime Sensor | | [23,500] |
| | | SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH | | 38,500 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY | | 38,500 |
| RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF | | | | |
| APPLIED RESEARCH | | | | |
| 007 | 0602203F | AEROSPACE PROPULSION | | 2,500 |
| | | Unfunded Requirement | | [2,500] |
| 012 | 0602605F | DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY | | 8,300 |

SEC. 4203. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Program Element | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|-----------------|--|-----------------|------------------|
| | | Unfunded Requirement | | [8,300] |
| | | SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH | | 10,800 |
| | | ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | |
| 018 | 0603211F | AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO | | 5,700 |
| | | Unfunded requirement | | [5,700] |
| 019 | 0603216F | AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY | | 13,500 |
| | | Unfunded requirement | | [13,500] |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | | 19,200 |
| | | ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | |
| 041 | 0604414F | CYBER RESILIENCY OF WEAPON SYSTEMS-ACS | | 10,200 |
| | | Unfunding requirement | | [10,200] |
| 062 | 1206438F | SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY | | 56,900 |
| | | AF UPL | | [56,900] |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | | 67,100 |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | |
| 230 | 0303131F | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN) | | 11,000 |
| | | AF UPL—support for AEHF terminals | | [11,000] |
| 302 | 1203001F | FAMILY OF ADVANCED BLOS TERMINALS (FAB-T) | | 58,400 |
| | | AF UPL—FAB-T testing activities | | [7,400] |
| | | AF UPL—POTUS voice conference configuration | | [31,900] |
| | | AF UPL—spares for testing | | [6,600] |
| | | AF UPL -spares for testing | | [12,500] |
| 312 | 1203614F | JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM | | 24,250 |
| | | AF UPL—BMC2 software | | [24,250] |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | | 93,650 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF | | 190,750 |
| | | RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW | | |
| | | ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES | | |
| 075 | 0603882C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT | | 351,000 |
| | | Increase GBI magazine capacity at Fort Greely | | [208,000] |
| | | Procure 3 additional EKV's | | [45,000] |
| | | Procure 7 additional boosters | | [98,000] |
| 117 | 1206895C | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS | | 27,500 |
| | | Initiates BMDS Global Sensors AoA recommendations for space sensor architecture | | [27,500] |
| | | SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES | | 378,500 |
| | | SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION | | |
| 137A | 0604XXX | RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF MILITARY RESPONSE OPTIONS FOR RUSSIAN INF TREATY VIOLATION | | 50,000 |
| | | Program increase | | [50,000] |
| | | SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION | | 50,000 |
| | | MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | |
| 151 | 0605200D8Z | GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE) | | 30,000 |
| | | PROJECT Maven | | [30,000] |
| | | SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | | 30,000 |
| | | OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT | | |
| 236 | 0305327V | INSIDER THREAT | | 5,000 |
| | | Defense Insider Threat Management and Analysis Center | | [5,000] |
| | | SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT | | 5,000 |
| | | TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW | | 463,500 |
| | | TOTAL RDT&E | | 778,616 |

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 1,455,366 | 2,193,657 |
| | Improve unit training and maintenance readiness | | [54,700] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [683,591] |
| 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 105,147 | 112,847 |
| | Execute the National Military Strategy | | [7,700] |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 604,117 | 692,417 |
| | Improve training readiness | | [88,300] |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 793,217 | 820,517 |
| | Decisive Action training and operations | | [27,300] |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,169,478 | 1,207,178 |
| | Combat Training Center Operations and Maintenance | | [37,700] |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 1,496,503 | 1,674,803 |
| | Aviation and ISR Maintenance Requirements | | [28,200] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [150,100] |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 3,675,901 | 3,767,870 |
| | Maintenance of organizational clothing and equipment | | [26,500] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [8,969] |
| | SOUTHCOM—Maritime Patrol Aircraft Expansion | | [38,500] |
| | SOUTHCOM—Mission and Other Ship Operations | | [18,000] |
| 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 466,720 | 466,720 |
| 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 1,443,516 | 1,594,265 |
| | Depot maintenance of hardware and munitions | | [46,600] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [104,149] |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 8,080,357 | 8,142,264 |
| | C4I / Cyber capabilities enabling support | | [13,200] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [48,707] |
| 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 3,401,155 | 3,433,155 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [32,000] |
| 120 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS | 443,790 | 443,790 |
| 140 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | | 135,150 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [126,250] |
| | Training, supplies, spares, and repair site support | | [8,900] |
| 180 | US AFRICA COMMAND | 225,382 | 225,382 |
| 190 | US EUROPEAN COMMAND | 141,352 | 185,602 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [44,250] |
| 200 | US SOUTHERN COMMAND | 190,811 | 194,311 |
| | Mission and Other Ship Operations | | [3,500] |
| 210 | US FORCES KOREA | 59,578 | 59,578 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 23,752,390 | 25,349,506 |
| MOBILIZATION | | | |
| 220 | STRATEGIC MOBILITY | 346,667 | 347,791 |
| | Sustainment of strategically positioned assets enabling force projection | | [1,124] |
| 230 | ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS | 422,108 | 483,846 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [56,500] |
| | Sustain Army War Reserve Secondary Items for deployed forces | | [5,238] |
| 240 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 7,750 | 7,750 |
| | SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION | 776,525 | 839,387 |
| TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | | |
| 250 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 137,556 | 137,556 |
| 260 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 58,872 | 58,872 |
| 270 | ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING | 58,035 | 58,035 |
| 280 | SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS | 505,089 | 505,089 |
| 290 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 1,015,541 | 1,018,685 |
| | Leadership development and training | | [3,144] |
| 300 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 1,124,115 | 1,124,115 |
| 310 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 220,688 | 220,688 |
| 320 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 618,164 | 621,690 |
| | Department of the Army directed training | | [3,526] |
| 330 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 613,586 | 613,586 |
| 340 | EXAMINING | 171,223 | 171,223 |
| 350 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 214,738 | 214,738 |
| 360 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 195,099 | 195,099 |
| 370 | JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS | 176,116 | 176,116 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 5,108,822 | 5,115,492 |
| ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 390 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 555,502 | 709,552 |
| | Logistics associated with increased end strength | | [57,900] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [96,150] |
| 400 | CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES | 894,208 | 905,657 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [11,449] |
| 410 | LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 715,462 | 715,462 |
| 420 | AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT | 446,931 | 446,931 |
| 430 | ADMINISTRATION | 493,616 | 493,616 |
| 440 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 2,084,922 | 2,102,822 |
| | Annual maintenance of Enterprise License Agreements | | [17,900] |
| 450 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 259,588 | 259,588 |
| 460 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 326,387 | 326,387 |
| 470 | OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT | 1,087,602 | 1,078,602 |
| | Program decrease | | [-9,000] |
| 480 | ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES | 210,514 | 210,514 |
| 490 | REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT | 243,584 | 243,584 |
| 500 | FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS | 284,592 | 292,992 |
| | DISA migration cost and system support | | [8,400] |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| <i>Line</i> | <i>Item</i> | <i>FY 2018 Request</i> | <i>House Authorized</i> |
|-------------|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 510 | INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS | 415,694 | 415,694 |
| 520 | MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS | 46,856 | 46,856 |
| 565 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 1,242,222 | 1,313,047 |
| | Army Analytics Group | | [5,000] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [65,825] |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES | 9,307,680 | 9,561,304 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 570 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | -426,100 |
| | Excessive standard price for fuel | | [-20,600] |
| | Foreign Currency adjustments | | [-146,400] |
| | Historical unobligated balances | | [-259,100] |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | -426,100 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY | 38,945,417 | 40,439,589 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 010 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 11,461 | 11,461 |
| 020 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 577,410 | 577,410 |
| 030 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 117,298 | 117,298 |
| 040 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 552,016 | 552,016 |
| 050 | AVIATION ASSETS | 80,302 | 81,461 |
| | Increase aviation readiness | | [1,159] |
| 060 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 399,035 | 399,258 |
| | Pay and allowances for career development training | | [223] |
| 070 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 102,687 | 102,687 |
| 080 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 56,016 | 56,016 |
| 090 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 599,947 | 599,947 |
| 100 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 273,940 | 273,940 |
| 110 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS | 22,909 | 22,909 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 2,793,021 | 2,794,403 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | |
| 120 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 11,116 | 11,116 |
| 130 | ADMINISTRATION | 17,962 | 17,962 |
| 140 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 18,550 | 20,950 |
| | Annual maintenance of Enterprise License Agreements | | [2,400] |
| 150 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 6,166 | 6,166 |
| 160 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 60,027 | 60,027 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 113,821 | 116,221 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 190 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | -2,500 |
| | Excessive standard price for fuel | | [-2,500] |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | -2,500 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES | 2,906,842 | 2,908,124 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 777,883 | 810,983 |
| | Unit training and maintenance readiness | | [33,100] |
| 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 190,639 | 190,639 |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 807,557 | 819,457 |
| | Improve training readiness | | [11,900] |
| 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 85,476 | 93,376 |
| | Decisive Action training and operations | | [7,900] |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 36,672 | 38,897 |
| | Aviation contract support for rotary wing aircraft | | [2,225] |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 956,381 | 974,581 |
| | Increase aviation readiness | | [18,200] |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 777,756 | 777,941 |
| | Pay and allowances for career development training | | [185] |
| 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 51,506 | 51,506 |
| 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 244,942 | 244,942 |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,144,726 | 1,144,726 |
| 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 781,895 | 781,895 |
| 120 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS | 999,052 | 999,052 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 6,854,485 | 6,927,995 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | |
| 130 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 7,703 | 7,703 |
| 140 | ADMINISTRATION | 79,236 | 81,236 |
| | Department of Defense State Partnership Program | | [2,000] |
| 150 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 85,160 | 94,760 |
| | Annual maintenance of Enterprise License Agreements | | [9,600] |
| 160 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 8,654 | 8,654 |
| 170 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 268,839 | 268,839 |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| 180 | REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT | 3,093 | 3,093 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 452,685 | 464,285 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 190 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | -10,700 |
| | Excessive standard price for fuel | | [-10,700] |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | -10,700 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG | 7,307,170 | 7,381,580 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 5,544,165 | 5,570,915 |
| | Cbt logistics Mnt for TAO-187 | | [22,000] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [4,750] |
| 020 | FLEET AIR TRAINING | 2,075,000 | 2,075,000 |
| 030 | AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES | 46,801 | 46,801 |
| 040 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 119,624 | 119,624 |
| 050 | AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 552,536 | 594,536 |
| | Fund aviation spt to max executable | | [42,000] |
| 060 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 1,088,482 | 1,088,482 |
| 070 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 40,584 | 40,584 |
| 080 | AVIATION LOGISTICS | 723,786 | 843,786 |
| | Fund aviation logistics to max executable | | [120,000] |
| 090 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 4,067,334 | 4,071,011 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [3,677] |
| 100 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING | 977,701 | 977,701 |
| 110 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 7,165,858 | 7,175,358 |
| | Western Pacific Ship Repair | | [9,500] |
| 120 | SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 2,193,851 | 2,193,851 |
| 130 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE | 1,288,094 | 1,299,494 |
| | Logistics support for legacy C41 systems | | [6,000] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [5,400] |
| 150 | SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE | 206,678 | 211,078 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [4,400] |
| 160 | WARFARE TACTICS | 621,581 | 622,581 |
| | Operational Range and Environmental Compliance | | [1,000] |
| 170 | OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY | 370,681 | 370,681 |
| 180 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 1,437,966 | 1,460,950 |
| | Coastal Riverine Force meet operational requirements | | [7,000] |
| | COMPACFLT C41 Upgrade | | [10,000] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [5,984] |
| 190 | EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE AND DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 162,705 | 162,705 |
| 210 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS | 65,108 | 65,108 |
| 220 | COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT | 86,892 | 155,992 |
| | Joint Training Capability and Exercise Programs | | [64,100] |
| | No-Notice Agile Logistics Exercise | | [5,000] |
| 230 | MILITARY INFORMATION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 8,427 | 8,427 |
| 240 | CYBERSPACE ACTIVITIES | 385,212 | 385,212 |
| 260 | FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE | 1,278,456 | 1,278,456 |
| 280 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 745,680 | 751,980 |
| | Munitions wholeness | | [5,000] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [1,300] |
| 290 | OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 380,016 | 380,016 |
| 300 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION | 914,428 | 914,428 |
| 310 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 1,905,679 | 1,905,679 |
| 320 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 4,333,688 | 4,356,688 |
| | Operational range clearance | | [11,000] |
| | Port Operations Service Craft Maintenance | | [12,000] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 38,787,013 | 39,127,124 |
| | MOBILIZATION | | |
| 330 | SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE | 417,450 | 427,450 |
| | Strategic sealift management | | [10,000] |
| 360 | SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS | 198,341 | 198,341 |
| 370 | EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS | 66,849 | 66,849 |
| 390 | COAST GUARD SUPPORT | 21,870 | 21,870 |
| | SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION | 704,510 | 714,510 |
| | TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | |
| 400 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 143,924 | 143,924 |
| 410 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 8,975 | 8,975 |
| 420 | RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS | 144,708 | 144,708 |
| 430 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 812,708 | 812,708 |
| 450 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 180,448 | 182,448 |
| | Naval Sea Cadets | | [2,000] |
| 460 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 234,596 | 234,596 |
| 470 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 177,517 | 177,517 |
| 480 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 103,154 | 103,154 |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| 490 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 72,216 | 72,216 |
| 500 | JUNIOR ROTC | 53,262 | 53,262 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 1,931,508 | 1,933,508 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | |
| 510 | ADMINISTRATION | 1,135,429 | 1,126,429 |
| | Program decrease | | [-9,000] |
| 530 | CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 149,365 | 149,365 |
| 540 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 386,749 | 386,749 |
| 590 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 165,301 | 165,301 |
| 610 | PLANNING, ENGINEERING, AND PROGRAM SUPPORT | 311,616 | 311,616 |
| 620 | ACQUISITION, LOGISTICS, AND OVERSIGHT | 665,580 | 665,580 |
| 660 | INVESTIGATIVE AND SECURITY SERVICES | 659,143 | 659,143 |
| 775 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 543,193 | 553,193 |
| | Research and Technology Protection | | [10,000] |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 4,016,376 | 4,017,376 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 780 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | -356,800 |
| | Excessive standard price for fuel | | [-143,600] |
| | Foreign Currency adjustments | | [-35,300] |
| | Historical unobligated balances | | [-177,900] |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | -356,800 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY | 45,439,407 | 45,435,718 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 010 | OPERATIONAL FORCES | 967,949 | 1,132,682 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [164,733] |
| 020 | FIELD LOGISTICS | 1,065,090 | 1,065,090 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 286,635 | 286,635 |
| 040 | MARITIME PREPOSITIONING | 85,577 | 85,577 |
| 050 | CYBERSPACE ACTIVITIES | 181,518 | 181,518 |
| 060 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 785,264 | 785,264 |
| 070 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 2,196,252 | 2,196,252 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 5,568,285 | 5,733,018 |
| | TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | |
| 080 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 16,163 | 16,163 |
| 090 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 1,154 | 1,154 |
| 100 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 100,398 | 100,398 |
| 110 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 46,474 | 46,474 |
| 120 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 405,039 | 405,039 |
| 130 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 201,601 | 201,601 |
| 140 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 32,045 | 32,045 |
| 150 | JUNIOR ROTC | 24,394 | 24,394 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 827,268 | 827,268 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | |
| 160 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 28,827 | 28,827 |
| 170 | ADMINISTRATION | 378,683 | 375,683 |
| | Program decrease | | [-3,000] |
| 190 | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 77,684 | 77,684 |
| 215 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 52,661 | 52,661 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 537,855 | 534,855 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 220 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | -38,000 |
| | Excessive standard price for fuel | | [-1,800] |
| | Foreign Currency adjustments | | [-11,400] |
| | Historical unobligated balances | | [-24,800] |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | -38,000 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS | 6,933,408 | 7,057,141 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 596,876 | 596,876 |
| 020 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 5,902 | 5,902 |
| 030 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 94,861 | 94,861 |
| 040 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 381 | 381 |
| 050 | AVIATION LOGISTICS | 13,822 | 13,822 |
| 060 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING | 571 | 571 |
| 070 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 16,718 | 16,718 |
| 080 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 118,079 | 118,079 |
| 090 | CYBERSPACE ACTIVITIES | 308 | 308 |
| 100 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION | 28,650 | 28,650 |
| 110 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 86,354 | 86,354 |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|--|------------------|------------------|
| 120 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 103,596 | 103,596 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 1,066,118 | 1,066,118 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | |
| 130 | ADMINISTRATION | 1,371 | 1,371 |
| 140 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 13,289 | 13,289 |
| 160 | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 3,229 | 3,229 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 17,889 | 17,889 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 180 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | -9,800 |
| | Excessive standard price for fuel | | [-9,800] |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | -9,800 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES | 1,084,007 | 1,074,207 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 010 | OPERATING FORCES | 103,468 | 103,468 |
| 020 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 18,794 | 18,794 |
| 030 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 32,777 | 32,777 |
| 040 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 111,213 | 111,213 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 266,252 | 266,252 |
| | ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | |
| 060 | ADMINISTRATION | 12,585 | 12,585 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 12,585 | 12,585 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 080 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | -300 |
| | Excessive standard price for fuel | | [-300] |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | -300 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE | 278,837 | 278,537 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 694,702 | 727,802 |
| | Adversarial Air Training- mission qualification | | [10,200] |
| | B-2 Replenishment spares | | [9,000] |
| | PACAF Contingency response group | | [4,200] |
| | Rocket system launch program | | [8,000] |
| | Training equipment shortfalls | | [1,700] |
| 020 | COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES | 1,392,326 | 1,547,048 |
| | Battlefield airman equipment assembly | | [8,300] |
| | Personnel recovery requirements | | [500] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [96,522] |
| | TARP contractor specialist | | [800] |
| | Training equipment shortfalls | | [6,000] |
| | Training specialist contract | | [400] |
| | Unified capabilities | | [42,200] |
| 030 | AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS) | 1,128,640 | 1,179,940 |
| | F-35 maintenance instructors | | [49,700] |
| | Readiness decision support enterprise | | [1,600] |
| 040 | DEPOT PURCHASE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 2,755,367 | 2,873,088 |
| | Aircraft depot level repairables | | [92,100] |
| | Battlefield airman equipment | | [7,100] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [18,521] |
| 050 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 3,292,553 | 3,315,253 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [22,700] |
| 060 | CONTRACTOR LOGISTICS SUPPORT AND SYSTEM SUPPORT | 6,555,186 | 6,756,965 |
| | Aircraft depot level repairables | | [177,700] |
| | E4B maintenance personnel | | [1,000] |
| | EC-130H service life extension | | [12,000] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [4,279] |
| | Sustain C-37B | | [6,800] |
| 070 | FLYING HOUR PROGRAM | 4,135,330 | 4,201,997 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [66,667] |
| 080 | BASE SUPPORT | 5,985,232 | 6,090,537 |
| | Application hosting/MSO | | [27,000] |
| | Cloud migration | | [25,600] |
| | Enterprise svcs in FY18 | | [39,000] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [13,705] |
| 090 | GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING | 847,516 | 977,216 |
| | Aviation readiness shortfalls | | [2,000] |
| | Cyber readiness shortfalls | | [35,300] |
| | Cyber security readiness shortfalls | | [57,500] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [2,000] |
| | Space based readiness shortfalls | | [32,900] |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| <i>Line</i> | <i>Item</i> | <i>FY 2018 Request</i> | <i>House Authorized</i> |
|--|---|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 100 | OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS | 1,131,817 | 1,253,379 |
| | Anti-terrorism force protection | | [10,000] |
| | Cyber readiness shortfalls | | [4,000] |
| | Cyber training readiness shortfalls | | [11,000] |
| | EOD training and readiness shortfalls | | [5,400] |
| | Installation processing nodes | | [51,400] |
| | ISR sustainment and readiness | | [9,800] |
| | PACAF- restore contingency response group | | [10,100] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [19,562] |
| | Tailored OPIR intel products | | [300] |
| 120 | LAUNCH FACILITIES | 175,457 | 175,457 |
| 130 | SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 353,458 | 541,758 |
| | Command and Control sustainment and readiness | | [47,100] |
| | Operationalizing commercial SSA | | [15,000] |
| | Space based sustainment and readiness shortfalls | | [126,200] |
| 160 | US NORTHCOM/NORAD | 189,891 | 189,891 |
| 170 | US STRATCOM | 534,236 | 534,236 |
| 180 | US CYBERCOM | 357,830 | 357,830 |
| 190 | US CENTCOM | 168,208 | 168,208 |
| 200 | US SOCOM | 2,280 | 2,280 |
| 210 | US TRANSCOM | 533 | 533 |
| 215 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 1,091,655 | 1,091,655 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 30,792,217 | 31,985,073 |
| MOBILIZATION | | | |
| 220 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS | 1,570,697 | 1,577,097 |
| | C-37B flying hours | | [1,800] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [4,600] |
| 230 | MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS | 130,241 | 288,311 |
| | Basic Expeditionary Airfield Resources PACOM | | [22,600] |
| | BEAR PACOM | | [22,600] |
| | BEAR PACOM spares | | [2,900] |
| | PACAF Contingency response group | | [10,100] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [99,870] |
| | SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION | 1,700,938 | 1,865,408 |
| TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | | |
| 270 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 113,722 | 113,722 |
| 280 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 24,804 | 24,804 |
| 290 | RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) | 95,733 | 95,733 |
| 320 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 395,476 | 395,476 |
| 330 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 501,599 | 501,599 |
| 340 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 287,500 | 287,500 |
| 350 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 91,384 | 91,384 |
| 370 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 166,795 | 166,795 |
| 380 | EXAMINING | 4,134 | 4,134 |
| 390 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 222,691 | 222,691 |
| 400 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 171,974 | 171,974 |
| 410 | JUNIOR ROTC | 60,070 | 60,070 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 2,135,882 | 2,135,882 |
| ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 420 | LOGISTICS OPERATIONS | 805,453 | 808,453 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [3,000] |
| 430 | TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 127,379 | 127,379 |
| 470 | ADMINISTRATION | 911,283 | 911,283 |
| 480 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 432,172 | 422,172 |
| | Program decrease | | [-10,000] |
| 490 | OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | 1,175,658 | 1,166,658 |
| | Program decrease | | [-9,000] |
| 500 | CIVIL AIR PATROL | 26,719 | 29,819 |
| | Civil Air Patrol | | [3,100] |
| 530 | INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT | 76,878 | 76,878 |
| 535 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 1,244,653 | 1,244,653 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 4,800,195 | 4,787,295 |
| UNDISTRIBUTED | | | |
| 540 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | -389,600 |
| | Excessive standard price for fuel | | [-135,400] |
| | Foreign Currency adjustments | | [-84,300] |
| | Historical unobligated balances | | [-169,900] |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | -389,600 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE | 39,429,232 | 40,384,058 |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 1,801,007 | 1,801,007 |
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 210,642 | 210,642 |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|--|------------------|------------------|
| 030 | DEPOT PURCHASE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 403,867 | 403,867 |
| 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 124,951 | 124,951 |
| 050 | CONTRACTOR LOGISTICS SUPPORT AND SYSTEM SUPPORT | 240,835 | 258,635 |
| | C-17 CLS workload | | [5,700] |
| | C-17 depot-level repairable | | [12,100] |
| 060 | BASE SUPPORT | 371,878 | 371,878 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 3,153,180 | 3,170,980 |
| ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 070 | ADMINISTRATION | 74,153 | 74,153 |
| 080 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 19,522 | 19,522 |
| 090 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC) | 12,765 | 12,765 |
| 100 | OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP) | 7,495 | 7,495 |
| 110 | AUDIOVISUAL | 392 | 392 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | 114,327 | 114,327 |
| UNDISTRIBUTED | | | |
| 120 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | -21,900 |
| | Excessive standard price for fuel | | [-21,900] |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | -21,900 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE | 3,267,507 | 3,263,407 |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS | 3,175,055 | 3,265,955 |
| | Additional training man days | | [54,900] |
| | Two C-130 simulators | | [36,000] |
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 746,082 | 801,682 |
| | Additional training man days | | [37,100] |
| | Restore support operations | | [18,500] |
| 030 | DEPOT PURCHASE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 867,063 | 867,063 |
| 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 325,090 | 325,090 |
| 050 | CONTRACTOR LOGISTICS SUPPORT AND SYSTEM SUPPORT | 1,100,829 | 1,152,129 |
| | C-130 propulsion improvements | | [16,100] |
| | Maintenance for RC-26 a/c | | [28,700] |
| | Sustain DCGS | | [6,500] |
| 060 | BASE SUPPORT | 583,664 | 593,464 |
| | Additional training man days | | [9,800] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 6,797,783 | 7,005,383 |
| ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 070 | ADMINISTRATION | 44,955 | 44,955 |
| 080 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 97,230 | 97,230 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES | 142,185 | 142,185 |
| UNDISTRIBUTED | | | |
| 090 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | -43,300 |
| | Excessive standard price for fuel | | [-43,300] |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | -43,300 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG | 6,939,968 | 7,104,268 |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 440,853 | 440,853 |
| 020 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF—CE2T2 | 551,511 | 551,511 |
| 040 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES | 5,008,274 | 5,104,244 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [95,970] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 6,000,638 | 6,096,608 |
| TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | | |
| 050 | DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY | 144,970 | 144,970 |
| 060 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 84,402 | 84,402 |
| 080 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 379,462 | 379,462 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 608,834 | 608,834 |
| ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 090 | CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS | 183,000 | 209,500 |
| | National Guard Youth Challenge | | [1,500] |
| | STARBASE | | [20,000] |
| | World War I Centennial Commission | | [5,000] |
| 110 | DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY | 597,836 | 597,836 |
| 120 | DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY | 1,439,010 | 1,439,010 |
| 130 | DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY | 807,754 | 807,754 |
| 140 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY | 2,009,702 | 2,009,702 |
| 160 | DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY | 24,207 | 24,207 |
| 170 | DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY | 400,422 | 414,922 |
| | Procurement Technical Assistance Program (PTAP) | | [14,500] |

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| 180 | DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY | 217,585 | 215,454 |
| | Program decrease | | [-2,500] |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [369] |
| 190 | DEFENSE PERSONNEL ACCOUNTING AGENCY | 131,268 | 131,268 |
| 200 | DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY | 722,496 | 872,496 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [150,000] |
| 210 | DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE | 683,665 | 703,665 |
| | Joint Acquisition Protection and Exploitation Cell (JAPEC) | | [20,000] |
| 230 | DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION | 34,712 | 34,712 |
| 240 | DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY | 542,604 | 517,604 |
| | Efficiencies from DTRA/JIDO integration | | [-25,000] |
| 260 | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY | 2,794,389 | 2,844,389 |
| | Impact Aid | | [50,000] |
| 270 | MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY | 504,058 | 504,058 |
| 290 | OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT | 57,840 | 57,840 |
| 300 | OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE | 1,488,344 | 1,515,110 |
| | Implementation of Military Housing Fall Prevention | | [16,000] |
| | Implementation of transparency of Defense Business System Data | | [25,000] |
| | Program decrease | | [-17,234] |
| | Support for Commission to Assess the Threat from Electromagnetic Pulse Attacks and Events | | [3,000] |
| 310 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/ADMIN & SVC-WIDE ACTIVITIES | 94,273 | 94,273 |
| 320 | WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES | 436,776 | 436,776 |
| 325 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 14,806,404 | 14,861,724 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [55,320] |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES | 27,976,345 | 28,292,300 |
| | UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| 330 | UNDISTRIBUTED | | -204,900 |
| | Excessive standard price for fuel | | [-6,500] |
| | Foreign Currency adjustments | | [-19,400] |
| | Historical unobligated balances | | [-179,000] |
| | SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED | | -204,900 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE | 34,585,817 | 34,792,842 |
| | MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS | | |
| 010 | US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE | 14,538 | 14,538 |
| 020 | OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID | 104,900 | 104,900 |
| 030 | COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION | 324,600 | 324,600 |
| 050 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY | 215,809 | 215,809 |
| | Department of Defense Cleanup and Removal of Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricant associated with the Prinz Eugen | | [6,000] |
| | Program decrease | | [-6,000] |
| 060 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY | 281,415 | 323,649 |
| | PFOA/PFOS Remediation | | [30,000] |
| | Program increase | | [12,234] |
| 070 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE | 293,749 | 323,749 |
| | PFOA/PFOS Remediation | | [30,000] |
| 080 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE | 9,002 | 9,002 |
| 090 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES | 208,673 | 208,673 |
| | TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS | 1,452,686 | 1,524,920 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE | 188,570,298 | 192,294,497 |

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 828,225 | 144,634 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-683,591] |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 25,474 | 25,474 |
| 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 1,778,644 | 1,778,644 |
| 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 260,575 | 260,575 |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 284,422 | 134,322 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-150,100] |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 2,784,525 | 2,775,556 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-8,969] |
| 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 502,330 | 502,330 |
| 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 104,149 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-104,149] |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 80,249 | 31,542 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-48,707] |
| 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 32,000 | 0 |

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-32,000] |
| 140 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 6,151,378 | 6,025,128 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-126,250] |
| 150 | COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 160 | RESET | 864,926 | 864,926 |
| 180 | US AFRICA COMMAND | 186,567 | 186,567 |
| 190 | US EUROPEAN COMMAND | 44,250 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-44,250] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 13,932,714 | 12,734,698 |
| MOBILIZATION | | | |
| 230 | ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS | 56,500 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-56,500] |
| | SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION | 56,500 | 0 |
| ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 390 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 755,029 | 658,879 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-96,150] |
| 400 | CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES | 16,567 | 5,118 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-11,449] |
| 410 | LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| 420 | AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT | 5,207 | 5,207 |
| 460 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 107,091 | 107,091 |
| 490 | REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT | 165,280 | 165,280 |
| 565 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 1,082,015 | 1,016,190 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-65,825] |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES | 2,137,189 | 1,963,765 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY | 16,126,403 | 14,698,463 |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 020 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 4,179 | 19,822 |
| | Training and operations of USAR early deploying units | | [15,643] |
| 030 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | | 4,718 |
| | Training and operations of USAR early deploying units | | [4,718] |
| 040 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 2,132 | 15,050 |
| | Training and operations of USAR early deploying units | | [12,918] |
| 060 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 779 | 779 |
| 090 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 17,609 | 17,609 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 24,699 | 57,978 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES | 24,699 | 57,978 |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 41,731 | 41,731 |
| 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 762 | 762 |
| 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 11,855 | 11,855 |
| 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 204 | 204 |
| 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 27,583 | 27,583 |
| 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 5,792 | 5,792 |
| 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 18,507 | 18,507 |
| 120 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS | 937 | 937 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 107,371 | 107,371 |
| ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 150 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 740 | 740 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 740 | 740 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG | 108,111 | 108,111 |
| AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND | | | |
| MINISTRY OF DEFENSE | | | |
| 010 | SUSTAINMENT | 2,660,855 | 2,660,855 |
| 020 | INFRASTRUCTURE | 21,000 | 21,000 |
| 030 | EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION | 684,786 | 684,786 |
| 040 | TRAINING AND OPERATIONS | 405,117 | 405,117 |
| | SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF DEFENSE | 3,771,758 | 3,771,758 |
| MINISTRY OF INTERIOR | | | |
| 050 | SUSTAINMENT | 955,574 | 955,574 |
| 060 | INFRASTRUCTURE | 39,595 | 39,595 |
| 070 | EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION | 75,976 | 75,976 |
| 080 | TRAINING AND OPERATIONS | 94,612 | 94,612 |
| | SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF INTERIOR | 1,165,757 | 1,165,757 |
| | TOTAL AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND | 4,937,515 | 4,937,515 |

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| <i>Line</i> | <i>Item</i> | <i>FY 2018 Request</i> | <i>House Authorized</i> |
|--|--|------------------------|-------------------------|
| COUNTER-ISIS TRAIN & EQUIP FUND | | | |
| COUNTER-ISIS TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND (CTEF) | | | |
| 010 | IRAQ | 1,269,000 | 1,269,000 |
| 020 | SYRIA | 500,000 | 500,000 |
| | SUBTOTAL COUNTER-ISIS TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND (CTEF) | 1,769,000 | 1,769,000 |
| | TOTAL COUNTER-ISIS TRAIN & EQUIP FUND | 1,769,000 | 1,769,000 |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 412,710 | 407,960 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-4,750] |
| 030 | AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES | 1,750 | 1,750 |
| 040 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 2,989 | 2,989 |
| 050 | AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 144,030 | 144,030 |
| 060 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 211,196 | 211,196 |
| 070 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,921 | 1,921 |
| 080 | AVIATION LOGISTICS | 102,834 | 102,834 |
| 090 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 855,453 | 851,776 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-3,677] |
| 100 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING | 19,627 | 19,627 |
| 110 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 2,483,179 | 2,548,179 |
| | Repairs related to USS Fitzgerald | | [65,000] |
| 130 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE | 58,886 | 53,486 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-5,400] |
| 150 | SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE | 4,400 | 0 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-4,400] |
| 160 | WARFARE TACTICS | 21,550 | 21,550 |
| 170 | OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY | 21,104 | 21,104 |
| 180 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 605,936 | 599,952 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-5,984] |
| 190 | EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE AND DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 11,433 | 11,433 |
| 280 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 325,011 | 323,711 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-1,300] |
| 290 | OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 9,598 | 9,598 |
| 310 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 31,898 | 31,898 |
| 320 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 228,246 | 228,246 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 5,553,751 | 5,593,240 |
| MOBILIZATION | | | |
| 360 | SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS | 1,869 | 1,869 |
| 370 | EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS | 11,905 | 11,905 |
| 390 | COAST GUARD SUPPORT | 161,885 | 161,885 |
| | SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION | 175,659 | 175,659 |
| TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | | |
| 430 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 43,369 | 43,369 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 43,369 | 43,369 |
| ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 510 | ADMINISTRATION | 3,217 | 3,217 |
| 540 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 7,356 | 7,356 |
| 590 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 67,938 | 67,938 |
| 620 | ACQUISITION, LOGISTICS, AND OVERSIGHT | 9,446 | 9,446 |
| 660 | INVESTIGATIVE AND SECURITY SERVICES | 1,528 | 1,528 |
| 775 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 12,751 | 12,751 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 102,236 | 102,236 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY | 5,875,015 | 5,914,504 |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | OPERATIONAL FORCES | 710,790 | 546,057 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-164,733] |
| 020 | FIELD LOGISTICS | 242,150 | 242,150 |
| 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 52,000 | 52,000 |
| 070 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 17,529 | 17,529 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 1,022,469 | 857,736 |
| TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | | |
| 120 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 29,421 | 29,421 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 29,421 | 29,421 |
| ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 160 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 61,600 | 61,600 |
| 215 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 3,150 | 3,150 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 64,750 | 64,750 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS | 1,116,640 | 951,907 |

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|--|-------------------|------------------|
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 030 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 14,964 | 14,964 |
| 080 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 9,016 | 9,016 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 23,980 | 23,980 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES | 23,980 | 23,980 |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | OPERATING FORCES | 2,548 | 2,548 |
| 040 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 819 | 819 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 3,367 | 3,367 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE | 3,367 | 3,367 |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 248,235 | 248,235 |
| 020 | COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES | 1,394,962 | 1,298,440 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-96,522] |
| 030 | AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS) | 5,450 | 5,450 |
| 040 | DEPOT PURCHASE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 699,860 | 719,339 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-18,521] |
| | Restoration of Damaged U-2 Aircraft | | [38,000] |
| 050 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 113,131 | 90,431 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-22,700] |
| 060 | CONTRACTOR LOGISTICS SUPPORT AND SYSTEM SUPPORT | 2,039,551 | 2,035,272 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-4,279] |
| 070 | FLYING HOUR PROGRAM | 2,059,363 | 1,992,696 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-66,667] |
| 080 | BASE SUPPORT | 1,088,946 | 1,075,241 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-13,705] |
| 090 | GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING | 15,274 | 13,274 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-2,000] |
| 100 | OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS | 198,090 | 178,528 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-19,562] |
| 120 | LAUNCH FACILITIES | 385 | 385 |
| 130 | SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 22,020 | 22,020 |
| 160 | US NORTHCOM/NORAD | 381 | 381 |
| 170 | US STRATCOM | 698 | 698 |
| 180 | US CYBERCOM | 35,239 | 35,239 |
| 190 | US CENTCOM | 159,520 | 159,520 |
| 200 | US SOCOM | 19,000 | 19,000 |
| 215 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 58,098 | 58,098 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 8,158,203 | 7,952,247 |
| MOBILIZATION | | | |
| 220 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS | 1,430,316 | 1,425,716 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-4,600] |
| 230 | MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS | 213,827 | 113,957 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-99,870] |
| | SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION | 1,644,143 | 1,539,673 |
| TRAINING AND RECRUITING | | | |
| 270 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 300 | 300 |
| 280 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 298 | 298 |
| 290 | RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) | 90 | 90 |
| 320 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 25,675 | 25,675 |
| 330 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 879 | 879 |
| 340 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 1,114 | 1,114 |
| 350 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 1,426 | 1,426 |
| | SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING | 29,782 | 29,782 |
| ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 420 | LOGISTICS OPERATIONS | 151,847 | 148,847 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-3,000] |
| 430 | TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 8,744 | 8,744 |
| 470 | ADMINISTRATION | 6,583 | 6,583 |
| 480 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 129,508 | 129,508 |
| 490 | OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | 84,110 | 84,110 |
| 530 | INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT | 120 | 120 |
| 535 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 53,255 | 53,255 |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES | 434,167 | 431,167 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE | 10,266,295 | 9,952,869 |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE | | | |

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 030 | DEPOT PURCHASE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 52,323 | 52,323 |
| 060 | BASE SUPPORT | 6,200 | 6,200 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 58,523 | 58,523 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE | 58,523 | 58,523 |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 3,468 | 3,468 |
| 060 | BASE SUPPORT | 11,932 | 11,932 |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 15,400 | 15,400 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG | 15,400 | 15,400 |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 010 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 4,841 | 4,841 |
| 040 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES | 3,305,234 | 3,236,404 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-95,970] |
| | Unfunded Requirement- Joint Task Force Platform Expansion | | [6,300] |
| | Unfunded Requirement- Publicly Available Information (PAI) Capability Acceleration | | [20,840] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | 3,310,075 | 3,241,245 |
| ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 110 | DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY | 9,853 | 9,853 |
| 120 | DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY | 21,317 | 21,317 |
| 140 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY | 64,137 | 64,137 |
| 160 | DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY | 115,000 | 115,000 |
| 180 | DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY | 13,255 | 12,886 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-369] |
| 200 | DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY | 2,312,000 | 2,012,000 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-150,000] |
| | Transfer of funds to Ukraine Security Assistance | | [-150,000] |
| 260 | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY | 31,000 | 31,000 |
| 300 | OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE | 34,715 | 34,715 |
| 320 | WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES | 3,179 | 3,179 |
| 325 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 1,797,549 | 1,742,229 |
| | Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-55,320] |
| | SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES | 4,402,005 | 4,046,316 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE | 7,712,080 | 7,287,561 |
| UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE | | | |
| UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE | | | |
| 010 | UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE | | 150,000 |
| | Transfer from DSCA | | [150,000] |
| | SUBTOTAL UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE | | 150,000 |
| | TOTAL UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE | | 150,000 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE | 48,037,028 | 45,929,178 |

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|---|-----------------|------------------|
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | | 629,047 |
| | Demolition of excess facilities | | [50,000] |
| | Restore restoration and modernization shortfalls | | [154,500] |
| | Restore sustainment shortfalls | | [424,547] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | | 629,047 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY | | 629,047 |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES | | | |
| OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| 100 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | | 82,619 |
| | Demolition of excess facilities | | [25,000] |
| | Restore restoration and modernization shortfalls | | [12,300] |
| | Restore sustainment shortfalls | | [45,319] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | | 82,619 |

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|------|--|--------------------|---------------------|
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES | | 82,619 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | | 173,900 |
| | Demolition of excess facilities | | [25,000] |
| | Restore restoration and modernization shortfalls | | [35,200] |
| | Restore sustainment shortfalls | | [113,700] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | | 173,900 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG | | 173,900 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 310 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | | 414,200 |
| | Demolition of excess facilities | | [50,000] |
| | Restore restoration and modernization shortfalls | | [87,200] |
| | Restore sustainment shortfalls | | [277,000] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | | 414,200 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY | | 414,200 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 060 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | | 217,487 |
| | Demolition of excess facilities | | [50,000] |
| | Restore restoration and modernization shortfalls | | [35,300] |
| | Restore sustainment shortfalls | | [132,187] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | | 217,487 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS | | 217,487 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 110 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | | 11,500 |
| | Restore restoration and modernization shortfalls | | [1,500] |
| | Restore sustainment shortfalls | | [10,000] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | | 11,500 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES | | 11,500 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 030 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | | 7,246 |
| | Restore restoration and modernization shortfalls | | [3,900] |
| | Restore sustainment shortfalls | | [3,346] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | | 7,246 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE | | 7,246 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 050 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | | 507,700 |
| | Demolition of excess facilities | | [50,000] |
| | Restore restoration and modernization shortfalls | | [153,300] |
| | Restore sustainment shortfalls | | [304,400] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | | 507,700 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE | | 507,700 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | | 15,300 |
| | Restore restoration and modernization shortfalls | | [5,600] |
| | Restore sustainment shortfalls | | [9,700] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | | 15,300 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE | | 15,300 |
| | OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG | | |
| | OPERATING FORCES | | |
| 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | | 47,600 |
| | Restore restoration and modernization shortfalls | | [14,600] |
| | Restore sustainment shortfalls | | [33,000] |
| | SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES | | 47,600 |
| | TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG | | 47,600 |

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Line | Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|------|-----------------|------------------|
| TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE | | | 2,106,599 |

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| Military Personnel Appropriations | 133,881,636 | 134,066,025 |
| Military Personnel Pay Raise | | [206,400] |
| Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [214,289] |
| Freeze BAH reduction for Military Housing Privatization Initiative | | [125,000] |
| Historical unobligated balances | | [-363,300] |
| Department of Defense State Partnership Program | | [2,000] |
| Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions | 7,804,427 | 7,804,427 |
| Total, Military Personnel | 141,686,063 | 141,870,452 |

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|------------------|------------------|
| Military Personnel Appropriations | 4,276,276 | 4,061,987 |
| Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [-214,289] |

SEC. 4403. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.

