

**DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATIONS**

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Subtitle B—Army Programs

Airborne common sensor and enhanced medium altitude reconnaissance and surveillance system (sec. 111)

The budget request included \$88.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army for the purchase of three low rate initial production Enhanced Medium Altitude Reconnaissance and Surveillance System (EMARSS) aircraft. The committee understands, however, that the EMARSS program has an ambitious and risky development schedule that has already suffered schedule delays that makes the obligation of these funds in fiscal year 2011 unlikely. The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation of any funds for the Airborne Common Sensor, EMARSS, until the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology certifies to the congressional defense committees that the system has successfully completed its limited user tests and demonstrates the technical performance necessary for successful Milestone C approval.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Multiyear funding for detail design and construction of LHA replacement ship designated LHA-7 (sec. 121)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Navy to execute the contract for LHA-7 over fiscal years 2011 and 2012, subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose in budgets after 2011.

Requirement to maintain Navy airborne signals intelligence capabilities (sec. 122)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the retirement of the EP-3E Airborne Reconnaissance Integrated Electronic System II fleet or the Special Projects Aircraft (SPA) until the Navy has readied replacements that are equivalent or better in terms of meeting the requirements of the combatant commanders. The provision also requires that the two systems be maintained and upgraded to remain current against evolving threats and operational requirements.

The committee believes that this provision is necessary to ensure that the Navy sustains adequate signals intelligence (SIGINT) and multi-intelligence collection support for the Marine Corps, special

forces, ground component commanders, and naval fleet commanders, and joint combatant commands.

The Navy terminated the EP-X program due to escalating costs and a desire to pursue other solutions. The committee does not quarrel with this decision, but is concerned that the Navy shifted the EP-X outyear funds to other priorities and had no concrete plans for the future. The committee is concerned that the Navy's airborne intelligence collection capabilities would be seriously degraded as the current systems deteriorate well before new capabilities come on line.

The EP-3E and SPA fleets must be maintained and kept current while the Navy firms up and executes plans to acquire SIGINT on the Broad-Area Maritime Surveillance unmanned aerial system (UAS), and develops and produces the ship-based medium-endurance UAS.

The committee notes that the Navy operates multiple Reaper UAS under the Saber Focus program that have capable, and in some respects, unique sensors. These assets have been deployed both as a demonstration and to support operations overseas. The Navy's leadership is considering whether to cease operating these aircraft and transfer them to the Air Force. The committee has concerns about this proposed transfer. The committee's view is that the Navy's long-term plan to shift a much larger portion of its intelligence collection capabilities to UAS in the future could benefit from the continued availability of Reaper platforms to test sensors and to develop Navy UAS operational concepts. These Saber Focus assets could complement the SPA fleet if operated and managed together. The committee is also concerned that the transfer of these assets to the Air Force could result in the loss of, or a gap in, support for deployed forces.

Reports on service life extension of F/A-18 aircraft by the Department of the Navy (sec. 123)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a business case analysis comparing two options: (1) conducting a service life extension program (SLEP) for legacy F/A-18 aircraft beyond 8,600 hours; and (2) buying new F/A-18E/F aircraft. The provision also would specify the elements of that analysis. The Secretary would be required to complete that analysis and submit it to the congressional defense committees before he could begin such a SLEP effort.

The Department of the Navy has testified that, among the alternatives available to the Department for managing the shortfall it has projected in tactical aircraft inventory, one is to conduct a SLEP for some portion of the F/A-18 fleet that extends their service life beyond 8,600 flying hours. However, several objective reports have suggested that extending the service life of legacy F/A-18A-D aircraft to 10,000 hours may require significant depot work to rebuild parts of each aircraft. Such a situation raises uncertainty about the costs of such a program.

The provision would also require the Secretary of the Navy to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the operational risks and effects of any decision to reduce the size of F/A-18 squadrons before the Secretary takes any such action. The

provision would also specify topics or issues that this report should address. The committee understands that the Department of the Navy is planning to ask for funding to extend the service life of F/A-18 aircraft in fiscal year 2012 and will start reducing the size of its land-based F/A-18 squadrons in fiscal year 2011. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit the reports at the time the President submits his fiscal year 2012 budget proposal to Congress.

One of the ways that the Navy has decided it could deal with the shortfall of strike fighter aircraft would be to reduce the squadron size for expeditionary F/A-18 squadrons from 12 to 10 planes, beginning in fiscal year 2011. The committee understands that the Navy also intends to reduce the size of F/A-18 training squadrons. The committee, however, has seen no evidence that the Department of the Navy has conducted an operational risk assessment and analysis of the effects of these reductions. The committee believes that a final decision on reducing operational or training squadrons should be made only after the Department has completed those analyses and has reported on them to the congressional defense committees.

Inclusion of basic and functional design in assessments required prior to start of construction of first ship of a shipbuilding program (sec. 124)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 124 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) to tighten the requirements under which the Secretary of the Navy is required to certify that a new shipbuilding program has achieved sufficient design maturity at the time the Navy begins construction on the first ship of any major shipbuilding program.

The Government Accountability Office, in its May 2009 report, “Best Practices: High Levels of Knowledge at Key Points Differentiate Commercial Shipbuilding from Navy Shipbuilding (GAO-09-322),” identified key steps that leading commercial shipbuilders and ship buyers follow to ensure their vessels deliver on-time, within planned costs, and with a high degree of innovation.

One critical step in this process is achieving design stability before start of fabrication. Leading commercial firms assess a ship design as stable once all basic and functional design activities have been completed (usually in the form of a complete 3D product model).

Section 124 as currently written does not specifically require that the assessment of design maturity directly address the completeness of the 3D modeling or completion of the activities that make up basic and functional design. This provision would add that requirement.

Multiyear procurement authority for F/A-18E, F/A-18F, and EA-18G fighter aircraft (sec. 125)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 128 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 110-84). Section 128 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 provided specific authorization,

as required under section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, for the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear contract for the purchase of additional F/A-18E, F/A-18F, or EA-18G aircraft under certain conditions, including that: (1) the statutorily required written certifications be submitted to the congressional defense committees; and (2) the Secretary sign the contract by a certain time. This provision would change the effective dates in section 128 to reflect the fact that the Department was unable to meet those specified dates.

The committee strongly cautions the Department that how it proceeded here is neither preferred nor desirable, and should not be viewed as setting any precedent for acquiring major systems on a multiyear basis in the future. However, the committee believes that, against the backdrop of challenges to the Navy's managing its projected shortfall in tactical aviation (discussed elsewhere in this report), the savings of \$590.0 million identified by the Secretary of Defense is "substantial" within the meaning of section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, and sufficient reason to accept the delayed agreement. Therefore, the committee recommends authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to sign a multiyear contract for these aircraft before the end of the fiscal year.

Extracting substantial savings from major systems near the end of their production is hard to achieve. In this case, the committee approves of the Department's proposal to: (1) implement certain cost reduction initiatives; (2) avoid certain sources of cost peculiar to this program; (3) implement a proposed multiyear contract free of certain "reopener" clauses that, if exercised, could easily extinguish its savings estimate; and (4) adopt a fixed price-type contract as the vehicle for implementing the multiyear agreement.

Subtitle D—Joint and Multiservice Matters

System management plan and matrix for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Aircraft Program (sec. 141)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the Secretary of Defense establish a system management plan and matrix for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program that would be used to measure progress in gaining maturity for the system during the remainder of the system development and demonstration (SDD) program.

The committee believes that the F-35 represents an essential national capability. However, it remains concerned about whether the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program will deliver required capability required by each of the services when the services need it and at prices the Department can afford.

The basis for that concern arises principally from several reviews that were conducted late last year at the direction of the Secretary of Defense, including reviews by the Joint Estimating Team, an Industry Manufacturing Review Team, and a Joint Assessment Team. In their annual assessments of the program, the Director, Operational Testing and Evaluation and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) also conveyed troubling information about the program's ability to perform as promised.

Based on the reviews he directed, the Secretary of Defense fundamentally restructured the program to: (1) extend the development test schedule to March 2015; (2) add additional research, development, testing, and evaluation funds to pay for mitigating known risks; (3) buy another carrier variant developmental test aircraft and add another software integration line to the program; (4) use up to three aircraft procured under low-rate initial production (LRIP) contracts for developmental testing; (5) reduce procurement quantities over the future-years defense program to slow the planned production ramp up and offset added funding for developmental testing; and (6) install a new fee structure that would provide incentives for the contractor team to achieve key performance events and cost goals. While the Marine Corps may delay its initial operational capability date for a few months in 2012, the Navy and the Air Force extended theirs several years to 2016.

The committee supports the Secretary's plan to restructure the F-35 JSF program. However, the committee believes that greater insight into it for Congress and others outside the Department is warranted. To achieve that goal, the committee believes that the Defense Department needs to establish milestones against which we can measure progress of the program.

Therefore, in accordance with the goals set forth by the Program Executive Officer for the program, the committee expects the Department of Defense to manage the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter aircraft program so as to achieve the following milestones by the end of this calendar year:

- (1) achieve first flight of the F-35C (carrier variant);
- (2) install and operate Block 1.0 software on all flight test aircraft to be delivered this year;
- (3) fully implement those recommendations of the Independent Manufacturing Review Team, reflected in its October 2009 report and its follow-on assessment of the Production Integrated Transition Plan, that address manufacturing issues affecting initial production (in particular, those recommendations relating to the global supply chain; parts shortages and change management; first article inspections; test and evaluation; quantitative management metrics; the reduction of unit recurring flyaway costs; an integrated management plan/integrated management schedule; the completion of an independent schedule risk assessment by the government; and assessments of producibility);
- (4) deliver all LRIP Lot I aircraft and all remaining developmental aircraft (except for the additional F-35C test aircraft to be bought with fiscal year 2011 funds) in flyable status with software in Block 1.0 configuration;
- (5) deliver 11 test aircraft in flyable status with software in Block 1.0 configuration to Patuxent River Naval Air Station and Edwards Air Force Base;
- (6) conduct test flights at a rate of 12 flights per aircraft per month;
- (7) complete a minimum of 400 test flights;
- (8) deliver at least 3 training aircraft to Eglin Air Force Base; and

(9) capture real-time data from the flight testing of all F-35 JSF developmental aircraft and training aircraft using the F-35 Autonomous Logistics Information System. Such data collection shall be sufficient to support the Department's development of a revised operations and sustainment estimate in the second quarter of fiscal year 2012.

If the program reaches each of those milestones, the committee believes that the program will be in a position to award a fixed-price incentive fee contract no later than the fiscal year 2011 procurement.

The Acting Program Executive Officer in the Joint Program Office and the prime contractor both stipulated that the foregoing milestones are achievable.

The committee expects that the program will achieve these milestones and that, if they are not, the Department of Defense will undertake appropriate action to correct any reason for delays, including (but not limited to) withholding fees.

The recommended provision would look prospectively to measure progress during the remainder of the SDD program. As GAO recommended in its most recent report, "Joint Strike Fighter: Additional Costs and Delays Not Meeting Warfighter Requirements on Time," such a plan should provide criteria and conditions for comparing documented results to expected progressive levels of demonstrated weapon system maturity in relationship to planned increases in future procurement quantities.

The committee believes that the system management plan and matrix required under this section will serve as a useful tool by which Congress can require the Department to explain how increasing levels of demonstrated, quantifiable knowledge about the Joint Strike Fighter program's maturity at annual procurement decision-points justify increased procurement funding and quantities, as the program proceeds to a full-rate procurement decision.

