



## Amendments to H.R. 2685—Fiscal Year 2016 Defense Appropriations (Frelinghuysen, R-NJ) – Part I

CONTACT: MATT DICKERSON, [MATTHEW.DICKERSON@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV](mailto:MATTHEW.DICKERSON@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV), 6-9718

The committee report can be found [here](#), and the text of the legislation can be found [here](#).

### AMENDMENTS WITH REQUESTED VOTES:

1. **Lowenthal (D-CA)**: Would increase funding for the DOD STARBASE program by \$5 million and would reduce Operation and Maintenance (O&M), Army and Operation and Maintenance (O&M), Defense Wide by \$3 million each.

The [STARBASE program](#) is meant to motivate fifth graders to explore Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM). The bill would provide \$25 million for STARBASE. The president's budget would eliminate this program.

The O&M accounts provides for military readiness.

2. **Huffman (D-CA) / McClintock (R-CA)**: Would strike section 8053 which requires that the air force facility in Kaiserslautern, Germany, use only anthracite coal shipped from Pennsylvania at the cost of [\\$20 million per year](#). This provision of the bill has existed in defense appropriations bills since 1972. No other military base is subject to the same legislative requirements to use a particular type of fuel.

The provision was recently given the "Golden Fleece" award by the [Taxpayers for Common Sense](#). An article on this provision was included in the [Fiscal Times](#).

**Key Vote Yes:** [National Taxpayers Union](#)

Outside Group Support: Taxpayers for Common Sense, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW), and the Coalition to Reduce Spending.

3. **Visclosky (D-IN)**: Would strike the provision in the bill that would prohibit funds to transfer or release any detainee held at Guantanamo Bay into the U.S (Sec. 8100).
4. **Nadler (D-NY)**: Would strike the provision in the bill that would prohibit funds to modify any facility in the U.S. to house any Guantanamo detainee (Sec. 8101).
5. **Nadler (D-NY)**: Would strike the provision in the bill that would prohibit funds to be used in contravention [Section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014](#), which requires the Administration to notify Congress 30 days in advance of a detainee transfer to a foreign country (Sec. 8102). [According to the GAO](#), the administration violated a similar provision included in

the FY 2014 DOD Appropriations bill when it transferred Guantanamo detainees for Sgt. Bergdahl transfer.

6. **Forbes (R-VA)**: Would strike the provision in the bill that would prohibit the transfer of funds to the National Sea Based Deterrent Fund (Sec. 8122).

The [House-passed NDAA](#) would have established a new National Sea Based Deterrent Fund to provide the funding of the construction of the replacement for the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarines that would be separate from the Navy's normal shipbuilding account. The Department of Defense would have the ability to transfer unobligated funds from other DOD accounts to the National Sea Based Deterrent Fund without Congressional approval or going through the normal reprogramming process. The new account was created due to concerns that because the new submarines are projected to [cost \\$5 billion each](#), construction costs could crowd out needed funds for other projects in the shipbuilding account. An [amendment](#) to the NDAA offered by Rep. Blumenauer (D-OR) to eliminate the National Sea Based Deterrent Fund and require funding to go through the normal shipbuilding account was defeated by a [43 – 375](#) vote. A CRS report on the issue can be found [here](#).

The bill would provide \$971 million for the development of the replacement for the Ohio-class submarine under RDTE, a level that is equal to the president's budget request.

**Key Vote No:** [National Taxpayers Union](#)

7. **Poe (R-TX)**: Would reduce aid to Pakistan by \$430 million, an amount equal to about half the amount provided in the bill.
8. **Wahlberg (R-MI)**: Would strike the proviso that would allow the DOD to use up to \$50 million of OCO funds for additional costs associated with projects previously funded by the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund. The Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR) has been critical of the Fund. An [amendment](#) to the FY 2015 DOD Appropriations bill that would prohibit funding for the Fund passed by a voice vote.
9. **Nolan (D-MN)**: Would eliminate the Iraq Train and Equip Fund. The bill would provide \$715 million for the Iraq Train and Equip Fund.
10. **Clawson (R-FL)**: Would eliminate finding for U.S. support of Syrian rebel forces. The bill would provide \$600 million for the Syria Train and Equip Fund.

Some believe that a train-and-equip program for the moderate and vetted Syrian opposition would be a key component of U.S. strategy to defeat ISIL in Syrian territory without aiding the Assad regime. Without the Syria train and equip program, U.S. and coalition forces would have no ground component to combat ISIL in Syrian on the ground. According to the [Washington Institute for Near East Policy](#), "augmenting the planned force could help address intensifying threats posed by ISIS, along with Iran-backed militias and the Assad regime."

Other have raised concerns that the "[U.S.'s effort](#) to aid moderate fighters battling the Assad regime has gone badly". A dear colleague from the amendment sponsor that raises questions about the goals of this program and the difficulty of vetting rebels can be found [here](#).

11. **Poe (R-TX):** Would strike the provision in the bill that would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the conditions placed upon aid to Pakistan that are included in the bill.

The underlying legislation would require that the Secretary of Defense certify that Pakistan has met seven conditions (such as not supporting terrorist activities and dismantling IED networks) prior to providing aid to Pakistan. However, the bill also allows the Secretary to waive those conditions if it is “in the national security interest to do so.”

---

**NOTE:** *RSC Legislative Bulletins are for informational purposes only and should not be taken as statements of support or opposition from the Republican Study Committee.*

###