SEC. 4403. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|-----------------|------------------|
| Military Personnel Appropriations | | 1,017,700 |
| Increase Active Army end strength by 10k | | [829,400] |
| Increase Army National Guard end strength by 4k | | [105,500] |
| Increase Army Reserve end strength by 3k | | [82,800] |
| Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions | | 44,140 |
| Accrual payment associated with increased Army end strength | | [44,140] |
| Total, Military Personnel | | 1,061,840 |

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|------------------|------------------|
| WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY | | |
| INDUSTRIAL OPERATIONS | 43,140 | 43,140 |
| SUPPLY MANAGEMENT—ARMY | 40,636 | 90,747 |
| Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base | | [50,111] |
| TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY | 83,776 | 133,887 |
| WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE | | |
| SUPPLY MANAGEMENT | 66,462 | 66,462 |
| TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE | 66,462 | 66,462 |
| WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA | | |
| COMMISSARY OPERATIONS | 1,389,340 | 1,344,340 |
| Civilian Personnel Compensation and Benefits | | [-20,000] |
| Commissary operations | | [-25,000] |
| TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA | 1,389,340 | 1,344,340 |
| WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE | | |
| SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT—DEFENSE | 47,018 | 47,018 |
| TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE | 47,018 | 47,018 |

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND | | |
| LG MED SPD RO/RO MAINTENANCE | 135,800 | 135,800 |
| DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS | 11,197 | 11,197 |
| TAH MAINTENANCE | 54,453 | 54,453 |
| RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 18,622 | 18,622 |
| READY RESERVE FORCES | 289,255 | 296,255 |
| Strategic Sealift SLEP | | [7,000] |
| TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND | 509,327 | 516,327 |
| CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION | | |
| CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—O&M | 104,237 | 104,237 |
| CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—RDT&E | 839,414 | 839,414 |
| CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—PROC | 18,081 | 18,081 |
| TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION | 961,732 | 961,732 |
| DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF | | |
| DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE | 674,001 | 691,001 |
| Administrative Overhead | | [-2,000] |
| SOUTHCOM ISR | | [21,000] |
| Travel, Infrastructure, Support | | [-2,000] |
| DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM | 116,813 | 116,813 |
| TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF | 790,814 | 807,814 |
| OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL | | |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE | 334,087 | 334,087 |
| RDT&E | 2,800 | 2,800 |
| TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL | 336,887 | 336,887 |
| DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM | | |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE | | |
| IN-HOUSE CARE | 9,457,768 | 9,475,768 |
| Maintenance of inpatient capabilities of OCONUS MTFs | | [10,000] |
| Pre-mobilization health care under section 12304b | | [8,000] |
| PRIVATE SECTOR CARE | 15,317,732 | 15,317,732 |
| CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT | 2,193,045 | 2,193,045 |
| INFORMATION MANAGEMENT | 1,803,733 | 1,803,733 |
| MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES | 330,752 | 321,752 |
| Program decrease | | [-9,000] |
| EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 737,730 | 737,730 |
| BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS | 2,255,163 | 2,255,163 |
| RDT&E | | |
| RESEARCH | 9,796 | 9,796 |
| EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT | 64,881 | 64,881 |
| ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 246,268 | 276,268 |
| Program increase for hypoxia research | | [5,000] |
| Research of chronic traumatic encephalopathy | | [25,000] |
| DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION | 99,039 | 99,039 |
| ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT | 170,602 | 170,602 |
| MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT | 69,191 | 69,191 |
| CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT | 13,438 | 13,438 |
| PROCUREMENT | | |
| INITIAL OUTFITTING | 26,978 | 26,978 |
| REPLACEMENT & MODERNIZATION | 360,831 | 360,831 |
| THEATER MEDICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM | | |
| JOINT OPERATIONAL MEDICINE INFORMATION SYSTEM | 8,326 | 8,326 |
| DOD HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MODERNIZATION | 499,193 | 499,193 |
| UNDISTRIBUTED | | |
| UNDISTRIBUTED | | -149,600 |
| Foreign Currency adjustments | | [-15,500] |
| Historical unobligated balances | | [-134,100] |
| TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM | 33,664,466 | 33,545,866 |
| TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS | 37,849,822 | 37,760,333 |

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVER-SEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY | | |
| INDUSTRIAL OPERATIONS | | |

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Item | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|-----------------|------------------|
| SUPPLY MANAGEMENT—ARMY | 50,111 | -50,111 |
| <i>Realign European Reassurance Initiative to Base</i> | | [-50,111] |
| TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY | 50,111 | -50,111 |
| WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE | | |
| ENERGY MANAGEMENT—DEFENSE | 70,000 | 70,000 |
| SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT—DEFENSE | 28,845 | 28,845 |
| TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE | 98,845 | 98,845 |
| DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF | | |
| DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE | 196,300 | 196,300 |
| TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF | 196,300 | 196,300 |
| OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL | | |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE | 24,692 | 24,692 |
| TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL | 24,692 | 24,692 |
| DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM | | |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE | | |
| IN-HOUSE CARE | 61,857 | 61,857 |
| PRIVATE SECTOR CARE | 331,968 | 331,968 |
| CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT | 1,980 | 1,980 |
| TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM | 395,805 | 395,805 |
| TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS | 765,753 | 715,642 |

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/Country and Installation | Project Title | FY 2018 Request | House Agreement |
|---------|--|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| Army | Alabama Fort Rucker | Training Support Facility | 38,000 | 38,000 |
| Army | Arizona Davis-Monthan AFB | General Instruction Building | 22,000 | 22,000 |
| Army | Fort Huachuca | Ground Transport Equipment Building | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| Army | California Fort Irwin | Land Acquisition | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Army | Colorado Fort Carson | Ammunition Supply Point | 21,000 | 21,000 |
| Army | Fort Carson | Battlefield Weather Facility | 8,300 | 8,300 |
| Army | Florida Eglin AFB | Multipurpose Range Complex | 18,000 | 18,000 |
| Army | Georgia Fort Benning | Air Traffic Control Tower | 0 | 10,800 |
| Army | Fort Benning | Training Support Facility | 28,000 | 28,000 |
| Army | Fort Gordon | Access Control Point | 33,000 | 33,000 |
| Army | Fort Gordon | Automation-Aided Instructional Building | 18,500 | 18,500 |
| Army | Germany Stuttgart | Commissary | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| Army | Wiesbaden | Administrative Building | 43,000 | 43,000 |
| Army | Hawaii Fort Shafter | Command and Control Facility, Incr 3 | 90,000 | 90,000 |
| Army | Indiana Crane Army Ammunition Plant | Shipping and Receiving Building | 24,000 | 24,000 |
| Army | Korea Kunsan AB | Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar | 53,000 | 53,000 |
| Army | New York U.S. Military Academy | Cemetery | 22,000 | 22,000 |
| Army | South Carolina Fort Jackson | Reception Barracks Complex, Ph1 | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| Army | Shaw AFB | Mission Training Complex | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Army | Texas Camp Bullis | Vehicle Maintenance Shop | 13,600 | 13,600 |
| Army | Fort Hood | Vehicle Maintenance Shop | 0 | 33,000 |
| Army | Fort Hood, Texas | Battalion Headquarters Complex | 37,000 | 37,000 |
| Army | Turkey Turkey Various | Forward Operating Site | 6,400 | 0 |
| Army | Virginia Fort Belvoir | Secure Admin/Operations Facility, Incr 3 | 14,124 | 14,124 |
| Army | Joint Base Langley-Eustis | Aircraft Maintenance Instructional Bldg | 34,000 | 34,000 |
| Army | Joint Base Myer-Henderson | Security Fence | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Army | Washington Joint Base Lewis-McChord | Confinement Facility | 66,000 | 66,000 |
| Army | Yakima | Fire Station | 19,500 | 19,500 |
| | Worldwide Unspecified | | | |

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/Country and Installation | Project Title | FY 2018 Request | House Agreement |
|--|--|--|------------------|------------------|
| Army | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Host Nation Support | 28,700 | 28,700 |
| Army | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 72,770 | 72,770 |
| Army | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Prior Year Savings: Unspecified Minor Construction, Army | 0 | -10,000 |
| Army | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 31,500 | 41,500 |
| Military Construction, Army Total | | | 920,394 | 957,794 |
| Navy | Arizona Yuma | Enlisted Dining Facility & Community Bldgs | 36,358 | 36,358 |
| Navy | California Barstow | Combat Vehicle Repair Facility | 36,539 | 36,539 |
| Navy | Camp Pendleton | Ammunition Supply Point Upgrade | 61,139 | 61,139 |
| Navy | Coronado | Undersea Rescue Command Operations Building | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| Navy | Lemoore | F/A 18 Avionics Repair Facility Replacement | 60,828 | 60,828 |
| Navy | Miramar | Aircraft Maintenance Hangar (Inc 2) | 39,600 | 39,600 |
| Navy | Miramar | F-35 Simulator Facility | 0 | 47,600 |
| Navy | Twentynine Palms | Potable Water Treatment/Blending Facility | 55,099 | 55,099 |
| Navy | District of Columbia NSA Washington | Electronics Science and Technology Laboratory | 37,882 | 37,882 |
| Navy | NSA Washington | Washington Navy Yard AT/FP | 60,000 | 14,810 |
| Navy | Djibouti Camp Lemonnier | Aircraft Parking Apron Expansion | 13,390 | 0 |
| Navy | Florida Mayport | Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant (AWWTP) | 74,994 | 74,994 |
| Navy | Mayport | Missile Magazines | 9,824 | 9,824 |
| Navy | Georgia Albany | Combat Vehicle Warehouse | 0 | 43,300 |
| Navy | Greece Souda Bay | Strategic Aircraft Parking Apron Expansion | 22,045 | 22,045 |
| Navy | Guam Joint Region Marianas | Aircraft Maintenance Hangar #2 | 75,233 | 75,233 |
| Navy | Joint Region Marianas | Corrosion Control Hangar | 66,747 | 66,747 |
| Navy | Joint Region Marianas | MALS Facilities | 49,431 | 49,431 |
| Navy | Joint Region Marianas | Navy-Commercial Tie-in Hardening | 37,180 | 37,180 |
| Navy | Joint Region Marianas | Water Well Field | 56,088 | 56,088 |
| Navy | Hawaii Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam | Sewer Lift Station & Relief Sewer Line | 73,200 | 73,200 |
| Navy | Kaneohe Bay | LHD Pad Conversions MV-22 Landing Pads | 19,012 | 19,012 |
| Navy | Wahiawa | Communications/Crypto Facility | 65,864 | 65,864 |
| Navy | Japan Iwakuni | KC-130J Enlisted Aircrew Trainer Facility | 21,860 | 21,860 |
| Navy | Maine Kittery | Paint, Blast, and Rubber Facility | 61,692 | 61,692 |
| Navy | North Carolina Camp Lejeune | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters | 37,983 | 37,983 |
| Navy | Camp Lejeune | Water Treatment Plant Replacement Hadnot Pt | 65,784 | 65,784 |
| Navy | Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point | F-35B Vertical Lift Fan Test Facility | 15,671 | 15,671 |
| Navy | Virginia Dam Neck | ISR Operations Facility Expansion | 29,262 | 29,262 |
| Navy | Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek—Story | ACU-4 Electrical Upgrades | 2,596 | 2,596 |
| Navy | Norfolk Portsmouth | Chambers Field Magazine Recap PH 1 | 34,665 | 34,665 |
| Navy | Yorktown | Ship Repair Training Facility | 72,990 | 72,990 |
| Navy | Washington Indian Island | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters | 36,358 | 36,358 |
| Navy | Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Missile Magazines | 44,440 | 44,440 |
| Navy | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 219,069 | 219,069 |
| Navy | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Prior Year Savings: Unspecified Minor Construction | 0 | -10,000 |
| Navy | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 23,842 | 23,842 |
| Military Construction, Navy Total | | | 1,616,665 | 1,674,985 |
| AF | Alaska Eielson AFB | F-35A ADAL Conventional Munitions Facility | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| AF | Eielson AFB | F-35A Age Facility / Fillstand | 21,000 | 21,000 |
| AF | Eielson AFB | F-35A Consolidated Munitions Admin Facility | 27,000 | 27,000 |
| AF | Eielson AFB | F-35A Extend Utiliduct to South Loop | 48,000 | 48,000 |
| AF | Eielson AFB | F-35A OSS/Weapons/Intel Facility | 11,800 | 11,800 |
| AF | Eielson AFB | F-35A R-11 Fuel Truck Shelter | 9,600 | 9,600 |
| AF | Eielson AFB | F-35A Satellite Dining Facility | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| AF | Eielson AFB | Repair Central Heat/Power Plant Boiler PH 4 | 41,000 | 41,000 |
| AF | Australia Darwin | APR—Bulk Fuel Storage Tanks | 76,000 | 76,000 |
| AF | California Travis Air Force Base | KC-46A ADAL B14 Fuel Cell Hangar | 0 | 1,400 |
| AF | Travis Air Force Base | KC-46A Aircraft 3-Bay Maintenance Hangar | 0 | 107,000 |
| AF | Travis Air Force Base | KC-46A Alter B181/185/187 Squad Ops/AMU | 0 | 6,400 |
| AF | Travis Air Force Base | KC-46A Alter B811 Corrosion Control Hangar | 0 | 7,700 |

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/Country and Installation | Project Title | FY 2018 Request | House Agreement |
|---|---------------------------------|---|------------------|------------------|
| <i>Colorado</i> | | | | |
| AF | Buckley Air Force Base | SBIRS Operations Facility | 38,000 | 38,000 |
| AF | Fort Carson, Colorado | 13 ASOS Expansion | 13,000 | 13,000 |
| AF | U.S. Air Force Academy | Air Force Cyberworx | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| <i>Florida</i> | | | | |
| AF | Eglin AFB | F-35A Armament Research Fac Addition (B614) | 8,700 | 8,700 |
| AF | Eglin AFB | Long-Range Stand-Off Acquisition Fac | 38,000 | 38,000 |
| AF | Eglin AFB | Dormitories (288 RM) | 0 | 44,000 |
| AF | MacDill AFB | KC-135 Beddown OG/MXG HQ | 8,100 | 8,100 |
| AF | Tyndall AFB | Fire Station | 0 | 17,000 |
| <i>Georgia</i> | | | | |
| AF | Robins AFB | Commercial Vehicle Visitor Control Facility | 9,800 | 9,800 |
| <i>Italy</i> | | | | |
| AF | Aviano AB | Guardian Angel Operations Facility | 27,325 | 0 |
| <i>Kansas</i> | | | | |
| AF | McConnell AFB | Combat Arms Facility | 17,500 | 17,500 |
| <i>Mariana Islands</i> | | | | |
| AF | Tinian | APR Land Acquisition | 12,900 | 12,900 |
| <i>Maryland</i> | | | | |
| AF | Joint Base Andrews | PAR Land Acquisition | 17,500 | 17,500 |
| AF | Joint Base Andrews | Presidential Aircraft Recap Complex | 254,000 | 124,000 |
| <i>Massachusetts</i> | | | | |
| AF | Hanscom AFB | Vandenberg Gate Complex | 11,400 | 11,400 |
| <i>Nevada</i> | | | | |
| AF | Nellis AFB | Red Flag 5th Gen Facility Addition | 23,000 | 23,000 |
| AF | Nellis AFB | Virtual Warfare Center Operations Facility | 38,000 | 38,000 |
| <i>New Jersey</i> | | | | |
| AF | McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | KC-46A ADAL B1749 for ATGL & LST Servicing | 0 | 2,000 |
| AF | McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | KC-46A ADAL B1816 for Supply | 0 | 6,900 |
| AF | McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | KC-46A ADAL B2319 for Boom Operator Trainer | 0 | 6,100 |
| AF | McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | KC-46A ADAL B2324 Regional Mx Training Fac | 0 | 18,000 |
| AF | McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | KC-46A ADAL B3209 for Fuselage Trainer | 0 | 3,300 |
| AF | McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | KC-46A Add to B1837 for Body Tanks Storage | 0 | 2,300 |
| AF | McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | KC-46A Aerospace Ground Equipment Storage | 0 | 4,100 |
| AF | McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | KC-46A Alter Apron & Fuel Hydrants | 0 | 17,000 |
| AF | McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | KC-46A Alter Bldgs for Ops and TFI AMU-AMXS | 0 | 9,000 |
| AF | McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | KC-46A Alter Facilities for Maintenance | 0 | 5,800 |
| AF | McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | KC-46A Two-Bay General Purpose Maintenance Hangar | 0 | 72,000 |
| <i>New Mexico</i> | | | | |
| AF | Cannon AFB | Dangerous Cargo Pad Relocate CATM | 42,000 | 42,000 |
| AF | Holloman AFB | RPA Fixed Ground Control Station Facility | 4,250 | 4,250 |
| AF | Kirtland Air Force Base | Fire Station | 0 | 9,300 |
| <i>North Dakota</i> | | | | |
| AF | Minot AFB | Indoor Firing Range | 27,000 | 27,000 |
| <i>Oklahoma</i> | | | | |
| AF | Altus AFB | KC-46A FTU Fuselage Trainer Phase 2 | 4,900 | 4,900 |
| <i>Qatar</i> | | | | |
| AF | Al Udeid, Qatar | Consolidated Squadron Operations Facility | 15,000 | 0 |
| <i>Texas</i> | | | | |
| AF | Joint Base San Antonio | Air Traffic Control Tower | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| AF | Joint Base San Antonio | BMT Classrooms/Dining Facility 4 | 38,000 | 38,000 |
| AF | Joint Base San Antonio | BMT Recruit Dormitory 7 | 90,130 | 90,130 |
| AF | Joint Base San Antonio | Camp Bullis Dining Facility | 18,500 | 18,500 |
| <i>Turkey</i> | | | | |
| AF | Incirlik AB | Dormitory—216 PN | 25,997 | 0 |
| <i>United Kingdom</i> | | | | |
| AF | Royal Air Force Fairford | EIC RC-135 Infrastructure | 2,150 | 2,150 |
| AF | Royal Air Force Fairford | EIC RC-135 Intel and Squad Ops Facility | 38,000 | 38,000 |
| AF | Royal Air Force Fairford | EIC RC-135 Runway Overrun Reconfiguration | 5,500 | 5,500 |
| AF | Royal Air Force Lakenheath | Consolidated Corrosion Control Facility | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| AF | Royal Air Force Lakenheath | F-35A 6-Bay Hangar | 24,000 | 24,000 |
| AF | Royal Air Force Lakenheath | F-35A F-15 Parking | 10,800 | 10,800 |
| AF | Royal Air Force Lakenheath | F-35A Field Training Detachment Facility | 12,492 | 12,492 |
| AF | Royal Air Force Lakenheath | F-35A Flight Simulator Facility | 22,000 | 22,000 |
| AF | Royal Air Force Lakenheath | F-35A Infrastructure | 6,700 | 6,700 |
| AF | Royal Air Force Lakenheath | F-35A Squadron Operations and AMU | 41,000 | 41,000 |
| <i>Utah</i> | | | | |
| AF | Hill AFB | UTTR Consolidated Mission Control Center | 28,000 | 28,000 |
| <i>Worldwide</i> | | | | |
| AF | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | KC-46A Main Operating Base 4 | 269,000 | 0 |
| <i>Worldwide Unspecified</i> | | | | |
| AF | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 97,852 | 97,852 |
| AF | Various Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 31,400 | 31,400 |
| <i>Wyoming</i> | | | | |
| AF | F. E. Warren AFB | Consolidated HELO/TRF OPS//AMU and Alert Facility | 62,000 | 62,000 |
| Military Construction, Air Force Total | | | 1,738,796 | 1,610,774 |

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/Country and Installation | Project Title | FY 2018 Request | House Agreement |
|----------|---|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| | California | | | |
| Def-Wide | Camp Pendleton | Ambulatory Care Center Replacement | 26,400 | 26,400 |
| Def-Wide | Camp Pendleton | SOF Marine Battalion Company/Team Facilities | 9,958 | 9,958 |
| Def-Wide | Camp Pendleton | SOF Motor Transport Facility Expansion | 7,284 | 7,284 |
| Def-Wide | Coronado | SOF Basic Training Command | 96,077 | 96,077 |
| Def-Wide | Coronado | SOF Logistics Support Unit One Ops Fac. #3 | 46,175 | 46,175 |
| Def-Wide | Coronado | SOF Seal Team Ops Facility | 66,218 | 66,218 |
| Def-Wide | Coronado | SOF Seal Team Ops Facility | 50,265 | 50,265 |
| | Colorado | | | |
| Def-Wide | Schriever AFB | Ambulatory Care Center/Dental Add./Alt. | 10,200 | 10,200 |
| | CONUS Classified | | | |
| Def-Wide | Classified Location | Battalion Complex, PH 1 | 64,364 | 64,364 |
| | Florida | | | |
| Def-Wide | Eglin AFB | SOF Simulator Facility | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Def-Wide | Eglin AFB | Upgrade Open Storage Yard | 4,100 | 4,100 |
| Def-Wide | Hurlburt Field | SOF Combat Aircraft Parking Apron | 34,700 | 34,700 |
| Def-Wide | Hurlburt Field | SOF Simulator & Fuselage Trainer Facility | 11,700 | 11,700 |
| | Georgia | | | |
| Def-Wide | Fort Gordon | Blood Donor Center Replacement | 10,350 | 10,350 |
| | Germany | | | |
| Def-Wide | Rhine Ordnance Barracks | Medical Center Replacement Incr 7 | 106,700 | 106,700 |
| Def-Wide | Spangdahlem AB | Spangdahlem Elementary School Replacement | 79,141 | 79,141 |
| Def-Wide | Stuttgart | Robinson Barracks Elem. School Replacement | 46,609 | 46,609 |
| | Greece | | | |
| Def-Wide | Souda Bay | Construct Hydrant System | 18,100 | 18,100 |
| | Guam | | | |
| Def-Wide | Andersen AFB | Construct Truck Load & Unload Facility | 23,900 | 23,900 |
| | Hawaii | | | |
| Def-Wide | Kunua | NSAH Kunua Tunnel Entrance | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| | Italy | | | |
| Def-Wide | Signonella | Construct Hydrant System | 22,400 | 0 |
| Def-Wide | Vicenza | Vicenza High School Replacement | 62,406 | 62,406 |
| | Japan | | | |
| Def-Wide | Iwakuni | Construct Bulk Storage Tanks PH 1 | 30,800 | 30,800 |
| Def-Wide | Kadena AB | SOF Maintenance Hangar | 3,972 | 3,972 |
| Def-Wide | Kadena AB | SOF Special Tactics Operations Facility | 27,573 | 27,573 |
| Def-Wide | Okinawa | Replace Mooring System | 11,900 | 11,900 |
| Def-Wide | Sasebo | Upgrade Fuel Wharf | 45,600 | 45,600 |
| Def-Wide | Torri Commo Station | SOF Tactical Equipment Maintenance Fac | 25,323 | 25,323 |
| Def-Wide | Yokota AB | Airfield Apron | 10,800 | 10,800 |
| Def-Wide | Yokota AB | Hangar/Aircraft Maintenance Unit | 12,034 | 12,034 |
| Def-Wide | Yokota AB | Operations and Warehouse Facilities | 8,590 | 8,590 |
| Def-Wide | Yokota AB | Simulator Facility | 2,189 | 2,189 |
| | Maryland | | | |
| Def-Wide | Bethesda Naval Hospital | Medical Center Addition/Alteration Incr 2 | 123,800 | 123,800 |
| Def-Wide | Fort Meade | NSAW Recapitalize Building #2 Incr 3 | 313,968 | 313,968 |
| | Missouri | | | |
| Def-Wide | Fort Leonard Wood | Blood Processing Center Replacement | 11,941 | 0 |
| Def-Wide | Fort Leonard Wood | Hospital Replacement | 250,000 | 150,000 |
| Def-Wide | St Louis | Next NGA West (N2W) Complex | 381,000 | 200,000 |
| | New Mexico | | | |
| Def-Wide | Cannon AFB | SOF C-130 AGE Facility | 8,228 | 8,228 |
| | North Carolina | | | |
| Def-Wide | Camp Lejeune | Ambulatory Care Center Addition/Alteration | 15,300 | 15,300 |
| Def-Wide | Camp Lejeune | Ambulatory Care Center/Dental Clinic | 21,400 | 21,400 |
| Def-Wide | Camp Lejeune | Ambulatory Care Center/Dental Clinic | 22,000 | 22,000 |
| Def-Wide | Camp Lejeune | SOF Human Performance Training Center | 10,800 | 10,800 |
| Def-Wide | Camp Lejeune | SOF Motor Transport Maintenance Expansion | 20,539 | 20,539 |
| Def-Wide | Fort Bragg | SOF Human Performance Training Ctr | 20,260 | 20,260 |
| Def-Wide | Fort Bragg | SOF Support Battalion Admin Facility | 13,518 | 13,518 |
| Def-Wide | Fort Bragg | SOF Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facility | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Def-Wide | Fort Bragg | SOF Telecomm Reliability Improvements | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| Def-Wide | Seymour Johnson AFB | Construct Tanker Truck Delivery System | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| | Puerto Rico | | | |
| Def-Wide | Punta Borinquen | Ramey Unit School Replacement | 61,071 | 61,071 |
| | South Carolina | | | |
| Def-Wide | Shaw AFB | Consolidate Fuel Facilities | 22,900 | 22,900 |
| | Texas | | | |
| Def-Wide | Fort Bliss | Blood Processing Center | 8,300 | 0 |
| Def-Wide | Fort Bliss | Hospital Replacement Incr 8 | 251,330 | 251,330 |
| | United Kingdom | | | |
| Def-Wide | Menwith Hill Station | RAFMH Main Gate Rehabilitation | 11,000 | 11,000 |
| | Utah | | | |
| Def-Wide | Hill AFB | Replace POL Facilities | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| | Virginia | | | |
| Def-Wide | Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek— Story | SOF SATEC Range Expansion | 23,000 | 23,000 |
| Def-Wide | Norfolk | Replace Hazardous Materials Warehouse | 18,500 | 18,500 |
| Def-Wide | Pentagon | Pentagon Corr 8 Pedestrian Access Control Pt | 8,140 | 8,140 |

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/Country and Installation | Project Title | FY 2018 Request | House Agreement |
|----------|---|---|------------------|------------------|
| Def-Wide | Pentagon | S.E. Safety Traffic and Parking Improvements | 28,700 | 28,700 |
| Def-Wide | Pentagon | Security Updates | 13,260 | 13,260 |
| Def-Wide | Portsmouth | Replace Hazardous Materials Warehouse | 22,500 | 22,500 |
| | Worldwide Unspecified | | | |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Contingency Construction | 10,000 | 0 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Energy Resilience and Conserv. Invest. Prog. | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | ERCIP Design | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Exercise Related Minor Construction | 11,490 | 11,490 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning & Design | 23,012 | 23,012 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning & Design MDA East Coast Site | 0 | 10,000 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 26,147 | 26,147 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 39,746 | 39,746 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 1,942 | 1,942 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 1,150 | 1,150 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 40,220 | 40,220 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 13,500 | 13,500 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Prior Year Savings: Defense Wide Unspecified Minor Construction | 0 | -27,440 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 7,384 | 7,384 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 2,039 | 2,039 |
| Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| | Military Construction, Defense-Wide Total | | 3,114,913 | 2,763,832 |
| | Worldwide Unspecified | | | |
| NATO | NATO Security Investment Program | NATO Security Investment Program | 154,000 | 177,932 |
| NATO | NATO Security Investment Program | Prior Year Savings: NATO Security Investment Program | 0 | -25,000 |
| | NATO Security Investment Program Total | | 154,000 | 152,932 |
| | Delaware | | | |
| Army NG | New Castle | Combined Support Maintenance Shop | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| | Idaho | | | |
| Army NG | MTC Gowen | Enlisted Barracks Transient Training | 0 | 9,000 |
| Army NG | Orchard Training Area | Digital Air/Ground Integration Range | 22,000 | 22,000 |
| | Maine | | | |
| Army NG | Presque Isle | National Guard Readiness Center | 17,500 | 17,500 |
| | Maryland | | | |
| Army NG | Sykesville | National Guard Readiness Center | 19,000 | 19,000 |
| | Minnesota | | | |
| Army NG | Arden Hills | National Guard Readiness Center | 39,000 | 39,000 |
| | Missouri | | | |
| Army NG | Springfield | Aircraft Maintenance Center | 0 | 32,000 |
| | New Mexico | | | |
| Army NG | Las Cruces | National Guard Readiness Center Addition | 8,600 | 8,600 |
| | Virginia | | | |
| Army NG | Fort Belvoir | Readiness Center Add/Alt | 0 | 15,000 |
| Army NG | Fort Pickett | Training Aids Center | 4,550 | 4,550 |
| | Washington | | | |
| Army NG | Turnwater | National Guard Readiness Center | 31,000 | 31,000 |
| | Worldwide Unspecified | | | |
| Army NG | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 16,271 | 16,271 |
| Army NG | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 16,731 | 16,731 |
| | Military Construction, Army National Guard Total | | 210,652 | 266,652 |
| | California | | | |
| Army Res | Fallbrook | Army Reserve Center | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| | Puerto Rico | | | |
| Army Res | Aguadilla | Army Reserve Center | 12,400 | 12,400 |
| Army Res | Fort Buchanan | Reserve Center | 0 | 26,000 |
| | Washington | | | |
| Army Res | Lewis-McCord | Reserve Center | 0 | 30,000 |
| | Wisconsin | | | |
| Army Res | Fort McCoy | AT/MOB Dining Facility-1428 PN | 13,000 | 13,000 |
| | Worldwide Unspecified | | | |
| Army Res | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 6,887 | 6,887 |
| Army Res | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 5,425 | 5,425 |
| | Military Construction, Army Reserve Total | | 73,712 | 129,712 |
| | California | | | |
| N/MC Res | Lemoore | Naval Operational Support Center Lemoore | 17,330 | 17,330 |
| | Georgia | | | |
| N/MC Res | Fort Gordon | Naval Operational Support Center Fort Gordon | 17,797 | 17,797 |