Contracts for commercial imaging satellite capacities (sec. 142)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense (DOD) to procure or acquire the capacity of imaging satellites with 1.5-meter telescopes after December 31, 2010, if DOD seeks to sustain an augmentation of national overhead imagery capabilities with commercial-class electro-optical capability. The committee intends for DOD to begin to procure or acquire the use of 1.5-meter imaging satellites when it is necessary to replenish the additional capacity being acquired through the Enhanced View contract around the middle of the decade.

The committee was informed by DOD officials that DOD no longer has a requirement for survivable, wartime, moderate resolution, wide-area electro-optical imagery. The committee was informed that the additional capacity being acquired through the Enhanced View contract vehicle is intended solely as a backup in the event of shortfalls or gaps in the collection of imagery by National Intelligence Program (NIP) funded satellite programs. The committee was told that the collection capacity provided by the commercial augmentation program is actually in excess of requirements when the national overhead constellation is at normal levels

of capacity. The committee was informed by DOD officials that, in the event of a gap or shortfall in national overhead collection capacity, DOD would lower the altitude of the planned 1.1-meter satellites to increase their resolution, regardless of the significant reduction this would cause in the lifetime of the satellites.

The committee requests that the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council provide the committee with a summary of DOD's peacetime and wartime requirements for space-based electro-optical imaging other than from national overhead collection systems prior to conference on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

The committee notes that a gap or shortfall in national overhead collection capacity would most heavily impact the satisfaction of requirements for high-resolution point target collection. The committee notes further that 1.5-meter satellites would be far more capable of providing high-resolution point collection capacity than 1.1-meter satellites to make up for any such gap. If the purpose of the additional capacity being acquired through the Enhanced View contract is to provide insurance against a gap in national overhead collection, 1.5-meter satellites are clearly preferable.

Information provided to the committee from the Office of the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff indicates that the 10-year cost of procuring and operating 1.5-meter satellites, and associated ground costs, would be comparable to the 10-year cost of acquiring the capacity of 1.1-meter satellites, using independent cost estimates of the cost of the 1.5-meter satellites. Yet, the performance of the 1.5-meter satellites would be much greater than the 1.1-meter satellites. If DOD decides to procure the 1.5-meter satellites directly, the Department should contract with the Commercial Data Providers (CDP) to operate the satellites and to process and disseminate the data through the CDPs' ground infrastructure, and to allow the CDPs to sell imagery commercially.

In terms of performance, on a one-to-one comparison, the 1.5-meter would collect 3-4 times more high-resolution points and high-priority points, and 40-60 percent more total points. In the event of a delay or an impairment in national overhead capabilities, a 1.5-meter satellite initiative could regain performance to the baseline, whereas the 1.1-meter constellation would fall far short.

For these reasons, the committee is persuaded that DOD should pursue the 1.5-meter-class commercial satellites in the future.

Quarterly reports on the use of Combat Mission Requirements funds (sec. 143)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) to report to the congressional defense committees quarterly on the use of Combat Mission Requirements funding. The quarterly reports would address: (1) the balance of the Combat Mission Requirements account at the beginning of the quarter; (2) the balance of the Combat Mission Requirements account at the end of the quarter; (3) any transfer of funding into or out of the Combat Mission Requirements account during the quarter (including the source of any transfer into the fund, and the objective of any transfer out of the fund); (4) a description of any Combat Mission Requirements

approved for procurement and/or procured during the quarter; and (5) the amount of funds committed to each requirement.

The committee understands that the Combat Mission Requirements account plays an important role in providing funding for critical equipment to satisfy emergent requirements for deploying and deployed special operations forces. However, the committee believes that increased visibility over the account, including transfers into and out of the account, is necessary to ensure that the congressional defense committees possess sufficient information to exercise adequate oversight of relevant procurement accounts. The committee encourages USSOCOM to review its practices regarding transfers into and out of the account to ensure that these practices are consistent with requirements of law and policy related to the reprogramming of defense funds.

Integration of solid state laser systems into certain aircraft (sec. 144)

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has longstanding research and development programs to advance the military usefulness of high-powered lasers mounted on aircraft for defensive and offensive capabilities. Recent advances in the power and cooling of solid state lasers have led the Department to begin to develop, integrate, and test such lasers on military aircraft such as the B-1 bomber. There is concern that the Department may solely focus on the B-1 platform without fully analyzing the cost-benefit implications as it moves from demonstration to development.

Hence, the committee recommends a provision for the Department to provide to the congressional defense committees no later than February 2011, a report analyzing various candidate aircraft that are being considered as platforms for high power solid state lasers and provide an estimated unit cost to develop an integrated laser-aircraft system. The analysis should also estimate the operations and maintenance costs of such an integrated laser aircraft system. The committee notes there may not be complete data for some candidate aircraft but asks the Department to begin this analysis as early as possible in order to fully understand long-term life cycle costs.

The committee also requests that the analysis of the B-1 should consider the operational placement of the laser in the aft bay so as to maintain the operational kinetic capabilities of the forward and center bays.

Budget Items

Army

AH-64 fuselage manufacturing

The budget request included \$160.7 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA) for AH-64 Apache block III helicopters. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.5 million in APA to acquire special tooling and qualify a domestic source for the manufacture of the Apache helicopter airframe assembly.

Guardrail common sensor

The budget request included \$30.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army, in the Overseas Contingency Operations budget for the Guardrail Common Sensor (GRCS) program. The Army decided to modernize and retain 14 GRCS platforms after the budget was submitted. As a result, the Army requires only \$6.0 million of the \$30.2 million requested. The committee therefore recommends a reduction of \$24.2 million.

Air warrior survival vest ensemble reset program

The budget request included \$52.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA) for aircrew integrated systems, but provided no funding for the Air Warrior survival vest ensemble reset program. The Army requires inspection and reset of aviation survival equipment carriers, flotation collars, and egress air equipment. Due to increased operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, equipment is wearing out before its planned maintenance. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in APA for the Air Warrior survival vest ensemble reset program.

Non-line of sight launch system

The budget request included \$350.6 million in Missile Procurement, Army (MPA) for the non-line of sight launch system (NLOS-LS). The committee is aware that due to performance shortfalls, high projected costs for each missile, and the availability of other technologies to meet precision artillery fire requirements, the Army has recommended cancellation of the NLOS-LS program. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$350.6 million in MPA for the NLOS-LS.

Patriot upgrades

The budget request included \$57.2 million in Missile Procurement, Army for modification of the Patriot air and missile defense system and the Patriot Advanced Capability 3 (PAC-3) interceptor missile, but insufficient funds to repair and recertify PAC-3 missiles, and procure additional upgraded Patriot launching station kits. These PAC-3 upgrades are an Army Chief of Staff unfunded priority for fiscal year 2011. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$133.6 million in Missile Procurement, Army to cover the cost of the Patriot repairs and upgrades included on its Unfunded Priorities List. The Patriot system is the only combat-proven missile defense system in the U.S. military, and demand for Patriot and the PAC-3 missile is high among regional combatant commanders, since it provides defensive capability against the many existing short-range ballistic missiles in their Areas of Responsibility.

Paladin Integrated Management program

The budget request included \$105.3 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicle Procurement, Army (WTCV) for Paladin Integrated Management (PIM) systems. The PIM program would upgrade and extend the life of the Army's current M109A6 Paladin self-propelled howitzer system. The committee is aware that due to technical and program management challenges the procurement of

PIM systems will be delayed and therefore procurement is premature. The committee recommends a decrease of \$105.3 million in WTCV for PIM procurement.

M2A1 quick change barrel kits

The budget request included \$15.0 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles (WTCV) for M2 50 caliber machine gun modifications. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in WTCV for procurement of M2A1 quick change barrel kits to support operational safety and enhance the effectiveness of the M2 machine gun.

120mm mortars, Advanced Precision Mortar Initiative reduction

The budget request included \$28.6 million in the base budget and \$70.0 million in the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) budget request in Procurement of Ammunition, Army for the Advanced Precision Mortar Initiative (APMI) 120mm mortars, all types. The Army was able to achieve substantial savings through open competition in the source selection process and as a result no longer needs this funding.

The committee recommends a decrease of \$28.6 million in the base budget request and a decrease of \$50.1 million in the OCO for APMI unit cost savings.

Efficiency and safety modifications to Heavy Expanded Mobility Ammunition Trailer

The budget request included \$25.6 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for tactical trailers, but included no funds for the Heavy Expanded Mobility Ammunition Trailer (HEMAT) systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in OPA for HEMAT systems.

Navstar Global Positioning System

The budget request included \$45.7 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Navstar Global Positioning System. The committee recommends an increase of \$51.2 million in OPA for Navstar global positioning systems. The additional funding would be used to accelerate replacement of older versions of the Precision Lightweight Global Position System Receivers that are not Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) compliant. SAASM-compliance is a critical component of Army electronic force tracking and identification systems. This is a Chief of Staff, Army unfunded priority.

Tactical Local Area Network

The budget request included \$201.1 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for information systems. The Army has a requirement to support Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations units with Tactical Local Area Network (TACLAN) to consolidate numerous automation and communications efforts into a single program consisting of both hardware and common-user software applications. The committee recommends an increase of \$55.0 million in

OPA to accelerate the acquisition and fielding of TACLAN. This is a Chief of Staff, Army unfunded priority.

Lightweight Counter Mortar Radar

The budget request included \$58.0 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Lightweight Counter Mortar Radar (LCMR). The LCMR (version 3) is a force protection system that provides 360 degrees all around coverage to detect, locate, and report the target location of enemy mortar firing systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$47.1 million in OPA for LCMR. This is a Chief of Staff, Army unfunded priority.

Brigade Combat Team unattended ground sensor

The budget request included \$29.7 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for Brigade Combat Team unattended ground sensors (BCT-UGS). The committee notes that after 6 years of development and an investment of approximately \$130.0 million the BCT-UGS system has failed in user tests to demonstrate required technical performance, is unreliable, and has not proven its tactical effectiveness or utility. Specifically, the UGS system demonstrated poor communications connectivity, inadequate transmission ranges, poor image quality, and frequent system failures.

The committee also notes that the Army will conduct a System Breakout/Contracting Review in December 2010 to address whether the BCT-UGS full-rate production will be multi-sourced through an open competition to qualified technologies and vendors. The Army reports that non-BCT-UGS systems already procured and deployed do not meet all the Capability Production Document's requirements or are not compliant with the Army's communications network. However, the committee is aware that the program of record BCT-UGS system does not meet all the requirements either. The committee is concerned that the Army is missing an opportunity to test alternatives and introduce competition into its UGS program by failing to take advantage of multiple technologies from multiple vendors that may have developed or are capable of developing and producing unattended sensors. Accordingly, the committee directs that the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology conduct tests of currently available alternative UGS capabilities with particular emphasis on technical maturity, interoperability, operational effectiveness, reliability, and affordability.

Given the technical challenges confronting the Army's BCT-UGS system, procurement is premature. The committee recommends a decrease of \$29.7 million in OPA for BCT-UGS.

Forward Entry Devices

The budget request included \$6.9 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data System Forward Entry Devices (FED). The FED is a pocket-sized, handheld computer used by artillery forward observers to communicate target data to artillery fire direction centers for precision target engagement. The committee recommends an increase of \$16.2 million in OPA to procure 408 additional FED devices. This is a Chief of Staff, Army unfunded priority.

Line of Communication Bridge

The budget request included \$53.7 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for tactical bridges. The Army has three levels of bridging: Assault, Tactical, and Line-of-Communication (LOCB). The LOCB provides a sustained capability for heavy traffic over a long period of time. Funds provided would accelerate procurement of the LOCB to meet an operational needs statement to support forces in Afghanistan. The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million in OPA for LOCB. This is a Chief of Staff, Army unfunded priority.

