AMENDMENT TO RULES COMMITTEE PRINT 115– 23

OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Add at the end of title XVI the following new subtitle:

Subtitle H—Advancing America's Missile Defense Act of 2017

3 SEC. 1699D. SHORT TITLE.

4 This subtitle may be cited as the "Advancing Amer-5 ica's Missile Defense Act of 2017".

6 SEC. 1699E. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CURRENT STATE OF
7 UNITED STATES MISSILE DEFENSE, FUTURE
8 INVESTMENT, AND ACCELERATING CAPABILI-

9 TIES TO OUTPACE CURRENT THREATS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con-10 11 gress that the Secretary of Defense should use the upcoming Ballistic Missile Defense Review (BMDR) and the 12 13 Missile Defeat Review (MDR) to accelerate the development of new and existing means to sustain and increase 14 15 the capacity, capability, and reliability of the ground-based midcourse defense element of the ballistic missile defense 16 system and other missile defense programs. 17

(b) ACCELERATION OF DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN
 ADVANCED MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES TOWARD
 FIELDING.—

4 (1) IN GENERAL.—To the degree practicable, 5 the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall use 6 the policies of the Department of Defense to accel-7 erate the development, testing, and fielding of the 8 redesigned kill vehicle, the multi-object kill vehicle, 9 the C3 booster, a space-based sensor layer, an air-10 borne laser on unmanned aerial vehicles, and a po-11 tential additional missile defense site, including the 12 completion of any outstanding environmental impact 13 statements (EISs) for an additional missile defense 14 site on the East Coast or in the Midwest regions of 15 the United States.

16 (2) PRIORITY.—The Director shall prioritize
17 the development of capabilities listed in paragraph
18 (1) subject to annual authorization and appropria19 tion of funding.

20 (3) DEVELOPMENT.—The Director shall use
21 sound acquisition processes and program manage22 ment to develop the capabilities set forth in para23 graph (1).

1SEC. 1699F. AUTHORIZATION TO INCREASE CURRENT2GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE CA-3PACITY BY 28 GROUND-BASED INTERCEP-4TORS.

5 (a) INCREASE IN CAPACITY.—The Secretary of De6 fense shall, subject to the annual authorization of appro7 priations and the annual appropriation of funds for Na8 tional Missile Defense, increase the number of United
9 States ground-based interceptors by up to 28.

10 (b) Report to Congress.—

11 (1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed or 12 recommended by the BMDR, not later than 90 days 13 after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Di-14 rector of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to 15 the congressional defense committees a report on in-16 frastructure requirements and costs associated to in-17 crease the number of ground-based interceptors at 18 Missile Field 1 and Missile Field 2 at Fort Greely 19 to 20 ground-based interceptors each.

20 (2) CONTENTS.—The report required by para-21 graph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An analysis of the strategic, operational, and tactical benefits of adding additional ground-based interceptors at each missile
field.

| 1 | (B) A detailed description of the infra- |
|--|---|
| 2 | structure needed and costs associated with ex- |
| 3 | panding each missile field. |
| 4 | (C) An identification of any environmental, |
| 5 | technical, or logistical barriers to expanding |
| 6 | each missile field. |
| 7 | (D) Any analysis of alternatively using |
| 8 | Missile Field 4 and Missile Field 5 to increase |
| 9 | the number of ground-based interceptors. |
| 10 | (3) FORM.—The report submitted under para- |
| 11 | graph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, |
| 12 | but may include a classified annex. |
| | |
| 13 | SEC. 1699G. MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY REPORT ON IN- |
| 13 14 | SEC. 1699G. MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY REPORT ON IN- CREASING NUMBER OF GROUND-BASED |
| | |
| 14 | CREASING NUMBER OF GROUND-BASED |
| 14 15 | CREASING NUMBER OF GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTORS UP TO 100. |
| 14 15 16 | CREASING NUMBER OF GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTORS UP TO 100. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con- |
| 14 15 16 17 | CREASING NUMBER OF GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTORS UP TO 100. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con- gress that it is the policy of the United States to maintain |
| 14 15 16 17 18 | CREASINGNUMBEROFGROUND-BASEDINTERCEPTORS UP TO 100.(a)SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that it is the policy of the United States to maintainand improve, with the allies of the United States, an effect |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 | CREASING NUMBER OF GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTORS UP TO 100. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con- gress that it is the policy of the United States to maintain and improve, with the allies of the United States, an effec- tive, robust layered missile defense system capable of de- |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | CREASING NUMBER OF GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTORS UP TO 100. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con- gress that it is the policy of the United States to maintain and improve, with the allies of the United States, an effec- tive, robust layered missile defense system capable of de- fending the citizens of the United States residing in terri- |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | CREASING NUMBER OF GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTORS UP TO 100. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con- gress that it is the policy of the United States to maintain and improve, with the allies of the United States, an effec- tive, robust layered missile defense system capable of de- fending the citizens of the United States residing in terri- tories and States of the United States, allies of the United |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | CREASING NUMBER OF GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTORS UP TO 100. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con- gress that it is the policy of the United States to maintain and improve, with the allies of the United States, an effec- tive, robust layered missile defense system capable of de- fending the citizens of the United States residing in terri- tories and States of the United States, allies of the United States, and deployed Armed Forces of the United States. |