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/Country and Installation | Project Title | FY 2018 Request | House Agreement |
|--|--|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| N/MC Res | New Jersey McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst | Aircraft Apron, Taxiway & Support Facilities | 11,573 | 11,573 |
| N/MC Res | Texas Fort Worth | KC130-J EACTS Facility | 12,637 | 12,637 |
| N/MC Res | Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning & Design | 4,430 | 4,430 |
| N/MC Res | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 1,504 | 1,504 |
| Military Construction, Naval Reserve Total | | | 65,271 | 65,271 |
| Air NG | California March AFB | TFI Construct RPA Flight Training Unit | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Air NG | Colorado Peterson AFB | Space Control Facility | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| Air NG | Connecticut Bradley IAP | Construct Base Entry Complex | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Air NG | Indiana Fort Wayne International Airport | Add to Building 764 for Weapons Release | 0 | 1,900 |
| Air NG | Hulman Regional Airport | Construct Small Arms Range | 0 | 8,000 |
| Air NG | Kentucky Louisville IAP | Add/Alter Response Forces Facility | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| Air NG | Mississippi Jackson International Airport | Construct Small Arms Range | 0 | 8,000 |
| Air NG | Missouri Rosecrans Memorial Airport | Replace Communications Facility | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Air NG | New York Hancock Field | Add to Flight Training Unit, Building 641 | 6,800 | 6,800 |
| Air NG | Ohio Rickenbacker International Airport | Construct Small Arms Range | 0 | 8,000 |
| Air NG | Toledo Express Airport | NORTHCOM—Construct Alert Hangar | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Air NG | Oklahoma Tulsa International Airport | Construct Small Arms Range | 0 | 8,000 |
| Air NG | Oregon Klamath Falls IAP | Construct Corrosion Control Hangar | 10,500 | 10,500 |
| Air NG | Klamath Falls IAP | Construct Indoor Range | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| Air NG | South Dakota Joe Foss Field | Aircraft Maintenance Shops | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| Air NG | Tennessee McGhee-Tyson Airport | Replace KC-135 Maintenance Hangar and Shops | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Air NG | Wisconsin Dane County Regional Airport/Truax Field | Construct Small Arms Range | 0 | 8,000 |
| Air NG | Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning and Design | 18,000 | 18,000 |
| Air NG | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 17,191 | 17,191 |
| Military Construction, Air National Guard Total | | | 161,491 | 203,391 |
| AF Res | Florida Patrick AFB | Guardian Angel Facility | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| AF Res | Georgia Robins Air Force Base | Consolidated Mission Complex Phase 2 | 0 | 32,000 |
| AF Res | Guam Joint Region Marianas | Reserve Medical Training Facility | 5,200 | 5,200 |
| AF Res | Hawaii Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam | Consolidated Training Facility | 5,500 | 5,500 |
| AF Res | Massachusetts Westover ARB | Indoor Small Arms Range | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| AF Res | Minnesota Minneapolis- St Paul IAP | Indoor Small Arms Range | 0 | 9,000 |
| AF Res | North Carolina Seymour Johnson AFB | KC-46A ADAL for Alt Mission Storage | 6,400 | 6,400 |
| AF Res | Texas NAS JRB Fort Worth | Munitions Training/Admin Facility | 0 | 3,100 |
| AF Res | Utah Hill AFB | Add/Alter Life Support Facility | 3,100 | 3,100 |
| AF Res | Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Planning & Design | 4,725 | 4,725 |
| AF Res | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Unspecified Minor Construction | 3,610 | 3,610 |
| Military Construction, Air Force Reserve Total | | | 63,535 | 107,635 |
| FH Con Army | Georgia Fort Gordon | Family Housing New Construction | 6,100 | 6,100 |
| FH Con Army | Germany Baumholder | Construction Improvements | 34,156 | 34,156 |
| FH Con Army | South Camp Vilseck | Family Housing New Construction (36 Units) | 22,445 | 22,445 |
| FH Con Army | Korea Camp Humphreys | Family Housing New Construction Incr 2 | 34,402 | 34,402 |

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/Country and Installation | Project Title | FY 2018 Request | House Agreement |
|--|--|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| | <i>Kwajalein</i> | | | |
| FH Con Army | <i>Kwajalein Atoll</i> | Family Housing Replacement Construction | 31,000 | 31,000 |
| | <i>Massachusetts</i> | | | |
| FH Con Army | <i>Natick</i> | Family Housing Replacement Construction | 21,000 | 21,000 |
| | <i>Worldwide Unspecified</i> | | | |
| FH Con Army | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Planning & Design | 33,559 | 33,559 |
| FH Con Army | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Prior Year Savings: Family Housing Construction, Army | 0 | -18,000 |
| Family Housing Construction, Army Total | | | 182,662 | 164,662 |
| | <i>Worldwide Unspecified</i> | | | |
| FH Ops Army | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Furnishings | 12,816 | 12,816 |
| FH Ops Army | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Housing Privatization Support | 20,893 | 20,893 |
| FH Ops Army | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Leasing | 148,538 | 148,538 |
| FH Ops Army | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Maintenance | 57,708 | 57,708 |
| FH Ops Army | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Management | 37,089 | 37,089 |
| FH Ops Army | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Miscellaneous | 400 | 400 |
| FH Ops Army | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Services | 8,930 | 8,930 |
| FH Ops Army | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Utilities | 60,251 | 60,251 |
| Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Army Total | | | 346,625 | 346,625 |
| | <i>Bahrain Island</i> | | | |
| FH Con Navy | <i>SW Asia</i> | Construct on-Base GFOQ | 2,138 | 2,138 |
| | <i>Mariana Islands</i> | | | |
| FH Con Navy | <i>Guam</i> | Replace Andersen Housing PH II | 40,875 | 40,875 |
| | <i>Worldwide Unspecified</i> | | | |
| FH Con Navy | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Construction Improvements | 36,251 | 36,251 |
| FH Con Navy | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Planning & Design | 4,418 | 4,418 |
| FH Con Navy | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Prior Year Savings: Family Housing Construction, N/MC | 0 | -8,000 |
| Family Housing Construction, Navy And Marine Corps Total | | | 83,682 | 75,682 |
| | <i>Worldwide Unspecified</i> | | | |
| FH Ops Navy | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Furnishings | 14,529 | 14,529 |
| FH Ops Navy | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Housing Privatization Support | 27,587 | 27,587 |
| FH Ops Navy | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Leasing | 61,921 | 61,921 |
| FH Ops Navy | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Maintenance | 95,104 | 95,104 |
| FH Ops Navy | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Management | 50,989 | 50,989 |
| FH Ops Navy | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Miscellaneous | 336 | 336 |
| FH Ops Navy | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Services | 15,649 | 15,649 |
| FH Ops Navy | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Utilities | 62,167 | 62,167 |
| Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Navy And Marine Corps Total | | | 328,282 | 328,282 |
| | <i>Worldwide Unspecified</i> | | | |
| FH Con AF | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Construction Improvements | 80,617 | 80,617 |
| FH Con AF | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Planning & Design | 4,445 | 4,445 |
| FH Con AF | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Prior Year Savings: Family Housing Construction | 0 | -20,000 |
| Family Housing Construction, Air Force Total | | | 85,062 | 65,062 |
| | <i>Worldwide Unspecified</i> | | | |
| FH Ops AF | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Furnishings | 29,424 | 29,424 |
| FH Ops AF | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Housing Privatization | 21,569 | 21,569 |
| FH Ops AF | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Leasing | 16,818 | 16,818 |
| FH Ops AF | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Maintenance | 134,189 | 134,189 |
| FH Ops AF | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Management | 53,464 | 53,464 |
| FH Ops AF | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Miscellaneous | 1,839 | 1,839 |
| FH Ops AF | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Services | 13,517 | 13,517 |
| FH Ops AF | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Utilities | 47,504 | 47,504 |
| Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Air Force Total | | | 318,324 | 318,324 |
| | <i>Worldwide Unspecified</i> | | | |
| FH Ops DW | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Furnishings | 407 | 407 |
| FH Ops DW | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Furnishings | 641 | 641 |
| FH Ops DW | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Furnishings | 6 | 6 |
| FH Ops DW | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Leasing | 12,390 | 12,390 |
| FH Ops DW | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Leasing | 39,716 | 39,716 |
| FH Ops DW | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Maintenance | 567 | 567 |
| FH Ops DW | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Maintenance | 655 | 655 |
| FH Ops DW | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Management | 319 | 319 |
| FH Ops DW | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Services | 14 | 14 |
| FH Ops DW | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Utilities | 268 | 268 |
| FH Ops DW | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Utilities | 4,100 | 4,100 |
| FH Ops DW | <i>Unspecified Worldwide Locations</i> | Utilities | 86 | 86 |
| Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Defense-Wide Total | | | 59,169 | 59,169 |

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/Country and Installation | Project Title | FY 2018 Request | House Agreement |
|---|---|---|------------------|------------------|
| FHIF | Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Administrative Expenses—FHIF | 2,726 | 2,726 |
| DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund Total | | | 2,726 | 2,726 |
| UHIF | Worldwide Unspecified Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund | Administrative Expenses—UHIF | 623 | 623 |
| Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund Total | | | 623 | 623 |
| BRAC | Worldwide Unspecified Base Realignment & Closure, Army | Base Realignment and Closure | 58,000 | 58,000 |
| Base Realignment and Closure—Army Total | | | 58,000 | 58,000 |
| BRAC | Worldwide Unspecified Base Realignment & Closure, Navy | Base Realignment & Closure | 93,474 | 128,474 |
| BRAC | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON-100: Planning, Design and Management | 8,428 | 8,428 |
| BRAC | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON-101: Various Locations | 23,753 | 23,753 |
| BRAC | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON-138: NAS Brunswick, ME | 647 | 647 |
| BRAC | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON-157: MCSA Kansas City, MO | 40 | 40 |
| BRAC | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON-172: NWS Seal Beach, Concord, CA | 5,355 | 5,355 |
| BRAC | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DON-84: JRB Willow Grove & Cambria Reg AP | 4,737 | 4,737 |
| BRAC | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | Undistributed | 7,210 | 7,210 |
| Base Realignment and Closure—Navy Total | | | 143,644 | 178,644 |
| BRAC | Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Locations | DOD BRAC Activities—Air Force | 54,223 | 54,223 |
| Base Realignment and Closure—Air Force Total | | | 54,223 | 54,223 |
| Total, Military Construction | | | 9,782,451 | 9,585,000 |

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/Country and Installation | Project Title | FY 2018 Request | House Agreement |
|--|--|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| Army | Cuba Guantanamo Bay | OCO: Barracks | 115,000 | 115,000 |
| Army | Turkey Various Locations | Forward Operating Site | 0 | 6,400 |
| Army | Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Locations | ERI: Planning and Design | 15,700 | 15,700 |
| Army | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | OCO: Planning and Design | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| Military Construction, Army Total | | | 139,700 | 146,100 |
| Navy | Djibouti Camp Lemonnier | Aircraft Parking Apron Expansion | 0 | 13,390 |
| Navy | Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Locations | ERI: Planning and Design | 18,500 | 18,500 |
| Military Construction, Navy Total | | | 18,500 | 31,890 |
| AF | Estonia Amari Air Base | ERI: POL Capacity Phase II | 4,700 | 4,700 |
| AF | Amari Air Base | ERI: Tactical Fighter Aircraft Parking Apron | 9,200 | 9,200 |
| AF | Hungary Kecskemet AB | ERI: Airfield Upgrades | 12,900 | 0 |
| AF | Kecskemet AB | ERI: Construct Parallel Taxiway | 30,000 | 0 |
| AF | Kecskemet AB | ERI: Increase POL Storage Capacity | 12,500 | 0 |
| AF | Iceland Keflavik | ERI: Airfield Upgrades | 14,400 | 14,400 |
| AF | Italy Aviano AB | Guardian Angel Operations Facility | 0 | 27,325 |
| AF | Jordan Azraq | OCO: MSAB Development | 143,000 | 143,000 |
| AF | Latvia Lielvarde Air Base | ERI: Expand Strategic Ramp Parking | 3,850 | 3,850 |
| AF | Luxembourg Sanem | ERI: ECAOS Deployable Airbase System Storage | 67,400 | 67,400 |
| AF | Norway | | | |

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Account | State/Country and Installation | Project Title | FY 2018 Request | House Agreement |
|--|--|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| AF | Rygge Qatar | ERI: Replace/Expand Quick Reaction Alert Pad | 10,300 | 0 |
| AF | Al Udeid | Consolidated Squadron Operations Facility | 0 | 15,000 |
| AF | Romania Campia Turzii | ERI: Upgrade Utilities Infrastructure | 2,950 | 2,950 |
| AF | Slovakia Malacky | ERI: Airfield Upgrades | 4,000 | 0 |
| AF | Malacky | ERI: Increase POL Storage Capacity | 20,000 | 0 |
| AF | Sliac Airport | ERI: Airfield Upgrades | 22,000 | 0 |
| AF | Turkey Incirlik AB | Dormitory—216PN | 0 | 25,997 |
| AF | Incirlik AB | OCO: Relocate Base Main Access Control Point | 14,600 | 14,600 |
| AF | Incirlik AB | OCO: Replace Perimeter Fence | 8,100 | 8,100 |
| AF | Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Locations | ERI: Planning and Design | 56,630 | 56,630 |
| AF | Unspecified Worldwide Locations | OCO—Planning and Design | 41,500 | 41,500 |
| Military Construction, Air Force Total | | | 478,030 | 434,652 |
| Def-Wide | Italy Sigonella | Construct Hydrant System | 0 | 22,400 |
| Def-Wide | Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Locations | ERI: Planning and Design | 1,900 | 1,900 |
| Military Construction, Defense-Wide Total | | | 1,900 | 24,300 |
| Total, Military Construction | | | 638,130 | 636,942 |

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Program | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| Discretionary Summary By Appropriation | | |
| Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies | | |
| Appropriation Summary: | | |
| Energy Programs | | |
| Nuclear Energy | 133,000 | 133,000 |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities | | |
| National nuclear security administration: | | |
| Weapons activities | 10,239,344 | 10,423,544 |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation | 1,793,310 | 1,873,310 |
| Naval reactors | 1,479,751 | 1,479,751 |
| Federal salaries and expenses | 418,595 | 407,595 |
| Total, National nuclear security administration | 13,931,000 | 14,184,200 |
| Environmental and other defense activities: | | |
| Defense environmental cleanup | 5,537,186 | 5,607,186 |
| Other defense activities | 815,512 | 818,512 |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| Total, Environmental & other defense activities | 6,382,698 | 6,455,698 |
| Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities | 20,313,698 | 20,639,898 |
| Total, Discretionary Funding | 20,446,698 | 20,772,898 |
| Nuclear Energy | | |
| Idaho sitewide safeguards and security | 133,000 | 133,000 |
| Total, Nuclear Energy | 133,000 | 133,000 |
| Weapons Activities | | |
| Directed stockpile work | | |
| Life extension programs | | |
| B61 Life extension program | 788,572 | 788,572 |
| W76 Life extension program | 224,134 | 224,134 |
| W88 Alteration program | 332,292 | 332,292 |
| W80-4 Life extension program | 399,090 | 399,090 |
| Total, Life extension programs | 1,744,088 | 1,744,088 |
| Stockpile systems | | |
| B61 Stockpile systems | 59,729 | 59,729 |
| W76 Stockpile systems | 51,400 | 51,400 |
| W78 Stockpile systems | 60,100 | 60,100 |
| W80 Stockpile systems | 80,087 | 80,087 |
| B83 Stockpile systems | 35,762 | 35,762 |

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Program | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| W87 Stockpile systems | 83,200 | 83,200 |
| W88 Stockpile systems | 131,576 | 131,576 |
| Total, Stockpile systems | 501,854 | 501,854 |
| Weapons dismantlement and disposition | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 52,000 | 52,000 |
| Stockpile services | | |
| Production support | 470,400 | 470,400 |
| Research and development support | 31,150 | 31,150 |
| R&D certification and safety | 196,840 | 196,840 |
| Management, technology, and production | 285,400 | 285,400 |
| Total, Stockpile services | 983,790 | 983,790 |
| Strategic materials | | |
| Uranium sustainment | 20,579 | 20,579 |
| Plutonium sustainment | 210,367 | 210,367 |
| Tritium sustainment | 198,152 | 198,152 |
| Domestic uranium enrichment | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| Strategic materials sustainment | 206,196 | 206,196 |
| Total, Strategic materials | 695,294 | 695,294 |
| Total, Directed stockpile work | 3,977,026 | 3,977,026 |
| Research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) | | |
| Science | | |
| Advanced certification | 57,710 | 57,710 |
| Primary assessment technologies | 89,313 | 89,313 |
| Dynamic materials properties | 122,347 | 122,347 |
| Advanced radiography | 37,600 | 37,600 |
| Secondary assessment technologies | 74,833 | 74,833 |
| Program decrease | [-2,000] | [-2,000] |
| Academic alliances and partnerships | 52,963 | 52,963 |
| Enhanced Capabilities for Subcritical Experiments | 50,755 | 50,755 |
| Total, Science | 487,521 | 485,521 |
| Engineering | | |
| Enhanced surety | 39,717 | 39,717 |
| Weapon systems engineering assessment technology | 23,029 | 23,029 |
| Nuclear survivability | 45,230 | 49,230 |
| Program increase | [4,000] | [4,000] |
| Enhanced surveillance | 45,147 | 45,147 |
| Stockpile Responsiveness | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| Total, Engineering | 193,123 | 197,123 |
| Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield | | |
| Ignition | 79,575 | 76,575 |
| Program decrease | [-3,000] | [-3,000] |
| Support of other stockpile programs | 23,565 | 23,565 |
| Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support | 77,915 | 77,915 |
| Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion | 7,596 | 7,596 |
| Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas | 9,492 | 9,492 |
| Facility operations and target production | 334,791 | 331,791 |
| Program decrease | [-3,000] | [-3,000] |
| Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield | 532,934 | 526,934 |
| Advanced simulation and computing | | |
| Advanced simulation and computing | 709,244 | 709,244 |
| Construction: | | |
| 18-D-670, Exascale Class Computer Cooling Equipment, LNL | 22,000 | 22,000 |
| 18-D-620, Exascale Computing Facility Modernization Project | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Total, Construction | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Total, Advanced simulation and computing | 734,244 | 734,244 |
| Advanced manufacturing | | |
| Additive manufacturing | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| Component manufacturing development | 38,644 | 38,644 |
| Processing technology development | 29,896 | 29,896 |
| Total, Advanced manufacturing | 80,540 | 80,540 |
| Total, RDT&E | 2,028,362 | 2,024,362 |
| Infrastructure and operations (formerly RTBF) | | |
| Operations of facilities | 868,000 | 868,000 |
| Safety and environmental operations | 116,000 | 116,000 |
| Maintenance and repair of facilities | 360,000 | 395,000 |
| Program increase to address high-priority preventative maintenance through FIRRPP | [35,000] | [35,000] |
| Recapitalization | 427,342 | 542,342 |
| Program increase to address high-priority deferred maintenance through FIRRPP | [115,000] | [115,000] |
| Construction: | | |

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Program | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| 18-D-670, Material Staging Facility, PX | 0 | 5,200 |
| Project initiation | | [5,200] |
| 18-D-660, Fire Station, Y-12 | 28,000 | 28,000 |
| 18-D-650, Tritium Production Capability, SRS | 6,800 | 6,800 |
| 17-D-640 U1a Complex Enhancements Project, NNSS | 22,100 | 22,100 |
| 17-D-630 Expand Electrical Distribution System, LLNL | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| 16-D-515 Albuquerque complex project | 98,000 | 98,000 |
| 15-D-613 Emergency Operations Center, Y-12 | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| 07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL | 2,100 | 2,100 |
| 07-D-220-04 Transuranic liquid waste facility, LANL | 17,895 | 17,895 |
| 06-D-141 Uranium processing facility Y-12, Oak Ridge, TN | 663,000 | 663,000 |
| 04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy research facility replacement project, LANL | 180,900 | 180,900 |
| Total, Construction | 1,031,795 | 1,036,995 |
| Total, Infrastructure and operations | 2,803,137 | 2,958,337 |
| Secure transportation asset | | |
| Operations and equipment | 219,464 | 219,464 |
| Program direction | 105,600 | 105,600 |
| Total, Secure transportation asset | 325,064 | 325,064 |
| Defense nuclear security | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 686,977 | 719,977 |
| Support to physical security infrastructure recapitalization and CSTART | | [33,000] |
| Total, Defense nuclear security | 686,977 | 719,977 |
| Information technology and cybersecurity | 186,728 | 186,728 |
| Legacy contractor pensions | 232,050 | 232,050 |
| Total, Weapons Activities | 10,239,344 | 10,423,544 |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | | |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs | | |
| Global material security | | |
| International nuclear security | 46,339 | 46,339 |
| Radiological security | 146,340 | 146,340 |
| Nuclear smuggling detection | 144,429 | 139,429 |
| Program decrease | | [-5,000] |
| Total, Global material security | 337,108 | 332,108 |
| Material management and minimization | | |
| HEU reactor conversion | 125,500 | 125,500 |
| Nuclear material removal | 32,925 | 37,925 |
| Acceleration of priority programs | | [5,000] |
| Material disposition | 173,669 | 173,669 |
| Total, Material management & minimization | 332,094 | 337,094 |
| Nonproliferation and arms control | 129,703 | 129,703 |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation R&D | 446,095 | 451,095 |
| Acceleration of low-yield detection experiments and 3D printing efforts | | [5,000] |
| Nonproliferation Construction: | | |
| 18-D-150 Surplus Plutonium Disposition Project | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| 99-D-143 Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility, SRS | 270,000 | 340,000 |
| Program increase | | [70,000] |
| Total, Nonproliferation construction | 279,000 | 349,000 |
| Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs | 1,524,000 | 1,599,000 |
| Low Enriched Uranium R&D for Naval Reactors | 0 | 5,000 |
| Direct support to low-enriched uranium R&D for Naval Reactors | | [5,000] |
| Legacy contractor pensions | 40,950 | 40,950 |
| Nuclear counterterrorism and incident response program | 277,360 | 277,360 |
| Rescission of prior year balances | -49,000 | -49,000 |
| Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | 1,793,310 | 1,873,310 |
| Naval Reactors | | |
| Naval reactors development | 473,267 | 473,267 |
| Columbia-Class reactor systems development | 156,700 | 156,700 |
| S8G Prototype refueling | 190,000 | 190,000 |
| Naval reactors operations and infrastructure | 466,884 | 466,884 |
| Construction: | | |
| 15-D-904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3 | 13,700 | 13,700 |
| 15-D-903 KL Fire System Upgrade | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| 14-D-901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF | 116,000 | 116,000 |
| Total, Construction | 144,700 | 144,700 |
| Program direction | 48,200 | 48,200 |
| Total, Naval Reactors | 1,479,751 | 1,479,751 |

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Program | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| Federal Salaries And Expenses | | |
| Program direction | 418,595 | 407,595 |
| Program decrease to support maximum of 1,690 employees | | [-11,000] |
| Total, Office Of The Administrator | 418,595 | 407,595 |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup | | |
| Closure sites: | | |
| Closure sites administration | 4,889 | 4,889 |
| Hanford site: | | |
| River corridor and other cleanup operations | 58,692 | 93,692 |
| Acceleration of priority programs | | [35,000] |
| Central plateau remediation | 637,879 | 645,879 |
| Acceleration of priority programs | | [8,000] |
| Richland community and regulatory support | 5,121 | 5,121 |
| Construction: | | |
| 18-D-404 WESF Modifications and Capsule Storage | 6,500 | 6,500 |
| 15-D-401 Containerized sludge removal annex, RL | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| Total, Construction | 14,500 | 14,500 |
| Total, Hanford site | 716,192 | 759,192 |
| Idaho National Laboratory: | | |
| SNF stabilization and disposition—2012 | 19,975 | 19,975 |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition | 170,101 | 170,101 |
| Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition | 111,352 | 111,352 |
| Soil and water remediation—2035 | 44,727 | 44,727 |
| Idaho community and regulatory support | 4,071 | 4,071 |
| Total, Idaho National Laboratory | 350,226 | 350,226 |
| NNSA sites | | |
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory | 1,175 | 1,175 |
| Separations Process Research Unit | 1,800 | 1,800 |
| Nevada | 60,136 | 60,136 |
| Sandia National Laboratories | 2,600 | 2,600 |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory | 191,629 | 191,629 |
| Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites | 257,340 | 257,340 |
| Oak Ridge Reservation: | | |
| OR Nuclear facility D & D | | |
| OR-0041—D&D - Y-12 | 29,369 | 29,369 |
| OR-0042—D&D -ORNL | 48,110 | 48,110 |
| Construction: | | |
| 17-D-401 On-site waste disposal facility | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 14-D-403 Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment facility | 17,100 | 17,100 |
| Total, OR Nuclear facility D & D | 82,479 | 82,479 |
| U233 Disposition Program | 33,784 | 33,784 |
| OR cleanup and disposition | 66,632 | 66,632 |
| OR reservation community and regulatory support | 4,605 | 4,605 |
| OR Solid waste stabilization and disposition technology development | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Total, Oak Ridge Reservation | 207,600 | 207,600 |
| Office of River Protection: | | |
| Waste treatment and immobilization plant | | |
| Construction: | | |
| 01-D-416 A-D WTP Subprojects A-D | 655,000 | 655,000 |
| 01-D-416 E—Pretreatment Facility | 35,000 | 35,000 |
| Total, 01-D-416 Construction | 690,000 | 690,000 |
| WTP Commissioning | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant | 698,000 | 698,000 |
| Tank farm activities | | |
| Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition | 713,311 | 713,311 |
| Construction: | | |
| 15-D-409 Low activity waste pretreatment system, ORP | 93,000 | 93,000 |
| Total, Tank farm activities | 806,311 | 806,311 |
| Total, Office of River protection | 1,504,311 | 1,504,311 |
| Savannah River Sites: | | |
| Nuclear Material Management | 323,482 | 350,482 |
| Acceleration of priority programs | | [27,000] |
| Environmental Cleanup | | |
| Environmental Cleanup | 159,478 | 159,478 |
| Construction: | | |
| 08-D-402, Emergency Operations Center | 500 | 500 |

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

| Program | FY 2018 Request | House Authorized |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|
| Total, Environmental Cleanup | 159,978 | 159,978 |
| SR community and regulatory support | 11,249 | 11,249 |
| Radioactive liquid tank waste: | | |
| Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition | 597,258 | 597,258 |
| Construction: | | |
| 18-D-401, SDU #8/9 | 500 | 500 |
| 17-D-402—Saltstone Disposal Unit #7 | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| 05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River Site | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Total, Construction | 190,500 | 190,500 |
| Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste | 787,758 | 787,758 |
| Total, Savannah River site | 1,282,467 | 1,309,467 |
| Waste Isolation Pilot Plant | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 206,617 | 206,617 |
| Central characterization project | 22,500 | 22,500 |
| Transportation | 21,854 | 21,854 |
| Construction: | | |
| 15-D-411 Safety significant confinement ventilation system, WIPP | 46,000 | 46,000 |
| 15-D-412 Exhaust shaft, WIPP | 19,600 | 19,600 |
| Total, Construction | 65,600 | 65,600 |
| Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant | 316,571 | 316,571 |
| Program direction | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| Program support | 6,979 | 6,979 |
| WCF Mission Related Activities | 22,109 | 22,109 |
| Minority Serving Institution Partnership | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Safeguards and Security | | |
| Oak Ridge Reservation | 16,500 | 16,500 |
| Paducah | 14,049 | 14,049 |
| Portsmouth | 12,713 | 12,713 |
| Richland/Hanford Site | 75,600 | 75,600 |
| Savannah River Site | 142,314 | 142,314 |
| Waste Isolation Pilot Project | 5,200 | 5,200 |
| West Valley | 2,784 | 2,784 |
| Total, Safeguards and Security | 269,160 | 269,160 |
| Cyber Security | 43,342 | 43,342 |
| Technology development | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| HQEF-0040—Excess Facilities | 225,000 | 225,000 |
| Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup | 5,537,186 | 5,607,186 |
| Other Defense Activities | | |
| Environment, health, safety and security | | |
| Environment, health, safety and security | 130,693 | 130,693 |
| Program direction | 68,765 | 68,765 |
| Total, Environment, Health, safety and security | 199,458 | 199,458 |
| Independent enterprise assessments | | |
| Independent enterprise assessments | 24,068 | 24,068 |
| Program direction | 50,863 | 50,863 |
| Total, Independent enterprise assessments | 74,931 | 74,931 |
| Specialized security activities | 237,912 | 240,912 |
| Classified topic | | [3,000] |
| Office of Legacy Management | | |
| Legacy management | 137,674 | 137,674 |
| Program direction | 16,932 | 16,932 |
| Total, Office of Legacy Management | 154,606 | 154,606 |
| Defense-related activities | | |
| Defense related administrative support | | |
| Chief financial officer | 48,484 | 48,484 |
| Chief information officer | 91,443 | 91,443 |
| Project management oversight and assessments | 3,073 | 3,073 |
| Total, Defense related administrative support | 143,000 | 143,000 |
| Office of hearings and appeals | 5,605 | 5,605 |
| Subtotal, Other defense activities | 815,512 | 818,512 |
| Total, Other Defense Activities | 815,512 | 818,512 |
| Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal | | |
| Yucca mountain and interim storage | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| Total, Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal | 30,000 | 30,000 |

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 115-212 and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 431.

Each further amendment printed in part B of the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 2030

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, amendment No. 88 may be considered out of sequence.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY
MR. THORNBERRY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-212.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 155, line 19, strike "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000".

Page 258, beginning on line 23, strike subsection (b).

Page 322, line 8, insert "(1)" after "(b)".

Page 351, beginning on line 22, strike subsection (d).

Page 376, beginning on line 11, strike paragraph (3).

Page 381, after line 6, insert the following:

(A) in subsection (b)(3), by striking "section 377" and inserting "section 277";

Page 381, line 7, strike "(A)" and insert "(B)".

Page 381, line 7, strike "and".

Page 381, line 8, strike "(B)" and insert "(C)".

Page 381, line 9, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 381, after line 9, insert the following:

(D) in subsection (e), as so redesignated, by striking sections 375 and 376" and inserting "sections 275 and 276".

Page 381, line 16, strike "designating" and insert "redesignating".

Page 396, after line 4, insert the following:

(5) REPORT ON PROCUREMENT OF CONTRACT SERVICES.—By inserting after paragraph (64), as added by paragraph (4), the following new paragraph:

"(65) Section 235."

Page 410, beginning on line 3, strike paragraph (5) and insert the following:

(5) Section 129a(b) is amended by striking "(as identified pursuant to section 118b of this title)".

Page 412, line 22, strike "Section 1552(h)" and insert "Subsection (i) of section 1522, as redesignated by section 511(a)(1) of this Act."

Page 415, beginning on line 14, strike paragraph (42).

Page 567, line 13, strike the second period.

Page 569, line 12, strike "section 1501(2)" and insert "section 1501(a)(2)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a manager's amendment that contains technical and conforming edits to the bill. I do not know of any controversy.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I am not going to take that much time. I agree with the chairman. This is uncontroversial and should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-212.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of subtitle B of title III the following:

SEC. 316. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS OR AWARDS FOR DROP-IN BIOFUELS OR BIOREFINERIES DURING SEQUESTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Department of Defense may not, during fiscal year 2018 through 2021, enter into any new contracts or make any new award, and no funds may be obligated or expended, with respect to drop-in biofuels or biorefineries.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) DROP-IN BIOFUEL.—The term "drop-in biofuel" means a neat of blended liquid hydrocarbon fuel designed as a direct replacement for a traditional fuel with comparable performance characteristics and compatible with existing infrastructure and equipment.

(2) BIOREFINERY.—The term "biorefinery" means—

(A) a facility that converts or proposes to convert renewable biomass into advanced biofuels (as such term is defined under section 9001 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101)); and

(B) a facility (including equipment and processes) that converts renewable biomass into biofuels and biobased products (as such terms are defined, respectively, under section 9001 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002).

SEC. 317. CALCULATION OF THE COST OF DROP-IN FUELS.

Section 2922h of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) INCLUSION OF FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS FROM OTHER FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—For purposes of calculating the fully burdened cost of drop-in fuel under subsection (a), for a proposed purchase to be made on or after the beginning of fiscal year 2022, the Secretary of Defense shall include in such calculation any financial contributions made by other Federal departments and agencies."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a pretty straightforward amendment. It does two things. One, it saves and conserves valuable taxpayer dollars to be used on higher priority issues, and it holds the Department of Defense accountable for current law.

Mr. Chairman, we currently have in place a variety of agreements with folks who buy biofuels at costs ranging up to \$28 a gallon. The Army actually bought some at \$40 a gallon. At a time when you have heard, for over an hour now, the need for conserving resources, for reprioritizing resources, having those kind of contracts, new contracts come in existence makes no sense whatsoever.

This amendment would simply say that while sequestration is going on, while we are under the draconian measures of sequestration, the Army, Department of Defense, Navy, Air Force will not enter into new contracts. Existing contracts, wherever they may be, however costly they might be, would continue forward, we would honor those and the amendments made in that regard.

But as long as we are under sequestration and we are under this budgeting process that you have heard ad nauseam over the last hour or so, these would prevent this problem from going forward.

Then if sequestration goes away on its own or we somehow lift it ourselves, then this restriction would be lifted and then new contracts could be entered into, but those contracts would then have an accounting clause in it,

or the accounting department at the Pentagon would have an accounting process in which the cost of the fuels would have to take into account all of the other agencies who have been contributing to this fund.

Early on, there was a \$510 million pot of money created by the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Agriculture, using the Commodities Credit Corporation to fund this \$510 million. None of us know where that money went. It was supposed to do a refinery, but we don't know that. We can't prove that.

We do know that they bought jet fuel at \$28 a gallon under this program. Normally, at that same timeframe, they also bought jet fuel for \$3.35 a gallon. So 25 bucks a gallon differential, 2 million gallons bought at the higher prices, that is \$51 million of taxpayer dollars that were, I believe, misapplied and misprioritized in these tough times.

This program came into existence, in no small part, because of America's reliance on overseas sources of oil. This all predates the last 6 years of effort that has gone on in order to create the energy independence that we see on the horizon, given shale drilling and all of the opportunity to use these cheaper fuels.

So I ask my colleagues to support the amendment. This makes sense. It does not squander taxpayer resources. It does not affect existing contracts. It would only be for new contracts. The industry itself, of course, is going to be for it because they are selling a commodity at \$28 a gallon versus \$3 a gallon, and you would expect them to be against my amendment. But my amendment is for the servicemen and -women and for the taxpayers.

Mr. Chair, I encourage a "yes" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, before I proceed, I wanted to take a quick few seconds to thank and recognize Chairman THORBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH as a freshman member of the 115th Congress. It has been refreshing to see such bipartisan tone in leadership, so I just wanted to recognize them for those qualities and skills.

With the Department of Defense struggling to rein in spending while keeping our military strong and our country protected, it is amendments like Mr. CONAWAY's that are unnecessarily impeding cost competition and reductions that come with public-private partnerships.

This amendment limits competition between alternative fuel sources and may even force DOD to pay more by explicitly prohibiting purchases of cheaper fuel. That is not only inefficient, it is irresponsible.

The Department of Defense is the single largest energy consumer in the world. We should be incentivizing the diversification of liquid fuels as an option to bring down costs and reduce regulatory burden.

Not only does this amendment risk increased costs for DOD procurement, but it also stunts potential economic growth in the rapidly expanding biofuel field, a billion-dollar industry worldwide.

Yet another troubling result of this amendment, if passed, is its potential to impede military operations where an alternative fuel may be the only option available.

It is unethical to endanger our men and women in uniform with this ban, and, at the very least, a waiver should be included for national security matters.

Military leaders and experts have told Armed Services Committee members time and time again about the direct threat that climate change, particularly sea level rise, poses to our military operations and installations both at home in places like Norfolk and abroad.

My colleague, Mr. LANGEVIN, included language in this year's NDAA that specifically acknowledges this threat. It directs the Defense Department to study the impact of climate change and prepare an effective strategy to address its effects.

We have long known that carbon pollution and fossil fuels are heavily contributing to a changing climate and the extreme weather patterns that accompany this phenomenon. It is irresponsible for this Congress to ignore this reality and not even consider cost-effective and more clean energy sources for our military.

Finally, I would like to point out that this amendment is completely unnecessary. Current law already prohibits DOD from purchasing alternative fuel in large quantities unless it is cost-competitive with traditional fuel. I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided amendment that does far more harm than good to our Defense Department and to our service-members.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, the gentleman is incorrect in the sense that this does not, over the next year or 2 or 3, however long sequestration is going to be in place, measurably affect climate change one way or the other. The small amounts of fuel that are allowed to be purchased in excess of competitive costs are 2 million gallons at 28 bucks a gallon.

The Department of Defense buys 107 billion gallons of fuel, so any number

up to some multimillion dollar number, million gallon amount could be hidden under this amount. We also don't have a good accounting process to understand exactly what those costs are when they enter into these contracts, and asking the Department of Agriculture to subsidize this process doesn't make any sense either.

In order to hide from the program, the issue is the Department of Defense buys the fuel, they send a bill to the Commodities Credit Corporation to actually pay for it. So it is not even on the Department of Defense's books and records to get the proper accounting to make sure. This is straightforward stuff.

You can't, on the one hand, argue that we need to provide all that needs to be provided for our men and women to fight and spend an extra \$51 billion, plus \$510 million that we don't know where that went on a product that can be brought for \$3.35 a gallon.

I would argue there is nowhere in the world today where we need drop-in jet fuel that can be provided somewhere else. That argument is specious and it makes no sense whatsoever. That may be some future issue, but that is not today.

Giving the shale drilling and the opportunity to provide fossil fuels for our military and their direct mission of fighting, not doing the other things to try to support this issue, makes no sense. So I ask my colleagues to vote for this commonsense amendment. It does not affect the existing contracts, and it is a better use of taxpayer dollars, and it is better for the members of the service to put a hiatus on new contracts while we are under sequestration and all of the things that have been talked about.

So I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment. And with that, I yield to the chairman for any comments he might have.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I will point out that those figures are incorrect as stated by my colleague.

In 2015, the DOD paid \$2.03 for 77,660 gallons of fuel at a 10 percent blend. I just wanted to correct the record because those are the accurate figures, and I think those figures speak volumes.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House report 115–212.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 115–212.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X in division A, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ . REDUCTION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **REDUCTION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but subject to subsection (b), the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, and the Administrator for Nuclear Security, shall make such reductions in the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act in such manner as the President considers appropriate to achieve an aggregate reduction of 1 percent of the total amount of funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act. Such reduction shall be in addition to any other reduction of funds required by law.