Fido explosives detection system

The budget request included \$226.0 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for ground standoff mine detection systems, but provided no funds for the Fido explosives detection system. The Fido explosives detector is deployed and in use by units in Iraq to counter improvised explosive devices and land mines. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.0 million in OPA for the Fido explosive detection system.

The committee further directs that, not later than August 1, 2010, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, shall provide to the congressional defense committees a report on the Army's requirement, development, procurement, and fielding of Fido systems. The report should include the quantities currently in the Army inventory and deployed to theater and in use, and quantities of Fido systems requested in pending operational needs statements, if any, and how the Army plans to satisfy those requests.

Ground soldier system

The budget request includes \$110.5 million in Other Procurement, Army for the Ground Soldier System (GSS). The GSS is a dismounted small unit leaders' command and control system that increases tactical awareness, communication, navigation, safety, and unit effectiveness. The committee supports the Army's efforts to enhance the operational capabilities of its platoons, squads, and other small units for an increasingly complex and lethal operating environment. However, the committee notes that the Army's acquisition plan for GSS has high schedule risk and will procure over 4,500 systems ahead of the results of a 2010 limited user test and a Milestone C decision scheduled for early 2011. The Committee also notes that only 198 of over 4,500 GSS sets will actually deliver in fiscal year 2011. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$28.8 million in OPA for GSS.

Operator driving simulator

The budget request included \$297.2 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for non-system training devices, but included no funds for operator driving simulators. Additional driving simulators would allow deploying soldiers to maximize their training time while providing a realistic experience without risk to personnel or equipment. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in OPA for operator driving simulators.

Immersive group simulation virtual training system

The budget request included \$297.2 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for non-system training devices, but provided no funding for the Immersive Group Simulation Virtual Training System (IGS-VTS). The IGS-VTS is a fully immersive, interactive virtual reality platform that supports soldier vehicle training. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in OPA for the IGS-VTS.

Combat skills marksmanship trainer

The budget request included \$297.2 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for non-system training devices. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in OPA for additional combat skills marksmanship trainer systems.

Mine resistant ambush protected vehicle virtual trainers

The budget request included \$297.2 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for non-system training devices, but provided no funding for the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicle Virtual Trainer (MRAP-VVT). The MRAP-VVT is a fully interactive virtual reality platform that supports soldier vehicle training. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in OPA for the MRAP-VVT.

Combined arms collective training facility

The budget request included \$23.3 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) non-system training devices for combined arms collective training facilities. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.2 million in OPA to accelerate the installation of combined arms collective training facilities.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

The budget request includes \$215.9 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (JIEDDF) staff and infrastructure line of operation. The committee recommends full funding for Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO), but recommends transferring all of JIEDDF funds from title I to the same budget activities in title XV, which fund the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) of the Department.

The committee believes JIEDDO—despite the Department’s decision to institutionalize it—should be in the OCO portion of the budget request as it was established in response to threats confronted by U.S. forces in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Navy

F-18 multiyear procurement savings

The budget request included \$1,083.9 million to purchase 12 EA-18G and \$1,787.2 million to purchase 22 F/A-18E/F aircraft. Since the Navy had not completed negotiations for proposed multiyear procurement contract for these F-18 air-

craft, the Navy based the budget estimates on executing a series on annual procurements.

The committee understands that a multiyear contract for F-18s will result in \$130.5 million savings in fiscal year 2011 compared to the budget request, consisting of \$45.9 million savings for EA-18G and \$84.6 million for F/A-18E/F.

The committee has included a provision elsewhere in this Act that would enable the Navy to sign the multiyear contract, and, therefore, recommends a reduction of \$130.5 million to the budget request.

F/A-18E/F

The budget request included \$1,787.2 million to purchase 22 F/A-18E/F aircraft. This is four more than were approved in the fiscal year 2010 budget. This is also an increase of 5 aircraft from the fiscal year plan for 17 aircraft included in the last future-years defense program (FYDP) by President Bush.

The committee has expressed concern that the Navy is facing a sizeable gap in aircraft inventory as older F/A-18A-D Hornets retire before the aircraft carrier variant (F-35C) of the Joint Strike Fighter is available. The committee raised this issue in the committee reports accompanying: (1) S. 1547 (S. Rept. 110-77) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008; (2) S. 3001 (S. Rept. 110-335) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009; and (3) S. 1390 (S. Rept. 111-35) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010.

Two years ago, the committee received testimony from the Navy about a projected shortfall in Navy tactical aviation. The Navy indicated that, under assumptions current at that time, it would experience a shortfall of 69 tactical aircraft in the year 2017, a number that swells to 125 when requirements of the United States Marine Corps are included.

Last year, the Chief of Naval Operations said that the projected gap may be as high as 250 aircraft total for the Department of the Navy.

This year, the Navy says that through various “management techniques,” the maximum shortfall is now projected to be around 150 aircraft, or 3-4 carriers’ worth of airplanes.

This change is not based on a change in overall requirements. The committee is disappointed that, despite promises that the Department of Defense intends to review the whole issue of tactical aircraft force structure in the pending Quadrennial Defense Review, no decision on force structure came from that effort. The committee had hoped that the Department’s tactical aviation procurement strategies would have been informed by the Quadrennial Defense Review.

The committee is still seeking details behind the changed assumptions that lead to the new estimates. At first impression, some of these appear to be legitimate actions that the Navy should take. For example, changing the fielding plan for the Marine Corps F-35B to replace older F/A-18 aircraft, rather than first replacing AV-8B aircraft that still have service life remaining, seems to be reasonable. Other changed assumptions do not appear to be so legitimate. For example, a portion of the shortfall reduction comes

from reducing land-based Marine Corps F/A-18 squadron sizes from 12 to 10 aircraft. The committee has seen no analysis that would indicate that the effect of taking such action has been assessed in terms of war fighting capability. In fact, it represents the sort of action to modify requirements arbitrarily that the committee feared would be taken in the face of the impending shortage.

The change does not derive from implementing a service life extension program (SLEP) for older F/A-18s. The Navy says that any decision on undertaking a SLEP to solve some portion of that shortfall will not be made until the time the President submits the budget request for fiscal year 2012.

The committee understands that a SLEP to extend the life of select legacy F/A-18s from 8,600 to 10,000 flight hours is currently estimated to cost on average \$26.0 million per plane. In light of such costs, and in anticipation of the Navy's negotiating a multiyear procurement contract that could result in substantial savings over current procurement costs, the committee expects the Navy to present a thorough business case analysis with the fiscal year 2012 budget of the appropriate mix of alternatives for addressing the potential shortfall of aircraft, including both SLEP and new procurement.

The committee is encouraged by the increase in F/A-18E/F procurement in the fiscal year budget, both compared to fiscal year 2010 and compared to the plan for fiscal year 2011 in the last Bush FYDP. The committee understands that this increase was part of the Department's effort to address the shortfall and buy enough aircraft in the FYDP to make a multiyear procurement achieve the substantial savings that would make such a commitment attractive. On April 30, 2010, the Secretary of the Navy informed the Navy was still working through the details of negotiating with the contractor team on a multiyear contract that would take advantage of the authority provided by section 128 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84).

The committee applauds the Navy's efforts to reduce the shortfall, but believes that more action now is necessary. The committee is concerned that delays in the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program could exacerbate the problem beyond what it appears to be now. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$325.0 million to buy six additional F/A-18E/F aircraft in fiscal year 2011.

MH-60R/S mission avionics

The budget request included \$232.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for advance procurement for the MH-60R (\$162.0 million) and the MH-60S (\$70.1 million). Within that total, the request included \$36.0 million (\$32.3 million for MH-60R and \$3.7 million MH-60S) for economic order quantity (EOQ) funding associated with a potential multiyear procurement contract for MH-60R/S mission avionics that the Navy had hoped to award in fiscal year 2011.

In the committee's view, the Department should provide the certifications required under section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, in the same year as it seeks authorization for EOQ funding.

The committee understands, however, that due to an internal oversight within the Navy, the Navy was not able to obtain the cer-

tifications from the Secretary of Defense required under section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, and therefore will not be able to award any contract in 2011 for EOQ funding associated with a potential multiyear procurement request.

The committee understands that the Navy believes that it can preserve savings from a potential multiyear procurement contract by applying the 2011 EOQ funds instead to regular advance procurement activities in 2011.

Therefore, the committee recommends shifting all funds requested for EOQ to regular advance procurement activities.

AN/AAR-47 missile warning system computer processor upgrade

The budget request included \$21.9 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for common electronic counter measures, but included no funds for the AN/AAR-47 missile warning system. The AN/AAR-47 warns of approaching missiles by detecting radiation associated with rocket motors and automatically initiates flare ejection. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in APN for AN/AAR-47 missile warning system computer processor upgrade.

Readiness support for Navy unfunded aviation spares and repair parts maintenance priorities

The budget request included \$18.5 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) of which \$1.2 billion was for aircraft spares and repair parts, which is also one of only three unfunded requirements submitted by the Chief of Naval Operations. The Vice Chief of Naval Operations testified before the committee that this unfunded requirement is executable, and would directly support and restore Naval readiness.

The committee notes that the same unfunded priorities for ship and aircraft depot maintenance were identified in fiscal year 2010 but were not fully supported by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. As a result a 1-year backlog of deferred aircraft depot maintenance was not executed. The committee is concerned that failure to address this backlog and failure to support this unfunded request for active and reserve aircraft spares and repair parts in fiscal year 2011 for active and reserve units will continue to jeopardize and erode aircraft materiel readiness, further reduce the service life of the fleet, increase long-term sustainment costs, and further increase strategic risk for the Nation.

Additionally, the Vice Chief of Naval Operations testified before the committee that failure to support unfunded aircraft depot maintenance requirements could result in reducing flying hours and deferred training exercises which are vital to naval readiness and our responsibility to maintain a trained and equipped force. Exacerbating the issue, increased operational tempo in the United States Central Command area of operations has already resulted in added materiel strain on the fleet. The committee notes that as demand for aircraft use and flying hours increased, the demand and requirement for additional spares and repair parts increased

40 percent in fiscal year 2011 largely due to V-22, EA-18G, F/A-18E/F, and E-2C/D operational tempo increases.

The committee continues to urge the Secretary of the Navy and Chief of Naval Operations to fully restore aircraft spares and repair parts requirements in the fiscal year 2012 base budget request.

The committee recommends an increase of \$423.0 million in APN for aircraft depot maintenance spares to support 3,700 individual fleet aircraft.

Weapons industrial facilities

The budget request included \$3.3 million for various activities at government-owned, contractor-operated weapons industrial facilities. The committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 million to accelerate the facilities restoration program at the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory.

Gun mount mods

The budget request included \$44.0 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy (WPN), for various types of gun weapon system and sub-system modifications and upgrade requirements, including \$35.4 million for various modifications for the Mk 38 Mod 2 Minor Caliber Gun System, but included no funding improving the depot support capability for the Mk 38 Mod 2 system nor for the Mk 110 Gun System.

The committee believes that the Navy needs to move more expeditiously to establish and expand the level of depot support for these weapons systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$11.0 million in WPN for improving depot support capability for gun weapons systems, including \$6.0 million for the Mk 110 system and \$5.0 million for the Mk 38 Mod 2 system.

Virginia-class tube test equipment

The budget request included \$132.0 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for Virginia-class submarine support equipment, but no funding to procure tube test equipment for the class.