| 1 | after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Di- |
|----|--|
| 2 | rector of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to |
| 3 | the congressional defense committees a report on the |
| 4 | costs and benefits of increasing the capacity of the |
| 5 | ground-based midcourse defense element of the bal- |
| 6 | listic missile defense system. |
| 7 | (2) CONTENTS.—The report required by para- |
| 8 | graph (1) shall include the following: |
| 9 | (A) An identification of potential sites— |
| 10 | new or existing—to allow for the increase of up |
| 11 | to 100 ground-based interceptors. |
| 12 | (B) An analysis of the strategic, oper- |
| 13 | ational, tactical, and cost benefits of each site. |
| 14 | (C) A description of any environmental, |
| 15 | legal, or tactical challenges associated with each |
| 16 | site. |
| 17 | (D) A detailed description of the infra- |
| 18 | structure needed and costs associated with each |
| 19 | site. |
| 20 | (E) A summary of any completed or out- |
| 21 | standing environmental impact statements |
| 22 | (EIS) on each site. |
| 23 | (F) An operational evaluation and cost |
| 24 | analysis of the deployment of transportable |
| 25 | ground-based interceptors, including an identi- |

1 fication of potential sites, including in the east-2 ern United States and at Vandenberg Air Force 3 Base, and an examination of any environ-4 mental, legal, or tactical challenges associated 5 with such deployments, including to any sites 6 identified in subparagraph (A).

7 (G) A determination of the appropriate 8 fleet mix of ground-based interceptor kill vehi-9 cles and boosters to maximize overall system ef-10 fectiveness and increase its capacity and capa-11 bility, including the costs and benefits of contin-12 ued inclusion of capability enhancement II 13 (CE–II) Block 1 interceptors after the fielding 14 of the redesigned kill vehicle.

15 (H) A description of the planned improvements to homeland ballistic missile defense sen-16 17 sor and discrimination capabilities and an as-18 sessment of the expected operational benefits of 19 such improvements to homeland ballistic missile 20 defense.

21 (I) The and benefits of costs 22 supplementing ground-based midcourse defense 23 elements with other, more distributed, elements, 24 including both Aegis ships and Aegis Ashore in-25 stallations with Standard Missile-3 Block IIA

| 1 | and other interceptors in Hawaii and at other |
|----|--|
| 2 | locations for homeland missile defense. |
| 3 | (3) FORM.—The report required by paragraph |
| 4 | (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may |
| 5 | include a classified annex. |
| 6 | SEC. 1699H. EVALUATION AND EVOLUTION OF TERRES- |
| 7 | TRIAL GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE |
| 8 | SENSORS. |
| 9 | (a) Report to Congress.— |
| 10 | (1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed or |
| 11 | recommended by the BMDR, not later than 90 days |
| 12 | after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Di- |
| 13 | rector of the Missile Defense Agency, in coordination |
| 14 | with the Secretary of the Air Force, shall submit to |
| 15 | the congressional defense committees a report on the |
| 16 | status of the integrated layers of missile defense ra- |
| 17 | dars. |
| 18 | (2) CONTENTS.—The report required by para- |
| 19 | graph (1) shall include the following: |
| 20 | (A) A detailed analysis of the expected im- |
| 21 | provements resulting from the integration of |
| 22 | the Long Range Discrimination Radar into the |
| 23 | missile defense system architecture of the |
| 24 | United States, including— |