(b) **EXCLUSIONS.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the President shall not reduce the amount of funds for the following accounts:

(1) Military personnel, reserve personnel, and National Guard personnel accounts of the Department of Defense.

(2) The Defense Health Program account.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when we need to balance our budget and prevent a legacy of debt from being left to the next generation, it is really time to ask ourselves: Not only should we blast through the budget caps, but can't we afford to at least make a small and important step towards protecting our fiscal security as a nation, which is a critical part of our national security?

By spending beyond our means, we make ourselves economically beholden to other nations like China and Saudi Arabia. That makes America less secure rather than more secure.

As structured, the NDAA is fiscally irresponsible. We have had a number of discussions about that, that outside of the context of a full budget discussion, it is hard to talk about exceeding the Budget Control Act by 72.5 billion, an additional \$10 billion of base spending. It is a broader discussion about the budget that needs to be had.

What my amendment would do, very simply, Mr. Chairman, is give authority to the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to reduce the overall amount of money authorized in this bill by 1 percent.

It excludes personnel and health accounts from being included in these reductions. A 1 percent reduction still leaves us well above the original Defense cap spending levels that I actually support.

□ 2045

If I had my way, I would keep those budget numbers for defense spending, but I think this 1 percent is a very reasonable compromise for those of us who believe that we need to at least show a symbolic gesture towards fiscal responsibility as we head into the budget negotiations.

In this bill, there are many overfunded accounts. Accounts are funded at levels above and beyond what our own military requested. A 1 percent reduction in that context is extremely reasonable. It is \$6.2 billion out of this bill. I have no doubt that there are many ways to find the excess money in the bill that we would leave up to the military to reach that spending level.

We can consider numerous programs. This doesn't have to be across the board. We can consider programs where the bill authorizes procurement levels that exceed the President's request and the military's request. My colleague from Massachusetts pointed this out during the bill's markup when he introduced an amendment to reduce the number of littoral combat ships from three to the Navy's own request of one. We are effectively blocking the Navy from making a fiscally reasonable decision.

There are dozens more—helicopters, aircraft, and missiles—than the President even requested in his budget. So we are not going to cut every one of those items. Many of them have found their way onto the unfunded priority list which the Pentagon provides the Congress.

In a perfect world, if we had all the money in the world, we could have included all those items. But at some point, we have to make some decisions about the direction of our military budget, and we can't allow ourselves to be convinced that somehow we can sustain this level of spending. We can't.

Frankly, even with this 1 percent cut, the level of spending is unsustainable and plunges us further into debt; but I think, hopefully, that is the least that Democrats and Republicans in Congress can come together around as a simple first step.

My amendment is a very small first step. We don't have to choose between protecting the homeland and fiscal restraint. When Congress is imposing spending that the military itself doesn't even want, here is a vehicle to hand the military the ability to rein in some of that unnecessary spending that reduces our national security rather than improves it.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment and take this

modest step towards fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), chair of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not about fiscal security. It is arbitrary. It is arbitrary cuts without any reference whatsoever to our security risks, without any assessments to the needs of our military, and it is incorrectly stated that we are giving things to our military that they do not want. In fact, they needed more.

There is a whole category called unfunded requirements that they put before the House Armed Services Committee. And I want to say that again: unfunded requirements. It is not unfunded wishes, unfunded needs—unfunded requirements. And they are based on the mission that we have assigned the military and their inability to do so as a result of that gap, and many of which we were unable to fund in this bill.

What would some of those relate to? We could take a tour around the world and we know the risks that we are facing: China, Russia, North Korea, Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, ISIS, terrorism. These are not issues that you take up lightly and then say we can undertake an arbitrary cut.

By the way, if this was really about fiscal security, it would be a 1 percent cut across all spending, but it is only going to apply to the military. This doesn't apply to the IRS. It doesn't apply to the EPA. This is only saying that the military should be cut as a result of some concept of fiscal savings.

But the savings that we have taken have damaged our military already. The Air Force Vice Chief of Staff, General Stephen Wilson, at HASC, testified in February of this year, “. . . we have become one of the smallest, oldest equipped, and least ready forces across the full spectrum of operations in our service history,” the entire history of the Air Force.

In 1991, we went to Desert Storm. Our Air Force was 500,000 people and 134 fighter squadrons. Today we find ourselves at 317 in our active force, with 55 fighter squadrons.

The Navy is the same. It is the smallest since World War II. Deployments continue to increase, and training and maintenance periods have been shortened, eliminated, or deferred.

The number of Marine Corps infantry battalions have been reduced by four since 2010, going from 28 to 24.

Admiral William Moran, the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, has also indicated that of the Navy aircraft, 60 percent are unable to operate.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. TURNER. At the end of this amendment, it incorrectly states that there should be no cuts to military personnel, and it incorrectly states that because the rest of the cuts actually apply to our military personnel. It applies to what we ask them to do and what we give them to do the job.

Our military should be honored. It should not be faced with additional cuts. We should honor what is in this bill. We should satisfy their requirements, and we should support our men and women in uniform.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, the gentleman asked why aren't there cuts for other agencies. That is not the bill we have before us. We have the National Defense Authorization bill before us. I have supported similar cuts in various agencies when we have had those appropriations bills on the floor.

This is the biggest bill on the authorization side, and then, of course, the companion appropriations bill. This is over 40 percent of our discretionary expenditures, and the authorization for 40 percent of our discretionary expenditures is in this bill. So a 1 percent cut is very meaningful in this bill.

That doesn't mean that 1 percent cuts in other areas aren't meaningful, too. They are.

There is no single other area that is as important, fiscally, as this area, and I think it would set a positive tone for reining in out-of-control spending.

There are many accounts that are funded at levels above President Trump's request. So if the gentleman is saying somehow that this cut would leave anybody unprepared, he is basically saying that President Trump's budget would leave the military unprepared or leave people poorly equipped.

The truth is there are many of us who support vastly lower spending levels and believe that those are sufficient for national defense. That is not even what this amendment does. It simply reduces spending just over \$6.2 billion. It still blasts through the budget cap.

Mr. Chair, the ranking member has indicated that he supports this bill, and I deeply respect his expertise in military preparedness. I encourage my colleagues to unanimously adopt my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

As we all know, over the past 8 years, the world certainly has become a more

dangerous place, and we face a variety of threats that, quite frankly, we are not keeping pace with, and we simply cannot continue a pattern of underfunding our military.

Yes, we must keep our financial house in order, but we absolutely cannot afford to allow the quality of our national defense to decline by further defense budget cuts.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. I am concerned about a growing notion that we can thank servicemembers for their service but then somehow not provide them everything they need to do their job, that we can continue to allow them to have airplanes that don't fly, ships that can't sail, not having the readiness they need to prepare for the missions we send them on. As the gentleman from Ohio said, that hurts people, and, unfortunately, that is what has happened in recent years.

Mr. Chairman, defense spending this year is still 18 percent below what it was in 2010. So what has happened is we have cut the defense budget while the threats that we send our military out to keep us safe from have grown. And remember, 2010 was before Russia invaded Crimea, before China started building islands in the South China Sea, before ISIS even existed.

This budget that is before us does not fix all our problems. It is a start, and I think it is about as much as we can do in a single year. But even if this bill passes, we are not up to 2010 levels; we have not made up the ground that we have lost.

I believe that the men and women who serve deserve our best. This bill, I believe, comes close to providing our best to them this year. It should be supported, and this amendment should be rejected.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 115-212.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 451, after line 6, insert the following:
SEC. 1073. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING INVESTING IN THE HOMELAND TO ADVANCE NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A strong and safe homeland rests on the health and wellbeing of America's communities.

(2) Federal non-defense discretionary spending provides health care for our veterans, research to tackle cancer, safe highways, airports and waterways, economic security for families in need, and robust law enforcement.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any increase to the combined amount authorized to be appropriated for National Defense Budget (Function 50) and Overseas Contingency Operations should be matched—dollar for dollar—with increases in the annual amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Federal non-defense discretionary budget, which makes investments that are essential to the national security of the United States.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, the reality is that our economic security is part and parcel of our national security, and so it is in line with these values today that we introduce Amendment 334 to the National Defense Authorization Act, which states a sense of Congress that any appropriated increase to the combined national defense budget and the overseas contingency operations budget are matched dollar for dollar by nondefense discretionary spending increases.

For years now, these spending increases have occurred concurrently and equally, keeping important parity between defense and nondefense discretionary spending. Because genuine national security depends on the health, vibrancy, and safety of our communities, we must ensure that the spending parity continues and that this Democratic Party principle carries on into fiscal year 2018.

Nondefense discretionary spending includes a host of funds that are crucial to the American people, from education to research, to veterans' healthcare, to transportation and even homeland security. NDD funding is absolutely essential to moving our country forward.

Mr. Chairman, as vice ranking member of the Budget Committee, I echo the comments made earlier by our ranking member, Mr. SMITH, about the dysfunction that we have, as we have yet to consider a fiscal year 2018 budget resolution, and we have only 23 legislative days before the new fiscal year begins.

The effort to push through \$696 billion in defense spending will trigger sequestration under the Budget Control Act, and our communities will pay the

price in cuts to vital programs. This is senseless brinksmanship, and we must reject it.

Sequestration would, further, hinder job creation and stall economic growth by cutting \$2 trillion in discretionary spending for infrastructure that makes our communities thrive: roads, bridges, transit, railroad systems, broadband, ports, airports, waterways, schools, and safe, clean water systems. It will erode our investments in education, worker training, public health, and community development that strengthen the middle class and working families; and these shortfalls, Mr. Chairman, will hurt the American people and our economy and make us less secure as a nation.

Budgetary gimmicks don't make our Nation safer either, and that is why in the People's Budget, which we introduced in the Progressive Caucus, the overseas contingency operations budget is actually zeroed out, as it is essentially a zero accountability slush fund used to avoid the restrictions imposed by the Budget Control Act.

Some have pointed out that \$10 billion of the \$631.5 billion for the military base budget needs is actually labeled OCO purely as a technicality to evade the Budget Control Act caps. This is in addition to the clearly marked \$65 billion of OCO funds.

By including OCO funding one-to-one match in our amendment, we are sending a message that we will not accept these efforts to undermine the best interests of our country and its people.

Increasing opaque funding sources comes at the expense of our Nation's infrastructure programs, education, and all the other things that I mentioned earlier. So to the extent that Congress provides relief from the post-sequestration funding levels for our military, responsible Members of this body should be united in insisting that the same relief would apply to domestic discretionary spending. This amendment underscores the reality that economic security is national security.

For these reasons, and to support the continuation of this important principle, we urge support of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in some ways, I think this may be one of the most important debates we have in the next 3 days because the question is whether our support for the men and women who serve in the military is conditional or not. Will we only repair the planes they fly, will we only fix the ships they sail if, and only if, exactly an equal amount

will be added to domestic spending programs.

□ 2100

Will we only provide for military spouses for their needs? Will we only take care of wounded warriors for their increased needs if, and only if, an exact amount, the exact dollar for dollar, is added to domestic programs?

That holds the military hostage to a domestic political agenda, and I think that is fundamentally wrong at every level. These men and women go out and risk their lives to keep us safe, yet they not only have to worry about North Korea up on the DMZ, they not only have to worry about ISIS in Syria, they have to worry about whether we will pass some domestic program if we are going to adequately provide for them.

The Constitution says it is Congress' responsibility to provide for the military without condition. This sort of approach, saying, "We will only do this for the military if, and only if, we get what we want on domestic programs" breaks faith with the men and women who serve. It is wrong at every level.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing political about a domestic agenda, and this isn't conditional on additional money being spent. In fact, the chairman has got it exactly flip-flop.

The money that we are providing for the armed services at this point, the extra money, is conditioned on cutting it from everything else. As we saw in President Trump's budget, \$54 billion-plus up for defense and \$54 billion taken away from the domestic agenda.

And it is beyond insulting to say that if you support any sort of domestic spending, you don't care about the troops. That being concerned about transportation and infrastructure, which, by the way, bridges have collapsed and killed people in this country because of the problems with our transportation and infrastructure.

The Department of Homeland Security is part of nondefense discretionary spending. Does it not protect us? We have heard from the President it does.

The State Department is also part of nondefense discretionary spending, where we have heard from the Secretary of Defense that it saves lives.

So for our committee—the Armed Services Committee to say, "We are all that matters, to hell with everything else; and if you care at all about transportation or domestic agenda, you don't care about the troops," that is

what is an incredibly disingenuous argument.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of us care about domestic spending programs. I certainly do. And I am not for the cuts that were proposed by the administration. That is what we are here to do and decide.

What I am opposed to is the sense of Congress that every dollar we increase in defense has to be matched by an increased dollar on the domestic side. That makes it conditional. That makes it tied to a domestic political agenda on the EPA, the IRS, education, transportation, whatever it is.

My point is that all of those things need to stand on their own merits. Defense needs to stand on its own merits, support for our military needs to stand on its own merits, having planes that fly and ships that sail and adequate funding for our troops and their families stand on their own merits.

It cannot be conditional upon whether or not this Congress or this President agrees on other spending items. They need to stand on their own two feet, too. But it is absolutely wrong to say we will only support these military folks if we get what we want on the domestic side.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I have to say that this is conditional because we still don't have a budget resolution. So in the absence of a budget resolution, the reality is we are looking at a budget that could potentially raise \$676 billion for defense, but at the expense of all of the other programs that we have mentioned.

And the reality is that families in the armed services also care about education, about healthcare, about roads, and about everything else that is funded in domestic spending. So we have to make sure that these two things are interconnected. And, yes, we have got to make sure that the State Department is funded and that we continue to push for a budget that keeps parity between defense and nondefense discretionary.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS), a valuable member of our committee.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Chairman, no one can deny we have a readiness issue within our military due to funding shortfalls. This comes at a time when we are facing unprecedented threats all over the globe. Our Constitution makes it clear that our top priority and duty is to provide for the common defense.

In World War II, Americans willingly rationed whatever was necessary to support the war effort and our troops.

It would have been unthinkable—unimaginable—for someone to suggest that our military could not have the resources necessary to defeat our enemies, unless we had equal spending for everything else. Simply put, we would have lost the war and our freedom.

We cannot lose sight or take for granted our Nation's safety and security. Without it, the rest of the discretionary budget really doesn't matter so much.

I fear America has lost its way if we live in a culture that would suggest that we can't support our most vital obligation without equal financial representation of our other government expenditures.

I urge my colleagues to give our full support to the men and women in uniform, support the underlying bill, but oppose this amendment that adds unnecessarily to our debt and further threatens our ability to keep our Nation safe for the remaining threats we face.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 115-212.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In division A, strike section 1022 (relating to prohibition on use of funds for transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba to the United States).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will strike section 1022 of the bill that prohibits the transfer or release of prisoners from Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States.

We are currently imprisoning 41 people at Guantanamo, 26 of whom are being detained indefinitely without charge or trial, with no proceedings, no hearings, and no opportunity to plea their case, essentially forever.

Beyond existing as an affront to fundamental American values, Guantanamo is a dangerous counterproductive relic of the past. National security experts and our own military commanders agree that Guantanamo harms our national security by serving as a recruiting tool for terrorists and damaging our relationships with allies.

Furthermore, it is increasingly difficult to justify the annual cost of holding each Guantanamo detainee, which is now climbing to an incredible \$10 million a year per detainee. Guantanamo is now the most expensive prison on Earth, costing U.S. taxpayers approximately \$445 million per year. This is especially disappointing when you consider that each prisoner in Federal maximum security penitentiaries costs only \$78,000 a year. Not only does our refusal to close Guantanamo diminish our legal and ethical reputation throughout the world, it also costs American citizens astronomical sums of money for no purpose.

We have made excellent progress towards reducing the numbers of prisoners, and we should continue to do so. About 35 percent of released prisoners were confirmed or suspected of returning to the battlefield during the Bush administration. But the Obama administration developed a robust framework to ensure released detainees were more closely supervised to reduce the likelihood of a return to the battlefield.

The Bush administration struck diplomatic bills to repatriate large batches of prisoners to countries like Saudi Arabia and Afghanistan in bulk, and many recidivists came from those batches.

By contrast, the Obama administration developed an individualized review process by six agencies to determine whether to recommend transferring a detainee. Over time, it also developed more careful diplomatic and monitoring plans with receiving countries to ease a prisoner's reintegration into that country's society.

When the first detainees arrived at Guantanamo in January 2002, America was still reeling from the 9/11 attacks, and the war in Afghanistan had only just begun. Yet, 15 years later, it is clear that the war on terror has dragged on for too long, as we have expanded our involvement in costly clashes in Yemen, Somalia, and Syria. In doing so, we have embroiled ourselves in needless, endless conflict, without an exit strategy or a clear strategy for success.

The recent vote for Congresswoman BARBARA LEE's amendment to repeal the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force in the House Appropriations Committee demonstrated that Congress is finally realizing a blank check for perpetual war must be reevaluated and reconsidered.

Similarly, as we reconsider the 2001 AUMF, I look forward to working to-

gether in a bipartisan manner to close the Guantanamo prison, reevaluate our approach to these detainees, and close another dark and sad chapter that has damaged our national honor.

Guantanamo's continued operation provides a momentous challenge to the founding principles of the United States, that no person may be deprived of liberty without due process of law, and certainly may not be deprived of liberty indefinitely without due process of law, and for each day that its doors remain open, it becomes increasingly difficult for our Nation to claim the moral and ethical high ground.

We must close the detention facility at Guantanamo now, and this amendment will help us achieve that goal.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the Nadler amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, the Nadler amendment would allow detainees currently housed at GTMO to be transferred to the United States. As in previous conflicts, it is appropriate and lawful to hold detainees that we engage in our armed conflicts.

Guantanamo is the safest and most appropriate location to house these detainees. Members can visit there. It is secure and relatively distant from the United States.

Moving to the U.S. puts our homeland and citizens at risk. Our enemies have, when able, attacked and, on occasion, freed detainees, even committing suicide to do it. I have seen the attempts. I have served in Iraq at a detention facility.

And as far as Guantanamo being a recruitment tool, it might just be a recruitment tool, and here is why. Because if you are caught trying to kill Americans and committing acts of terrorism, you get to go to a Caribbean island that provides humane conditions for the detainees. Go visit there and you will see that. They have appropriate access to healthcare, the same healthcare that our troops get. They have recreational activities, and they have cultural and religious materials.

But, more important than anything else, our troops, and the detainees that they hold there, are all safer in Cuba. It is very difficult to sneak up and attack Guantanamo Bay.

The recent terrorist attacks in Europe should remind us all that there is significant risk, and that we face significant risk in this world. Yes, we wish the war on terror was over. But guess what. It is not.

This would only increase the risk right here in our own backyards. Congress has passed, and the President has signed into law, restrictions on Guantanamo detainee transfers to the U.S.

every year since fiscal year 2010. To house these terrorists, these enemies of freedom on our own land is dangerous. I ask for your support in defeating this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I will simply observe that this amendment prohibits the President from transferring prisoners.

Do you really think that Donald Trump, the current President, needs the prohibition that he would transfer prisoners to maximum security prisons in the United States if it weren't safe to do so?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON), my friend and colleague.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment.

I can attest unequivocally, based on firsthand knowledge, that this latest attempt to transfer detainees at Guantanamo Bay is strategically unwise and, I believe, morally wrong. None of the arguments in favor of transferring these prisoners are defensible militarily, legally, or financially.

We are in a war and these prisoners were captured on the battlefield. There is no hard evidence to support the argument that Guantanamo is a decisive recruiting tool, and is extremely naive to believe that closing it would somehow magically change the hearts and minds of our enemies. We could disarm and renounce every interest we have and they would just invent another reason to attack us.

The truth is that many of these prisoners are the worst of the worst, yet they are treated better than many of our own veterans. And here is the key point: prisoners released from Guantanamo have killed Americans in the past and, if given the chance, will gladly do so again, a fact openly conceded by officials in the Obama administration itself.

We do not want the blood of Americans killed by these terrorists in custody today on our hands.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, it costs the American taxpayer \$10 million a year per detainee to keep a detainee in Guantanamo. To keep that same detainee in a Federal maximum security penitentiary in the United States would cost \$78,000. That is a ridiculous waste of our military budget. Nobody has ever escaped from a Federal maximum security prison.

□ 2115

Transferring these prisoners to Federal maximum security prisons in the

United States would pose no danger to anybody.

And yes, some of these prisoners may be the worst of the worst. Many are not. They were not all caught on the battlefield. Some of them were sold for bounties by people in different tribes or groups in Afghanistan. Some of them were not captured on battlefields at all. Some of them are innocent; some are not.

But to keep them in Guantanamo for \$10 million each per year with no possibility of getting out is an affront to our values. It is an affront to our liberties. It is an affront to our military budget and to our pocketbooks, and it is, frankly, plain foolish.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), my friend and colleague.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Mr. NADLER's amendment, which strikes language that prohibits the use of funds to transfer or release Guantanamo Bay detainees to the United States.

As we are all aware here today, GTMO holds some of the world's most dangerous and heinous terrorists, individuals who are responsible for and are ideologically committed to killing Americans at home and abroad. They are responsible for killing our men and women in uniform.

Transferring these terrorists to the United States, where constitutional protections and immigration law may apply, puts our national security at risk and hinders our intelligence-gathering ability.

Today, we remain in a war against al-Qaida and all associated forces. It is the responsibility of Congress to do everything in our power to provide the resources and authorities to win that war, and transferring Guantanamo Bay detainees to the United States undermines these efforts. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), my friend and colleague.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the gentleman's amendment. We have debated this issue for years now, and every year we successfully maintain the prohibition on transferring dangerous detainees out of GTMO.

It is important to remember that most of the 41 remaining prisoners are very dangerous. The language in the underlying bill is required to keep the American people and our allies safe.

One of the main goals of Guantanamo Bay is to keep these terrorists from returning to the battlefield. Sadly, it has become clear that some of the detainees released have returned to the field to fight the United States.

We ask our servicemembers to put their lives on the line each and every

day in order to keep the American people safe. How can we ask them to do that, while knowing that we are releasing cruel, brutal terrorists back to the battlefield? It would be reprehensible.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and protect our servicemembers and the American people.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 115-212.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In division A, strike section 1023 (prohibition on use of funds to construct or modify facilities in the United States to house detainees transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes. This amendment will strike section 1023 of the bill that prohibits the use of funds to construct or modify facilities in the United States for Guantanamo detainees. The provision is simply designed to further delay the transferred detainees out of Guantanamo and is unnecessary and counterproductive.

The arguments for this amendment and against it are essentially the arguments for and against the previous amendment that we just went through. That amendment prohibited the use of funds to transfer prisoners. This amendment prohibits the use of funds—this provision, rather, prohibits the use of funds to construct facilities in the United States to receive such transferees. It is essentially the same pros and cons.

I just want to mention, though, that yes, some of those detainees may be the worst of the worst, but they will still be detained. But some of them are not. They are people who were caught up in bounty situations where they were sold for money because we were giving a bounty if someone claimed that so and so had been in combat against us, but we didn't really know.

We now know mistakes were made. We may choose to say some of these people can go home, and others can stay in the United States. It is simply, again, a question that we shouldn't be spending \$10 million a person, instead of \$78,000 a person, to hold them in secure facilities.

The other thing that Ms. STEFANIK of New York said I must comment on, she said we are holding people in Guantanamo because if we transfer them to the United States they will enjoy the constitutional rights of prisoners in the United States, and that we don't want to do, for whatever reason. She didn't say.

But the fact of the matter is, Guantanamo was built for that purpose because it was thought by the Bush administration initially that people held outside of the Continental United States, in Guantanamo, which is in Cuba, not the United States, would not enjoy constitutional rights, could not use the writ of habeas corpus and other things.

However, a series of Supreme Court decisions said that was wrong. The prisoners held in Guantanamo Bay have the same constitutional rights as prisoners held in prisons in the Continental United States, so there is no difference on that whatsoever. You can look up the Supreme Court decisions. They are not secret.

And what it comes down to is a prejudice against holding people here because of a ridiculous fear that people will escape from maximum security prisons, which no one has ever done in the United States, and we can't hold dangerous terrorists here, and we shouldn't release terrorists.

But nobody is talking about releasing terrorists. And you can hold dangerous terrorists and dangerous mobsters, dangerous all kinds of people, in maximum security facilities in the United States.

There are really two things we should do: bring them to maximum security facilities in the United States because it saves a lot of money and because it removes a major recruiting tool for our enemies abroad. And, within constitutional rights, people should have the opportunity to have a hearing.

What is most offensive is not that they are at Guantanamo, as opposed to some prison in the United States, what is most offensive is that we are holding some people without any hearing, without any due process, essentially forever.

And yes, we have held people as prisoners of war during the pendency of a war. But we don't claim these people are prisoners of war. We don't give them the rights of prisoners of war. We are just holding them. I am not sure how we are holding them, but we are holding them with no claim of any kind of due process, with no finding

that they have, in fact, been terrorists in an individual case; and that is just against all American values.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this irresponsible amendment that allows the construction of facilities in the U.S. to house detainees, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no." We are still at war with terrorism, and the law of war affirms that detainees can properly be held off the battlefield for the duration of the hostilities.

Both Republican and Democrats have repeatedly rejected bringing terrorists detained at Guantanamo Bay to the United States. It would be a negligent act to transfer highly dangerous terrorists, such as mastermind of 9/11, to U.S. soil to be housed near our neighborhoods and near our families.

The gentleman said that these, they are not the worst of the worst, that some people are just, you know, caught up perhaps, and they are there. That is not true. I have been there multiple times. At this point, we only have 41 left, and they are the worst of the worst. There is no one left who you might even claim was just caught up and accidentally arrested. That is false.

Like I said, I have visited multiple times to see firsthand the threats facing our country, and the detention procedures carried out at that facility.

It does not make sense to build a new facility to spend our precious defense dollars here to house terrorists when we already have adequate, very safe facilities at Guantanamo where they are being treated humanely. It is legal and transparent. It is a remote location. It is away from the battlefield and away from our loved ones.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, you will hear, and you have already heard, in favor of the Nadler amendment, such as GTMO is contrary to American values; detainees can be held safely at less cost in the U.S. prisons, and GTMO is a recruiting tool for terrorists.

Points against the Nadler amendment: the number one task of the Federal Government is to provide for the common defense and security of the United States of America and American citizens.

Americans are safer with detainees in Guantanamo versus the homeland.

GTMO is the safest and most appropriate location to hold detainees. It is appropriate and lawful to hold detain-

ees until all al-Qaida and associate forces are defeated.

The law for war detainees, including GTMO detainees, states that they cannot be commingled with Federal prisoners, thus requiring separate facilities costing hundreds of millions of dollars.

Evidence of the use of Guantanamo as a recruiting or propaganda tool is conjecture, subjective, and inconclusive.

Terrorists will continue to attack whether GTMO exists or not. Terrorists will invent any excuse to attract new recruits.

I will not support this.

Mr. NADLER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY), my friend and colleague.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Earlier this year, I had the opportunity to travel with Chairwoman HARTZLER to Guantanamo Bay to see firsthand the important work our military men and women stationed there are doing for our national security.

As representatives of the people, we have been given a duty by the American people to provide for our common defense, and that includes appropriately detaining suspected terrorists.

According to the March 2017 Director of National Intelligence report, it estimated 29 percent of former GTMO detainees are confirmed, 17 percent of those, or suspected, 12 percent, of re-engaging in terrorist or insurgent activities. The ones we hold now are the 41 worst of the worst, including KSM, and we cannot allow them back onto the battlefields.

These people do not need to be housed on U.S. soil. GTMO is the most appropriate and safest place to hold these detainees.

They live better than I lived both of my tours in Iraq in 2005 and 2009 and 2010.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank Congresswoman HARTZLER for her leadership, and I thank her for this opportunity to speak on this misguided amendment.

I have visited Guantanamo Bay twice, and I know firsthand the detainees at Guantanamo Bay are the worst of the worst, terrorists who are conspirators of Osama bin Laden, trained mass murderers, and extremists who have a sole intention of killing Americans.

We have also seen that releasing terrorists from Guantanamo puts American families at risk. In a report last

year, the Director of National Intelligence from the prior administration was clear that at least 116 detainees, nearly one-third, released from Guantanamo have returned to the battlefield to kill American families.

As we have seen from the proliferation of terrorists around the world, from Algeria and North Africa, through the Middle East, across to South Asia and the Philippines, the deterrence of incarceration at Guantanamo Bay has never been more important. I urge all of my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, no one is proposing to release these people, although some probably should be released, but no one is proposing that, so take that red herring off the table.

Second of all, I, too, have visited Guantanamo, and I don't know how you tell by visiting Guantanamo that these prisoners are the worst of the worst, or not, just by looking at them.

Thirdly, again, they have the same constitutional rights there as here, so you are not changing anything. And bringing them to maximum security facilities in the United States, while it may cost some money if you had to increase the facilities first, instead of spending \$445 million, or \$10 million a detainee, you would be spending \$78,000 a detainee, which would free up your military budget, part of it, for other things.

There is simply no rational reason for keeping these people in a military base in Guantanamo which simply serves as a recruiting tool and a measuring rod for our enemies abroad. So again, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2130

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. It is not a wise use of our tax dollars to build new facilities here like the gentleman wants to do to detain terrorists when we already have adequate facilities that are doing a great job right now at Guantanamo Bay. We need to keep our terrorists there, away from our families, away from our communities.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY
MR. BLUMENAUER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 115-212.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 505, line 21, strike "The" and insert "Subject to the limitation in subsection (c), the"

Page 506, after line 14, insert the following new subsection:

(c) LIMITATION.—The program of record in subsection (a) shall not be established, and none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for this section may be obligated or expended, until—

(1) the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that—

(A) a Nuclear Posture Review has been completed after January 20, 2017;

(B) a ground-launched intermediate-range missile is the preferred military system, in terms of cost, capability, and command, control, and communications arrangements, for ensuring that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's overall deterrence and defense posture remains credible, flexible, resilient, and adaptable in the face of a deployed Russian ground-launched intermediate-range missile; and

(C) a ground-launched intermediate-range missile is the preferred military system for maintaining strategic stability with the Russian Federation at reasonable cost, while hedging against potential technical problems or vulnerabilities; and

(2) the Secretary of State certifies to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that—

(A) the program of record established in subsection (a), and the expenditure of funds to research or develop such a ground-launched intermediate-range missile, is necessary to the Secretary of State's efforts to verifiably return Russia to full compliance with the INF Treaty;

(B) at least one NATO Member State government, within a range appropriate to provide counterforce capabilities to prevent intermediate-range ground-launched missile attacks against any NATO Party or to provide countervailing strike capabilities to enhance the forces of the United States or allies of the United States, has completed the necessary legal and constitutional requirements for an agreement to host a ground-launched intermediate-range missile; and

(C) the North Atlantic Council has endorsed the deployment of a ground-launched intermediate-range missile.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, my amendment deletes language in this bill that would mandate a program of

record, green lighting this proposal for road-mobile, ground-launched cruise missiles with ranges that, if tested or deployed, would violate the United States' obligations under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty.

For more than four decades, the United States and Russia have worked through bilateral agreements to reduce their nuclear weapons stockpiles, saving money, and making the world safer.

Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush were at the forefront of this effort with the START I and START II treaties.

There is a longstanding precedent of carefully negotiating these treaties in a bipartisan fashion because these leaders knew that a world with less of these weapons meant a safer world for all of us.

Yet over the last several years, our nuclear weapons proliferation has continued on autopilot. Right now we are on track to spend \$1.2 trillion on unneeded nuclear weapons. In fact, the Pentagon has concluded that already the United States' security needs could be met with one-third fewer strategic warheads deployed than New START limits of 1,550.

We can and should safely right-size the arsenal as envisioned by Ronald Reagan and the first President Bush. That is why these treaties are so important. They hold us and our adversaries accountable.

We see some confusing signals from the administration, at times appearing to favor nuclear escalation, but at the same time being deeply concerned about managing costs.

President Trump has demonstrated a lack of clear understanding of these treaties, but even his administration is fearful that the language undermining the treaty in this bill "unhelpfully ties them to a specific missile system."

Congress should be playing a lead role in getting us back on track with smarter defense spending, not working to abandon this nuclear nonproliferation legacy that Ronald Reagan and Bush, Sr., fought so hard for.

We can't simply fund every weapons program on the list while fulfilling other critical obligations like providing for our military personnel, ensuring we have adequate cybersecurity protections, strengthening our command and control infrastructure, not to mention our non-Defense Department programs like foreign assistance and diplomacy.

We have a poor track record when it comes to carefully managing and budgeting implementation of our weapons programs.

The House continues this poor record now. Why would we establish a program of record for something that our military, our diplomats, and our NATO allies haven't asked for?

Rather than rushing to adopt this program and abandoning a key international treaty in the process, let's

think this through. Let's do our homework to make sure our allies, the Departments of Defense and State are all on the same page, and develop a coherent approach to bring Russia back into compliance, rather than throw money at yet another unnecessary weapons program and undercut that regime.

This takes our eye off the ball and could have unintended and, I think in some instances, devastating consequences.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment for smarter defense spending and the protection of a landmark treaty that is part of the legacy of Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman, Mr. BLUMENAUER, for his amendment, although I urge its defeat.

I start off with pointing out that both the Obama administration and the Trump administration have decided the fact that Russia is in violation of the INF Treaty, and neither of those administrations have indicated any belief that Russia will come back into compliance.

But having said that, I want to say I am troubled that the gentleman would want to provide a veto on the development of a system that hasn't been developed, much less deployed. The gentleman is worried about deployment of a system that we still don't have developed yet. And hopefully it won't be developed when it is completed.

That is really the function of whether Russia comes back into compliance. General Selva, the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the HASC in March: "They do not intend to return to compliance absent some pressure from the international community and the United States as a cosigner of that same agreement. There is no trajectory in what they are doing that would indicate otherwise."

The development of this system that we are talking about here today is that very pressure that General Selva was referencing. This kind of development got the Russians to the table on the INF Treaty anyway, but they are violating the treaty. And that doesn't just matter to Europe. It matters to Asia, which is completely ignored by the gentleman's amendment. And Asia matters on INF. Why? Because 95 percent of China's missiles are in INF range.

The commander of PACOM has testified that he has requirements for intermediate-range missile capability in Asia, "the aspects of the INF Treaty that limit our ability to counter Chinese and other countries' land-based missiles, I think is problematic."

We didn't conjure the idea of a ground-launched cruise missile out of thin air. The U.S. Army reported that introducing intermediate-range ground-launched missiles into the land domain provides military value across the range of the joint military operations and provides a land-based counter to our adversaries' anti-access area denial capabilities.

This report was required by the HASC last year as a part of our multiyear oversight on how to respond to Russia's violations of the INF Treaty, which the prior administration did nothing to challenge.

I appreciate the gentleman's interest. I will gladly work with him on ways to counter Russia's violations of the treaty, but I must urge defeat of this well-intentioned but poorly conceived amendment.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of the bipartisan approach taken by the House Armed Services Committee in sections 1244 and 1245, and I urge a vote "no" on the Blumenauer amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the amount of time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, the question is how to get Russia into compliance. Walking away from our obligations? I think not.

The amendment allows going ahead if the Department of Defense certifies to Congress that it has completed a new nuclear posture review to make sure this program fits in the overall strategy; that it certifies that it prefers this program to ensure that NATO's overall deterrence and defense posture remains credible; that the Department of Defense certified it prefers this missile for maintaining strategic stability; that State certifies the program of record is necessary to help verifiably return Russia to compliance; that at least one NATO member state has proven it is serious about hosting the missile; and State certifies that the full Atlantic Council has endorsed deployment of this missile.

Those are the conditions in the amendment, and I would think they are reasonable conditions that the gentleman should not object to. If he truly believes in the merit of his argument, there is no reason that that cannot be complied with. And if not, it should not proceed.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, again, I want to remind the gentleman that nobody has indicated that Russia has any intention—they see no signs that Russia has any intention of coming back into compliance.

I think this is poorly thought out. We need to go forward and not be giving

veto to other people about what weapon systems we can start developing.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 115-212.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12 . RESTRICTION ON FUNDING FOR THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR-TEST-BAN TREATY ORGANIZATION.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Congress declares that United Nations Security Council Resolution 2310 (September 23, 2016) does not obligate the United States nor does it impose an obligation on the United States to refrain from actions that would run counter to the object and purpose of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

(b) RESTRICTION ON FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No United States funds may be made available to the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The restriction under paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to the availability of United States funds for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization's International Monitoring System.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the Chair for the opportunity to speak on the amendment to restrict the funding from the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization while still providing funds for the international monitoring system.

The purpose is simple. Congress never ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. It is irresponsible to the taxpayer and contradictory for the United States to financially support an organization that the United States has never officially joined or contributed funds for a treaty that was never enacted.

The amendment clearly continues to fund the international monitoring system to improve our global and nuclear detection capability, and returns us to the longstanding responsible policies from President George W. Bush's administration.

This amendment makes it clear that protecting American families is the job of Congress, not an unaccountable international body. As we see a rise in threats around the world, our nuclear deterrence capability is crucial to promote our ability to preserve peace. It is also important that the United States does not require adherence to this treaty in order to continue our self-imposed moratorium on testing nuclear weapons of any size or of any kind.