In order to maintain the readiness of submarine weapon systems, the Navy maintains a number of land-based test platforms at the Naval Undersea Warfare Center (NUWC). The Navy has installed test platforms at NUWC for all active classes of submarines, except for the Virginia-class submarines. The committee believes that funds should be used to provide NUWC with capability to support the Virginia-class by providing actual shipboard equipment that would allow NUWC to replicate ship conditions as closely as possible in executing its fleet support missions.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.8 million for the procurement of tube test equipment for the Virginia-class.

Remote monitoring and troubleshooting project

The budget request included \$126.8 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for ship support equipment items costing less than \$5.0 million, but included no funding for developing and implementing a remote monitoring and troubleshooting capability that would allow Navy engineers to provide global remote

sustainment support to the fleet by remotely reading on-board sensors, monitoring shipboard system status, and providing expert advice to sailors as they maintain and repair ship systems.

The committee believes that such a capability would yield savings, but, perhaps more importantly, lead to better readiness levels. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.9 million in OPN for completing a system design update, developing deployment plans, and certifications and deploying the initial system.

Helicopter hangar door upgrades

The budget request included \$126.8 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for ship support equipment items costing less than \$5.0 million, but included no funding for buying upgrade kits for DDG-51 helicopter hangar doors.

The helicopter hangar doors on DDG-51 destroyers have been experiencing a significant number of failures. When the doors are inoperable, the ship is prevented from being able to launch and recover its embarked helicopter. The Navy has been investigating a helicopter hangar door upgrade program which would be a comprehensive solution to the readiness issue facing the largest ship class in the U.S. Navy.

The committee believes that fielding an upgrade helicopter hangar door would lead to better readiness levels. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.6 million in OPN for buying DDG-51 hangar door upgrade kits.

Range support vehicle

The budget request included \$27.7 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for standard boats, but included no funding for buying any range support vessels that include capability to recover torpedoes and other Navy unmanned systems.

Most Navy installations that have a torpedo recovery mission have antiquated torpedo recovery boat fleets. The committee understands that most of these boats are approximately 40 years old and are at the end of their useful service life. These vessels are expensive to maintain, and have recovery systems that risk damaging new unmanned surface and undersea vehicles.

A new range support vehicle, with a new advanced multi-mission launch and recovery system, would be capable of executing all mission requirements, including lost weapon search, instrument deployment, equipment and personnel transfer, weapon trans-shipment, open ocean retrieval, Coast Guard search and rescue, and support for special vehicles and classified programs associated with anti-submarine warfare.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.4 million in OPN for buying a new range support vessel.

Man overboard indicators

The budget request included \$47.3 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for command support equipment, but no funding to procure man overboard indicators (MOBI).

The Navy has tested a one-per-person MOBI transmitter. Additionally, at least two expeditionary strike groups recommended the Navy procure MOBI transmitters for each embarked sailor, marine,

and airman. The committee understands that a large majority of ship commanding officers having MOBI systems installed have requested additional MOBI transmitters in order to protect all embarked personnel. In addition, the U.S. Navy Safety Center has recommended that each embarked sailor and marine be afforded MOBI protection.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.9 million for the procurement of additional MOBI systems.

Air Force

C-17

The budget request included \$14.3 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for C-17 aircraft procurement in the full funding line to purchase various support equipment items, and \$153.3 million for C-17 post production support activities. The Air Force made this request in error, as they should have requested \$114.4 million of the post production support funds in the full funding line, instead of the post production support line.

The Air Force asked that the committee make a zero sum transfer of this amount to the proper funding line. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$114.4 million in the C-17 full funding line and a reduction to the C-17 post production support line of the same amount.

Airborne signals intelligence payload

The budget request included \$863.6 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for the MQ-9 Reaper unmanned aerial vehicle. Of that amount, \$18.3 million is requested to begin production of the Airborne Signals Intelligence Payload 2C (ASIP 2C).

The Government Accountability Office notes that the Milestone B decision for this project will be made in November 2011, which means that the sensor will not be ready for production in fiscal year 2011. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of \$18.3 million.

C-135 modifications

The budget request included \$44.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for the C-135 Modifications Program, including \$8.4 million to begin procurement of the Block 45 upgrade program, and no funding for fielding any infrared countermeasures systems on the KC-135R tanker fleet. The Block 45 upgrade program for the KC-135 will address reliability, maintainability, and obsolescence issues currently experienced in the tanker fleet by replacing current cockpit equipment with the following new systems: (1) digital flight director; (2) digital radar altimeter; (3) digital autopilot; and (4) electronic engine instrument displays.

The committee believes that the Air Force should take greater steps to keep the KC-135 tanker fleet viable for meeting combatant commander requirements. The Air Force plan now appears to be to wait for fielding infrared countermeasures on tankers with the fielding of KC-X to provide a capability to operate in increased threat areas. The committee believes that the KC-X program should have that capability, but does not agree that the Air Force

should wait on KC-X. Even under the most optimistic KC-X acquisition plans, the KC-135R fleet will be operating for many years to come.

Therefore, the committee believes that the Air Force should begin to outfit high priority aircraft in the KC-135R fleet with pod-based large aircraft infrared countermeasures (LAIRCM) systems to make them better able to support war fighting requirements and recommends an increase in fiscal year 2011 for that purpose.

The committee supports the Block 45 upgrade program, but understands that the Air Force has decided to defer \$5.0 million of the fiscal year 2011 Block 45 procurement request until fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommends an increase of \$11.0 million for LAIRCM installations on 10 KC-135 aircraft and a reduction of \$5.0 million to reflect delays in the Block 45 program.

E-8 modifications

The budget request included \$188.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for the E-8 Modifications Program, including \$120.4 million to procure two re-engining kits for the Joint Surveillance/Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) aircraft.

The JSTARS system has been providing indispensable intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support to those serving in combat operations. In Afghanistan, the JSTARS wide-area ground surveillance radar plays a critical role in the military's ability to track and engage Taliban insurgents and find improvised explosive devices. The demands placed upon the JSTARS fleet underscores growing operational, sustainment, and safety issues with the existing engines.

Because engine problems currently jeopardize both the current operations and long-term viability of the JSTARS fleet, the Air Force commenced a JSTARS re-engining program in May 2008. Last year, the Air Force sought to interrupt the re-engining program when: (1) program officials saw cost increases in the program; (2) an Air Force Fleet Viability Board (FVB) report raised questions about the long-term prospects for retaining the JSTARS fleet; and (3) questions arose about the best way to meet ground moving target indicator (GMTI) capability in the future.

The committee recognizes that a significant portion of the cost increases that arose were the result of having to restructure the acquisition program from a commercial-type acquisition contract to one that follows normal Defense acquisition rules. Buying re-engining kits at low rates will not do anything to help keep costs under control. The lost economies of scale from only procuring two ship sets instead of four in fiscal year 2011 will raise the cost of the program.

The committee closely studied the FVB report. The major concern in the report revolved around concerns that the original aircraft conversion process had resulted in aircraft with uncertain structural and engineering pedigrees. The committee understands that the Air Force and the contractor team are working through the data in a manner that will resolve uncertainties. The committee had raised such concerns about remaining airframe life during the execution of the original JSTARS program. The committee

was assured by Air Force officials and the contractor team at the time that rigorous oversight and controls on the program were going to ensure that the aircraft delivered from the conversion program would have a full measure of service life remaining after conversion.

The committee believes that the Air Force is wise to consider long-term requirements for meeting GMTI requirements, since new requirements for dismounted GMTI have come from the combatant commanders. The JSTARS system may not be the optimal system for certain niche requirements, but field testing of JSTARS has shown promise for achieving dismounted GMTI capability with the aircraft. Unless the Defense Department were to decide that it can afford to divest itself of broad area GMTI capability, the committee believes that the JSTARS system will have an important place in the future force structure. While the Defense Department studies this mission area, the committee believes it is prudent and involves little risk in continuing the re-engining program to address near-term operating issues, and to address long-term sustainability concerns identified by the FVB report.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$102.5 million for two additional ship sets to retain economies of scale in this effort and put the Air Force on a track to execute the entire program over the future-years defense program to mitigate the negative operational, sustainment, and safety effects of operating with the current engines.

Milsatcom terminals

The budget request included \$140.5 million for milsatcom terminals for the family of beyond line of site terminals (FAB-T) in Air Craft Procurement, Air Force, line 75. The FAB-T program has been delayed and procurement funds are now needed to continue FAB-T research. The committee recommends that \$116.4 million be transferred to Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, PE 33601F line 180.

Evolved expendable launch vehicle

The budget request included \$1.2 billion for the evolved expendable launch vehicle (EELV) in Missile Procurement, Air Force, line 24. The committee recommends an additional \$24.0 million for the EELV, including \$10.0 million to continue the process of EELV modernization to ensure that the EELV is able to be tracked using global positioning system tracking capability, and \$14.0 million for crew augmentation. The additional \$14.0 million is recommended to support additional launch crews to accommodate the increase in the launch rate in 2011.

National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System

The budget request included \$26.3 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, line 28 for the Air Force portion of the acquisition of the sensors and the third National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS) satellite vehicle. The committee recommends a reduction of \$16.3 million.

The NPOESS was a joint Department of Commerce/National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) program that was restructured after the budget was submitted. With the restructuring, the Department of Defense (DOD) will be responsible for the early morning orbit and NOAA will be responsible for the afternoon orbit. Although DOD has indicated its intention to develop a successor program for the morning orbit there is no program plan at the moment. In addition, fiscal year 2010 funds are available to support any NPOESS follow-on decisions.

Joint threat emitter

The budget request included \$29.6 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF), for making improvements at combat training ranges, including \$11.8 million for the joint threat emitter (JTE) program. These improvements are aimed at increasing the capability to support realistic air-to-air, air-to-ground, ground-to-air, and electronic warfare training, along with the ability to record and play-back events for aircrew debriefing and analysis.

The committee believes that the Air Force should accelerate its range modernization efforts to replace existing systems with JTE and upgrade existing JTE systems.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of 7.5 million in OPAF for the JTE modernization program.

Eastern processing facility

The budget request included \$91.0 million for the Spacelift Range System in Other Procurement, Air Force, line 43 but no funds for the Eastern processing facility. The committee recommends an increase of \$14.0 million to complete the Eastern processing facility.

Kodiak Launch Complex

The budget request included \$91.0 for the Spacelift Range System (SLRS) in Other Procurement, Air Force, line 43 but no funds for the Kodiak Launch Complex (KLC). The committee recommends an increase of \$9.5 million to sustain the KLC to support Air Force and other U.S. government launches.

Defense-wide

Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system

The budget request included \$858.9 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, for procurement of Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) interceptors. The committee notes that there is currently a production and delivery delay of more than 3 months for THAAD interceptors because of a pending failure review board investigation of a failed safety component, the Laser-Initiated Ordnance System optical block. The committee commends MDA for conducting a thorough failure investigation and resolving the problem before resuming production and delivery of interceptors. Given this production delay, the committee recommends a reduction of \$25.0 million in Procurement, Defense-Wide, for THAAD production. This recommendation is made without prejudice to the THAAD system, and reflects the fact-of-life delay in production and

delivery, and the consequent inability of the program to execute the full level of requested funds within fiscal year 2011.

Special Operations Force Deployable Nodes

The budget request included \$58.4 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for special operations force (SOF) communications equipment and electronics, including SOF Deployable Nodes (SDN). SDN are a family of secure satellite communications devices that provide special operations personnel with deployable video, voice, and data transmission capabilities. The SDN family of devices come in light, medium, and heavy variants to meet the mission-tailored requirements of special operations units. The Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command has identified a \$28.0 million shortfall in funding for SDN-Light and SDN-Medium devices.