| 1 | (i) any adjustments to homeland mis- |
|----|--|
| 2 | sile defense tactics, techniques, and proce- |
| 3 | dures; |
| 4 | (ii) possible adjustments to ground- |
| 5 | based midcourse defense shot-doctrine and |
| 6 | required interceptor capacity; |
| 7 | (iii) possibilities for direct integration |
| 8 | with Fort Greely's Command and Control |
| 9 | node; and |
| 10 | (iv) impacts on regional missile de- |
| 11 | fense systems including Aegis Ballistic |
| 12 | Missile Defense, Aegis Ashore, and Ter- |
| 13 | minal High Altitude Area Defense. |
| 14 | (B) A detailed comparison of the capabili- |
| 15 | ties of Long Range Discrimination Radar and |
| 16 | the COBRA DANE radar, including— |
| 17 | (i) the unique capabilities of each |
| 18 | radar; |
| 19 | (ii) the overlapping capabilities of |
| 20 | each radar; and |
| 21 | (iii) the advantages and disadvantages |
| 22 | of each radar's location. |
| 23 | (C) A modernization plan and costs for the |
| 24 | long-term continued operations and mainte- |
| 25 | nance of the COBRA DANE radar or a plan to |

| 1 | replace its capability if COBRA DANE cannot |
|----|--|
| 2 | remain operational, and the costs associated |
| 3 | with each plan. |
| 4 | (b) Assessment by Comptroller General of |
| 5 | THE UNITED STATES.—Not later than 90 days after the |
| 6 | date on which the Director submits the report under sub- |
| 7 | section (a)(1), the Comptroller General of the United |
| 8 | States shall— |
| 9 | (1) complete a review of the plan required by |
| 10 | subsection $(a)(2)(C)$; and |
| 11 | (2) submit to the congressional defense commit- |
| 12 | tees a report on such review that includes the find- |
| 13 | ings and recommendations of the Comptroller Gen- |
| 14 | eral. |
| 15 | (c) FORM.—The reports submitted subsections (a) |
| 16 | and (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may |
| 17 | include a classified annex. |
| 18 | SEC. 1699I. AUTHORIZATION FOR MORE GROUND-BASED |
| 19 | MIDCOURSE DEFENSE TESTING. |
| 20 | (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con- |
| 21 | gress that— |
| 22 | (1) at a minimum, the Missile Defense Agency |
| 23 | should continue to flight test the ground-based mid- |
| 24 | course defense element at least once each fiscal year; |

(2) the Department of Defense should allocate
 increased funding to homeland missile defense test ing to ensure that our defenses continue to evolve
 faster than the threats against which they are pos tured to defend while pursuing a robust acquisition
 process;

7 (3) in order to rapidly innovate, develop, and
8 field new technologies, the Director of the Missile
9 Defense Agency should continue to focus testing
10 campaigns on delivering increased capabilities to the
11 Armed Forces as quickly as possible; and

(4) the Director of the Missile Defense Agency
should seek to establish a more prudent balance between risk mitigation and the more rapid testing
pace needed to quickly develop and deliver new capabilities to the Armed Forces.

17 (b) Report to Congress.—

18 (1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed or 19 recommended by the BMDR, not later than 90 days 20 after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Di-21 rector of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to 22 the congressional defense committees a revised mis-23 sile defense testing campaign plan that accelerates 24 the development and deployment of new missile de-25 fense technologies.

| 1 | (2) CONTENTS.—The report required by para- |
|----|---|
| 2 | graph (1) shall include the following: |
| 3 | (A) A detailed analysis of the costs and |
| 4 | benefits of accelerating each following pro- |
| 5 | grams: |
| 6 | (i) Redesigned kill vehicle. |
| 7 | (ii) Multi-object kill vehicle. |
| 8 | (iii) Configuration-3 booster. |
| 9 | (iv) Lasers mounted on small un- |
| 10 | manned aerial vehicles. |
| 11 | (v) Space-based missile defense sensor |
| 12 | architecture. |
| 13 | (vi) Such additional technologies as |
| 14 | the Director considers appropriate. |
| 15 | (B) A new deployment timeline for each of |
| 16 | the programs in listed in subparagraph (A) or |
| 17 | a detailed description of why the current |
| 18 | timeline for deployment technologies under |
| 19 | those programs is most suitable. |
| 20 | (C) An identification of any funding or pol- |
| 21 | icy restrictions that would slow down the de- |
| 22 | ployment of the technologies under the pro- |
| 23 | grams listed in subparagraph (A). |
| 24 | (D) A risk assessment of the potential |
| 25 | cost-overruns and deployment delays that may |

be encountered in the expedited development 1 2 process of the capabilities under paragraph (1). 3 (c) REPORT ON FUNDING PROFILE.—The Director shall include with the budget justification materials sub-4 5 mitted to Congress in support of the budget of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 (as submitted with 6 7 the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) a report on the funding profile 8 necessary for the new testing campaign plan required by 9 subsection (b)(1). 10

\times