However, as we live in a world of increasing threats, we should not bind the United States to an agreement that other nuclear powers like China and Russia do not adhere to.

The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty has never been enacted so there is no change in policy or outcome by supporting this amendment, just a saving of taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Chair, I urge passage of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the only physicist in the U.S. Congress, I feel a special responsibility to speak out on the importance of strengthening our global nuclear security architecture. At a time when it is more important than ever for the security of the United States to reinforce international norms against nuclear testing, we are here debating an amendment that would restrict the ability of a key international institution to monitor nuclear weapons, and, in fact, is designed to undercut prospects for either eventual ratification or even continued adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization Preparatory Commission is tasked with establishing a verification regime to monitor compliance with the comprehensive ban on nuclear explosive testing.

If enacted, this amendment would send the wrong signal to the world, deliberately risking an opening for the resumption of unrestricted nuclear testing by many nations on Earth, which would be a national security disaster for the United States.

□ 2145

During the debate on the Iran nuclear agreement, I received more than a dozen classified briefings, many of them individual classified briefings by our weapons experts who supported the negotiating team. At that time, I spent

a lot of time putting myself in the place of a terrorist or proliferating nation, and I came to understand the overwhelming technical advantage that the United States possesses today over both other nuclear states, and any potential proliferation state, because we conducted more than 1,000 nuclear tests from 1945 to 1992, more than all other countries on Earth combined.

Many of those tests were extensively instrumented and have provided us with the ability to accurately computer model and evaluate the performance of nuclear weapons without the risk to safety and to the environment. This is why no official of the Department of Energy, Department of Defense, or any other of our nuclear laboratories have ever called for a resumption of nuclear testing or an unsigned or deprecation of the CTBT, because the moment that other nations begin or resume testing, we lose that crucial advantage.

It seems very odd to me that my Republican colleagues would want other nuclear or nonnuclear states to obtain intellectual property and parity in this matter. Although under this amendment the direct funding for the international monitoring system would nominally remain unscathed, it is difficult to imagine that a significant reduction in U.S. technical and financial support to the CTBTO would not adversely affect the organization's ability to maintain and operate any nuclear monitoring system.

The proposed amendment also seeks to undermine the United States' obligation as a signatory not to conduct nuclear test explosions. If the United States unilaterally declares itself exempt, then other countries are very likely to do the same. In addition, contrary to what the amendment implies, U.N. Security Council Resolution 2310, does not impose any new obligations on the United States. Nothing is mandatory in the U.N. resolution. But repudiating support for the resolution could trigger bad faith in other nations around the world and reduce U.S. legitimacy and leverage that ensures other countries do not test nuclear weapons.

So we should not signal any intention that the United States encourages a return to a more hostile nuclear environment, an environment in which the United States does not condemn nuclear weapons testing but, rather, gives away our position as a country that seeks peace and prosperity for our future.

We have an opportunity to turn political rhetoric into concrete action to curb the global proliferation of nuclear weapons and secure the safety of future generations. From a national security point of view, we must acknowledge that the CTBT locks in an enormous competitive advantage for the United States, one that would be a huge mistake to begin throwing away.

Although the CTBT failed to be ratified by a handful of votes the first time it came up in 1999, as George Shultz, the Secretary of State under President Reagan said: "You can say that a Senator might have been right to vote against the CTBT when it was first put forward"—in 1999—"and right to vote for it now. Why? Because things have changed."

And what he meant by that is that stockpiled stewardship works, and that the detection system, both that is maintained by the United States and by the world communities by the CTBTO works as well. Short of ratification, the U.S. support for the CTBTO Preparatory Commission remains essential.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Wilson amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for offering this important amendment.

This is a simple and straightforward amendment that would help us set priorities in spending taxpayer dollars in a small but meaningful way. The U.S. signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, back in 1996, but the Senate voted against that ratification in 1999.

We are talking about two decades ago. In the meantime, the U.S. has abided by a unilateral pledge to refrain from nuclear explosive tests of any size or kind, but other nations, including Russia and China, have not. They continue to conduct very low-yield nuclear tests that the U.S. does not. Why? Two reasons: one, the CTBT has not entered into force, and the CTBT doesn't even define what it bans.

So while we keep a very stringent policy against testing, other nuclear powers do not. Twenty years later, it is time to ask ourselves why we continue to fund the organization for a treaty that is not going anywhere. This amendment wisely funds the International Monitoring System which provides us some benefits but prohibits the approximately \$2 million in payments to the CTBT organization itself that is included in the FY18 budget request for the State Department.

Let's set this small commonsense priority and let's reinforce the Obama administration's own position that the U.N. resolution from last year is not legally binding on the United States.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, to me, this is, again, clearly an amendment which is in coordination with the Senate initiative by Senator TOM COTTON of Arkansas that clearly

continues the funding of the International Monitoring System to improve our global nuclear detection capability and returns us to the longstanding policies from President George W. Bush's administration.

The amendment is clear. Protecting American families is the job of Congress, not an unaccountable, international body. As we see a rise—as I have stated in the past—in threats around the world, our nuclear deterrence capability is crucial to promote our ability to preserve peace.

Mr. Chair, I urge the approval of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. AGUILAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 115-212.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 1673. MODIFICATION TO CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REVIEW OF COST ESTIMATES FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

Paragraph (1)(A) of section 1043(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1576), as most recently amended by section 1643 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3650), is further amended by striking "10-year period" and inserting "30-year period".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chair, for decades, our Nation's nuclear weapons and triad have provided us with strategic deterrence against nuclear war and the existential threat it represents. And as is often said, it is essential that these weapons and delivery systems be safe, secure, and reliable.

However, the age of our forces is a major concern. Currently, our nuclear-capable bomber fleet contains 76 B-52s with the first models entering service over 50 years ago and continuing to fly only after numerous modernization efforts.

Our *Ohio* class submarines' lifespan, which were originally 30 years, have been extended to 42 years with the end of the 42-year lifespan approaching in 2027. The first Minuteman III ICBMs were deployed 40 years ago.

With the provocative actions of North Korea and the increase in nu-

clear weapon activities taking place around the world, a credible nuclear deterrent is vital to national security of the United States. But, over the past few years, there has been a good amount of debate as to how much this modernization process will cost.

Over the next 30 years, not only will all three legs of our nuclear triad, our bombers, ICBMs, and missile submarines have to be replaced, a sustainment and modernization program for our nuclear bombs and warheads will be taking place at the same time as well.

The Congressional Budget Office currently produces a projected cost of nuclear weapons report annually. However, it only covers 10 fiscal years into the future. My concern is that the CBO's current 10-year timeframe does not encompass the later out-year costs, including the late 2020s, and early 2030s, when costs are projected by many to increase significantly.

My amendment would modify section 1643 of the fiscal year 2015 NDAA, the CBO review of cost estimates of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapon delivery systems, to make the timeframe 30 years instead of 10 years, Mr. Chairman.

I brought this issue up last year when I served on the House Armed Services Committee, and earlier this year Ranking Member SMITH and Ranking Member VISLOSKEY wrote a letter to the CBO expressing their interest in an assessment of the sustainment and modernization costs associated with the triad for the next 30 years. The *New York Times* reports that the CBO 30-year estimate, which is due to be released later this year, will put costs at more than \$1.2 trillion.

With a resurgent Russia, a rising China, and destabilized Middle East, there is little evidence that the demands of our conventional forces will decrease. That is why it is imperative that we have proper accounting for our 30-year nuclear modernization process if we are to adequately plan for future conventional and nuclear investments and provide proper oversight.

Now, some of my colleagues will say that a 30-year cost estimate isn't worth the paper that it is written on; that they would depict a time period far too much into the future to obtain a realistic estimate. But that isn't the case. Why do we have an FY17 Annual Long-range Plan for the Construction of Naval Vessels, which not only contains an estimated 30-year funding requirement spanning the 30-year timeframe, but also this was produced by DOD for a cost of \$395,000 to produce. We have a 30-year cost estimate for the Navy, but not for our strategic deterrence.

I will close by mentioning, one of our nuclear gravity bombs is an example of why we need a permanent 30-year estimate. According to GAO, one cost estimate produced by NNSA's Office of

Cost Estimating points out that it could cost \$2.6 billion more than previous estimates to complete the B61-12 Life Extension Program. But the original baseline was from NNSA's fiscal year 2017 Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan.

If Congress hopes to provide proper oversight of these modernization efforts, we must have up-to-date estimates that accurately reflect any updates and changes that impact our nuclear bombs, warheads, and delivery systems. That is why I wish to make the time period for CBO's estimate 30 years instead of 10 years.

These are important investments to make in our national security and a responsible way to better understand the cost.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, my friend from California is correct about one thing: I will say a 30-year cost estimate is not worth the paper it is written on.

I oppose this amendment, just as I opposed a similar amendment by my friend from California, number 12. I submitted amendment No. 88 that we will consider shortly. My amendment was a hopeful compromise with my colleagues from California, who are offering amendment Nos. 10 and 12 on this same issue. Unfortunately, we have not been able to reach a compromise, so we will put them all before our colleagues here on the floor for consideration.

The bottom line is that my colleagues are asking DOD and CBO to create a 25- and 30-year cost estimate for how much our nuclear forces cost. That would triple the current requirement of 10-year cost estimates. Unfortunately, these type of multidecade cost estimates won't be worth the paper they are written on.

As evidence for that, Assistant Secretary of Defense Tom Hopkins, who would be responsible for creating the DOD report, has called a 25-year report on this "burdensome." He explained it to us this way during a hearing: "Right now we submit a 10-year report that does have programs and cost on it. . . . As you would expect, looking out that far, 25 years, the credibility of the numbers would be very, very suspect. . . ."

"Forecasting DOD costs over a 25-year period with any useful accuracy is extremely difficult given the challenges of predicting developments in the international security environment and ongoing technological advancements."

The Armed Services Committee and this House have considered these types of 30-year cost estimate amendments for DOD or CBO in the NDAAs for the last 5 years.

Each time, for 5 years in a row, these amendments have been defeated. That is because these types of amendments would not result in good, effective oversight and transparency.

It would result in false and unreliable data entering the public debate. If any of my colleagues are interested in a reasonable, commonsense way to try and shed a little more light on these very long-term plans and costs, I encourage them to vote for my amendment No. 88. My amendment allows the Secretary of Defense to provide for information beyond 10 years if he thinks it is accurate and would be useful in understanding the nuclear modernization programs.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this current amendment and “yes” on my amendment No. 88, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, if anything, my former chairman, when I was on Armed Services, is consistent. He is right. He has continued to oppose this amendment in the past.

But what I ask is: Why not have a 30-year estimate? We have one for the Navy. We have one for other programs. If these reports truly aren't worth the paper that they are written on, then why commission this report? It is almost \$400,000 in taxpayer costs.

□ 2200

The taxpayers deserve, and we deserve, to provide oversight over these costs. If Congress hopes to provide the oversight for modernizing these efforts, we need these up-to-date reports that accurately reflect these updates and changes to bombs, warheads, and delivery systems. I hope that the chairman would agree with me there.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would say that the Navy provides 30-year cost estimates because Congress made them, and the Navy doesn't want to do it, and they don't think they are reliable.

I urge a “no” vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 115-212.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 115-212.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 1673. IMPROVEMENT TO ANNUAL REPORT ON THE PLAN FOR THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS STOCKPILE, NUCLEAR WEAPONS COMPLEX, NUCLEAR WEAPONS DELIVERY SYSTEMS, AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM.

Subsection (a)(2) of section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1576), as most recently amended by section 1643 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3650), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph (F):

“(F) A detailed description of the plan, as applicable, to sustain, life-extend, modernize, or replace the nuclear weapons and bombs in the nuclear weapons stockpile.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (G), as redesignated by paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “subparagraphs (A) through (E)” and inserting “subparagraphs (A) through (F)”;

(B) by striking “10-year” and inserting “25-year”;

(C) by striking “military construction,” and inserting “construction”;

(D) by inserting “and the Department of Energy” before the period at the end.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, every year Congress receives a very important and very helpful report regarding our nuclear weapons enterprise. It is sometimes referred to as the 1043 Report because it is mandated by section 1043 of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2012.

It requires the Department of Defense, in cooperation with the Department of Energy, to submit a detailed 10-year plan and budget estimate for our nuclear weapons enterprise, that is, the bombs, the weapons themselves, the command and control, the national lab infrastructure, the delivery systems, et cetera, et cetera. That report is then reviewed by the Government Accountability Office for completeness and accuracy. Finally, the Congressional Budget Office then reviews it and submits an independent report.

Terrific, all good, we all agree that it is a good thing. I know that the chairman of the subcommittee wanted that to happen, and indeed we do have it.

This amendment simply deals with the reality that this is not a 10-year program. This is a program that will go on for at least the next 25, probably the next 30 years, with extraordinary costs that actually occur beyond the 10-year

time horizon. Therefore, it is important that the United States, as we get into this long-term effort to recapitalize our entire nuclear arsenal, that we encounter today and take into account today the most expensive years that will occur beyond the 10-year horizon.

This amendment that I am proposing simply requires that the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy consider a 25-year time horizon for the 1043 Report. We really do need to know, and, in fact, we have some of that information today.

The Department of Energy, that is in the National Nuclear Security Administration, does do a 25-year report, and they apparently think it is accurate enough to present to the committees here. The Department of Defense provides the equipment, the means for delivering the bombs, that is the submarines, the various ballistic and intercontinental ballistic missiles, the ground-based ballistic missiles, the new bombers, and, quite possibly, new long-range strike LRSO.

So let's find out. Let's consider that. The reason we need to consider it is that it is a pile of money, well over \$1 trillion that we will be spending in the next 25 years. This is not just my words but if one were to consider the people who deal with this on a regular basis; for example, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Mr. Kendall, on April 14, 2015, said that we have a problem with recapitalizing the strategic deterrent. We do have a huge affordability problem with that basket of systems. So it is a problem that we are going to have to face up to.

Well, who is we? We is us. We are going to have to figure out how to pay for all this, and we are going to have to make some tough choices. So this is simply a matter of trying to figure out how we can get detailed information.

I know that our esteemed chairman for whom I have tremendous regard has a little different view, and when he picks up his amendment, I will speak to that.

In the meantime, I would ask everybody to support this wise amendment so that we actually have good information upon which to make some decisions today that will then be paid for in the next 15 to 25 years. That is what this amendment is.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LAMALFA). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose this amendment from my friend and

colleague from California. He is a very serious, thoughtful, and clearly articulate Member, but it is for the same reasons that I just outlined with Mr. AGUILAR's amendment.

I will keep this brief because we just talked about this. But going down this path for a 25- or 30-year cost estimate for nuclear weapons is a bad idea and would result in bad data. The Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense in the Obama administration who is still in the Trump administration doesn't think it is a good idea either.

The HASC and the House have considered this 30-year cost estimate for the last 5 years in a row, and each time it has been rejected. This amendment would not result in good, effective oversight and transparency.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider voting for my reasonable, commonsense amendment when we get to it, amendment No. 88. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment and "yes" on Rogers 88.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense amendment. I have great esteem for the chairman, but I really don't think we ought to be mushrooms. I don't think we ought to be kept in the dark. We really are in the process here of making decisions today to spend a vast amount of money not just in the next 10 years—and we do have estimates of what that would cost—but in the out-years.

Those out-years, we know from information that has been delivered to us, that it will be a bow wave—to use the military term—of extraordinary dollars, well into the hundreds of billions of dollars that would be spent in the out-years beyond the 10 years.

We need to know today because that will bite into the money that we have available for all of the other things that we must do for our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask for an "aye" vote on this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman. We don't want to be mushrooms, but we also don't want bad data. So I would urge a "no" vote on this and urge people to support Rogers amendment No. 88, which will allow the Secretary to go beyond 10 years to 25 or 30 if the Secretary believes it would yield valuable data.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY
MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part B of House Report 115-212.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 16. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR
LONG-RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may not obligate or expend more than \$95,600,000 on development of the long-range standoff weapon or any other nuclear-capable air-launched cruise missile, and the Secretary of Energy may not obligate or expend more than \$220,253,000 on the life extension program for the W80-4 warhead, until the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a Nuclear Posture Review that includes a detailed and specific assessment of the following:

(1) The anticipated capabilities of the long-range standoff weapon to hold targets at risk beyond other already existing and planned nuclear-capable delivery systems.

(2) The anticipated ability of the long-range standoff weapon to elude adversary integrated air and missile defenses compared to the B-21 bomber.

(3) The anticipated effect of the long-range standoff weapon on strategic stability relative to other nuclear-armed countries.

(4) The anticipated effect of the long-range standoff weapon on the offensive nuclear weapons capabilities and programs of other nuclear-armed countries.

(5) The anticipated effect of the long-range standoff weapon on the response of other nuclear-armed countries to proposals to decrease or halt the growth of their nuclear stockpiles.

(6) The anticipated effect of the long-range standoff weapon on the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons.

(b) FORM.—The Nuclear Posture Review required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman

from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to insert fiscal sanity into our nuclear weapons planning. We are set to spend \$400 billion over the next decade and \$1.2 trillion over the next 30 years to recapitalize our entire nuclear arsenal. This nuclear escalation will build a force far exceeding what the Pentagon and security experts have said is necessary to deter a nuclear threat.

A stronger nuclear program is not going to help us deal with the strategic challenges we face today, like the fight the against Islamic State, but it will result in having to crowd out Army, Navy, and Air Force conventional priorities.

We need to revisit the strategy. We are here in Congress to make hard decisions about how to spend taxpayer dollars. The Pentagon should provide long-term cost reports and tell us what certain weapons will actually add to our existing capacity.

My amendment deals with one particular outrageous piece of this unsustainable escalation: the long-range standoff weapon, or the LRSO. Now, this weapon is projected to cost \$20 billion to \$30 billion.

This amendment would lock the LRSO funding at fiscal year 2017 levels until the administration submits a Nuclear Posture Review to Congress that includes a detailed assessment of why we need this weapon. It wouldn't prevent it. It would just keep the funding at the current level until they can tell us why we need it.

Until the administration carefully examines the utility of the LRSO, why should we rush its development? After all, the father of this device, former Secretary of Defense Bill Perry, has argued there is scant justification for spending tens of billions of dollars on that weapon. General Mattis has stated numerous times that he is not sold on the LRSO.

We shouldn't risk making tens of billions of dollars in commitments like this with potential failure to follow through all while forfeiting other critical priorities. Before we continue this nuclear escalation on autopilot, let's make sure.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment, but it is not just me. The

Armed Services Committee considered nearly the same amendment during markup, and it was soundly defeated.

It is not just the committee that opposed this amendment. It is also our country's senior-most military officers. They repeatedly described the urgent need for the LRSO and the declining reliability of the NACMs.

They have testified before our committee in March on this exact issue. Here is the Nation's second highest ranking military officer, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Selva:

ALCMs were designed and built in the 1970s with a 10-year lifespan. We know today they remain relevant, but we can't continue to maintain them. A decade from now, those weapons will not be able to penetrate Russian air defenses, and therefore there is an urgency for their replacement.

In the same year, STRATCOM Commander General Hyten said:

The LRSO is the first missile system developed in unison with a nuclear warhead in mind for many decades. Limiting resources or funding of either component will disrupt the entire concept-to-capability timeline.

Here is President Obama's Assistant Secretary of Defense, Bob Scher, testifying before my committee last year:

The Obama administration's decision to field a modern ALCM replacement is essential to maintain the ALCM's unique contribution to stable and effective deterrence.

Finally, let me briefly address this nonsense argument that LRSO is destabilizing. Here is President Obama's Under Secretary of State for Arms Control Rose Gottemoeller testifying before the Senate last year:

First, the LRSO is consistent with our arms control commitments and President Obama's Prague agenda. Second, the LRSO supports strategic stability and does not undermine it. Third, it is important in the eyes of our allies. There is no evidence that the LRSO or our nuclear modernization program are prompting an action-reaction cycle or catalyzing these arms races. The LRSO is valuable in maintaining strategic stability.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. Smith), who is the ranking member.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make two quick points, first to the point Mr. BLUMENAUER made about how we are planning on recapitalizing our entire nuclear arsenal.

Now, we have had a robust debate about how much that is going to cost over 10, 25, 30 years. I have some sympathy for the argument that Mr. ROGERS made. It is going to be very difficult to estimate how much it is going to cost over 25 or 30 years.

But I do know that if we are talking about recapitalizing our entire nuclear arsenal, all of the submarines, all of the ICBMs, a new bomber, it is going to

cost a lot. I don't know if it is \$1.2 trillion or \$2 trillion. Whatever it is, it is going to be enormously expensive.

□ 2215

At a time when we face a multiplicity of threats from Russia, North Korea, and where missile defense is critical, I do not believe this is the best investment of our money to get caught up in the Cold War, in the battle against Russia and their nuclear weapons, and making sure we can counter every possible scenario. It is not an efficient use of money.

This amendment is but one piece of it to say let's take a step back and see if this is the best place to spend the money. Maybe it would be better to spend it on cybersecurity. Maybe it would be better to spend it on missile defense.

There are a whole lot of other places I think that are better than trapping ourselves in these nuclear scenarios that require us to build an unbelievably expensive nuclear arsenal.

Secondly, I will disagree with Mr. ROGERS on one point: the more you build nuclear weapons, the more the other side tends to build nuclear weapons.

I cannot agree that this is not going to potentially lead to an escalation. In fact, the reason we are so hell-bent on building the LRSO and all of these others is because we are concerned about what Russia and China are doing.

That is how it works. It does have that destabilizing effect. I don't think this is the best place for us to spend our defense dollars.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I was quoting Rose Gottemoeller from the Obama administration, saying that it was not going to perpetuate this cycle.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), my friend and an outstanding member of the Armed Services Committee.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, it is surprising to sit here and hear arguments that we have been hearing really for the last almost 70 years now, the notion that the reason that our adversaries build nuclear weapons is because we are building nuclear weapons, or the notion that we all are building nuclear weapons for the same purposes.

The North Koreans are building nuclear weapons in order to threaten us. They are building nuclear weapons, potentially, in order to hold us hostage. They are building nuclear weapons against which we must deter.

The notion that if we advance our capabilities, the notion that if we produce the LRSO we are going to be in a position where we are encouraging the other side is just simply a flawed understanding. We already have a situation where our adversaries are modernizing their dual capable cruise mis-

siles. They don't think these things are destabilizing. We shouldn't argue that they are for us, as well.

In addition, the LRSO plays a hugely important deterrent role. It imposes important and real costs on any potential adversary. It forces them, in addition to modernizing their nuclear arsenals, to modernize their air defense arsenals.

It is hugely important that we proceed. It is hugely important that we modernize. I agree it is a very expensive undertaking, but I would urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and remember that the single most expensive thing we can do would be to fail to defend ourselves. The single most expensive thing we can do would be to encourage an adversary to attack us because they think they can overtake us or overcome our capabilities.

I think it is important that we not go down the path of unilateral disarmament and that we do everything we can to continue to modernize at a very rapid pace, to speed up the pace at which we are modernizing.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I am stunned to think that this is somehow the equivalent of unilateral disarmament.

The amendment says that the funding level for this new program would remain at the current fiscal year level until the administration submits a nuclear posture review to Congress that indicates a detailed assessment of why we need the weapon.

If what the gentleman says is true—and I get mixed signals from the Secretary—then they can easily do that. They are not cut off. It has nothing to do with unilateral disarmament. We have more than enough nuclear weapons to destroy these countries many times over.

My friend, Mr. SMITH, talks about other priorities, from cybersecurity to what is happening with ISIS. Lavishing funds on programs that have not yet been justified and can't meet this test is not worthy. You have other things that you want to help the Department of Defense do, which I think we share.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge approval of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY
MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part B of House Report 115–212.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 2702.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, our current defense spending is about where it was at the very peak of the Reagan defense buildup after adjusting for inflation. It is about the same as the next eight most powerful military forces on the planet, combined. Six of those eight are already our allies.

The President has proposed adding \$54 billion to this. That is the equivalent of adding more than the entire military establishment of Great Britain to what we already have.

Yet we are told, and I do not doubt, that much of our military force is ill equipped and unready for combat. If that is the case, it is not a fiscal problem; it is a management problem. We seem to care how much money is being spent, but not how it is being spent. That is a catastrophic failure of congressional oversight.

In recent years, the Pentagon has warned that its infrastructure is 22 percent bigger than necessary. It has asked Congress for another round of Base Realignment and Closure reviews. Just last month, Secretary Mattis urged resumption of BRAC. He believes it will save \$2 billion a year and \$20 billion over 10 years. That is enough money to buy 120 FA–18 Super Hornets, 300 more AH–64 helicopters, or four Virginia class submarines if only Congress would get out of the way and allow unneeded bases to close or consolidate.

The Pentagon has the authority to close or consolidate bases on foreign soil, but in the NDAA Congress blocks its authority to close or consolidate unnecessary bases on our own soil.

My amendment removes the NDAA prohibition on this needed process and allows BRAC to move forward as our President has requested. His Statement of Administration Policy on NDAA is crystal clear: “While the bill contains many promising reforms, it fails to authorize a Base Realignment and Closure round, which would result in substantial recurring savings and allow DOD to align infrastructure with force reduction.”

I have heard three objections:

First, we are told the upfront costs of consolidation can be high. But the results are now in, and the first four BRAC rounds are saving us \$7 billion a year.

Second, we are told local economies depend on these bases, but experience tells us that communities rapidly recover by freeing these assets for productive commercial use.

Third, we are told to wait until we finished expanding our forces, but the excess capacity estimate already assumes force expansion, and a new round of BRAC will only wring out a small portion of the overcapacity.

When we squander billions of defense dollars keeping obsolete military bases open in order to satisfy congressional constituencies, we directly rob our military forces of the resources that we are constantly reminded that they desperately need.

There is an old saying that you can't fill a broken bucket by pouring more water in it. At some point, you have got to fix the bucket. That is our responsibility. We need to take it more seriously.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the efforts by Mr. MCCLINTOCK, but simply put, now is not the time to consider a Base Realignment and Closure.

In the past, BRAC has been used without conducting a thorough study, has incurred significant costs and jeopardized valuable military communities, such as those of the Midlands of South Carolina surrounding Fort Jackson or the Aiken-Barnwell community that I represent adjacent to Fort Gordon, Georgia.

If facilities are shuttered, the existing secure assets will not be reasonably replicated. In testimony before the House Armed Services Committee just last month, Secretary Jim Mattis stated that he also has reservations about the BRAC assessments.

It is also important to be clear: BRAC is not a proven cost-saving measure. The last BRAC cost 67 percent more than planned to carry out, dramatically reducing any projected savings.

It would be undermining to our national security and to communities around the Nation to close down military installations without a comprehensive study, especially as the military works to grow the force to address emerging threats around the globe.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I disagree very strongly with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina.

First of all, the past BRACs have saved us an enormous amount of money. There have been five rounds. The first four saved us pretty much exactly as much money as they said they were going to. The fifth one was more expensive, but the fifth one was done in 2005, at a time when we were building up the size of the military. It wasn't so much a closure as it was a realignment. But even then, it is now saving us money.

So if you want to argue against BRAC, argue against BRAC; but please, let us not argue that it doesn't save us money because that is just factually ridiculous. It absolutely saves us money.

Second, there have been a number of studies by the Air Force and others. The Air Force has estimated that they are 20 percent over the capacity of their installations. It would be great if we could have a comprehensive study. I agree with that. What our bill has done every year for the last several years is prohibit them from even thinking about a BRAC.

So it is a brilliant argument to say, well, you can't do a BRAC because you haven't done a comprehensive study, and then to put in the bill you are prohibited from doing a comprehensive study. It is a nice little tautology, but it isn't helping our military.

As we have been discussing throughout the night, we have more needs than we have money for. We cannot afford for parochial interests to get in the way of what is in the best interest of our troops. We need a BRAC.

By the way, it doesn't even authorize a BRAC. It simply removes the prohibition of a BRAC. A BRAC cannot happen unless Congress authorizes it. So all this is going to do if this amendment passes is allow the military to do precisely what the gentleman from South Carolina just said they ought to do.

There is no reason to oppose this amendment, and I urge support.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), my friend and colleague.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to this amendment to the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act offered by my friend and colleague, Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California, that would strike a bipartisan provision that clarifies that the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act does not authorize a round of Base Realignment and Closures, otherwise known as BRAC.

After nearly 13 hours of debate in the Armed Services Committee, my colleagues and I came together and overwhelmingly approved language in the final mark that prevented a BRAC for the next fiscal year. We passed that vote by a vote of 60–1.

Many of my colleagues have argued that past BRACs eliminated excess infrastructure in the Nation's military or streamlined defense spending, but it is just not the case, Mr. Chair.

Earlier this year, Secretary Mattis testified to the Armed Services Committee on the need to reassess our military's current infrastructure resources and needs before closing or realigning any current resources.

The fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act required an updated DOD force structure plan and an infrastructure inventory. To date, DOD has not submitted the required infrastructure report.

Quite simply, we may not have enough capacity and infrastructure to meet our current needs and our needs going forward as we look at the threats coming from Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and the threat of global terrorism and transnational criminal organizations. Who knows what threat we will face tomorrow.

If the Secretary of Defense, I hope, will work with us to reassess our current capacity, then the need to halt realignments and closures to give him time to do so is all the more important. With outdated capacity information, there is simply no reason to close or realign an installation just to repurchase or rebuild a new one just a few years down the road. It is fiscally irresponsible in terms of defense spending and meeting our needs moving forward.

□ 2230

I have nothing but respect for my colleague from California and have fought many fights to get rid of waste and cut government spending with him. This is just one that I can't support.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in voting against Mr. MCCLINTOCK's broken bucket amendment.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, to vote against these measures, to vote to rob our military of \$20 million of savings over the next 10 years for military bases the Pentagon itself says are unnecessary, it comes down to that. You cannot provide for the common defense if you cannot pay for it, and the ability of our country to do so is being called into grave question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, let me say in 90 seconds then, it may

sound counterintuitive that BRAC doesn't save us money, but even though it can take money off the Defense rolls, the question is: Where does this property end up and who pays for it?

The bulk of the property ends up in the hands of local government, State government, and if it was public domain to begin with, the Department of the Interior has got first crack at it. I have also always sarcastically said every time there is a BRAC base closure, I end up with a new national park and national monument. And even though we have never done a study to verify it, I can give you a half dozen off the top of my head where that happened.

So the question is: Does the taxpayer save money? And if you invent a BRAC process that will guarantee that the Federal estate will not be enlarged, that you won't simply transfer property from one Federal entity to another or from the Federal Government to State governments so the taxpayer saves money, then I will gladly support a BRAC process.

But until we can guarantee that, all we are doing is shifting the money around, shifting the entity around. We may help the Department of Defense change their budget, but the taxpayer is still on the hook for all the property and all the efforts that go into it, and that is wrong, and that is the process.

When we change the BRAC process to make it more public, to make it so the taxpayer saves, then I will support it, but that hasn't happened yet.

Therefore, I ask Members to vote "no" on the amendment.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McClintock).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 88 printed in part B of House Report 115–212.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 1673. MODIFICATION TO ANNUAL REPORT ON PLAN FOR THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS STOCKPILE, NUCLEAR WEAPONS COMPLEX, NUCLEAR WEAPONS DELIVERY SYSTEMS, AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM.

Subsection (a)(2)(F) of section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1576), as most recently amended by section 1643 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3650), is further amended by inserting after the period at the end the following: "The Secretary may include information and data for a period beyond such 10-year period if the Secretary determines that such information and data is accurate and useful in understanding the long-term nuclear modernization plan."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, as I said a few minutes ago, I submitted this amendment as a hopeful compromise with my colleague from California who offered amendment Nos. 10 and 12 on this same issue. I will keep this very brief because we have discussed this thoroughly tonight.

But going down a path of a 30-year cost estimate for nuclear weapons is a bad idea and will result in bad data. As we debated this for the past 5 years now, the Obama administration didn't want to do it, the Trump administration doesn't want to do it, and the HASC and the House have voted against it every year.

I urge my colleagues to consider voting for my reasonable commonsense amendment, commonsense way to get this issue resolved with amendment No. 88.

My amendment allows the Secretary of Defense to provide information beyond 10 years if he thinks it would be accurate and useful in the information it yielded. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment and "no" on amendment Nos. 10 and 12.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I just want to say very quickly, I still have the concerns that I have expressed about the broader nuclear weapons issue and will talk a little bit more about that in a minute. But you know, this is a way to at least give an option to get a greater idea of the costs. So it may not be everything that we would want, but it is certainly not

something that we should oppose, so I do not oppose it and would urge support.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 431, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 3, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 printed in part B of House Report 115-212, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

Strike section 632 and insert the following:
SEC. 632. REPORT REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF MILITARY COMMISSARIES AND EXCHANGES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding management practices of military commissaries and exchanges.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under this section shall include a cost-benefit analysis with the goals of—

(1) reducing the costs of operating military commissaries and exchanges by \$2,000,000,000 during fiscal years 2018 through 2022; and

(2) not raising costs for patrons of military commissaries and exchanges.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 1 . INCREASE IN AMOUNTS FOR ENHANCING INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE CAPABILITY.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for aircraft procurement, Air Force, as specified in the corresponding funding table in division D, for BA 05: Modification of Inservice Aircraft: E-8 (line 056) is hereby increased by \$23,091,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 101 for aircraft procurement, Air Force, as specified in the corresponding funding table in division D, for BA 05: Modification of Inservice Aircraft / BSA 5: Other Aircraft (line 050) is hereby reduced by \$23,091,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2 . STRATEGY FOR USE OF VIRTUAL TRAINING TECHNOLOGY.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall direct the head of each military department—

(1) to establish a comprehensive strategy to determine what capability gaps exist in the department that can be rectified with virtual training;

(2) to review the virtual training possibilities for this gap to determine what virtual training would rectify this gap most efficiently; and

(3) to determine what acquisitions would need to be made to acquire the correct amount of technology to achieve desired goals.

(b) POST-FIELDING ANALYSIS.—The head of each military department concerned shall create a post-fielding training effectiveness analysis before commencing training using any virtual training technology acquired pursuant to subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2 . INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES OF THE ARMY.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for Applied Research, Electronics and Electronic Devices, Line 018, is hereby increased by \$2,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for Advanced Component Development and Prototypes, Technology Maturation Initiatives, Line 072, is hereby reduced by \$2,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 2 . INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND MINORITY INSTITUTIONS.

(a) INCREASE.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for Basic Research, Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Institutions, Line 006, is hereby increased by \$4,135,000.

(b) OFFSET.—Notwithstanding the amounts set forth in the funding tables in division D, the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 4201 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, as specified in the corresponding funding table in section 4201, for Advanced Technology Development, Advanced Innovative Analysis and Concepts, Line 038, is hereby reduced by \$4,135,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI OF ILLINOIS

At the end of title II, at the following new section:

SEC. 2 . ESTABLISHMENT AND EXPANSION OF HACKING FOR DEFENSE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The MD5 Hacking for Defense Program enables universities nationwide to provide valuable entrepreneurial and innovation education to students, providing formal training for scientists and engineers to pursue careers in business or government organizations.

(2) The MD5 Hacking for Defense Program is successful in part due to its focus on ensuring that government problems are well-defined and suitable for university courses, ensuring that educators are trained and certified in course methodology and curriculum, and providing an ecosystem of government and corporate mentors to student teams to enhance their education and access to clients familiar with specific problems.

(3) Hacking for Defense programs provide a unique pathway for veteran students to leverage their military expertise to solve rapidly emerging national security challenges while learning cutting-edge business innovation methodology.

(4) The MD5 Hacking for Defense Program's success in the early stages of the innovation continuum should be expanded to offer training to universities nationwide, and government personnel and organizations charged with innovation.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT AND EXPANSION OF HACKING FOR DEFENSE PROGRAM.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish a Hacking for Defense Program under which the Secretary may obligate or expend up to \$15,000,000 to support university-based entrepreneurial education programs, including—

(A) materials to recruit veterans for such programs;

(B) model curriculum for such programs;

(C) training materials for such programs; and

(D) best practices for the conduct of such programs.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense may consult with the heads of such Federal agencies, universities, and public and private entities engaged in the development of advanced technologies as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(3) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(A) develop and maintain eligibility criteria for programs to become recognized as Hacking for Defense education sites; and

(B) ensure that any recipient of a grant under the Small Business Technology Transfer program or the Small Business Innovation Research program has the option to participate in training under the MD5 Hacking for Defense Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE OF TEXAS

Page 86, after line 23, insert the following:
SEC. 323. PROHIBITION ON APPLICATION OF HIRING FREEZES AT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE FACILITIES.

Any memorandum, Executive order, or other action by the President to prevent a department or agency of the Federal Government from filling vacant Federal civilian employee positions or creating new such positions, shall have no force or effect with respect to any Department of Defense civilian position at, or in support of—

(1) any facility at which depot-level maintenance and repair (as that term is defined in section 2460 of title 10, United States Code) is carried out; or

(2) any facility designated under section 2474 of such title as a center for industrial and technical excellence.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 104, after line 6, insert the following:
SEC. 337. UPDATED GUIDANCE REGARDING BIENNIAL CORE REPORT.