The committee recommends an increase of \$28.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for SDN-Light and SDN-Medium devices for U.S. Special Operations Command.

Enhanced Combat Optical Sight

The budget request included \$30.1 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for Small Arms and Weapons. However, it included no funding for Enhanced Combat Optical Sights (ECOS) for grenade launchers used by special operations forces. U.S. Special Operations Command has a validated requirement for 5,386 ECOS, but has not procured any to date.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, Small Arms and Weapons, for the procurement of ECOS by U.S. Special Operations Command.

Special Operations Forces Combat Assault Rifle

The budget request included \$30.1 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for Small Arms and Weapons, including \$2.7 million for Special Operations Forces Combat Assault Rifles (SCAR). The SCAR family of rifles includes 5.56 and 7.62 mm variants, each with replacement barrels of different lengths to ensure modularity to meet mission requirements. The SCAR provides special operations personnel with improved reliability, lethality, and versatility over legacy rifles. The Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command has identified a \$1.6 million shortfall in funding for these rifles.

The committee recommends an increase of \$1.6 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for the SCAR family of rifles for U.S. Special Operations Command.

Ground Mobility Vehicle modification kits

The budget request included \$30.9 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for Tactical Vehicles, but did not include any funding for Ground Mobility Vehicle (GMV) modification kits. The GMV is a Service-provided High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle modified to meet special operations mission requirements. Special operations-peculiar modifications provide enhanced survivability, mobility, payload, and communications capabilities. The Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command has identified a \$55.0 million shortfall in funding for GMV modification kits.

The committee recommends an increase of \$55.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, Tactical Vehicles, for GMV modification kits for U.S. Special Operations Command.

Special operations binocular/monocular visual augmentation devices

The budget request included \$8.3 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for binocular/monocular vision augmentation devices. These devices allow special operations personnel to detect, recognize, and identify targets under varying light conditions or at ranges at which the operator would not normally be able to see. The Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command has identified a \$20.9 million shortfall in funding for these visual augmentation devices. Currently, special operations personnel are forced to share visual augmentation devices to accomplish missions.

The committee recommends an increase of \$20.9 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for binocular/monocular visual augmentation devices for U.S. Special Operations Command.

Clip On Thermal Imager

The budget request included \$18.6 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for the special operations forces (SOF) visual augmentation, lasers, and sensor systems. However, no funding was included for Clip On Thermal Imagers (COTI). These imagers attach to night vision goggles to significantly increase their performance in extreme low light or foliated conditions and provide the user with much greater situational awareness on the battlefield. The Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command has identified a \$4.9 million shortfall in funding for these imagers.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.9 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, SOF Visual Augmentation, Lasers and Sensor Systems, for COTIs for U.S. Special Operations Command.

Items of Special Interest

Assessment of helicopter support

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide, not later than January 15, 2011, the congressional defense committees his assessment of the helicopter requirements for civil support missions in Alaska. The Secretary's assessment should be based upon, and update if necessary, the determination of Department of Defense civil support requirements pursuant to section 1815 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181). The Secretary shall report his findings and the actions he proposes to take, if any, with respect to any capability gaps identified by his assessment.

Combat search and rescue helicopter fleet

The committee is concerned that the missions of the fleet of the Air Force combat search and rescue HH-60 helicopters, which has been expanded to include medical evacuation in Afghanistan, is dramatically increasing the routine "wear and tear" on these aging aircraft.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Commander, U.S. Air Force Special Operations Command, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days of enactment of this Act to address aircraft maintenance, upgrade, and replacement efforts currently underway to ensure that this mission can continue to be effectively executed.

Development and fielding of Paladin Integrated Management program

The M109A6 Paladin is the 6th version of the M109 self-propelled howitzer, originally designed in the 1950s and produced in the 1960s. According to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, the Paladin will begin to reach obsolescence by 2012 with the engine becoming unsupported and increased track, suspension, and generator failures.

Last year, in the Senate report accompanying S. 1390 (S. Rept. 111–35) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the committee directed the Army to prioritize the development and fielding of the Paladin Integrated Management (PIM) program due to the cancellation of the Non-Line of Sight Cannon program. The Army responded by making PIM a top priority and planned for full rate production beginning in 2012. The committee is aware that due to program mismanagement, the full rate production will not begin until 2017 based on the Army's current timeline. The committee is concerned by the Army's apparent inability to develop and execute a Paladin modernization program in less than 7 years. Delay in the PIM program will negatively impact the operational effectiveness and reliability of the Army's only self-propelled howitzer, as well as its broader indirect fire systems development program.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to reassess the PIM development and production schedules and report to the congressional defense committees, not later than November 1, 2010, its plans to compress the overall timeline. The report shall include cost, schedule, and performance alternatives that provide high, medium, and low risk options to developing, producing, and fielding PIM on a compressed schedule.

F-16 upgrades

The committee has received and reviewed the Air Force's report on procurement of so-called "4.5 generation" fighter aircraft required by section 121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). From this document, it is clear that the Air Force would prefer to ensure its F-16 fleet will remain capable through the end of its projected service life in 2025 by making appropriate upgrades to the fleet, rather than purchasing new F-16s. The committee notes that while mid-life extension programs and other upgrades have extended the capability of the existing F-16 fleet, there are still gaps in fourth generation capabilities that will need to be addressed. In addition, there are some investments in capability improvements that would have a potentially very positive effect on operating and support costs for the remainder of the life of the F-16 fleet. One such effort would

be upgrading the current F-16 radar with an active electronically scanned radar (AESA) that has been developed and flight tested on the F-16. The committee understands that the Air Force estimates that this AESA radar offers an 8 to 10 fold reduction in operations and sustainment cost, and a 5 to 10 fold increase in reliability over the mechanically scanned AN/APG-68 radar.

The committee strongly supports Air Force efforts to maintain and modernize the F-16 to avoid potential shortfalls in numbers or capabilities of these aircraft. As a part of that plan, the committee directs the Air Force to consider including AESA retrofit funding for engineering and manufacturing development and low-rate initial procurement in the budget request for fiscal year 2012, and recommends that any such retrofit program be executed expeditiously in order to minimize any potential shortfalls in force structure or capability.

40mm target practice rounds

The committee is aware that the MK281 target practice round is non-dud producing and an environmentally safe training cartridge for the M203 grenade launcher and MK19 grenade machine gun weapon systems. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than November 30, 2010, that details the Army's 40mm training cartridge requirements, acquisition history and strategy, including past and projected reprogramming actions, an assessment of the 40mm training cartridge industrial base, and a description of the annual consumption of 40mm target practice cartridges for the last 5 years.

High Mobility Multi-Purpose Wheeled Vehicle

The Committee is aware that vulnerabilities to improvised explosive devices in the current fleet of utility (thin-skinned) and armored High Mobility Multi-Purpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWV) has reduced the operational usefulness of these vehicles in support of overseas contingency operations, particularly, in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Committee also notes that this limited use of HMMWVs in theater has resulted in far fewer than expected combat losses and significantly lower maintenance demands and costs. Despite the appropriately limited use of HMMWVs in Iraq and Afghanistan due to these force protection considerations, the HMMWV will remain the foundation of the Department's light tactical wheeled vehicle fleet for years to come. The Army alone will have over 152,000 HMMWVs in its inventory, of which 60,000 will be armored.

The Committee supports the Army's and Marine Corps' plans to initiate a selective HMMWV recapitalization program that prudently resets, rebuilds, and extends the life of the existing utility and armored vehicle fleets at their current capabilities. At the same time, the Army and Marine Corps will investigate new armor technologies that may increase the HMMWV's protective capabilities and that could be applied in an additional recapitalization program. The Committee understands that should new approaches to HMMWV armor prove technologically feasible and affordable, the Army intends that the recapitalization program to apply this capa-

bility would be based upon a full and open competition among public, private, or public-private partnership providers.

The Committee supports this approach as a means of getting the most value out of what will be a very large utility and armored HMMWV vehicle fleet for many years to come. This approach will also look seriously at technologies to increase the HMMWVs force protection and survivability and potentially increase their relevance and availability for deployed contingency operations. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Acquisition to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 31, 2011, a report from each, detailing the military department's acquisition strategy for HMMWV recapitalization. The required reports shall include:

- (1) the requirements and analysis of alternatives regarding recapitalization of the existing HMMWV fleet, for active and reserve components, at the current levels of capability of utility and armored variants;

- (2) the strategy and plans for research, development, testing, competition, and procurement, including schedules and funding profiles, associated with a new program to recapitalize HMMWVs with increased survivability, mobility, or operational capability; and

- (3) the relationship of the military department's HMMWV recapitalization programs, for both current and potential future capabilities, with plans for the development and procurement of the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle.

Finally, the Committee directs the Assistant Secretaries of the Army and Navy named above to submit a report each describing their analysis and acquisition decisions at the conclusion of live fire testing of new armor alternatives, their business case analysis leading to a decision to compete a recapitalization program, and their decision to award a contract or contracts at the conclusion of a competition, if held.

Rapid equipping soldier support equipment

The committee notes with concern that the Army has been slow to obligate and expend funds provided by Congress for its rapid equipping soldier support equipment program. As of March this year, the Army had failed to obligate \$320.0 million provided in fiscal years 2008 and 2009 appropriations. The committee supports making funds available to the Army to meet the emergent requirements of deployed forces and take advantage of new technologies that have high military value and are immediately available for use. In this regard the committee has been willing to accept the uncertainty associated with providing the Department obligating authority without knowing specifically if or for what the funds will be used. The Department has the responsibility to prudently judge whether or not, as well as when and for what, to use these funds. However the committee expects the Army to aggressively manage this program to ensure that funds are obligated and expended within a reasonable time for the purposes intended. Accordingly, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology to provide a monthly report to

the congressional defense committees detailing the obligation and expenditure of funds in the rapid equipping soldier support equipment program until funds made available in fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010 are obligated. The Assistant Secretary should include in his initial report a description of how the funds are managed and what official is responsible for directing their use to ensure timely financial execution. Each subsequent report should include a justification for delays in obligation of such funds, if beyond the fiscal year for which they were made available.

Report on expeditionary amphibious warfare ship force structure

The Marine Corps provides a combined-arms, expeditionary force in readiness able to deploy rapidly by sea or air. Marine air-ground task forces are in high demand for missions such as sustained combat operations; irregular warfare; forward presence; maritime security; humanitarian assistance; disaster relief; and security cooperation.

The committee has heard testimony that the joint requirement for amphibious forcible entry is having a simultaneously employable two Marine Expeditionary Brigade (MEB) assault capability, reinforced and supported by a Maritime Prepositioning Force (MPF) squadron. Carrying one MEB assault echelon requires approximately 17 operationally available amphibious warfare ships, resulting in a combined total requirement of 34 operationally available ships. These 34 ships would carry a force of approximately 15,000 to 18,000 Marines and their equipment, vehicles, aircraft, and logistics support. The Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have determined that the Navy needs to have a total inventory of 38 ships to achieve a 34-ship level that is operationally available throughout the year. This larger number of ships allows for ships that are unavailable due to extended maintenance availabilities.

The Navy's "Report to Congress on Annual Long-Range Plan for Construction of Naval Vessels for FY 2011" uses the 313-ship battle force inventory as its baseline. In light of current fiscal constraints, the report states an amphibious inventory of approximately 33 amphibious ships will be maintained for the Marine Corps' assault echelon. The senior leadership of the Department of the Navy, including the Commandant, has testified to the committee that a 33-ship force of amphibious vessels represents an acceptable level of risk.