To ensure that the biennial core reporting procedures of the Department of Defense align with the requirements of section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, and that each reporting agency provides accurate and complete information, the Secretary of Defense should direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to update the Department of Defense Guidance, in particular Department of Defense Instruction 4151.20, to require future biennial core reports include instructions to the reporting agencies on how to—

- (1) report additional depot workload performed that has not been identified as a core requirement;
- (2) accurately capture inter-service workload;
- (3) calculate shortfalls; and
- (4) estimate the cost of planned workload.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. CÁRDENAS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 104, after line 6, insert the following:
SEC. 337. REPORT ON ARCTIC READINESS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on arctic readiness. Such report shall include—

- (1) an analysis of the challenges posed by the rapidly changing arctic region, including the reasons why the arctic region is changing at such a rapid rate;
- (2) an analysis of how the changes will affect other regions, particularly coastal communities;
- (3) an analysis of how the changes will affect military infrastructure; and
- (4) recommendations for congressional action to address the needs of the Armed Forces, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, resulting from changes in the arctic.

(b) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required under this section shall be unclassified, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF LOUISIANA

Page 104, after line 6, insert the following:
SEC. 337. REPORT ON CYBER CAPABILITY AND READINESS SHORTFALLS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to Congress a report on the Army Combat Training Centers and the current resident cyber capabilities and training at such centers to examine potential training readiness shortfalls and ensure that pre-rotational cyber training needs are met. In preparing the report, the Secretary shall take into account nearby cyber assets that could contribute to addressing potential cyber capability and readiness shortfalls.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 104, after line 6, insert the following:
SEC. 337. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF INCREASED AUTOMATION OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE ON MANUFACTURING WORKFORCE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the effects of the increased automation of

the defense industrial base over the ten-year period beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. Such report shall include, for the period covered by the report—

- (1) an estimate of the number of jobs in the United States manufacturing workforce expected to be eliminated due to automation in the defense sector;
- (2) an analysis describing any new types of jobs that are expected to be established as a result of an increasingly automated process, including an estimate of the number of these types of jobs that are expected to be created;
- (3) an analysis of the potential threats to the national security of the United States that are unique to the automation of the defense industry;
- (4) a strategy to assist in providing workforce training and transition preparation for workers who may lose manufacturing jobs in the defense industry due to automation;
- (5) a description of any training necessary for workers affected by automation to more easily transition to new types of jobs within the defense manufacturing industry; and
- (6) any actions taken, or planned to be taken, by the Department of Defense to assist in worker transition.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. KHANNA OF CALIFORNIA

Strike section 344 and insert the following:
SEC. 344. COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF UNIFORM SPECIFICATIONS FOR AFGHAN MILITARY OR SECURITY FORCES.

Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, whenever the Secretary of Defense enters into a contract for the provision of uniforms for Afghan military or security forces, the Secretary shall conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the uniform specification for the Afghan military or security forces uniform. Such analysis shall determine—

- (1) whether there is a more effective alternative uniform specification, considering both operational environment and cost, available to the Afghan military or security forces;
- (2) the efficacy of the existing pattern compared to other alternatives (both proprietary and non-proprietary patterns; and
- (3) the costs and feasibility of transitioning the uniforms of the Afghan military or security forces to a pattern owned by the United States, using existing excess inventory where available, and acquiring the rights to the Spec4ce Forest pattern.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. HERRERA BEUTLER OF WASHINGTON

Page 126, after line 12, insert the following:
SEC. 516. TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **MEMBERS OF BOARDS FOR THE CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS.**—Section 534(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 10 U.S.C. 1552 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “This curriculum shall also address the proper handling of claims in which a sex-related offense is alleged to have contributed to the original characterization of the discharge or release of the claimant, including guidelines for the consideration of evidence substantiating such allegations in accordance with the requirements of section 1554(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code.”

(b) **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONNEL WHO INVESTIGATE CLAIMS OF RETALIATION.**—Section 546(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) is amended by striking “section.” and inserting “section, including

guidelines for the consideration of evidence substantiating such allegations in accordance with the requirements of section 1554(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code.”

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Page 146, after line 16, insert the following new section:

SEC. 531. INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN ANNUAL SAPRO REPORTS.

Section 1631 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—

“(1) **SEXUAL ASSAULT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘sexual assault’ includes rape, sexual assault, forcible sodomy, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, and attempts to commit such offenses, as those terms are defined in the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

“(2) **SEXUAL COERCION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘sexual coercion’ includes unwanted vaginal, oral, or anal sex after the perpetrator pressured the victim by means including—

- “(A) repeated requests to the victim for sex;
- “(B) expressions of unhappiness due to the victim refusing to have sex with the perpetrator;
- “(C) lies;
- “(D) threats; and
- “(E) sexual harassment as that term is defined in section 1561(e) of title 10, United States Code.”

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle D of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 544. EXTENSION OF SUICIDE PREVENTION AND RESILIENCE PROGRAM.

Section 10219(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “October 1, 2018” and inserting “October 1, 2019”.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF NORTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. FIVE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO THE TRANSITION AND SUPPORT OF MILITARY DEPENDENT STUDENTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

Section 574(c)(3) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (20 U.S.C. 7703b note), as most recently amended by section 572 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2141), is amended by striking “September 30, 2017” and inserting “September 30, 2022”.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 156, beginning on line 19, strike “. not including a member or former member of the Coast Guard.”

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MRS. WATSON COLEMAN OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 575. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NON-DISCRIMINATION AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY.

Congress affirms the nondiscrimination policy of the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York, including as applied to female cadets, staff, and faculty.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle G of title V in division A, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ . EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO PROVIDE FOR THE CONDUCT OF MEDICAL DISABILITY EXAMINATIONS BY CONTRACT PHYSICIANS.

Section 704(c) of the Veterans Benefits Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-183; 38 U.S.C. 5101 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “December 31, 2018”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of a very important part of this en bloc proposal, which is filled with important parts.

Dr. Afridi is a Pakistani doctor who risked his life to help our special forces identify the hiding place of Osama bin Laden, the planner and commander of the slaughter of 3,000 Americans on 9/11.

Dr. Afridi, clearly an American hero, has languished in a Pakistani dungeon for the past 6 years and has been sentenced to spend another two decades in captivity.

Dr. Afridi is a courageous hero. He is not forgotten. His plight is not ignored.

Tonight, I am pleading that this language be retained in the final version of this en bloc amendment. This man is suffering for us.

Making my amendment in order acknowledges Dr. Afridi's sacrifice and demands Pakistani authorities release him immediately.

If we turn our backs on such a noble friend as Dr. Afridi, shame on us.

And I thank the Members who put this bill together for including this very moral statement.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to speak on amendment No. 66.

On July 4, the Communist totalitarian regime in North Korea marked the holiday testing an intercontinental ballistic missile. This is yet another escalation by a regime that has tested ballistic missiles and has conducted five nuclear tests.

This amendment expresses a clear sense of Congress: we will not tolerate the escalation by the regime in North Korea testing ballistic missiles or developing a nuclear weapon threatening American families.

The amendment also reaffirms the strong commitment of the United States to our allies in the region, especially South Korea, Japan, and Aus-

tralia. I am encouraged by the leadership of President Donald Trump for a commitment of peace through strength. It is clear the regime in North Korea will only respond to strength, and this sense of Congress strongly states our commitment to keeping all options on the table while addressing the threat of North Korea, whether it be military, diplomatic, or economic.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment with the en bloc package.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chair, the most important duty of this body is to ensure the safety of every American family from foreign enemies who intend us harm. We must advocate for a foreign policy that projects strength and purpose.

The threat profile our Nation faces has never been more severe, including from rogue regimes and those who directly and indirectly support the spread of terror. Acting in isolation, each of these threats requires U.S. attention. However, we must also investigate and understand the scope of evil's reach, especially the nexus between Iran and North Korea.

Mr. Chair, my amendment would compel the Pentagon to report the extent of cooperation on nuclear programs, ballistic missile development, chemical and biological weapons development, and conventional weapons programs between Pyongyang and Tehran. Only when we understand the complex dealings between these enemies of peace can we outline a plan to combat them.

My amendment will provide better, more comprehensive tools for American defense, and I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to support it for the sake of our Nation's security.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI).

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of a bipartisan amendment I have offered along with my colleagues from Texas, Chairman THORNBERRY of the Armed Services Committee and Mr. CONAWAY, a fellow CPA.

It is essential the Democrats and Republicans work together to control government costs to root out waste, fraud, and abuse, and that we specifically focus these efforts on the Department of Defense.

Chairman THORNBERRY has promoted a reform agenda of which I am very supportive. During the Armed Services Committee markup of the bill, I proposed changes to the chairman's reform package. My amendment sought

to make the use of private sector auditors more efficient and effective by eliminating bureaucratic mandates and an unnecessarily bureaucratic committee.

The chairman supported my goals, and I suggested that I work with my fellow CPA, Mr. CONAWAY. In a bipartisan spirit, we agreed to this amendment, which will, one, help eliminate the incurred cost audit backlog; two, help reallocate resources to prioritize higher risk audits with potential savings for government; three, help ensure private sector auditing capacity exists; and, most importantly, four, root out waste, fraud, and abuse in Defense contracting.

I never thought I would come to Washington to work on Department of Defense audits, but Chairman THORNBERRY's willingness to engage my expertise and the bipartisan manner of the amendment will hopefully result in significant reforms and aid in my ongoing efforts to help save taxpayers' dollars by making government more effective and efficient.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the National Defense Authorization Act being considered this evening and on my amendment No. 22 to require an Army cyber training readiness assessment.

It is vital that we adequately fund our military with the necessary training and tools they need to succeed. Our men and women in uniform deserve the greatest amount of resources we can possibly provide at all times.

If agreed to, my amendment requires the Army to review the combat training centers, or CTCs, and the resident cyber capabilities and training to make certain the needs of prerotational cyber training are fully met.

These CTCs' rotations serve as the premier events to evaluate collective training, and the rotations provide feedback to commanders on how well they have trained their units and their leaders and what they need to do to improve readiness.

Including cyber training is a commonsense step to meet the threats our Nation will face. The Army has testified before Congress that this area is falling short and additional resources are desperately needed for cyber training.

Our Armed Forces must be able to operate within highly defended environments, possibly at the leading edge of a joint force, to control the air, sea, space, and cyberspace domain. My amendment will assist us in this endeavor, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

□ 2245

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment in en bloc package 3, amendment 53, that would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to provide Congress a report of any cyber attack attempts by the Russian Government and other Russian actors targeting the Department of Defense within the past 2 years.

These Defense Department systems are the foundation of our Nation's defense and security, and it is crucial that they are protected. Despite this understanding, our Nation is still not fully aware of the magnitude of the problems, and Congress is not appropriately advised of these past breaches.

My amendment would require a report from the Secretary of the Defense to Congress so that we can begin to properly address the strength of our Nation's security.

I thank Congresswoman SHEA-PORTER for supporting my amendment, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers on this en bloc amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment No. 88 of 228, H.R. 2810.

This amendment would call upon the Department of Defense to update its cyber strategy, requiring the President to draft guidance for offensive cyber capabilities, and to authorize international cooperation, including building of our NATO partner allies' cybersecurity.

World war III is raging in cyberspace now. It has become one of the most crucial homeland and global security issues. Our Presidential election came under cyber attack, possibly compromising the American electoral system. But the U.S. is not alone. There were press reports of massive cyber attacks of French President Emmanuel Macron's campaign as well.

My amendment will increase our offensive cyber capabilities to prevent our adversaries from engaging in cyber espionage like we witnessed during the past election cycle and recent global cyber attacks.

Protecting our network is vital to the security of our Nation and allies, and my amendment works to that end.

I thank Congresswoman ROSEN for supporting my amendment as well, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the en bloc amendments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chair, I want to start off by thanking the chair and ranking member for supporting these two amendments, one in this bloc, one in the next bloc.

The first amendment will authorize the Hacking for Defense, or H4D, Program. This is an innovative program developed in Silicon Valley with the help of battlefield-experienced Iraq and Afghanistan veterans, and it finds unique solutions to national security problems.

First taught at Stanford, H4D uses lean business startup methods to engage America's best and brightest in solving real security challenges faced by the DOD.

Rapid, low-cost technological innovation is what makes Silicon Valley revolutionary, but the DOD hasn't historically had the mechanisms in place to harness this American advantage.

Hacking for Defense creates ways for talented scientists and engineers to work alongside with veterans, military leaders, and business mentors to innovate solutions that make America safer. For example, a July 7 New York Times article details how an H4D graduate, Capella Space, is helping track North Korean nuclear capabilities, helping to try to make our world safer.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD this article, along with these letters of support from universities and tech communities.

[From the New York Times, July 7, 2017]

TINY SATELLITES WILL TRACK NORTH KOREA MISSILES

(By David E. Sanger and William J. Broad; Eric Schmitt contributed reporting)

For years before North Korea fired its first intercontinental ballistic missile this week, the Pentagon and intelligence experts had sounded a warning: Not only was the North making progress quickly, spy satellite coverage was so spotty that the United States might not see a missile being prepared for launch.

That set off an urgent but quiet search for ways to improve America's early-warning ability—and the capability to strike missiles while they are on the launchpad. The most intriguing solutions have come from Silicon Valley, where the Obama administration began investing in tiny, inexpensive civilian satellites developed to count cars in Target parking lots and monitor the growth of crops.

Some in the Pentagon accustomed to relying on highly classified, multibillion-dollar satellites, which take years to develop, resisted the move. But as North Korea's missile program progressed, American officials laid out an ambitious schedule for the first of the small satellites to go up at the end of this year, or the beginning of next.

Launched in clusters, some staying in orbit just a year or two, the satellites would provide coverage necessary to execute a new military contingency plan called "Kill Chain." It is the first step in a new strategy to use satellite imagery to identify North Korean launch sites, nuclear facilities and

manufacturing capability and destroy them pre-emptively if a conflict seems imminent.

Even a few extra minutes of warning might save the lives of tens of thousands of Americans—and millions of South Koreans and Japanese who already live within range of the North's missiles.

"Kim Jong-un is racing—literally racing—to deploy a missile capability," Robert Cardillo, the director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, which coordinates satellite-based mapping for the government, said in an interview days before North Korea's latest launch. "His acceleration has caused us to accelerate."

The timeline for getting the satellites in orbit, which defense officials have never discussed publicly, reflects the urgency of the problem. The missile launch by North Korea on Tuesday was initiated from a new site, a mobile launcher at the Pang Hyon Aircraft Factory. Capt. Jeff Davis, a Pentagon spokesman, said the missile "is not one we have seen before."

That mobility is the problem that the new satellites, with wide coverage using radar sensors that work at night and during storms, are designed to address. Less than one-third of North Korea is under spy satellite coverage at a given moment.

American intelligence analysts detected indications of an impending launch in the days before the missile firing, according to a spokesman for the Defense Intelligence Agency, Cmdr. William Marks. But even after the launch, the Pentagon misjudged what it was looking at. Minutes after its 37-minute flight ended, the United States Pacific Command described the missile as an intermediate-range model, often seen.

Hours later, Secretary of State Rex W. Tillerson issued a very different conclusion: that the North had tested its first intercontinental ballistic missile, able to reach Alaska.

The commercial radar push is one of several new ways the administration is seeking to counter the North Korean threat. President Trump inherited a secret effort to sabotage the North's missile launches. But its success has been spotty at best, especially of late.

And joint American-South Korean missile tests, conducted hours after the ICBM test, appeared to be part of the new strategy that includes Kill Chain—the missiles were designed to reach Pyongyang, where the country's leadership lives.

Kill Chain was also mentioned in a joint statement issued last week by the United States and South Korea, a notable shift for the South's new president, Moon Jae-in. He has rejected public discussion of pre-emptive military action, arguing it plays into the North Korean paranoia that the United States and its allies are plotting to end the Kim government.

Mr. Moon has spoken of reviving direct talks—a so-called sunshine policy, which he advocated as chief of staff to an earlier South Korean president.

But Mr. Trump has tried to build pressure, using warships, sanctions and missile defenses. He was recently presented with new options, including military ones, for responding to a sixth nuclear detonation by the North or a test of a missile that could reach the United States.

"The threat is much more immediate," H.R. McMaster, Mr. Trump's national security adviser, told a conference last week at the Center for a New American Security in Washington. "So it's clear that we can't repeat the same approach—failed approach—of the past."

The new satellite initiative builds on technology created more for Wall Street than the Pentagon. From an office in an old Defense Department building within view of the Google campus in California, Raj Shah, the director of the Defense Innovation Unit Experimental, or DIUx, is already investing in companies that exploit tiny civilian radar satellites, able to pierce darkness or storms, in hopes that the Pentagon can use them by the end of the year, or early in 2018.

"It's a very challenging target," said Mr. Shah, a former F-16 pilot in Iraq whose extensive experience in Silicon Valley appealed to Defense Secretary Ashton B. Carter, who set up the unit during Mr. Obama's second term and recruited Mr. Shah.

"The key is using technologies that are already available, and making the modifications we need for a specific military purpose," Mr. Shah said.

His unit made an investment to jump-start the development efforts of Capella Space, a Silicon Valley start-up named after a bright star. It plans to loft its first radar satellite late this year. The company says its radar fleet, if successfully deployed, will be able to monitor important targets hourly.

"The entire spacecraft is the size of a backpack," said Payam Banazadeh, a founder of the company. Born in Iran, he learned satellite design at the University of Texas and NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, specializing in miniaturization.

Once in orbit, the payload, he added, would unfurl its antenna and solar panels.

"Everything is getting smaller," Mr. Banazadeh said of the craft's parts. "Even the next version of the satellite is getting smaller."

Seeing the early fruits of the Pentagon experiment, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency is opening its doors to companies that can supply it with satellite radar data in addition to traditional images. Its outpost, set up this year, is in San Jose, the heart of Silicon Valley.

Federal officials rarely, if ever, acknowledge the poor reconnaissance coverage of the North from traditional military satellites. But William J. Perry, the former secretary of defense, recently said in Washington that if the North rolled out a missile to hit the United States or its allies, "there's a good chance we'd never see it."

The threat grew worse last year as North Korea began using solid fuels after decades of relying on liquid propellants to power its big rockets and missiles. While liquid-fueled missiles can take hours or even days of preparation, solid-fueled missiles can be fired with little or no warning.

Mr. Kim has made the effort a personal project, posing next to a large solid-fueled motor after a successful ground test last year. The North followed that firing with four successful flight tests, twice last year and twice this year.

The advances, said Young-Keun Chang, director of the Global Surveillance Research Center at the Korea Aerospace University in Seoul, moved the North significantly closer to a mobile intercontinental missile that could eventually pose "a serious potential threat to the United States."

The key to detecting launch preparations is the near-constant presence of satellites that can see through clouds, rain, snow, foliage and camouflage and can detect the movement of military gear, including missiles. That requires space-based radars, which over the years have been highly expensive, with their big antennas and tendency to use large amounts of power. Like any radar,

they fire radio waves at targets and gather faint echoes.

Space-based radars can also detect changes in ground elevation that signal hidden tunnels, bunkers and even radioactive cavities left by nuclear blasts, experts say, because such hollows cause the surface above them to subside ever so slightly.

But building the radars has historically been expensive for the government.

In 2007, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that a constellation of 21 radar satellites would cost the nation up to \$94 billion—or more than \$4 billion each. The report, published shortly after the North's first nuclear detonation, zeroed in on whether the satellites could track Korean missiles on mobile launchers. It called the goal "highly challenging," and said 35 to 50 spacecraft would be needed to make such detections rapidly.

The new generation of tiny, cheap satellites has made that outcome more achievable. Capella plans to loft its first radar satellite late this year and build up to 36 orbital radars, within the range the congressional report recommended.

In addition to Capella, private companies rushing to make and exploit new generations of small radar satellites include Urso Space Systems in Ithaca, N.Y.; UrtheCast in Vancouver, Canada; and Iceye in Espoo, Finland. Like many new companies seeking to make small satellites, most have strong ties to Silicon Valley.

The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency's initiative, known as the Commercial Geoint Activity, builds on programs in which the agency bought radar-satellite data from Canada, Italy and Germany as part of its evaluation of the new civilian technologies.

Mr. Cardillo said the new partnerships could help the United States close the gaps in tracking Mr. Kim's rapidly expanding arsenal of threatening missiles.

"If any of these companies, new or old, can help fill those gaps," he said, "then I'm interested."

LELAND STANDFORD, JUNIOR UNIVERSITY,

July 11, 2017.

Hon. DANIEL W. LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LIPINSKI: I am writing to express my personal support for your proposed amendment 352 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. This amendment would provide statutory authorization for the Hacking for Defense program, something developed here at Stanford University that is effectively changing the way students think about national security.

Hacking for Defense is a class first taught at Stanford and now at growing number of other universities around the country in which students learn to apply lean startup methods to national security challenges. Instructors gather projects or problems from branches of the military and intelligence agencies for the students to address. A core component of the course is gaining an in-depth understanding of the problem the students are trying to solve, which the students do by conducting 100 interviews with potential "customers" or beneficiaries of a solution. By the end of the course, although students aren't required to come up with a new product or service, many of them do such as the "tiny satellites" project recently in the news regarding North Korea's missiles.

Hacking for Defense is valuable because it combines a student's knowledge and entrepreneurial energy with the experience of their business and military mentors to innovatively solve national security challenges. In addition, it exposes rising generation of technology stars to the potential value and benefit of careers in national service.

Authorization and federal support of this program will enable its expansion to many more universities throughout the country, helping solve high priority problems and train a new generation of civic-minded entrepreneurs and technologists. I strongly support inclusion of this program in the National Defense Authorization Act.

Respectfully,

THOMAS H. BYERS, PH.D.,
Professor, Management Science &
Engineering, Endowed Chair in
Entrepreneurship Education, School of
Engineering,
Founder and Faculty Director, Stanford
Technology Ventures Program, Stanford
University.

JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY,

Harrisonburg, VA, July 12, 2017.

Hon. DANIEL W. LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LIPINSKI: As strong supporters of establishing a national security innovation workforce, we commend your support for the Hacking for Defense Program, operated under MD5, the National Security Technology Accelerator within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. We support your effort to authorize the program and create the option for the Secretary of Defense to expend up to \$15 million to expand and strengthen existing programs designed to boost Veterans innovation education.

A public-private partnership between the National Defense University and a network of national defense research universities, MD5 was recognized in the Fiscal Year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act as "an important pilot program making vital contributions in the field of technology innovation." The program emphasizes the incentives, outreach, professional military education, and skills-based training necessary to build a National Security Innovation Corps.

By leveraging programs like Hacking for Defense (H4D), MD5 is growing a cadre of entrepreneurs that are adept at critical thinking, creative problem solving, and the formation of successful ventures that deliver economic, national security, and social value. H4D classes educate Veterans and other students in technology innovation and entrepreneurship, and provide a unique pathway for Veterans to leverage their expertise while learning cutting-edge business innovation methodology, increasing post-military opportunities and applying their knowledge to new national security problems.

Additional funds will help MD5 build on its early success by expanding H4D training to universities nationwide, as well as government personnel and other organizations responsible for innovation efforts. Funds will be used to expand the development of resources, to include Veteran recruitment materials, model curriculum, training materials, and best practices to support university entrepreneurial education programs.

We support your amendment 352 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2018, to continue to grow the national security innovation workforce.

Sincerely,

YVONNE R. HARRIS, PH.D.,
Vice Provost.

ZOIC LABS,
Culver City, CA, July 11, 2017.

Hon. DANIEL W. LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LIPINSKI: As strong supporters of establishing a national security innovation workforce, we commend your support for the Hacking for Defense Program, operated under MD5, the National Security Technology Accelerator within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. We support your effort to authorize the program and create the option for the Secretary of Defense to expend up to \$15 million to expand and strengthen existing programs designed to boost veterans innovation education.

A public-private partnership between the National Defense University and a network of national research universities, MD5 was recognized in the Fiscal Year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act as “an important pilot program making vital contributions in the field of technology innovation.” The program emphasizes the incentives, outreach, professional military education, and skills-based training necessary to build a National Security Innovation Corps.

By leveraging programs like Hacking for Defense (H4D), MD5 is growing a cadre of entrepreneurs that are adept at critical thinking, creative problem solving, and the formation of successful ventures that deliver economic, national security, and social value. H4D classes educate veterans and other students in technology innovation and entrepreneurship, and provide a unique pathway for veterans to leverage their expertise while learning cutting-edge business innovation methodology, increasing post-military opportunities and applying their knowledge to new national security problems.

Additional funds will help MD5 build on its early success by expanding H4D training to universities nationwide, as well as government personnel and other organizations responsible for innovation efforts. Funds will be used to expand the development of resources, to include veteran recruitment materials, model curriculum, training materials, and best practices to support university entrepreneurial education programs.

We support your amendment 352 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, to continue to grow the national security innovation workforce.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW THUNELL,
Executive Vice President.

ALION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
McLean, VA, July 12, 2017.

Hon. DANIEL W. LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LIPINSKI: For over 80 years, Alion has been called upon to solve the nation’s most important and challenging problems. Our original charter in 1936, as Armour Research Foundation (later the Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute, or “IITRI”), identified our purpose: “to experiment upon, test, promote, and develop the public, scientific, and commercial value of inventions, discoveries, and processes.” Our focus has remained constant, while we

continue to evolve to apply the latest innovations in science, technology and engineering to address the needs of this great nation. One innovation still in use today is our development of the “Armour alloy,” a titanium alloy that saved the Air Force’s gas turbine engine program, and is still used in military fighting vehicles and advanced prosthetics. Beginning during the interwar period, continuing through America’s superpower status in the wake of our successful contributions to World War II, and enduring through the rapidly evolving and complex global security environment of the present day, Alion is an important part of the American fabric of innovation.

Today, Alion stands strong on this solid foundation, supporting customers in defense, civilian government, and commercial industries. Our 21 labs and 2,300-person staff provide Alion the physical and intellectual resources to tackle any problem. Our history as an academic research center informs our approach of bringing together the brightest minds and best technologies from wherever they reside: government labs, large industry, universities, or small businesses. For example, when in 2015 the Secretary of Defense established a new initiative to expand access to global commercial technology innovations, Alion was the first partner to close a deal with a commercial company focused on big data analytics; as we have done many times, Alion brokered an effective translation between military need and commercial capabilities, bringing the two together into a successful solution.

As strong supporters of establishing a national security innovation workforce, we commend your support for the Hacking for Defense Program, operated under MD5, the National Security Technology Accelerator within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. We support your effort to authorize the program and create the option for the Secretary of Defense to expend up to \$15 million to expand and strengthen existing programs designed to boost veterans’ innovation education.

A public-private partnership between the National Defense University and a network of national research universities, MD5 was recognized in the Fiscal Year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act as “an important pilot program making vital contributions in the field of technology innovation.” The program emphasizes the incentives, outreach, professional military education, and skills-based training necessary to build a National Security Innovation Corps.

By leveraging programs like Hacking for Defense (H4D), MD5 is growing a cadre of entrepreneurs that are adept at critical thinking, creative problem solving, and the formation of successful ventures that deliver economic, national security, and social value. H4D classes educate veterans and other students in technology innovation and entrepreneurship, and provide a unique pathway for veterans to leverage their expertise while learning cutting-edge business innovation methodology, increasing post-military opportunities and applying their knowledge to new national security problems.

Additional funds will help MD5 build on its early success by expanding H4D training to universities nationwide, as well as government personnel and other organizations responsible for innovation efforts. Funds will be used to expand the development of resources, to include veteran recruitment materials, model curriculum, training materials, and best practices to support university entrepreneurial education programs.

We support your amendment 352 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, to continue to grow the national security innovation workforce.

Sincerely,

GERRY DECKER,
Chief Growth Officer.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO BOULDER,
Boulder, CO, July 12, 2017.

Hon. DANIEL W. LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LIPINSKI: The University of Colorado, and its College of Engineering and Applied Science, is an avid supporter of establishing a strong national security innovation workforce, and we commend your support for MD5, the National Security Technology Accelerator within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. We support your effort to authorize the program and create the option for the Secretary of Defense to expend up to \$15 million to expand and strengthen existing programs designed to boost veteran’s innovation education.

In our position as the flagship research university in one of the nation’s top Aerospace & Defense economies, we recognize the need to maintain a decisive advantage in technology innovation. Our research partners—including Ball Aerospace, Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman, Sierra Nevada Corporation, and Raytheon—routinely emphasize an increasing need for highly trained, technically competent, agile, and innovative engineers and scientists to address the most pressing technology challenges in National Security.

As the newest member of MD5, we believe programs like Hacking for Defense (H4D) are critical to developing a strong corps of future entrepreneurs that are adept at critical thinking, creative problem solving, and the formation of successful ventures that deliver economic, national security, and social value. The H4D curriculum educates veterans and other students in technology innovation and entrepreneurship, and provides a unique pathway to leverage their expertise while learning cutting-edge business innovation methodology and applying their knowledge to new national security problems.

Additional funding will help MD5 build on its early success by expanding H4D training to universities and other innovation organizations nationwide. Funds will be used to expand the development of resources, to include veteran recruitment materials, model curriculum, training materials, and best practices that will further enhance our university entrepreneurial education programs.

We support your amendment 352 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, to continue to grow the national security innovation workforce.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. BRAUN,
Dean, College of Engineering and Applied Science.

OGSYSTEMS,
July 12, 2017.

Hon. DANIEL W. LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LIPINSKI: As strong supporters of establishing a national security innovation workforce, we commend your support for the Hacking for Defense Program, operated under MD5, the National Security Technology Accelerator within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. We support your effort to authorize the program

and create the option for the Secretary of Defense to expend up to \$15 million to expand and strengthen existing programs designed to boost veteran innovation education.

A public-private partnership between the National Defense University and a network of national research universities, MD5 was recognized in the Fiscal Year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act as “an important pilot program making vital contributions in the field of technology innovation.” The program emphasizes the incentives, outreach, professional military education, and skills-based training necessary to build a National Security Innovation Corps.

By leveraging programs like Hacking for Defense (H4D), MD5 is growing a cadre of entrepreneurs that are adept at critical thinking, creative problem solving, and the formation of the workforce innovative government contractors like OGSys need to deliver economic, national security, and social value. H4D classes educate veterans and other students in technology innovation and entrepreneurship, and provide a unique pathway for veterans to leverage their expertise while learning cutting-edge business innovation methodology, increasing post-military opportunities and applying their knowledge to new national security problems.

I have personally seen the positive impact to the Government agencies we support in both the H4D definition of problems and in the engagement of innovative sources of ideas to solve them. An example of one of the teams I helped to mentor was Capella Space at Stanford University, who is now VC funded and working on national defense problems in radar that even the Multi-Billion defense contractors weren't interested in investing IR&D funding. This is a win-win situation in the activation of non-traditional sources of innovation for DoD and the driving of solutions that impact national security.

Additional funds will help MDS build on its early success by expanding H4D training to universities nationwide, as well as government personnel and other organizations responsible for innovation efforts. Funds will be used to expand the development of resources, to include veteran recruitment materials, model curriculum, training materials, and best practices to support university entrepreneurial education programs.

We support amendment 352 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, to continue to grow the national security innovation workforce.

Sincerely,

GARRETT PAGON,
President.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chair, the second amendment deals with cybersecurity standards.

At the end of 2016, the DOD issued important updated cybersecurity standards for defense contractors. Companies must implement these new standards by January 1, 2018. However, I have heard from a number of small manufacturers in my district that it is very difficult getting the information and expertise necessary to institute these standards. They fear this may mean the end of their companies.

America cannot afford to lose these small businesses, so my amendment encourages the Secretary of Defense to establish a cooperative program between the DOD and MIST to educate and assist small- and medium-sized

manufacturing firms in achieving compliance with the updated cybersecurity standards.

This would help improve cybersecurity access across the defense supply chain while also preserving competition for DOD contracts. It has received broad support from the business and technology community.

Mr. Chair, I thank the chair and ranking member for supporting these two amendments in this bloc and the next.

I ask my colleagues to support these amendments.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment to reauthorize the Suicide Prevention and Resilience Program to 2019.

This is a critical program that provides members of the National Guard and Reserves, as well as their families, with training in suicide prevention, resilience, and community healing resources.

We simply cannot allow this critical suicide prevention program to expire, not for the men and women who are or have been on the front lines. Our Nation's veterans deserve the best care after putting their lives on the line to protect the freedoms we hold dear.

My bipartisan amendment reauthorizes and extends this program to improve safety and ensure continuity and peace of mind for the men and women who serve.

Just one soldier lost to suicide is too many. We should do everything in our power to help as many servicemembers as we can.

National Guardsmen and Reservists face unique challenges. They are citizen soldiers who do not live on a base. They often leave their jobs and families on a moment's notice to suit up to protect us.

Even a great Guardsman or Reservist may not know when and how to ask for help, yet these men and women still need access to support systems and community networks to help identify potential mental health issues. That is why it is critical that we extend this program to protect the well-being of all of our soldiers.

I am proud to offer this amendment in honor of those who serve in the New Jersey Guard and Reserve and across the Nation, as well as for their families.

I thank my colleague, Congresswoman MCSALLY, for her leadership on this issue and for her advocacy on behalf of all servicemembers.

I also thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their important work on this critical legislation. I look forward to coming together as Democrats and Republicans to de-

fend our Nation and protect all of those who serve.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of Mr. Rogers' amendment allocating additional base funding for one of our nation's most critical battle management command and control platforms: the E-8C Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System, or JSTARS fleet.

JSTARS' critical mission is enabled by leveraging its extremely capable active radar system providing invaluable moving target indicator (MTI) intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance targeting information to multiple users both on the ground and in airborne attack platforms.

The demand for MTI capability within each geographic combatant commander's area of responsibility far exceeds what JSTARS can currently provide due to its limited legacy fleet size of 16 aircraft and strained crew resources.

Thankfully, FY18 NDAA includes JSTARS Recapitalization funds, but the legacy fleet of 16 aircraft still has issues and challenges that the Air Force must successfully navigate to maintain viability until the current fleet is replaced by the Recapitalization program beginning in the late 2020s.

Despite these issues and challenges, we are confident that the Secretary of the Air Force can develop a successful legacy JSTARS to JSTARS Recapitalization transition plan that would not prematurely retire E-8C aircraft, reassign crews or maintenance personnel, or otherwise increase the MTI ISR capability gap from what existing levels of aircraft are currently experiencing.

To do this, we need strong support and necessary resources. That's why I'm here tonight in supporting additional resources for the JSTARS legacy fleet to update and maintain their critical battle management capabilities.

As the premiere military in the world, we cannot afford to let this important military capability deteriorate before our eyes, putting our warfighters and strategic campaigns at risk around the world.

One of the greatest duties we have as Members of Congress is to provide for our nation's defense, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure as well as other provisions supporting our warfighters and ensuring our men and women in uniform have the resources they need to meet the unique security needs of the 21st century.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 431, I offer a second package of amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, and 49 printed in part B of House Report 115–212, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 5 . ISSUANCE OF CONSOLIDATED PREGNANCY AND PARENTHOOD INSTRUCTION.

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each military department issues a single, consolidated instruction that addresses the decisions, actions, and requirements for members of the Armed Forces relating to pregnancy, the postpartum period, and parenthood.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. CARSON OF INDIANA

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 704. MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES DEPLOYED IN SUPPORT OF A CONTINGENCY OPERATION.

Section 1074m(a)(1)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “Until January 1, 2019, once” and inserting “Once”.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Page 204, after line 5, insert the following:

SEC. 704. COUNSELING AND TREATMENT FOR SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS AND CHRONIC PAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR MEMBERS WHO SEPARATE FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 1145(a)(6)(B)(i) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) in subclause (I)—
 - (A) by inserting “, substance use disorder,” after “post-traumatic stress disorder”; and
 - (B) by striking “and” at the end;
 - (2) by redesignating subclause (II) as subclause (III); and
 - (3) by inserting after subclause (I) the following:
 - “(II) chronic pain management services, including counseling and treatment of co-occurring mental health disorders and alternatives to opioid analgesics; and”.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. LANCE OF NEW JERSEY

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7 . PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR TERMINATION OF VETS4WARRIORS CRISIS HOTLINE PROGRAM.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to terminate the Vets4Warriors crisis hotline program unless the Secretary of Defense has submitted to the congressional defense committees a report describing a sufficient replacement to such program.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL OF NEW JERSEY

In title VII, at the end of subtitle C add the following:

SEC. . REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF GAO RECOMMENDATIONS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the implementation by the Department of Defense of the

recommendations from the Government Accountability Office report entitled “Actions Needed to Ensure Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Traumatic Brain Injury Are Considered in Misconduct Separations” and published May 16, 2017.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7 . AUTHORIZATION OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS FOR THE PROVISION OF HEALTH SCREENINGS.

Section 2679(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Such term includes health screenings for conditions relating to the exposure of perfluorooctanesulfonic acid and perfluorooctanoic acid in communities near formerly used defense sites that have been identified by the Secretary of Defense as sources of such acids.”

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following new section:

SEC. 7 . STUDY ON SAFE OPIOID PRESCRIBING PRACTICES.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the effectiveness of the training provided to military health care providers regarding opioid prescribing practices, initiatives in opioid safety, the use of the VA/DOD Clinical Practice Guideline for Management of Opioid Therapy for Chronic Pain, and other related training.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study under subsection (a) shall address the effectiveness of training with respect to the following:

- (1) Reducing the total number of prescription opioids dispensed by the Department of Defense to beneficiaries of health care furnished by the Department.
- (2) Reducing the average dosage prescribed by a military health care provider to such beneficiaries.
- (3) Reducing the average number of doses per prescription for treatment of acute pain.
- (4) Reducing the average duration of opioid therapy for chronic pain.
- (5) Reducing the number of overdoses due to prescription opioids for patients with acute pain and patients undergoing opioid therapy for chronic pain.
- (6) Providing counseling and referrals to treatment alternatives to opioid analgesics.
- (7) Providing education on the risks of opioid medications to individuals for whom such medications are prescribed, and to their families, with special consideration given to raising awareness among adolescents on such risks.
- (8) Effectiveness in communicating to military health care providers changes in Department policies regarding opioid safety and prescribing practices.

(c) BRIEFING.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a briefing on the results of the study under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Strike section 802 and insert the following: **SEC. 802. PERFORMANCE OF INCURRED COST AUDITS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2313a the following new section:

“§ 2313b. Performance of incurred cost audits
“(a) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS OF RISK AND MATERIALITY.—Not later than October 1,

2020, the Secretary of Defense shall comply with commercially accepted standards of risk and materiality in the performance of each incurred cost audit of costs associated with a contract of the Department of Defense.

“(b) CONDITIONS FOR THE USE OF QUALIFIED PRIVATE AUDITORS TO PERFORM INCURRED COST AUDITS.—(1) The Secretary shall use a qualified private auditor to perform a sufficient number of incurred cost audits of contracts of the Department of Defense in order to ensure that—

“(A) any backlog of incurred cost audits of the Defense Contract Audit Agency is eliminated by October 1, 2020;

“(B) incurred cost audits are completed not later than one year after the date of receipt of a qualified incurred cost submission;

“(C) sufficient private sector capacity exists to meet the current and future needs of the Department of Defense for the performance of incurred cost audits;

“(D) qualified private auditors are used to perform a substantial number of incurred cost audits on an ongoing basis to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the performance of incurred cost audits;

“(E) the Defense Contract Audit Agency is able to devote ample resources to high priority audits; and

“(F) multi-year auditing is conducted only to address outstanding incurred cost audits for which a qualified incurred cost submission was submitted to the Defense Contract Audit Agency more than 12 months before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2)(A) Not later than October 1, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a copy of the acquisition plan required by the Federal Acquisition Regulation for the task order contract to be awarded under subparagraph (B). Such plan shall also include—

“(i) a description of the incurred cost audits that the Secretary determines are appropriate to be conducted by qualified private auditors, including the approximate number and dollar value of such incurred cost audits; and

“(ii) an estimate of the number and dollar value of incurred cost audits to be conducted by qualified private auditors for each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2025 necessary to meet the requirements of paragraph (1).

“(B) Not later than October 1, 2019, the Secretary of Defense or a Federal department or agency authorized by the Secretary shall award an indefinite delivery-indefinite quantity task order contract to two or more qualified private auditors to perform incurred cost audits of costs associated with contracts of the Department of Defense.

“(C) The Defense Contract Management Agency, a contract administration office of a military department, or an authorized entity outside of the Department of Defense shall issue a task order to perform an incurred cost audit to a qualified private auditor under a task order contract awarded under subparagraph (B), if issuing such task order will assist the Secretary in meeting the requirements of paragraph (1). Such task order may be issued only to a qualified private auditor that certifies that the qualified private auditor possesses the necessary independence to perform such an audit.

“(D) A qualified private auditor performing an incurred cost audit of a contract of the Department of Defense shall develop and maintain complete and accurate working papers on each incurred cost audit. All working papers and reports on the incurred cost audit prepared by such qualified private

auditor shall be the property of the Department of Defense, except that the qualified private auditor may retain a complete copy of all working papers to support such reports made pursuant to this section.

“(E) The Defense Contract Audit Agency may not conduct further audit or review of an incurred cost audit performed by a qualified private auditor pursuant to this section unless requested to do so as part of conducting contract quality assurance functions in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(3)(A) Effective October 1, 2022, the Defense Contract Audit Agency may issue unqualified audit findings for an incurred cost audit only if the Defense Contract Audit Agency is peer reviewed by a commercial auditor and passes such peer review. This peer review shall be conducted in accordance with the peer review requirements of generally accepted government auditing standards of the Comptroller General of the United States and shall be deemed to meet the requirements of the Defense Contract Audit Agency for a peer review under such standards.

“(B) The peer review referred to in subparagraph (A) shall occur not less frequently than once every three years.

“(C) Not later than October 1, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives an update on the process of securing a commercial auditor to perform the peer review referred to in subparagraph (A).

“(4) The Secretary of Defense shall consider the results of an incurred cost audit performed under this section without regard to whether the Defense Contract Audit Agency or a qualified private auditor performed the audit.

“(5) The contracting officer for a contract that is the subject of an incurred cost audit shall have the sole discretion to accept or reject an audit finding on direct costs of the contract.

“(C) MATERIALITY STANDARDS FOR INCURRED COST AUDITS.—(1) Not later than October 1, 2020, and except as provided in paragraph (2), the minimum materiality standard used by an auditor shall—

“(A) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount less than or equal to \$100,000, be 4 percent of such costs;

“(B) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$100,000 but less than \$500,000, be \$2,000 plus 2 percent of such costs;

“(C) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$500,000 but less than \$1,000,000, be \$5,000 plus 1 percent of such costs;

“(D) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$1,000,000 but less than \$5,000,000, be \$8,000 plus 0.9 percent of such costs;

“(E) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$5,000,000 but less than \$10,000,000, be \$13,000 plus 0.8 percent of such costs;

“(F) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$10,000,000 but less than \$50,000,000, be \$23,000 plus 0.7 percent of such costs;

“(G) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$50,000,000 but less than \$100,000,000, be \$73,000 plus 0.6 percent of such costs;

“(H) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$100,000,000 but less than \$500,000,000, be \$153,000 plus 0.52 percent of such costs; and

“(I) for an incurred cost audit of costs in an amount greater than \$500,000,000, be \$503,000 plus 0.45 percent of such costs.

“(2) An auditor that performs an incurred cost audit under this section may use a materiality standard of a lesser amount than the materiality standard described under paragraph (1) with respect to a particular qualified incurred cost submission from a contractor based on an assessment of risk presented by such qualified incurred cost submission. The risk shall be assessed by the auditor in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards and guidance issued by the Secretary of Defense.

“(3) Not later than March 1, 2019, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on practices for assessing risk and materiality in auditing, which shall include—

“(A) a summary of commercially accepted standards of risk and materiality and Government standards for risk and materiality as related to incurred cost audits;

“(B) examples of how commercial auditing firms apply such standards in developing methodologies for conducting incurred cost audits; and

“(C) recommendations, if appropriate, to modify the minimum materiality standards under paragraph (1) to be consistent with commercially accepted standards of risk and materiality.

“(4) Not later than October 1, 2019, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on commercially accepted standards of risk and materiality as related to incurred cost audits. The report may contain recommendations to modify the materiality standards under paragraph (1) to be consistent with such commercially accepted standards of risk and materiality.

“(d) TIMELINESS OF INCURRED COST AUDITS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that all incurred cost audits performed pursuant to subsection (b) are performed in a timely manner.

“(2) The Secretary of Defense shall notify a contractor within 60 days after receipt of an incurred cost submission from the contractor whether the submission is a qualified incurred cost submission.

“(3) With respect to qualified incurred cost submissions received on or after the date of the enactment of this section, audit findings shall be issued for an incurred cost audit not later than one year after the date of receipt of such qualified incurred cost submission.

“(4) If audit findings are not issued within one year after the date of receipt of a qualified incurred cost submission, such qualified incurred cost submission shall be considered accepted in its entirety unless the Secretary of Defense can demonstrate that the contractor unreasonably withheld information necessary to perform the incurred cost audit.

“(f) REVIEW OF AUDIT PERFORMANCE.—Not later than April 1, 2025, the Comptroller General of the United States shall provide a report to the congressional defense committees that evaluates for the period beginning on October 1, 2019, and ending on August 31, 2023—

“(1) the timeliness, individual cost, and quality of incurred cost audits, set forth separately by incurred cost audits performed by the Defense Contract Audit Agency and by qualified private auditors;

“(2) the cost to contractors of the Department of Defense for incurred cost audits, set forth separately by incurred cost audits performed by the Defense Contract Audit Agency and by qualified private auditors;

“(3) the effect, if any, on other types of audits conducted by the Defense Contract Audit Agency that results from incurred cost audits conducted by qualified private auditors; and

“(4) the capability and capacity of commercial auditors to conduct incurred cost audits for the Department of Defense.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘commercial auditor’ means a private entity engaged in the business of performing audits.

“(2) The term ‘flexibly priced contract’ means—

“(A) a cost-type contract, fixed-price incentive fee contract, or price-redeterminable contract, or a task order issued under an indefinite delivery-indefinite quantity task order contract, for which final payment is based on actual costs incurred; or

“(B) the materials portion of a time-and-materials contract or labor-hour contract of the Department of Defense.

“(3) The term ‘incurred cost audit’ means an audit of charges to the Government by a contractor under a flexibly priced contract.

“(4) The term ‘materiality standard’ means a dollar amount of misstatements, including omissions, contained in an incurred cost audit that would be material if the misstatements, individually or in the aggregate, could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of the Government made on the basis of the incurred cost audit.

“(5) The term ‘qualified incurred cost submission’ means a submission by a contractor of costs incurred under a flexibly priced contract that has been qualified by the Department of Defense as sufficient to conduct an incurred cost audit.

“(6) The term ‘qualified private auditor’ means a commercial auditor—

“(A) that performs audits in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards of the Comptroller General of the United States; and

“(B) that has received a passing peer review rating, as defined by generally accepted Government auditing standards.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2313a the following new item:

“2313b. Performance of incurred cost audits.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 247, strike lines 4 through 7 and insert the following:

“(5) The Director shall develop guidelines and resources on intellectual property matters and make them available to the acquisition workforce. Such guidelines and resources shall include templates for specially negotiated licenses (as appropriate) and a collection of definitions, key terms, examples, and case studies that demonstrate and resolve ambiguities in the differences between—

“(A) detailed manufacturing and process data;

“(B) form, fit, and function data; and

“(C) data required for operations, maintenance, installation, and training.”.

Page 248, line 3, insert after the period the following: “As part of such communications, the Director shall regularly engage with appropriately representative entities, including large and small businesses, traditional and non-traditional Government contractors, prime contractors and subcontractors, and maintenance repair organizations.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY
OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 8. DEVELOPMENT OF PROCUREMENT ADMINISTRATIVE LEAD TIME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall develop, make available for public comment, and finalize—

(1) a definition of the term “Procurement Administrative Lead Time” or “PALT”, to be applied Department of Defense-wide, that describes the amount of time from the date on which a solicitation is issued to the date of an initial award of a contract or task order of the Department of Defense; and

(2) a plan for measuring and publicly reporting data on PALT for Department of Defense contracts and task orders above the micro-purchase threshold.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR DEFINITION.—Unless the Secretary determines otherwise, the amount of time in the definition of PALT developed under subsection (a) shall—

(1) begin on the date on which a solicitation is issued for a contract or task order of the Department of Defense by the Secretary of a military department or head of a Defense Agency; and

(2) end on the date of an initial award of the contract or task order.

(c) DEVIATION FROM PALT MILESTONES.—The Secretary may deviate from current PALT milestones as the Secretary determines necessary, to develop the definition of PALT under subsection (a).

(d) COORDINATION.—In developing the definition of PALT, the Secretary shall coordinate with the senior contracting official of each military department and Defense Agency to determine the variations of the definition in use across the Department of Defense and each military department and Defense Agency.

(e) USE OF EXISTING PROCUREMENT DATA SYSTEMS.—In developing the plan for measuring and publicly reporting data on PALT required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider, to the maximum extent practicable, relying on the information captured by the Federal procurement data system established pursuant to section 1122(a)(4) of title 41, United States Code (or any similar or successor system).

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. NOLAN OF
MINNESOTA

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 870A. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING STEEL PRODUCED IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Frequent surges in unfairly trade steel imports have materially injured the iron ore and steel industries in the United States, putting our national, economic, and energy security at risk.

(2) High-quality American steel products are vital to the success of the United States military and are used in a variety of applications from aircraft carriers to armor plate for tanks.

(3) Domestic producers of defense-related steel products are dependent on the overall financial health of the iron ore and steel industries in the United States.

(4) The loss of a strong domestic iron ore and steel industry would make the United States dangerously dependent upon foreign sources of steel, such as China.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that a strong domestic iron ore and

steel industry is vital to the national security of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY
OF VIRGINIA

At the end of subtitle D of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 871. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) ELIMINATION OF SUNSET RELATING TO TRANSPARENCY AND RISK MANAGEMENT OF MAJOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS.—Subsection (c) of section 11302 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking the first paragraph (5).

(b) ELIMINATION OF SUNSET RELATING TO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PORTFOLIO, PROGRAM, AND RESOURCE REVIEWS.—Section 11319 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by striking paragraph (6).

(c) EXTENSION OF SUNSET RELATING TO FEDERAL DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION INITIATIVE.—Subsection (e) of section 834 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 44 U.S.C. 3601 note) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2020”.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI OF
ILLINOIS

At the end of subtitle C of title IX, add the following new section:

SEC. 924. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COOPERATIVE PROGRAM FOR INFORMATION SECURITY EDUCATION.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense should provide adequate resources to the Office of the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense and the Defense Procurement Acquisition Policy to enable such entities to establish a cooperative program with the National Institute of Standards and Technology-Manufacturing Extension Partnership; and

(2) the cooperative program described in paragraph (1) should—

(A) educate and assist small- and medium-sized manufacturing firms in the Department of Defense supply chain in achieving compliance with NIST Special Publication 800-171 titled “Protecting Controlled Unclassified Information in Nonfederal Information Systems and Organizations” as such publication is incorporated into the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement;

(B) highlight the resources available to businesses that have contracts with the Department or that are applying for such contracts; and

(C) educate such businesses on—

(i) the System Security Plan of the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

(ii) the procurement toolbox of the Defense Procurement Acquisition Policy;

(iii) the Cyber Security Evaluation Tool of the Department of Homeland Security; and

(iv) the risks of using third party companies in assessing compliance with NIST Special Publication 800-171.

Page 640, after line 12, insert the following:

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the quarterly cyber operations briefings required under section 484 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), should include an update on the progress of the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the cooperative program described in section 924.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY
OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 1004. AMENDMENTS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FINANCIAL AUDIT PLAN.

(a) AMENDMENT TO NAME OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FINANCIAL AUDIT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1003 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note) is amended by striking “Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan” each place such term appears in heading and text and inserting “Financial Improvement and Audit Remediation Plan”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1003(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note) is amended by striking “Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan” each place such term appears in heading and text and inserting “Financial Improvement and Audit Remediation Plan”.

(b) REPORT AND BRIEFING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 1003 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) REPORT AND BRIEFING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) ANNUAL REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 31, 2019, and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status of the implementation by the Department of Defense of the Financial Improvement and Audit Remediation Plan required by subsection (a).

“(B) ELEMENTS.—Each report under subparagraph (A) shall include, at a minimum—

“(i) an analysis of the consolidated corrective action plan management summary prepared pursuant to section 1002 of this Act; and

“(ii) current Department of Defense-wide information on the status of corrective actions plans related to critical capabilities and material weaknesses, including the standard data elements recommended in the implementation guide for Office of Management and Budget Circular A-123, for the armed forces, military departments, and Defense Agencies.

“(2) SEMIANNUAL BRIEFINGS.—Not later than March 31 and October 31 each year, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the Comptrollers of the military departments shall provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the status of the corrective action plan.

“(3) CRITICAL CAPABILITIES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘critical capabilities’ means the critical capabilities described in the Department of Defense report titled ‘Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) Plan Status Report’ and dated May 2016.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note) is amended by striking section 881.

(B) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note) is amended by striking section 1003.

(C) Section 1005(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note) is amended by striking paragraph (2).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (b) shall take effect December 1, 2017.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS
OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 1004. REPORT ON AUDITABLE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report ranking all military departments and Defense Agencies in order of how advanced they are in achieving auditable financial statements as required by law. The report should not include information otherwise available in other reports to Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO OF
FLORIDA

Page 359, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 1026. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CLOSE OR RELINQUISH CONTROL OF UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 may be used—

(1) to close or abandon United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba;

(2) to relinquish control of Guantanamo Bay to the Republic of Cuba; or

(3) to implement a material modification to the Treaty Between the United States of America and Cuba signed at Washington, D.C. on May 29, 1934, that constructively closes United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In section 1037(c)(1), strike “and approvals” and insert “, approvals, and the total costs of all flyover missions, including the costs of fuel, maintenance, and manpower.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO OF
FLORIDA

Page 375, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 1040. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PROVISION OF MAN-PORTABLE AIR DEFENSE SYSTEMS TO THE VETTED SYRIAN OPPOSITION.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—If a determination is made during fiscal year 2018 to use funds available to the Department of Defense for that fiscal year to provide man-portable air defense systems (MANPADs) to the vetted Syrian opposition pursuant to the authority in section 1209 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3541), such funds may not be used for that purpose until—

(1) the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the determination; and

(2) 30 days elapses after the date of the submittal of such report to the appropriate congressional committees.

(b) **REPORT REQUIREMENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall set forth the following:—

(1) A description of each element of the vetted Syrian opposition that will provided man-portable air defense systems as described in subsection (a), including—

(A) the geographic location of such element;

(B) a detailed intelligence assessment of such element;

(C) a description of the alignment of such element within the broader conflict in Syria; and

(D) a description and assessment of the assurance, if any, received by the commander

of such element in connection with the provision of man-portable air defense systems.

(2) The number and type of man-portable air defense systems to be so provided.

(3) The logistics plan for providing and resupplying each element to be so provided man-portable air defense systems with additional man-portable air defense systems.

(4) The duration of support to be provided in connection with the provision of man-portable air defense systems.

(5) The justification for the provision of man-portable air defense systems to each element of the vetted Syrian opposition, including an explanation of the purpose and expected employment of such systems.

(6) Any other matters that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State jointly consider appropriate.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” has the meaning given that term in section 1209(e)(2) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3541).

(d) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for fiscal year 2018 for “Counter-ISIS Train and Equip Fund” Counter may be used to procure or transfer man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time, and I simply urge adoption of this package of en bloc amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to clean up a couple of earlier debates we had on amendments. I just wanted to make a couple of arguments.

On the nuclear weapons issue, I just want to be clear, we support a strong and robust nuclear deterrence. We are not advocating unilateral disarmament by any stretch of the imagination.

We are simply asking: In the budget challenge environment that we have, is this the best use of our money to totally rebuild our entire nuclear weapons system?

And the amendments that were offered weren't even necessarily saying no. They are just saying this is something we ought to study and ought to talk about.

And I will, however, disagree with one argument that was made about how somehow it is a myth that over the last 70 years, all of our adversaries are building nuclear weapons in response to the nuclear weapons that we have built. I think that is a big misreading of history.

We all recall that we were first to the table on this. And thank goodness we were. It enabled us to end World War

II. But we are still the only nation on Earth that has actually used nuclear weapons. And when the Soviet Union developed theirs, we had them and they didn't. And I think it is a little ridiculous to assume that no part of their thinking was that:

Well, if the United States of America, our prime adversary, has nuclear weapons, we better have them, too.

And then we saw the arms race accelerate, even to the point of the famous debate in 1960, how candidate JOHN KENNEDY talked about the missile gap that we had. That turned out to be a total fabrication. It wasn't true. We didn't have that gap. It was unfair to what the Eisenhower administration was doing. But the argument from the other side that the notion of an arms race is ridiculous is something that I think is wrong.

Arms races do happen. And part of what we need to do in working with our adversaries is to try to contain them in a reasonable fashion. So I do believe that in many cases, it becomes a self-perpetuating thing. We build them, they build them; we build them, they build them. And I hope that part of our nuclear strategy isn't just building as many nuclear weapons as is humanly possible, but is actually opening up lines of communication with potential adversaries like China, with adversaries like Russia.

Now, I will grant you that where North Korea is concerned, and as I have said repeatedly, we have to deter them, but we have the power to destroy North Korea, I think, hundreds of times over. We have the capacity in terms of our weapons systems to deter them.

So I hope, as we look at modernizing our nuclear weapons systems, we will consider the cost and the effectiveness of doing that. And I know Mr. ROGERS has offered his thoughtful amendment to give the Department of Defense some opportunity to do that, but that is all we were trying to say on that.

On BRAC, a couple of arguments were made at the end there that were somewhat misleading. One was that Secretary Mattis had said that he wanted to totally relook at the situation, implying that Secretary Mattis didn't think that a BRAC was a good idea.

The Pentagon—President Donald Trump's Pentagon and Secretary Mattis' Pentagon—recommended a BRAC round that we rejected. So make no mistake about it, the Republican President and Secretary Mattis support a BRAC round.

And two more minor points. It was argued that, well, we voted for this bill 60 to 1 out of committee, so we were all in favor of it. Yes, not all, but we were in favor of the bill. This was a small piece of that bill. So to argue in a bill—and forgive me, I don't know how many pages this year's bill is. I know last

year's was 1,600—that in a 1,600-page bill, if you vote for it, you have got to support absolutely everything in it is a notion that I don't think any Member would support.

Again, I will emphasize an argument that I made with Mr. WILSON on the notion that, well, gosh, they don't have a study, they haven't looked at it, they haven't thought about what they are going to do, when, in fact, it is Congress that has prohibited them legislatively—and I don't know how many of the last few years, but several of them—from doing that.

Let's at least let them take a look at it to give us the numbers, because the same point as the nuclear weapons issue, as we have heard over and over today, we have crucial readiness shortfalls.

In many ways I will agree with the chairman: we are right now not doing right by the men and women who serve in the military by not providing them with the training and the equipment they need to do the missions that we are contemplating having them do. And if that is the case, if we can find savings by not building as many nuclear weapons as we need or by closing institutions that we do not need, then I think that is something that we owe the men and women who serve in the military.

And let's not kid ourselves. This is a very parochial issue. There are a whole bunch of bases in the State of Washington. I don't want to see any of them closed, but if the military decides that that is the best thing to do, I am not going to stand in the way of it.

And I hope, given the dire situation that we face that has been described by my Republican colleagues, that we would put parochial concerns to the side and do what is best for the military, to make sure that we are spending the money as wisely as we possibly can and to make absolutely certain that the men and women who serve are trained, equipped, and ready to fight whatever fight it is we ask them to go into.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the second en bloc amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2300

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to address the topics that the gentleman from Washington addressed.

First off, I completely agree with him. This bill that we are considering today, tomorrow, and the next day is about 1,000 pages. I don't agree with it all. It has everything from missile defense to helping spouses pay licenses when they are forced to move from State to State, and I suspect I will not agree with it all at the end of the day.

What is important, though, is the overriding obligation we have to sup-

port the men and women who risk their lives to protect us. So, I think the gentleman is exactly right. Just because you vote for the bill does not mean you endorse everything in it. And at the same time, even if you disagree with some of the things in it, it is important to support the men and women who serve by voting for the bill, even if you have disagreements. I completely concur with the gentleman on that.

When it comes to the nuclear issue, there are a few points I want to make that maybe were not made during the previous debates.

Number one is we have drastically fewer nuclear weapons now than we had during the Cold War. I think a lot of people do not realize how significantly fewer weapons and delivery systems we have now than we had all during the fifties, sixties, seventies, and into the eighties.

But these are still machines. They do not live forever. Whether you are talking about the weapon itself or the delivery systems, they age; and, as they age, there are chemical reactions, parts wear out, and things change. So they have to be modernized if our deterrent is to remain credible.

Now, you can get into an argument about, okay, how many weapons does it take to be credible and what delivery systems are required to penetrate defenses, to hold enough targets at risk, to have that credible defense, but what I think there can be little debate about is that the world is growing more dangerous in the nuclear field. We have seen what happened with North Korea. There is enormous concern about what happens in the Middle East and elsewhere.

I believe that our nuclear deterrent is the foundation upon which the rest of our defense efforts are built, and that foundation must remain credible. It has to be rebuilt. My understanding is the estimates are at no point will rebuilding that entire nuclear deterrent require more than 7 percent of any year's defense budget, 7 percent for the foundation and 93 percent for the House that is built on it.

It is essential that we maintain that credible deterrent, and it has got to be big enough to be credible so that a country like China does not think they can build a few more weapons and get to parity with the United States.

On the subject of BRAC, I do disagree with the gentleman from Washington on this point. Two years ago, I specifically asked that we have included in the bill that was signed into law a requirement that the Pentagon provide us with an updated cost estimate on excess infrastructure.

What we have all been citing is a 2004 estimate that there is about 20 percent excess infrastructure. Twenty-two percent is the number that is often used. What we got back was seven pages of nothing.

By the way, that was not prohibited by the bill. It was required by the bill.

What I am interested in is a real updated, data-driven study that shows whether we have excess infrastructure and of what sort. And I think that is exactly what Secretary Mattis said. Let me quote his exact sentence:

I am not comfortable right now that we have a full 20-some percent excess infrastructure. I need to go back through and look at this again because I don't want to get rid of something that we can't sustain and then say we have got to go buy some land here in 10 years.

I think that is what we need is an updated study. And if it shows that we have got excess infrastructure, I am not at all opposed to having another round of BRAC. I am very opposed to having another round like 2005, which, I believe, it is either CBO or GAO, I can't remember which, says has not yet broken even 12 years later. It still costs more money than it has, and it has not started to save yet. So I don't want a repeat of that.

I am interested if it shows that we do have excess infrastructure and a way to deal with that. Secretary Mattis, I believe, shares that view, but until we see the data, I am not supportive of another round.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it is not clear that it has got a prohibition on a study, nor does it call for one.

So as we get into conference, I think it might be a worthwhile thing to say that we authorize, ask—you know, and I am not sure if this is something the Defense Department can do without our authorization or not, but it is something that we should discuss as we get into conference, to have them do that study.

I think that would be an excellent first step, but I am not sure that we cover it in this bill. Maybe we do, and we can figure that out over the course of the next 48 hours. But if it doesn't, that is something that I think we ought to try to do.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the point. I am not convinced that the gentleman and I really differ on this point.

What the bill says, now, is: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize an additional base alignment and closure round." That is what it says. It says we don't authorize it, of course. It does not prohibit a study to say whether we ought to. Again, I would welcome a real data-driven study that will help us reach that conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, this is just further evidence that there is a wide range of issues and discussions to have on this bill, all for that purpose of supporting

the men and women who serve our Nation.

I support en bloc package No. 2. I urge my colleagues to, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the bipartisan amendment I introduced with Congressman TOM ROONEY from Florida. The amendment would require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress within 180 days on the implementation of recommendations from a recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) report entitled "Actions Needed to Ensure Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Traumatic Brain Injury Are Considered in Misconduct Separations," which was released in May 2017. GAO found that some of the service branch policies related to the consideration of traumatic brain injury (TBI) and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in "other than honorable" discharges were inconsistent with Department of Defense policy. To remedy these inconsistencies, DOD issued five recommendations.

As the co-chair and co-founder of the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force, I have worked to address the effects brain injuries have on both the military and civilian populations. TBI and PTSD have been recognized as the signature injuries of the Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Estimates from the RAND Corporation in 2008 estimated that nearly 20 percent—or 320,000—of the 1.6 million men and women deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan sustained a brain injury while in the line of duty. Additionally, between 11–20 percent of Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom have PTSD in a given year, according to the Department of Veteran Affairs (VA).

Given the impact that TBI and PTSD have on an individual's behavior and decision-making skills, it is imperative that these conditions are accurately diagnosed in a timely manner. It is also important that these conditions receive appropriate consideration when a servicemember is discharged for misconduct. According to the GAO's report, in the case of 16 percent of the separations for misconduct that the GAO examined, the servicemembers suffered from PTSD or TBI. Additionally, the GAO found that two of the four branches of the military have policies inconsistent with DOD's policy on the impact of TBI and PTSD on separations for misconduct. It is troubling that the Army and Marine Corps may not have adhered to their own screening, training, and counseling policies related to PTSD and TBI. That is why it is imperative that DOD's policies are implemented consistently across all of the military services and that there is adequate oversight of adherence.

When an individual receives an "other than honorable" discharge, he or she may not be eligible for health benefits through the VA. A lack of health coverage is problematic for anyone, but especially so for individuals suffering from TBI or PTSD. DOD policy requires that servicemembers requesting separation in lieu of trial by court-martial be counseled on the negative consequences of this type of separation. However, of the 48 separation packets the GAO examined, 11 had unclear or undocumented evidence that counseling took place. If servicemembers are agreeing to less than honorable discharges, they need to understand the consequences of that decision.

After the release of this report, I sent a letter to DOD Secretary James Mattis urging him to give due consideration to the recommendations made by the GAO. We must ensure the department provides accurate and timely diagnosis of PTSD and TBI in determining separation for misconduct, consistent policies across all branches of the military with accountability, and adequate counseling for servicemembers about the consequences of separation for misconduct, including the loss of health benefits.

This amendment is supported by the Brain Injury Association of America, the National Association of State Head Injury Administrators, and the U.S. Brain Injury Alliance.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 431, I offer a third package of amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YOH). The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68 printed in part B of House Report 115–212, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

Page 375, after line 8, insert the following:
SEC. 1040. DETERMINATION REGARDING TRANSFER OF DEFENSE ARTICLES TO UNITS COMMITTING GROSS VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—In carrying out the Golden Sentry program to monitor end-use compliance of the government of a foreign state to which defense articles and services have been provided, the Director of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, in consultation with the appropriate United States embassy personnel in the foreign state, shall determine whether the government of the foreign state has transferred any defense article to a unit that is prohibited from receiving assistance from the United States by reason of a determination by the Secretary of State that there is credible evidence that such unit has committed a gross violation of human rights.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the implementation of subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Page 396, strike lines 17 through 24 and insert the following:

SEC. 1052. REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ARCTIC CAPABILITY AND RESOURCE GAPS AND REQUIRED INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to

the congressional defense committees a report setting forth—

(1) necessary steps the Department of Defense is undertaking to resolve arctic security capability and resource gaps; and

(2) the requirements and investment plans for military infrastructure required to protect United States national security interests in the arctic region.

Page 397, after line 21, insert the following:

(c) ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall also include the following:

(1) A review of United States national security interests in the arctic region, including strategic national assets, United States citizens, territory, freedom of navigation, and economic and trade interests in the region.

(2) A description of United States military capabilities needed for operations in arctic terrain, including types of forces, major weapon systems, and logistics required for operations in such terrain.

(3) A description of the installations, infrastructure, and deep water ports for deployment of assets required to support operations in the arctic region, including the stationing, deployment, and training of military forces for operations in the region.

(4) An investment plan to establish the installations and infrastructure required for operations in the arctic region.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. EVANS OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 409, after line 2, insert the following:
SEC. 1058. REPORT ON POTENTIAL AGREEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF RUSSIA ON THE STATUS OF SYRIA.

Before entering into any agreement or understanding with the government of Russia regarding the status of Syria, the President shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) a description of any understanding between the President and the government of Russia regarding a plan to divide territory among parties to the conflict; and

(2) a description of any such understanding that would provide Iran with access to the border between Israel and Syria.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. CORREA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 409, after line 2, insert the following:
SEC. 1058. REPORT ON PRIOR ATTEMPTED RUSSIAN CYBER ATTACKS AGAINST DEFENSE SYSTEMS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the Congress a written report on all attempts to breach, intrude, or otherwise hack into Department of Defense systems that—

(1) occurred during the last 24-month period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) were attributable either to the government of the Russian Federation or actors substantially supported by the government of the Russian Federation.

(b) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. BRENDAN F. BOYLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 409, after line 2, insert the following:
SEC. 1058. REPORT ON ALTERNATIVES TO AQUEOUS FILM FORMING FOAM.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this

Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the Department's status toward developing a new military specification for safe and effective alternatives to aqueous film forming foam (hereinafter referred to as "AFFF") that do not contain perfluorooctanoic acid (hereinafter referred to as "PFOA") or erfluorooctanesulfonic acid (hereinafter referred to as "PFOS").

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subparagraph (1) shall include the following:

(1) A detailed explanation of the Department's status toward developing a new military specification for safe and effective alternatives to AFFF that do not contain PFOA or PFOS.

(2) An update on the Department's plans for replacing AFFF containing PFOA or PFOS at military installations across the country and methods of disposal for AFFF containing PFOA or PFOS.

(3) An overview of current and planned research and development for AFFF alternatives that do not contain PFOA or PFOS.

(4) An assessment of how the establishment of a maximum contaminant level for PFOA or PFOS under the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq), rather than the current health advisory level, would impact the Department's mitigation actions, prioritization of such actions, and research and development related to PFOA and PFOS.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI OF INDIANA

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 1058.

(a) REPORT ON PROJECT, PROGRAM, AND PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT STANDARDS.—

(1) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall deliver, not later than 90 days after enactment, a report to Congress on the adoption of project, program, and portfolio management standards within the Department of Defense.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall address, at a minimum, the following:

(A) Existing policy, guidance, and instruction of the Department of Defense related to project, program, and portfolio management.

(B) An assessment of how the Department of Defense can incorporate nationally accredited standards for project, program, and portfolio management—as required by Public Law 104-113 and Public Law 114-264—into its existing project, program, and portfolio management policy, guidance, and instruction, as well as how it may replace or revise existing policy, guidance, and instruction related to project, program, and portfolio management.

(b) REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT.—

(1) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall deliver, not later than nine months after enactment, a report to Congress on enhancing portfolio management capabilities and structure within the Department of Defense.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall address, at a minimum, the following:

(A) Existing policy and guidance of the Department of Defense related to portfolio management, the management and alignment of portfolios of projects and programs to realize organization strategy and objectives.

(B) An assessment of how milestone decision authority and budget allocations in a portfolio management model at the enter-

prise, Program Executive Officer, and Service Acquisition Executive levels could be revised in a manner consistent with the existing Defense Acquisition Management System framework and Office of Management and guidance set forth in Office of Management and Budget Circular A-11 to streamline decisionmaking authority and enhance agility, including the appropriate roles for developing, managing, and overseeing portfolio strategies, portfolio roadmaps and portfolio documentation, portfolio decisionmaking, and portfolio budget decisions.

(C) An assessment of portfolio organizational structures within government and industry with the potential to improve integration of overall Department of Defense enterprise strategy and program execution.

(D) An assessment of nationally accredited standards-based portfolio management models for adoption by the Department of Defense to manage its portfolios of projects and programs and streamline decisionmaking.

(E) An assessment of the Department of Defense's existing standards, policy, guidance, and instruction for portfolio management and how the adoption of nationally accredited standards for portfolio management may replace or revise existing policy, guidance and instruction.

(F) Any other matters related to Department of Defense portfolio management the Comptroller General determines are relevant.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. HARPER OF MISSISSIPPI

Add at the end of subtitle F of title X the following:

SEC. 10 . PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN RESPONSE TO CYBERSECURITY EVENTS.

(a) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE.—If the Speaker of the House of Representatives (or the Speaker's designee), with the concurrence of the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives (or the Minority Leader's designee), determines that a cybersecurity event has occurred and that containing, mitigating, or resolving the event exceeds the resources of the House of Representatives, then notwithstanding any other provision of law or any rule, regulation, or executive order—

(1) the Speaker may request assistance in responding to the event from the head of any Executive department, military department, or independent establishment;

(2) not later than 24 hours after receiving the request, the head of the department or establishment shall begin to provide appropriate assistance in response to the incident, including (if necessary) restoring the information systems of the House to an operational state which allows for the continuation of the legislative process and for Members, officers, and employees of the House to continue to meet their official and representational duties; and

(3) such assistance shall be provided without reimbursement by the House of Representatives.

(b) SCOPE OF ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The assistance provided to the Speaker by the head of a department or establishment under this section may consist only of a type that the head of the department or establishment is authorized under law to provide to the department or establishment, another Executive department, military department, or independent establishment, or a private entity.

(2) CONNECTIONS BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OR ESTABLISHMENT AND HOUSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS.—In providing assistance under this section—

(A) personnel of a department or establishment may not log onto the information systems of the House without the authorization of the Speaker (or the Speaker's designee); and

(B) personnel of a department or establishment may provide the House with access to technological support services of the department or establishment, including by authorizing personnel or systems of the House to connect with and operate services or programs of the department or establishment with guidance from subject matter experts of the department or establishment.

(c) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.—

(1) TERMINATION UPON NOTICE FROM SPEAKER.—After initiating assistance under this section, the head of the department or establishment shall continue providing assistance until the Speaker (or Speaker's designee) notifies the head of the department or establishment that the cybersecurity incident has terminated and that it is no longer necessary for the department or establishment to provide post-incident assistance.