The Navy's report also indicates that the amphibious assault ships USS *Nassau* (LHA-4) and USS *Peleliu* (LHA-5) will be decommissioned earlier than had been planned, resulting in a reduction in amphibious warfare force inventory levels to a level of 29 ships within the current future-years defense program. This reduction may create a higher level of strategic risk. It is not clear to the committee that either the Department of the Navy or the Department of Defense has yet assessed and incorporated these revised force levels into updated planning to determine if this smaller force can meet combatant commander requirements.

The committee notes the Navy's ability to reestablish a 33-ship force may be adversely affected by a constrained shipbuilding budg-

et, among other factors. The new *San Antonio*-class of amphibious transport dock ships and LHA-6 class amphibious assault ships continue to experience construction delays and late deliveries. Moreover, in-service *San Antonio*-class ships are now experiencing structural and material deficiencies that oblige the Navy to remove them from service at least temporarily to conduct unscheduled maintenance and repair availabilities.

The Navy also has revised its long-range shipbuilding plans in ways that will reduce the capability of its amphibious force structure. The Mobile Landing Platform (MLP) was originally planned to be a part of the larger Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future) (MPF (F)). The MPF (F) set of capabilities were being developed under a sea-basing concept that would have provided a means to conduct combat operations and other missions in areas of the world where access to port facilities was not available.

The Navy has now restructured the previous MPF (F) concept in favor of enhancing existing afloat prepositioning capabilities for use in low-threat environments. As a result of this change, the Navy may delay acquisition of large, medium-speed roll-on/roll-off ships by more than a decade. Additionally, the MLP has been redesigned as a smaller, less capable ship than the ship for which Congress authorized and appropriated advance procurement funding in fiscal year 2010.

Therefore, the committee directs the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to conduct a capabilities-based study of the Navy's latest 30-year shipbuilding plan for amphibious warfare ship force structure. The study shall address each of the foregoing developments by assessing their effect on: (1) the Navy's ability to satisfy joint and combatant commander requirements for U.S. Marine Corps amphibious capabilities; (2) the Navy's ability to support U.S. Marine Corps force-in-readiness requirements, to include operational tempo and personnel tempo; and (3) training and readiness of the Marine Corps to execute its full set of expeditionary amphibious missions. The committee directs that the CBO provide this report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011.

The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to complete an operational capabilities-based assessment that reviews and reconciles amphibious requirements, ship retirement schedules, and the 30-year shipbuilding plan. The report will include: (1) combatant commanders' requirements for sufficient expeditionary amphibious capabilities; (2) Marine Corps' requirements for sufficient expeditionary amphibious capabilities to fully support combatant commanders' requirements; (3) effects of early decommissioning of amphibious ships prior to their replacement on Marine Corps training, capacity, force structure, and combat capability; (4) review of Marine Corps operations and contingency plans that require expeditionary amphibious capabilities; (5) review of how Marine Corps expeditionary capabilities and Navy expeditionary amphibious ships and capacity fit within the U.S. military's regional concept of operations and defense-planning scenarios; and (6) description of the cost savings associated with retiring amphibious ships on their current schedule and an explanation of how the Navy will invest such savings in other programs or to address other funding requirements. The committee directs that the Secretary of Defense

provide this report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2011.

Surface ship construction and industrial base issues

The committee recognizes that the Navy's most recent Long-Range Plan for the Construction of Naval Vessels continues the Navy's long stated goal of a minimum fleet of 313 battle force ships. The committee notes that this plan is based on a 2005 Force Structure Assessment and a new Force Structure Assessment is required to address expanded requirements identified in the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review for irregular warfare support, ballistic missile defense, intratheater lift, and humanitarian missions. The committee encourages the Navy to complete this review as expeditiously as possible so the results can be incorporated in the next Long-Range Plan.

The committee continues to have significant concerns regarding the implications of the plan for the non-nuclear surface ship industrial base. If the Navy and industry, working together, are unable to control requirement driven cost growth and deliver the ships in the plan for the projected costs, the inevitable reductions in quantity will likely impact the Navy's ability to reach the required fleet size and further jeopardize the industrial base. The committee notes that the current shipbuilding plan includes the cost of the SSBN (X) program and the committee encourages the Navy to closely scrutinize requirements for this program in order to minimize its impact on the recapitalization of the Navy's battle force.

Furthermore, the committee urges the Navy and the contractors to negotiate as expeditiously as possible fair and reasonable construction contracts for ships previously authorized in order to reduce uncertainty and maintain and foster affordability in the procurement of large surface combatants and other naval vessels.

In reviewing the Long-Range Plan for the Construction of Naval Vessels in conjunction with recent program performance highlights, the committee notes the following observations and expectations:

The stated requirement for amphibious ships is 38 vessels; however, the Long-Range Plan projects accepting moderate risk by having 33 ships by 2016, but then declining to 29 or 30 ships after 2034. Although there have been improvements in recently delivered ships, cost and quality issues have been all too common in the procurement of large and medium amphibious ships, making an already constrained shipbuilding budget more difficult to execute. A new dock landing ship class, LSD(X), is important to the recapitalization of the amphibious force. The requirements for this ship must be closely validated to ensure affordability. The committee notes the Navy's plan to have a gap year following the lead ship of the class and believes that this may help alleviate cost, schedule, and performance issues. Overall, the committee remains concerned with the Navy's management of the amphibious ship accounts and expects continued close scrutiny of these programs by Navy leadership.

In large surface combatants, the Navy's last official report stated that the industrial base can only be effectively sustained if naval ship yards were building the equivalent of three DDG-51 destroyers per year, with additional work assumed at one of the yards.

Even if the Navy fully executes both of the large surface combatant programs of record in the near-term, the President's fiscal year 2011 budget request and future-years defense program propose to buy an average of 1.5 large surface combatants per year. Even at projected procurement rates, the number of cruisers and destroyers falls below the required level of 88 ships in 2027 and remains below that level for the following 13 years. At its worst, the number of large surface combatants is 21 ships below the expected requirement in 2034.

The Navy has testified that continued demand for large surface combatants to meet forward presence and strike operations requirements coupled with emerging ballistic missile defense requirements drives the Navy to consider abandoning lesser priority missions for more recent, higher priority ones. In light of the current pressure on the large surface combatant force, the committee is concerned that the Navy's projected rate of production is insufficient, and anticipates that the Navy will closely assess future demand for large surface combatants, and operational and additional risk to the industrial base of maintaining relatively low rates of procurement for large surface combatants.

The committee remains concerned with the Navy's ability to execute what it believes is an overly optimistic procurement strategy for large surface combatants. The truncation of the DDG-1000, the restart of the DDG-51 class and the proposed Flight III variant of the DDG-51 inject a great deal of instability into the SCN accounts. The Navy's testimony before Congress has led this committee to identify six risk areas in the Navy's plan for DDG-51s: (1) the availability of the Air and Missile Defense Radar; (2) the extent and cost of modifications to the underlying ship's design package to support proposed changes to the ship; (3) increased limitation on service life margins of the early restart ships; (4) combat system software integration; (5) the overall complexity of various separate programs that need to converge for successful completion of the restart and Flight III programs; and (6) cost and schedule growth for the Aegis Combat System Modernization. The committee expects the Navy to keep it closely apprised of developments in these risk areas so that it can monitor appropriate risk mitigation efforts.

The Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program has made progress during the past year and the recent decision to move to a single design should improve affordability. The LCS fleet is expected to comprise 55 vessels of the Navy's 313-ship fleet force structure. Even modest cost growth in this large component of the fleet magnifies the problem of achieving that objective. The committee notes that the Navy's acquisition strategy for the LCS program introduces competition for this class of ships and is therefore cautiously optimistic that this program is making progress.

In summary, the committee considers the specialized shipbuilding industrial base for large surface combatants, amphibious ships, Navy auxiliary ships, and littoral vessels as a critical component of national security and expects the Department of Defense to appropriately sustain this industrial base. The committee expects the Department of the Navy to include these considerations as it

incorporates the updated force structure assessment in the upcoming Long-Range Plan for the Construction of Naval Vessels.

The committee understands that the Navy is conducting a comprehensive review of the shipbuilding industrial base and calls upon the Navy to update the committee on the scope and timeline for such a study. The committee understands the objective of the study is to identify the challenges facing the Navy and the associated shipbuilding industrial base and the strategies for mitigating the effects of those challenges. The committee expects that this study will inform its deliberations in connection with the fiscal year 2012 budget. As a general proposition, the committee expects that the Department of Defense will provide the Navy with the support it needs to focus on the matters referred to above.

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY							
AIRCRAFT							
FIXED WING							
1	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA)		0				0
2	C-12 CARGO AIRPLANE		0				0
3	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)		88,483				88,483
4	MQ-1 UAV	26	459,310			26	459,310
5	RQ-11 (RAVEN)	312	20,152			312	20,152
6	BCT UNMANNED AERIAL VEH (UAVS) INCR 1		44,206				44,206
ROTARY							
8	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	50	305,272			50	305,272
9	AH-64 APACHE BLOCK III	16	390,571		5,500	16	396,071
9	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-57,890				-57,890
	AH-64 fuselage manufacturing				[5,500]		
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		161,150				161,150
11	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	72	1,352,786			72	1,352,786
11	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-102,220				-102,220
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		100,532				100,532
13	CH-47 HELICOPTER	40	1,151,969			40	1,151,969

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
13	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-50,676				-50,676
14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		57,756				57,756
15	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING		9,383				9,383
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
16	C12 AIRCRAFT MODS		0				0
17	MQ-1 PAYLOAD—UAS		100,413				100,413
18	MQ-1 WEAPONIZATION—UAS		14,729				14,729
19	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)		29,899		-24,200		5,699
	Guardrail common sensor				[-24,200]		
20	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)		16,981				16,981
21	AH-64 MODS		393,769				393,769
21	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		0				0
22	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0
23	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)		66,207				66,207
23	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		0				0
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0
25	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		13,716				13,716
26	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS		814				814
27	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS		63,085				63,085
28	KIOWA WARRIOR		94,400				94,400
29	AIRBORNE AVIONICS		219,425				219,425
30	GATM ROLLUP		100,862				100,862
31	RQ-7 UAV MODS		505,015				505,015
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
34	SPARE PARTS (AIR)		7,328				7,328
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
35	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		24,478				24,478

•S 3454 PCS

656

36	ASE INFRARED CM		174,222		174,222
	OTHER SUPPORT				
37	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,885		4,885
38	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		76,129		76,129
39	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		52,423	3,000	55,423
	Air warrior survival vest ensemble reset program			[3,000]	
40	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		82,844		82,844
41	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,567		1,567
42	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		2,892		2,892
43	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS		0		0
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		5,976,867	-15,700	5,961,167
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY				
	OTHER MISSILES				
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM				
1	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	78	480,247		78 480,247
2	SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY:		116,732		116,732
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		0		0
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0		0
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM				
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	240	31,881		240 31,881
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS				
5	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	715	163,929		715 163,929
6	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY		30,326		30,326
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		0		0
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		48,355		48,355
8	BCT NON LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM—INCREME		350,574	-350,574	0
	Program termination			[-350,574]	
9	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	2,592	291,041		2,592 291,041
10	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	2,058	15,886		2,058 15,886
11	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMARS)	44	211,517		44 211,517
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES				
	MODIFICATIONS				