(2) REMOVAL OF TECHNOLOGICAL SUPPORT SERVICES.—Upon receiving notice from the Speaker under paragraph (1), the head of the department or establishment shall ensure that any technological support services or programs of the department or establishment are removed from the information systems of the House, and that personnel of the department or establishment are no longer monitoring such systems.

(d) COMPLIANCE WITH EXISTING STANDARDS.—In providing assistance under this section, the head of the Executive department, military department, or independent establishment shall meet the requirements of section 113 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2017 (Public Law 115-31).

(e) NO EFFECT ON OTHER AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE SUPPORT.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect the authority of an Executive department, military department, or independent establishment to provide any support, including cybersecurity support, to the House of Representatives under any other law, rule, or regulation.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, each of the terms "Executive department", "military department", and "independent establishment" has the meaning given such term in chapter 1 of title 5, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

In title X, at the end of subtitle F add the following:

SEC. . REVIEW AND UPDATE OF REGULATIONS GOVERNING DEBT COLLECTORS INTERACTIONS WITH UNIT COMMANDERS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall review and update Department of Defense Directive 1344.09 and any associated regulations to ensure that such regulations comply with Federal consumer protection laws with respect to the collection of debt.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA OF HAWAII

Page 451, after line 6, insert the following:
SEC. 1073. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PACIFIC WAR MEMORIAL.

(a) FINDING.—Congress recognizes that there is currently no memorial that specifically honors the members of the United States Armed Forces who served in the Pacific Theater of World War II, also known as the Pacific War.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that a Pacific War memorial should

be established at a suitable location at or near the Pearl Harbor site of the World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument in Honolulu, Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER OF WASHINGTON

At the end of title XI, insert the following:

SEC. 1109. EXTENSION OF OVERTIME RATE AUTHORITY FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY EMPLOYEES PREFORMING WORK ABOARD OR DOCKSIDE IN SUPPORT OF THE NUCLEAR-POWERED AIRCRAFT CARRIER FORWARD DEPLOYED IN JAPAN.

Section 5542(a)(6)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2018” and inserting “September 30, 2019”.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO OF ARIZONA

At the end of subsection (b) of section 1212, add the following new paragraph:

“(6) A description of—
“(A) support provided to the Taliban, al-Qaeda, the Haqqani network, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and other terrorist organizations operating in Afghanistan by Russia, Iran, Pakistan, and other countries; and
“(B) United States military and diplomatic efforts to disrupt such support.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12xx. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO DR. SHAKIL AFRIDI.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The attacks of September 11, 2001, killed approximately 3,000 people, most of whom were Americans, but also included hundreds of individuals with foreign citizenships, nearly 350 New York Fire Department personnel, and about 50 law enforcement officers.

(2) Downed United Airlines flight 93 was reportedly intended, under the control of the al-Qaeda high-jackers, to crash into the White House or the Capitol in an attempt to kill the President of the United States or Members of the United States Congress.

(3) The September 11, 2001, attacks were largely planned and carried out by the al-Qaeda terrorist network led by Osama bin Laden and his deputy Ayman al Zawahiri, after which Osama bin Laden enjoyed safe haven in Pakistan from where he continued to plot deadly attacks against the United States and the world.

(4) Since 2001, the United States has provided more than \$30 billion in security and economic aid to Pakistan.

(5) The United States very generously and swiftly responded to the 2005 Kashmir Earthquake in Pakistan with more than \$200 million in emergency aid and the support of several United States military aircraft, approximately 1,000 United States military personnel, including medical specialists, thousands of tents, blankets, water containers and a variety of other emergency equipment.

(6) The United States again generously and swiftly contributed approximately \$150 million in emergency aid to Pakistan following the 2010 Pakistan flood, in addition to the service of nearly twenty United States military helicopters, their flight crews, and other resources to assist the Pakistan Army’s relief efforts.

(7) The United States continues to work tirelessly to support Pakistan’s economic development, including millions of dollars allo-

cated towards the development of Pakistan’s energy infrastructure, health services and education system.

(8) The United States and Pakistan continue to have many critical shared interests, both economic and security related, which could be the foundation for a positive and mutually beneficial partnership.

(9) Dr. Shakil Afridi, a Pakistani physician, is a hero to whom the people of the United States, Pakistan and the world owe a debt of gratitude for his help in finally locating Osama bin Laden before more innocent American, Pakistani and other lives were lost to this terrorist leader.

(10) Pakistan, the United States and the international community had failed for nearly 10 years following attacks of September 11, 2001, to locate and bring Osama bin Laden, who continued to kill innocent civilians in the Middle East, Asia, Europe, Africa and the United States, to justice without the help of Dr. Afridi.

(11) The Government of Pakistan’s imprisonment of Dr. Afridi presents a serious and growing impediment to the United States’ bilateral relations with Pakistan.

(12) The Government of Pakistan has leveled and allowed baseless charges against Dr. Afridi in a politically motivated, spurious legal process.

(13) Dr. Afridi is currently imprisoned by the Government of Pakistan, a deplorable and unconscionable situation which calls into question Pakistan’s actual commitment to countering terrorism and undermines the notion that Pakistan is a true ally in the struggle against terrorism.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Dr. Shakil Afridi is an international hero and that the Government of Pakistan should release him immediately from prison.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MS. SINEMA OF ARIZONA

Page 475, after line 15, insert the following new paragraph:

(9) A description of amounts and sources of Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant financing in Syria and efforts to disrupt this financing as part of the broader strategy of the United States in Syria.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12_. REPORT ON MERITS OF AN INCIDENTS AT SEA AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES, IRAN, AND CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report assessing the relative merits of a multilateral or bilateral incidents at Sea military-to-military agreement between the United States, the Government of Iran, and other countries operating in the Persian Gulf aimed at preventing accidental naval conflict in the Persian Gulf and the Strait of Hormuz.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—Such assessment should consider and evaluate the current maritime security situation in the Persian Gulf and the effect that such an agreement might have on military and other maritime activities in the region, as well as other United States regional strategic interests.

(c) FORM.—The report required by this section shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. KIHUEN OF NEVADA

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12_. EXTENSION OF QUARTERLY REPORTS ON CONFIRMED BALLISTIC MISSILE LAUNCHES FROM IRAN AND IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THOSE LAUNCHES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Iran continues to test ballistic missile technology notwithstanding the restrictions imposed under United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

(2) On January 29, 2017, Iran tested the medium-range Khorramshahr ballistic missile that flew 600 miles before exploding, in a failed test of a reentry vehicle.

(3) According to press reports, in March 2017 Iran tested two short-range Fateh 110 ballistic missiles.

(4) Iran has inscribed anti-Israel propaganda on its missiles, including “Israel should be wiped off the Earth”.

(b) EXTENSION.—Section 1226(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2487) is amended by striking “December 31, 2019” and inserting “December 31, 2022”.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12_. REPORT ON STEPS AND PROTOCOLS RELATED TO THE RESCUE, CARE, AND TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES OF THE ISLAMIC STATE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report containing each of the following:

(1) A description of any steps the Department of Defense is taking to ensure coordination between the Armed Forces of the United States and local forces in conducting military operations in regions controlled by the Islamic State where religious or minority groups are known or thought to be held captive, in order to incorporate the rescue of such captives as a secondary objective.

(2) A description of any protocols that will be put in place by the Department of Defense, including protocols developed in coordination with the Government of Iraq, for the care and treatment of religious or minority groups rescued from captivity under the Islamic State, including any protocol for relocating such groups of captives to safe locations.

(b) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12_. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON NORTH KOREA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, also known as North Korea, continues

to develop a ballistic and nuclear weapons development program that poses a grave threat to the United States, United States allies the Republic of Korea, Japan, and Australia, and to regional and global security.

(2) North Korea continues to escalate the pace and number of its ballistic missile launches, and to date has conducted five nuclear tests.

(3) On July 4, 2017, North Korea conducted the first test of an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) it claims is capable of reaching United States territory, which, if reliable and effective, constitutes a new threat to America's security.

(4) On June 3, 2017, Secretary of Defense James Mattis stated, during remarks at the Shangri-La Dialogue, that "the current North Korea program signals a clear intent to acquire nuclear armed ballistic missiles, including those of intercontinental range that pose direct and immediate threats to our allies, our partners and all the world".

(5) On April 27, 2017, Admiral Harry Harris, Jr., Commander of the United States Pacific Command, testified that "North Korea continues to disregard United Nations sanctions by developing, and threatening to use intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons that will threaten the U.S. Homeland."

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should act to counter North Korea's continued development and testing of nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles;

(2) the development of a functional and operational North Korean nuclear and intercontinental ballistic missile program constitutes a threat to the security of the United States and to our allies and partners in the region;

(3) the defense of the United States and our allies against North Korean aggression remains a top priority, and the United States maintains an unwavering and steadfast commitment to the policy of extended deterrence, especially with respect to South Korea and Japan;

(4) the United States supports the deployment of the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system in South Korea to counter North Korea's missile threat and the deployment of ballistic missile defense systems to allies in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region to protect from the growing threat of North Korea's nuclear weapons and ballistic missile programs;

(5) the United States should encourage further multilateral security cooperation and dialogue among South Korea, Japan, and Australia to address the North Korea threat;

(6) the United States calls upon the People's Republic of China to use its leverage to pressure North Korea to cease its provocative behavior and abandon and dismantle its nuclear and ballistic missile programs, and comply with all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions;

(7) the United States should fully enforce all existing sanctions on North Korea and undertake a comprehensive diplomatic effort to urge allies and other countries to fully enforce, and build upon, existing international sanctions; and

(8) the United States should retain diplomatic, economic, and military options to defend against and pressure North Korea to abandon its illicit weapons program.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. BERA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle G of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12. STRATEGY TO FURTHER UNITED STATES-INDIA DEFENSE COOPERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall develop a strategy for advancing defense cooperation between the United States and India.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy shall address the following:

- (1) Common security challenges.
- (2) The role of United States partners and allies in the United States-India defense relationship.
- (3) The role of the Defense Technology and Trade Initiative.
- (4) How to advance the Communications Interoperability and Security Memorandum of Agreement and the Basic Exchange and Cooperation Agreement for Geospatial Cooperation.
- (5) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State determines to be appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. WALZ OF MINNESOTA

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 1282. REPORT BY DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ON CERTAIN MILITARY CAPABILITIES OF CHINA AND RUSSIA.

(a) REPORT.—The Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the appropriate congressional committees a report on the military capabilities of the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include, with respect to the military of China and the military of Russia, the following:

(1) An update on the presence, status, and capability of the military with respect to any national training centers similar to the Combat Training Center Program of the United States.

(2) An analysis of a readiness deployment cycle of the military, including—

(A) as compared to such a cycle of the United States; and

(B) an identification of metrics used in the national training centers of that military.

(3) A comprehensive investigation into the capability and readiness of the mechanized logistics of the army of the military, including—

(A) an analysis of field maintenance, sustainment maintenance, movement control, intermodal operations, and supply; and

(B) how such functions under subparagraph (A) interact with specific echelons of that military.

(4) An assessment of the future of mechanized army logistics of that military.

(c) NONDUPLICATION OF EFFORTS.—The Defense Intelligence Agency may make use of or add to any existing reports completed by the Agency in order to respond to the reporting requirement.

(d) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) may be submitted in classified form.

(e) BRIEFING.—The Director shall provide a briefing to the Secretary and the committees specified in subsection (a) on the report under such subsection.

(f) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives

and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to support en bloc package No. 3, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to support the en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Chair, thank you for this opportunity to highlight my amendment, floor amendment Number 58 to H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA).

Among the battles fought by the United States (U.S.) during World War II were many battles throughout the Pacific, sometimes referred to as the Asia-Pacific. From 1941 through 1945, U.S. service members fought on land, in the air, and at sea through numerous South Pacific islands to secure peace and defend our democracy and freedom. Our nation suffered over 150,000 casualties in the war.

My amendment recognizes that while Pearl Harbor memorializes the beginning of the Pacific War (the USS *Arizona*) and the end of the Pacific War (the USS *Missouri*), there is no memorial honoring our service members who defended our country and gave their lives during the Pacific War. As such, my amendment expresses the sense of Congress that there should be such a memorial established at or near the Pearl Harbor site of the World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument in Honolulu, Hawai'i.

The idea for a Pacific War Memorial originated with Admiral Lloyd "Joe" Vasey, who turned 100 years old earlier this year. Admiral Vasey served aboard the submarine USS *Gunnel* in the Pacific during World War II, under John S. McCain, Jr., father of U.S. Senator JOHN MCCAIN. During a fierce battle aboard the *Gunnel*, Admiral Vasey thought to himself, "There has to be a better way to resolve international disputes." Years later, Admiral Vasey put that thought into action and founded the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), also known as the Pacific Forum, to promote peace in the Asia-Pacific.

In the words of Admiral Vasey: "There is no recognition of the brave Americans who were lost in the Pacific War . . . They are resting on the bottom of the Pacific Ocean somewhere, or their remains are scattered across the South Pacific islands. We need to honor them, and their families need a place to mourn."

I wholeheartedly agree with Admiral Vasey and feel strongly that the location of such a memorial should be in Hawai'i, preferably at Pearl Harbor near the USS *Arizona* and USS *Missouri*. It would be fitting to share the stories of the brave service members who fought and gave their lives in the Pacific War alongside

sites that commemorate events and other U.S. service members of the Pacific during World War II.

I thank my House colleagues for supporting Admiral Vasey's idea and my amendment to H.R. 2810. I look forward to continuing my work with my colleagues to make Admiral Vasey's desire for a Pacific War memorial a reality.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 431, I offer a fourth package of amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, and 87 printed in part B of House Report 115-212, offered by Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas:

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12 . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security cooperation and an enduring instrument for promoting stability in Europe and around the world for over 65 years.

(2) NATO currently faces a range of security challenges, including Russian aggression in Eastern Europe and instability and conflict in the Middle East and North Africa.

(3) In light of these and other threats, NATO must have a credible deterrence to defend NATO members, if necessary, against adversaries or threats.

(4) Since the 2014 NATO summit in Wales and the 2016 summit in Warsaw, NATO has made progress in implementing a Readiness Action Plan to enhance allied readiness and collective defense in response to Russian aggression. However, much work remains to be done.

(5) NATO's solidarity is strengthened by bolstering its conventional and nuclear deterrence, increasing defense spending by NATO members, and continuing the enlargement of NATO.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) NATO members should—

(A) continue to advance the NATO Open-Door Policy and build on the successes of previous enlargement initiatives;

(B) continue to work with countries that are seeking to join NATO to prepare for entry;

(C) commend Montenegro's final accession to NATO;

(D) seek a Dayton II agreement to resolve the constitutional issues faced by Bosnia and Herzegovina;

(E) work with the Republic of Kosovo to prepare the country for entrance into the NATO Partnership for Peace program;

(F) continue support for the NATO Membership Action Plan for Georgia;

(G) implement specific plans to ensure that sufficient investments are made to meet NATO responsibilities, including by allocating at least 2 percent of each member's gross domestic product to defense spending, 20 percent of which should be dedicated to major equipment procurement, as agreed at the 2014 Wales Summit and reaffirmed at the 2016 Warsaw Summit;

(H) continue to build on efforts to identify and address, through consensus, the security threats facing the alliance, such as by enhancing counterterrorism activities;

(I) continue to bolster deterrence efforts and promote the Enhanced Forward Presence in Eastern Europe;

(J) as decided at the 2016 Warsaw Summit, use the new rotational deployments of four multinational combat battalions in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to promote stability in that region as well as to deter Russian aggression; and

(K) invest in infrastructure projects necessary to guarantee free and efficient movement throughout the territories of NATO members; and

(2) The United States should commit to maintaining a robust military presence in Europe as a means of promoting allied interoperability, providing visible assurance to NATO allies, and deterring Russian aggression in the region.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. TROTT OF MICHIGAN

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12 . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE EXPORT OF DEFENSE ARTICLES TO TURKEY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) on June 6, 2017, the House of Representatives voted unanimously to pass H. Res. 354, condemning the violence that took place outside the Turkish Ambassador's residence on May 16, 2017, and calling on the perpetrators to be brought to justice under United States law; and

(2) the security force that participated in this violence may be the recipient of arms exported from the United States under a proposed deal.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the proposed sale of semiautomatic handguns for export to Turkey should remain under scrutiny until a satisfactory and appropriate resolution is reached to the violence described in subsection (a)(1).

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12 . STRATEGY TO IMPROVE DEFENSE INSTITUTIONS AND SECURITY SECTOR FORCES IN NIGERIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a comprehensive strategy to support improvements in defense institutions and security sector forces in Nigeria.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the threats posed by terrorist and other militant groups operating in Nigeria, including Boko Haram, ISIS-WA, and Niger Delta militants, as well as a description of the origins, strategic aims, tactical methods, funding sources, and leadership structures of each such organization.

(2) An assessment of efforts by the Government of Nigeria to improve civilian protection, accountability for human rights violations, and transparency in the defense institutions and security sector forces.

(3) A description of the key international and United States diplomatic, development, intelligence, military, and economic resources available to address instability across Nigeria, and a plan to maximize the coordination and effectiveness of these resources to counter the threats posed by Boko Haram, ISIS-WA, and Niger Delta militants.

(4) An assessment of efforts undertaken by the security forces of the Government of Nigeria to improve the protection of civilians in the context of—

(A) ongoing military operations against Boko Haram in the northeast region;

(B) addressing farmer-herder land disputes in the Middle Belt;

(C) renewed militant attacks on oil and gas infrastructure in the Delta; and

(D) addressing pro-Biafra protests in the southeast region.

(5) An assessment of the effectiveness of the Civilian Joint Task Force that has been operating in parts of northeastern Nigeria in order to ensure that underage youth are not participating in government-sponsored vigilante activity in violation of the Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-340).

(6) An assessment of the options for the Government of Nigeria to eventually incorporate the Civilian Joint Task Force into Nigeria's military or law enforcement agencies or reintegrate its members into civilian life.

(7) A plan for the United States to work with the Nigerian security forces and judiciary to transparently investigate allegations of human rights violations committed by the security forces of the Government of Nigeria that have involved civilian casualties, including a plan to undertake tangible measures of accountability following such investigations in order to break the cycle of conflict.

(8) A plan for the United States to work with the Nigerian defense institutions and security sector forces to improve detainee conditions.

(9) A plan to work with the Nigerian military, international organizations, and non-governmental organizations to demilitarize the humanitarian response to the food insecurity and population displacement in northeastern Nigeria.

(10) Any other matters the President considers appropriate.

(c) UPDATES.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the report required under subsection (a) is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees, and annually thereafter for 5 years, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an update of the report containing updated assessments and evaluations on progress made on the plans described in the report, including—

(1) updated assessments on the information described in paragraphs (2), (4), and (6) of subsection (a); and

(2) descriptions of the steps taken and outcomes achieved under each of the plans described in paragraphs (7), (8), (9), and (10) of subsection (a), as well as assessments of the effectiveness and descriptions of the metrics used to evaluate effectiveness for each such plan.

(d) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) and the updates required under (c) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MS. WILSON OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12 . . . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE CHIBOK SCHOOLGIRLS AND BOKO HARAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) . The members of Jama’atu Ahlis Sunna Lidda’awati wal-Jihad, commonly known as Boko Haram, have terrorized the people of Nigeria with increasing violence since 2009, targeting military, government, and civilian sites in Nigeria, including schools, mosques, churches, markets, villages, and agricultural centers, and killing thousands and abducting hundreds of civilians in Nigeria and the surrounding countries.

(2) On the night of April 14, 2014, 276 female students, most of them between 15 and 18 years old, were abducted by Boko Haram from the Chibok Government Girls Secondary School, a boarding school located in Borno state in the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

(3) While some Chibok girls have fled their captors and others have been released through negotiations, more than 100 Chibok girls remain in captivity.

(4) In addition to kidnapping the Chibok schoolgirls, Boko Haram has killed more than 20,000 people, coerced women and girls into carrying out suicide missions, displaced more than 3,000,000 Nigerians, tens of thousands of whom are at risk of starving to death, and caused thousand of school closures.

(5) In supporting efforts to reunite the Chibok schoolgirls with their families, the United States has authorized the deployment of military personnel to assist with intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, and provided training, equipment, and humanitarian services to the populations affected by and vulnerable to Boko Haram violence.

(6) The Secretary of State designated several individuals linked to Boko Haram, including its leader, Abubakar Shekau, as Specially Designated Global Terrorists in 2012, and designated Boko Haram as a Foreign Terrorist Organization in November 2013.

(7) The Senate and the House of Representatives have both passed legislation and undertaken other initiatives to condemn Boko Haram and support the Chibok schoolgirls.

(8) In addition to legislation, members of Congress have traveled to Nigeria to meet with freed Chibok schoolgirls and their families, held briefings, press conferences, and hearings, and, every week that Congress is in session, participated in Wear Something Red Wednesday, a bipartisan campaign led by Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi, Republican Conference Chair Cathy McMorris Rodgers, and Congresswoman Frederica Wilson, during which lawmakers wear a red outfit or accessory and take group photos to share on

social media to raise awareness about the kidnapped Chibok schoolgirls.

(9) The 114th Congress unanimously passed S. 1632, which President Barack Obama signed into law on December 14, 2016, to direct the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense to jointly develop a five-year strategy to aid Nigeria and the Multinational Joint Task Force, composed of troops from Benin, Cameroon, Chad, Niger, and Nigeria, to combat Boko Haram.

(10) On June 27, 2017, President Donald Trump met with two freed Chibok schoolgirls at the White House.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) commends the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and Director of National Intelligence for delivering a report to Congress on a five-year strategy for the United States to employ diplomatic, development, defense, and other tools to assist and enable our African partners to lead the effort to degrade and ultimately defeat Boko Haram, the Islamic State in Iraq and ash Sham – West Africa (ISIS-WA), and any potential splinter or successor groups;

(2) affirms United States support for the international effort to degrade Boko Haram and ISIS-WA and to assist the Multinational Joint Task Force to address the underlying drivers of violent extremism; and

(3) supports the efforts of the Department of Defense to implement a United States strategy for countering Boko Haram and ISIS-WA.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12 . . . MODIFICATION OF ANNUAL REPORT ON MILITARY AND SECURITY DEVELOPMENTS INVOLVING THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

Subsection (b) of section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), as most recently amended by section 1271 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2538), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(23) Any Chinese laws, regulations, or policies that could jeopardize the economic security of the United States.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12 . . . REPORT ON IRAN AND NORTH KOREA NUCLEAR AND BALLISTIC MISSILE COOPERATION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the ballistic missile programs of Iran and North Korea represent a serious threat to allies of the United States in the Middle East, Europe, and Asia, members of the Armed Forces deployed in those regions, and ultimately the United States; and

(2) further cooperation between Iran and North Korea on nuclear weapons or ballistic missile technology is not in the security interests of the United States or our allies.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the heads of other relevant agencies, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that includes—

(A) an assessment of the extent of cooperation on nuclear programs, ballistic missile development, chemical and biological weap-

ons development, or conventional weapons programs between the Government of Iran and the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, including the identity of Iranian and North Korean persons that have knowingly engaged in or directed the provision of material support or the exchange of information (including through the transfer of goods, services, technology, or intellectual property) between the Government of Iran and the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea; and

(B) a determination whether any of the activities described in subparagraph (A) violate United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1695 (2006), 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013), 2094 (2013), 2231 (2015), 2270 (2016) and 2321 (2016).

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(3) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO OF FLORIDA

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12 . . . MODIFICATION OF ANNUAL UPDATE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION OPERATIONS REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 1275 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2540) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) For each country identified under paragraph (1) as making an excessive maritime claim challenged by the United States under the program referred to in subsection (a), the types and locations of excessive maritime claims by such country that have not been challenged by the United States, if any, under the program referred to in subsection (a).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made subsection (a) takes effect of the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to each report required to be submitted under section 1275 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 on or after such date of enactment.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12 . . . CONTINGENCY PLANS RELATING TO SOUTH SUDAN.

The Secretary of Defense shall prepare contingency plans—

(1) to assist relief organizations in delivery of humanitarian assistance in South Sudan; and

(2) to engage Sudan’s military to promote efforts to reduce conflicts.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 579, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 1523. SEPARATE ACCOUNT LINES FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FUNDS.

For accountability and transparency purposes, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of Defense shall establish separate accounts to ensure that amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this title are administered separately from amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated or made available for the Department of Defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND—

Page 579, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 1523. GUIDELINES FOR BUDGET ITEMS TO BE COVERED BY OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS ACCOUNTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of Management and Budget, shall update the guidelines regarding the budget items that may be covered by overseas contingency operations accounts. Such revised guidelines shall be consistent with the recommendations included in Government Accountability Report GAO-17-68 entitled “Overseas Contingency Operations: OMB and DOD Should Revise the Criteria for Determining Eligible Costs and Identify the Costs Likely to Endure Long Term” published January 18, 2017.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF FLORIDA

Insert after section 1622 the following:

SEC. 1623. COORDINATING EFFORTS TO PREPARE FOR SPACE WEATHER EVENTS.

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure the timely provision of operational space weather observations, analyses, forecasts, and other products to support the mission of the Department of Defense and coalition partners, including the provision of alerts and warnings for space weather phenomena that may affect weapons systems, military operations, or the defense of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. CORREA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle D of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 1656. STRATEGY FOR THE OFFENSIVE USE OF CYBER CAPABILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (commonly known as “NATO”) remains a critical alliance for the United States and a cost-effective, flexible means of providing security to the most important allies of the United States.

(2) The regime of Russian President Vladimir Putin is actively working to erode democratic systems of NATO member states, including the United States.

(3) According to the report of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence dated January 6, 2017, on the Russian Federation’s hack of the United States presidential election: “Russian efforts to influence the 2016 presidential election represent the most recent expression of Moscow’s longstanding desire to undermine the US-led liberal democratic order.”

(4) As recently as May 4, 2017, the press reported a massive cyber hack of French President Emmanuel Macron’s campaign, likely attributable to Russian actors.

(5) It is in the core interests of the United States to enhance the offensive and defensive cyber capabilities of NATO member states to deter and defend against Russian cyber and influence operations.

(6) Enhanced offensive cyber capabilities would enable the United States to dem-

onstrate strength and deter the Russian Federation from threatening NATO, while reassuring allies, without a provocative buildup of conventional military forces.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CYBER STRATEGY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—It is the sense of Congress that —

(1) the Secretary of Defense should update the cyber strategy of the Department of Defense (as that strategy is described in the Department of Defense document titled “The Department of Defense Cyber Strategy” dated April 15, 2015); and

(2) in updating the cyber strategy of the Department, the Secretary should—

(A) specifically develop an offensive cyber strategy that includes plans for the offensive use of cyber capabilities, including computer network exploitation and computer network attacks, to thwart air, land, or sea attacks by the regime of Russian President Vladimir Putin and other adversaries;

(B) provide guidance on integrating offensive tools into the cyber arsenal of the Department; and

(C) assist NATO partners, through the NATO Cooperative Cyber Center of Excellence and other entities, in developing offensive cyber capabilities.

(c) STRATEGY FOR OFFENSIVE USE OF CYBER CAPABILITIES.—

(1) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—The President shall develop a written strategy for the offensive use of cyber capabilities by departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The strategy developed under paragraph (1) shall include, at minimum—

(A) a description of enhancements that are needed to improve the offensive cyber capabilities of the United States and partner nations, including NATO member states; and

(B) a statement of principles concerning the appropriate deployment of offensive cyber capabilities.

(3) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the congressional defense committees (as that term is defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code) the strategy developed under paragraph (1).

(B) FORM OF SUBMISSION.—The strategy submitted under subparagraph (A) may be submitted in classified form.

(d) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The President, acting through the Secretary of Defense and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, is authorized to provide technical assistance to NATO member states to assist such states in developing and enhancing offensive cyber capabilities.

(2) TECHNICAL EXPERTS.—In providing technical assistance under paragraph (1), the President, acting through the NATO Cooperative Cyber Center of Excellence, may detail technical experts in the field of cyber operations to NATO member states.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude or limit the authorities of the President or the Secretary of Defense to provide cyber-related assistance to foreign countries, including the authority of the Secretary to provide such assistance under section 333 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. AGUILAR OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle D of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 1656. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CYBER WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program to be known as the “Cyber Workforce Development Pilot Program” (in this section referred to as the “Pilot Program”) under which the Secretary shall provide funds, in addition to other funds that may be available, for the recruitment, training, professionalization, and retention of personnel in the cyber workforce of the Department of Defense.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Pilot Program shall be to assess the effectiveness of carrying out a full-scale talent management program to ensure that the cyber workforce of the Department of Defense has the capacity, in both personnel and skills, needed to effectively perform its cyber missions and the kinetic missions impacted by cyber activities.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—The Pilot Program shall be managed by the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense, in consultation with the Principal Cyber Advisor to the Secretary of Defense.

(d) GUIDANCE.—The Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense, in consultation with the Principal Cyber Advisor to the Secretary of Defense, shall issue guidance for the administration of the Pilot Program. Such guidance shall include provisions that—

(1) identify areas of need in the cyber workforce that funds under the Pilot Program may be used to address, including—

(A) changes to the types of skills needed in the cyber workforce;

(B) capabilities to develop the cyber workforce and assist members of the cyber workforce in achieving qualifications and professionalization through activities such as training, education, and exchange programs;

(C) incentives to retain qualified, experienced cyber workforce personnel; and

(D) incentives for attracting new, high-quality personnel to the cyber workforce;

(2) describe the process under which entities may submit an application to receive funds under the Pilot Program;

(3) describe the evaluation criteria to be used for approving or prioritizing applications for funds under the Pilot Program in any fiscal year; and

(4) describe measurable objectives of performance for determining whether funds under the Pilot Program are being used in compliance with this section.

(e) CONSIDERATIONS.—When selecting entities to provide training and education services under the Pilot Program, consideration shall be given to whether the entity providing such services is a Center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education (as that term is defined in section 2200e of title 10, United States Code).

(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the end of each of fiscal year for which funds are appropriated for the Pilot Program, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the operation of the Pilot Program during such fiscal year. Each report shall include, for the fiscal year covered by such report, the following:

(1) A description of the expenditures made under the Pilot Program (including expenditures following a transfer of funds under the Pilot Program to a military department or Defense Agency) in such fiscal year, including the purpose of such expenditures.

(2) A description and assessment of improvements in the Department of Defense

cyber workforce resulting from such expenditures.

(3) Recommendations for additional authorities to fulfill the purpose of the Pilot Program.

(4) A statement of the funds that remain available under the Pilot Program at the end of such fiscal year.

(g) **TERMINATION.**—The Pilot Program and the annual reporting requirement under subsection (f) shall each terminate on the date that is five years after the date on which funds are first appropriated for the Pilot Program and any funds not obligated or expended under the Pilot Program on that date shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

(h) **CYBER WORKFORCE DEFINED.**—In this Act, the term “cyber workforce” means the following:

(1) Personnel in positions that require the performance of cybersecurity or other cyber-related functions as so identified pursuant to the Federal Cybersecurity Workforce Assessment Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–113; 5 U.S.C. 301 note).

(2) Military personnel or civilian employees of the Department of Defense who are not described in paragraph (1) but who—

(A) are assigned functions that contribute significantly to cyber operations; and

(B) are designated as temporary members of the cyber workforce by the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense, or by the head of a military department or Defense Agency, for the limited purpose of receiving training for the performance of cyber-related functions.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. COOPER OF TENNESSEE

Page 685, line 24, strike “any” and insert “the”.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of subtitle F of title XVI, add the following new section:

SEC. 1694. NORTH KOREAN NUCLEAR INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the hazards or risks posed directly or indirectly by the nuclear ambitions of North Korea, focusing upon—

(1) the development and deployment of intercontinental ballistic missiles or nuclear weapons;

(2) the consequences to the United States, the interests of the United States, and allies of the United States of North Korea’s nuclear and missile programs;

(3) a plan to deter and defend against such threats from North Korea;

(4) protecting vital interest and capabilities of the United States in space from such threats from North Korea; and

(5) the potential damage or destruction caused by such missiles to satellites and space stations, including magnetic fields such as the Van Allen belts.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. CULBERSON OF TEXAS

Add at the end of subtitle E of title XXVIII the following:

SEC. 2844. BATTLESHIP PRESERVATION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is hereby established within the Department of the Interior a grant program for the preservation of our nation’s most historic battleships.

(b) **USE OF GRANTS.**—Amounts received through grants under this section shall be

used for the preservation of our nation’s most historic battleships in a manner that is self-sustaining and has an educational component.

(c) **CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible for a grant under this section, an entity shall—

(1) submit an application under procedures prescribed by the Secretary;

(2) match the amount of the grant, on a 1-to-1 basis, with non-Federal assets from non-Federal sources, which may include cash or durable goods and materials fairly valued as determined by the Secretary;

(3) maintain records as may be reasonably necessary to fully disclose—

(A) the amount and the disposition of the proceeds of the grant;

(B) the total cost of the project for which the grant is made; and

(C) other records as may be required by the Secretary, including such records as will facilitate an effective accounting for project funds; and

(4) provide access to the Secretary for the purposes of any required audit and examination of any books, documents, papers, and records of the entity.

(d) **MOST HISTORIC BATTLESHIP DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “most historic battleship” means a battleship that is—

(1) between 75 and 115 years old;

(2) listed on the National Register of Historic Places; and

(3) located within the State for which it was named.

(e) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—The authorities contained in this section shall be in addition to, and shall not be construed to supercede or modify those contained in the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470–470x–6).

(f) **PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No Federal funds made available to carry out this section may be used to acquire any real property, or any interest in any real property, without the written consent of the owner (or owners) of that property or interest in property.

(2) **NO DESIGNATION.**—The authority granted by this section shall not constitute a Federal designation or have any effect on private property ownership.

(g) **SUNSET.**—The authority to make grants under this section expires on September 30, 2024.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA OF CALIFORNIA

Add at the end of subtitle G of title XXVIII the following new section:

SEC. 2863. RESTRICTIONS ON REHABILITATION OF OVER-THE-HORIZON BACKSCATTER RADAR STATION.

(a) **RESTRICTIONS.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Air Force may not use any funds or resources to carry out the rehabilitation of the Over-the-Horizon Backscatter Radar Station on Modoc National Forest land in Modoc County, California.

(b) **EXCEPTION FOR MAINTENANCE OF PERIMETER FENCE.**—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary may use funds and resources to maintain the perimeter fence surrounding the Over-the-Horizon Backscatter Radar Station.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

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

SEC. 2703. UPDATE TO REPORT ON INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of

Defense shall prepare and release to the public an updated version of the March 2016 report on “Department of Defense Infrastructure Capacity”.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of subtitle C of title XXXI, add the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING URANIUM MINING AND NUCLEAR TESTING.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States should compensate and recognize all of the miners, workers, downwinders, and others suffering from the effects of uranium mining and nuclear testing carried out during the Cold War.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 76 printed in part B of House Report 115–212 be modified by the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title XII, add the following new section:

SEC. 12 ____ CONTINGENCY PLANS RELATING TO SOUTH SUDAN.

The Secretary of Defense shall prepare contingency plans—

(1) to assist relief organizations in delivery of humanitarian assistance in South Sudan; and

(2) to engage South Sudan’s military to promote efforts to reduce conflicts.

Mr. THORNBERRY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the modification be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I support en bloc package No. 4, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I support the en bloc package, as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The en bloc amendments, as modified, were agreed to.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0036

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. BYRNE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-217) on the resolution (H. Res. 440) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GUTHRIE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of his participation in a healthcare listening session in Lexington, Kentucky, with Vice President PENCE.

Mr. KHANNA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of birth of his child.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 37 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, July 13, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1928. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Nora W. Tyson, United States Navy, and her advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1929. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing two officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1930. A letter from the Board Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress, pursuant to Public Law 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1931. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's Major final rule — Arbitration Agreements [Docket No.: CFPB-2016-0020] (RIN: 3170-AA51) received July 10, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1932. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prosulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0218; FRL-9962-97] received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1933. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Procedures for Chemical Risk Evaluation Under the Amended Toxic Substances Control Act [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2016-0654; FRL-9964-38] (RIN: 2070-AK20) received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1934. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flonicamid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0013; FRL-9962-15] received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1935. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Volatile Organic Compound Reasonably Available Control Technology for 1997 Ozone Standard [EPA-R03-

OAR-2016-0561; FRL-9964-58-Region 3] received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1936. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Air Plan Approval; TN: Non-interference Demonstration for Federal Low-Reid Vapor Pressure Requirement in Shelby County [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0136; FRL-9964-56-Region 4] received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1937. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Control of Emissions of Organic Materials That Are Not Regulated by VOC RACT Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0272; FRL-9964-46-Region 5] received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1938. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Redesignation of the Muncie Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0137; FRL-9964-63-Region 5] received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1939. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Emissions Statement Rule Certification for the 2008 Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0278; FRL-9964-65-Region 5] received July 7, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1940. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-35, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1941. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-31, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1942. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-34, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1943. A letter from the Acting Director of Government Relations, Corporation For National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's revised Semi-Annual Report (SAR) to Congress due to an error by the Office of Inspector General (OIG) in its original report submission; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1944. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting two notifications of a discontinuation of service in acting role, and designation of acting officer,