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
12	PATRIOT MODS		57,170		133,600		190,770
	Patriot upgrades				[133,600]		
13	ITAS/TOW MODS		13,281				13,281
14	MLRS MODS		8,217				8,217
15	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		39,371				39,371
16	HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS		10				10
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
17	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		19,569				19,569
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
18	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		3,613				3,613
19	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MISSILES)		1,208				1,208
20	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		4,510				4,510
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		1,887,437		-216,974		1,670,463
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1	BRADLEY PROGRAM		0				0
2	BRADLEY TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)		0				0
3	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES		0				0
4	STRYKER VEHICLE	83	299,545			83	299,545
5	FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS: (FCS)		0				0
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		0				0
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0
7	FCS SPIN OUTS		41,871				41,871
7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-41,871				-41,871
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						

658

9	STRYKER (MOD)		146,352			146,352
10	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		31,083			31,083
11	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)		215,133			215,133
12	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		105,277		-105,277	0
	Program delay				[-105,277]	
13	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	17	69,609		17	69,609
14	ARMORED BREACHER VEHICLE	17	77,930		17	77,930
15	M88 FOV MODS		9,157			9,157
16	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE	9	44,133		9	44,133
17	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		230,907			230,907
18	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	21	183,000		21	183,000
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES					
19	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		3,145			3,145
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES					
20	HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119	2	5,575		2	5,575
21	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM)	1,655	28,179		1,655	28,179
22	MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL	5,900	79,496		5,900	79,496
23	LIGHTWEIGHT .50 CALIBER MACHINE GUN	350	18,941		350	18,941
24	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN (5.56MM)		0			0
25	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM)	238	4,465		238	4,465
26	MORTAR SYSTEMS	138	17,082		138	17,082
27	M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE		235			235
28	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	3,869	16,282		3,869	16,282
29	M110 SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM (SASS)	155	5,159		155	5,159
30	M4 CARBINE	11,494	20,180		11,494	20,180
31	SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS)	3,659	7,153		3,659	7,153
32	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION (CRO)		0			0
33	HANDGUN	5,000	3,371		5,000	3,371
34	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)		0			0
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH					
35	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS		4,286			4,286
36	M4 CARBINE MODS		14,044			14,044
37	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS		0		6,000	6,000
	M2A1 quick change barrel kits				[6,000]	

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
38	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		5,922				5,922
39	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		15,852				15,852
40	M119 MODIFICATIONS		39,810				39,810
41	M16 RIFLE MODS		3,855				3,855
42	M14 7.62 RIFLE MODS		0				0
43	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		6,083				6,083
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
44	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		0				0
45	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		7,869				7,869
46	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		409				409
47	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		4,042				4,042
48	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		0				0
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		1,723,561		-99,277		1,624,284
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	AMMUNITION						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		195,406				195,406
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		79,622				79,622
3	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		5,377				5,377
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		160,712				160,712
5	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES		0				0
6	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		15,887				15,887
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		95,222				95,222
8	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		167,632				167,632
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
9	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		14,340				14,340

10	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	24,036		24,036
11	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	96,335	-28,600	67,735
	APMI unit cost savings		[-28,600]	
	TANK AMMUNITION			
12	CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES	7,794		7,794
13	CTG, TANK, 120MM, ALL TYPES	114,798		114,798
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION			
14	CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES	7,329		7,329
15	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES	76,658		76,658
16	CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES	45,752		45,752
17	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982	62,114		62,114
18	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T	29,309		29,309
	ARTILLERY FUZES			
19	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES	25,047		25,047
	MINES			
20	MINES, ALL TYPES	817		817
21	MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES	8,000		8,000
	NETWORKED MUNITIONS			
22	SPIDER NETWORK MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	53,005		53,005
23	SCORPION, INTELLIGENT MUNITIONS SYSTEM , ALL	10,246		10,246
	ROCKETS			
24	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	43,873		43,873
25	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	120,628		120,628
	OTHER AMMUNITION			
26	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	19,824		19,824
27	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	41,803		41,803
28	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	39,472		39,472
29	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	11,389		11,389
	MISCELLANEOUS			
30	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	17,499		17,499
31	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES	5,266		5,266
32	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	5,322		5,322
33	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	9,768		9,768
34	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	12,721		12,721

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
35	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		11,786				11,786
36	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		100				100
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
37	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		144,368				144,368
38	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		9,504				9,504
39	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES		9,025				9,025
40	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL		178,367				178,367
41	ARMS INITIATIVE		3,261				3,261
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		1,979,414		-28,600		1,950,814
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	2,359	25,560		5,000	2,359	30,560
	Efficiency and safety mods to Heavy Expanded Mobility Ammunition Trailer ..				[5,000]		
2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	391	38,713			391	38,713
3	SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS		0				0
4	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)		0				0
5	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	2,960	918,195			2,960	918,195
6	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEN		21,317				21,317
7	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		549,741				549,741
8	PLS ESP		100,108				100,108
9	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	94	114,478			94	114,478
10	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY		230,978				230,978
11	FAMILY OF MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTEC (MRAP)		0				0
12	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	55	37,519			55	37,519
13	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV P	708	173,565			708	173,565

14	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM	0		0
15	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	349,256		349,256
16	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TAC VEH)	0		0
17	TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL	234		234
18	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS, OPA1	746		746
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES			
19	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	4	1,875	4
20	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		3,323	
21	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		19,586	
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT			
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS			
22	VEHICLE MTD MINE DETECTE		0	
23	JOINT COMBAT IDENTIFICATION MARKING SYSTEM		11,411	
24	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK		421,798	
25	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		4,690	
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS			
26	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS (S		115,744	
27	SHF TERM		14,198	
28	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)		662	
29	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)		32,193	
	Procurement of additional systems			51,200
				[51,200]
30	SMART-T (SPACE)		10,285	
31	SCAMP (SPACE)		930	
32	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS		4,586	
33	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)		1,506	
	COMM—COMBAT SUPPORT COMM			
34	MOD-IN-SERVICE PROFILER		938	
	COMM—C3 SYSTEM			
35	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		20,387	
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS			
36	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)		700	
37	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM		209,568	
38	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		5,796	
39	SINCGARS FAMILY		14,504	

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
40	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2		3,860				3,860
41	MULTI-PURPOSE INFORMATIONS OPERATIONS SYSEMS		9,501				9,501
42	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING		5,965				5,965
43	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT		26,358				26,358
44	IMS REMOTE CONTROL UNIT		6,603				6,603
45	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS		5,125				5,125
46	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)		2,397				2,397
47	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY		9,983				9,983
48	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)		23,606				23,606
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM						
49	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,465				1,465
	INFORMATION SECURITY						
50	TSEC—ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)		25,959				25,959
51	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP		63,340				63,340
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
52	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		137				137
53	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		28,406				28,406
54	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)		11,566				11,566
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
55	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		201,081		55,000		256,081
	Tactical local area network				[55,000]		
56	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		6,264				6,264
57	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM(.....		178,242				178,242
58	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM		10,427				10,427
	ELECT EQUIP—NAT INTEL PROG (NIP)						
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						
63	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS)		0				0
64	JTT/CIBS-M		3,321				3,321

65	PROPHET GROUND	71,517		71,517
66	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYS (TUAS)	0		0
67	SMALL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (SUAS)	0		0
68	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS)	441		441
69	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)	0		0
70	DCGS-A (MIP)	137,424		137,424
71	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	9,279		9,279
72	TROJAN (MIP)	28,345		28,345
73	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)	7,602		7,602
74	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS) (MIP)	7,416		7,416
75	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MIP)	18,721		18,721
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)			
76	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	32,980	47,100	80,080
	Procurement of additional systems		[47,100]	
77	WARLOCK	24,127		24,127
78	BCT UNATTENDED GROUND SENSOR	29,718	-29,718	0
	Program reduction		[-29,718]	
79	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	1,394		1,394
80	CI MODERNIZATION	1,263		1,263
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)			
81	FAAD GBS	91,467		91,467
82	SENTINEL MODS	30,976		30,976
83	SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STFW)	24,939		24,939
84	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	70,528		70,528
85	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	255,641		255,641
86	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	248,899		248,899
87	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF	8,520		8,520
88	RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS	0		0
89	COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY & MORTAR (C-RAM)	2,088		2,088
90	BASE EXPEDITIONARY TARGETING AND SURV SYS	0		0
91	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	6,042		6,042
92	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS)	0		0
93	ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SE	0		0
94	PROFILER	4,408		4,408

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
95	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		2,843				2,843
96	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)		39,786				39,786
97	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)		147				147
98	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD)		65,970				65,970
99	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMB32		815				815
100	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		16,475				16,475
101	COUNTERFIRE RADARS		275,867				275,867
102	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM		2,062				2,062
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
103	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS		53,768				53,768
104	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY		49,077		16,200		65,277
	Forward entry devices				[16,200]		
105	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM (BC)		25,866				25,866
106	FAAD C2		42,511				42,511
107	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD)		57,038				57,038
108	KNIGHT FAMILY		120,723				120,723
109	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		1,710				1,710
110	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY		10,858				10,858
111	TC AIMS II		10,457				10,457
112	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS)		0				0
113	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER		1,594				1,594
114	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE		18,492				18,492
115	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		96,162				96,162
116	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)		99,819				99,819
117	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET		15,466				15,466
118	MOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND ON THE MOVE (MBCOTM)		0				0
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION						
119	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM		97,858				97,858

120	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION	36,158		36,158
121	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	203,864		203,864
122	CSS COMMUNICATIONS	39,811		39,811
123	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	39,360		39,360
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)			
124	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (A/V)	663		663
125	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	6,467		6,467
	ELECT EQUIP—MODS TACTICAL SYS/EQ			
126	WEAPONIZATION OF UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (UAS)	0		0
	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT			
127	ITEMS UNDER \$5M (SSE)	0		0
128	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	542		542
129	BCT NETWORK	176,543		176,543
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,560		2,560
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT			
130	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	2,489		2,489
131	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)	9,305		9,305
132	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION	180,351		180,351
133	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)	831		831
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT			
134	TACTICAL BRIDGING	62,817	15,000	77,817
	Line of communication bridge		[15,000]	
135	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	105,837		105,837
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT			
136	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-HST	43,871		43,871
137	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMIDS)	35,002	7,000	42,002
	Fido explosives detection system		[7,000]	
138	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	54,093		54,093
139	< \$5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	3,655		3,655
140	AERIAL DETECTION	0		0
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
141	HEATERS AND ECU'S	20,610		20,610
142	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES	0		0

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
143	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		5,416				5,416
144	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)		0				0
145	LAND WARRIOR		0				0
146	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)		7,813				7,813
147	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM		110,524		-28,800		81,724
	Program reduction—early to need				[-28,800]		
148	MOUNTED SOLDIER SYSTEM		38,872				38,872
149	FORCE PROVIDER		41,539				41,539
150	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT		23,826				23,826
151	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM		69,496				69,496
152	MOBILE INTEGRATED REMAINS COLLECTION SYSTEM:		26,532				26,532
153	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (ENG SPT)		31,420				31,420
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
154	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER		175,069				175,069
	WATER EQUIPMENT						
155	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS		3,597				3,597
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
156	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		30,365				30,365
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
157	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS		159,285				159,285
158	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MAINT EQ)		3,702				3,702
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
159	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		48,379				48,379
160	SKID STEER LOADER (SSL) FAMILY OF SYSTEM		17,498				17,498
161	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING		12,452				12,452
162	DISTR, WATER, SP MIN 2500G SEC/NON-SEC		0				0
163	MISSION MODULES—ENGINEERING		62,111				62,111
164	LOADERS		7,205				7,205

165	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	8,458		8,458
166	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	64,032		64,032
167	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	10,783		10,783
168	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) FOS	64,959		64,959
169	CONST EQUIP ESP	11,063		11,063
170	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	20,565		20,565
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT			
171	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	202,764		202,764
172	HARBORMASTER COMMAND AND CONTROL CENTER (HCCC)	37,683		37,683
173	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	8,052		8,052
	GENERATORS			
174	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	113,573		113,573
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT			
175	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)	29,460		29,460
176	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	12,936		12,936
177	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	17,352		17,352
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT			
178	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	23,400		23,400
179	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	297,200	26,200	323,400
	Operator driving simulator		[5,000]	
	Immersive group simulation virtual training system		[6,000]	
	Combat skills marksmanship trainer		[6,000]	
	Mine resistant ambush protected vehicle virtual trainer		[6,000]	
	Combined arms collective training facility		[3,200]	
180	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	64,912		64,912
181	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AVCA)	26,120		26,120
182	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING	4,964		4,964
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)			
183	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	38,778		38,778
184	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	104,472		104,472
185	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	19,166		19,166
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
186	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	42,229		42,229
187	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	56,195		56,195

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
188	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT		1,873				1,873
189	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)		103,046				103,046
190	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		2,233				2,233
191	BUILDING, PRE-FAB, RELOCATABLE		0				0
192	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		44,483				44,483
193	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3		13,104				13,104
194	MA8975		3,894				3,894
195	BCT UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE		20,046				20,046
196	BCT TRAINING/LOGISTICS/MANAGEMENT		61,581				61,581
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	OPA2						
197	INITIAL SPARES—C&E		38,707				38,707
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		9,765,808		164,182		9,929,990
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND						
	NETWORK ATTACK						
1	ATTACK THE NETWORK		0				0
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT						
2	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		0				0
	FORCE TRAINING						
3	TRAIN THE FORCE		0				0
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
4	OPERATIONS		215,868		-215,868		0
	Transfer to OCO account				[-215,868]		
	TOTAL, JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		215,868		-215,868		0

670

**AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY
COMBAT AIRCRAFT**

1	EA-18G	12	1,049,297		-45,891	12	1,003,406
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-20,496				-20,496
	Savings from multiyear procurement				[-45,891]		
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		55,081				55,081
3	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET	22	1,838,058	6	240,439	28	2,078,497
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-53,164				-53,164
	Buy 6 additional aircraft			[6]	[325,000]		
	Savings from multiyear procurement				[-84,561]		
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		2,295				2,295
5	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	7	2,146,611			7	2,146,611
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-479,518				-479,518
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		219,895				219,895
7	JSF STOVL	13	2,289,816			13	2,289,816
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		286,326				286,326
9	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	30	2,267,628			30	2,267,628
9	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-146,592				-146,592
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		81,875				81,875
11	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	28	789,103			28	789,103
11	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-50,394				-50,394
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		69,360				69,360
13	MH-60S (MYP)	18	564,755			18	564,755
13	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-86,164				-86,164
14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		70,080		0		70,080
	Economic order quantity funding for MYP				[-3,700]		
	Advance procurement funding				[3,700]		
15	MH-60R	24	1,031,797			24	1,031,797
15	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-133,864				-133,864
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		162,006		0		162,006
	Economic order quantity funding for MYP				[-32,300]		
	Advance procurement funding				[32,300]		
17	P-8A POSEIDON	7	1,970,336			7	1,970,336
17	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-145,899				-145,899

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		166,153				166,153
19	E-2D ADV HAWKEYE	4	913,816			4	913,816
19	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-94,632				-94,632
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		118,619				118,619
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
21	C-40A		0				0
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
22	JPATS	38	266,065			38	266,065
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
23	KC-130J		33,832				33,832
23	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-33,832				-33,832
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0
25	RQ-7 UAV		0				0
26	MQ-8 UAV	3	47,484			3	47,484
27	STUASLO UAV	18	23,912			18	23,912
28	OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT		0				0
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
29	EA-6 SERIES		14,891				14,891
30	AEA SYSTEMS		33,772				33,772
31	AV-8 SERIES		19,386				19,386
32	F-18 SERIES		492,821				492,821
33	H-46 SERIES		17,685				17,685
34	AH-1W SERIES		11,011				11,011
35	H-53 SERIES		25,871				25,871
36	SIH-60 SERIES		67,779				67,779
37	H-1 SERIES		3,060				3,060
38	EP-3 SERIES		90,323				90,323
39	P-3 SERIES		221,982				221,982

40	E-2 SERIES	47,046		47,046
41	TRAINER A/C SERIES	23,999		23,999
42	C-2A	16,020		16,020
43	C-130 SERIES	17,839		17,839
44	FEWSG	21,928		21,928
45	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	16,092		16,092
46	E-6 SERIES	149,164		149,164
47	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	43,443		43,443
48	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	14,679		14,679
49	T-45 SERIES	61,515		61,515
50	POWER PLANT CHANGES	19,948		19,948
51	JPATS SERIES	1,831		1,831
52	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS	8,084		8,084
53	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	21,947	5,000	26,947
	AN/AAR-47 computer processor upgrade		[5,000]	
54	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	101,120		101,120
55	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM	0		0
56	ID SYSTEMS	20,397		20,397
57	RQ-7 SERIES	18,121		18,121
58	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY	21,985		21,985
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS			
59	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	1,244,673	423,000	1,667,673
	Unfunded requirement for spares		[423,000]	
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES			
60	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	322,063		322,063
61	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	17,998		17,998
62	WAR CONSUMABLES	25,248		25,248
63	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	7,579		7,579
64	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	45,916		45,916
65	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	1,752		1,752
66	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	18,508,613	622,548	19,131,161

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY							
BALLISTIC MISSILES							
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES							
1	TRIDENT II MODS	24	1,106,911			24	1,106,911
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES							
2	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,446				3,446
OTHER MISSILES							
STRATEGIC MISSILES							
3	TOMAHAWK	196	300,178			196	300,178
TACTICAL MISSILES							
4	AMRAAM	101	155,553			101	155,553
5	SIDEWINDER	146	52,293			146	52,293
6	JSOW	333	131,141			333	131,141
7	STANDARD MISSILE	67	295,922			67	295,922
8	RAM	90	74,976			90	74,976
9	HELLFIRE	575	43,495			575	43,495
10	AERIAL TARGETS		43,988				43,988
11	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		3,981				3,981
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES							
12	ESSM	33	48,152			33	48,152
13	HARM MODS		53,543				53,543
14	STANDARD MISSILES MODS		61,896				61,896
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES							
15	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,281		30,000		33,281
	Accelerate facility restoration program				[30,000]		
16	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	1	534,492			1	534,492
16	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-28,758				-28,758
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0

674

	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
18	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	52,152		52,152
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT			
19	ASW TARGETS	10,123		10,123
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP			
20	MK-54 TORPEDO MODS	42,144		42,144
21	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	43,559		43,559
22	QUICKSTRIKE MINE	6,090		6,090
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
23	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	43,766		43,766
24	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	9,557		9,557
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION			
25	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	3,494		3,494
	OTHER WEAPONS			
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS			
26	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	14,316		14,316
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS			
27	CIWS MODS	41,408		41,408
28	COAST GUARD WEAPONS	20,657		20,657
29	GUN MOUNT MODS	43,991	11,000	54,991
	Mk 110 gun weapon system depot support		[6,000]	
	Mk 38 Mod 2 gun weapon system depot support		[5,000]	
30	LCS MODULE WEAPONS	9,808		9,808
31	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS	52,426		52,426
32	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS	23,007		23,007
	OTHER			
33	MARINE CORPS TACTIAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM	0		0
34	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS			
35	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	58,806		58,806
	TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	3,359,794	41,000	3,400,794
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC			

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
NAVY AMMUNITION							
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		80,028				80,028
2	JDAM		0				0
3	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		38,721				38,721
4	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		21,003				21,003
5	PRACTICE BOMBS		33,666				33,666
6	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		53,667				53,667
7	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		59,626				59,626
8	JATOS		2,869				2,869
9	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		34,492				34,492
10	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION		37,234				37,234
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		36,275				36,275
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		46,192				46,192
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		11,310				11,310
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		4,105				4,105
MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION							
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		64,839				64,839
16	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		15,329				15,329
17	40 MM, ALL TYPES		62,835				62,835
18	60MM, ALL TYPES		17,877				17,877
19	81MM, ALL TYPES		41,053				41,053
20	120MM, ALL TYPES		6,458				6,458
21	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		2,937				2,937
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		9,298				9,298
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		13,995				13,995
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		70,423				70,423
25	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		19,464				19,464
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES		18,032				18,032

27	NON LETHALS	3,009		3,009
28	AMMO MODERNIZATION	8,985		8,985
29	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	4,269		4,269
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	817,991	0	817,991
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY			
	OTHER WARSHIPS			
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM SUBSEQUENT FULL FUNDING (CY)	1,731,256		1,731,256
1	COMPLETION OF PRIOR YEAR SHIPBUILDING (CY)	0		0
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	908,313		908,313
3	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	5,344,446	2	5,344,446
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-1,902,994		-1,902,994
3	COMPLETION OF PRIOR YEAR SHIPBUILDING (CY)	0		0
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	1,691,236		1,691,236
5	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	0		0
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0		0
5	LESS: SUBSEQUENT FULL FUNDING (FY)	0		0
5	SUBSEQUENT FULL FUNDING (CY)	1,255,799		1,255,799
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	408,037		408,037
7	SSBN ERO	5,221		5,221
7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-5,221		-5,221
7	COMPLETION OF PRIOR YEAR SHIPBUILDING (CY)	0		0
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0		0
9	DDG 1000	186,312		186,312
9	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0		0
9	LESS: SUBSEQUENT FULL FUNDING (FY)	0		0
9	SUBSEQUENT FULL FUNDING (CY)	0		0
10	DDG-51	3,499,400	2	3,499,400
10	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-577,210		-577,210
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	47,984		47,984
12	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	1,230,984	2	1,230,984
13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	278,351		278,351
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS			

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
14	LPD-17		0				0
14	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		0				0
14	LESS: SUBSEQUENT FULL FUNDING (FY)		0				0
14	SUBSEQUENT FULL FUNDING (CY)		0				0
14	COMPLETION OF PRIOR YEAR SHIPBUILDING (CY)		0				0
15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0
16	LHA REPLACEMENT	1	3,397,892			1	3,397,892
16	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-347,243				-347,243
16	LESS: SUBSEQUENT FULL FUNDING (FY)		-2,100,752				-2,100,752
16	COMPLETION OF PRIOR YEAR SHIPBUILDING (CY)		0				0
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0
18	INTRATHEATER CONNECTOR	1	180,703			1	180,703
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST						
19	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS	1	88,561			1	88,561
20	OUTFITTING		306,640				306,640
21	SERVICE CRAFT		13,770				13,770
22	LCAC SLEP	4	83,035			4	83,035
23	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		0				0
	TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		15,724,520		0		15,724,520
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE		12,137				12,137
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		14,923				14,923
3	OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT		0				0
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						

678

4	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	23,167		23,167
	PERISCOPES			
5	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	85,619		85,619
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT			
6	DDG MOD	296,691		296,691
7	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	11,974		11,974
8	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	3,962		3,962
9	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	25,614		25,614
10	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,730		7,730
11	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	132,039	4,800	136,839
	Tube test equipment		[4,800]	
12	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	44,057		44,057
13	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	22,811		22,811
14	DSSP EQUIPMENT	3,869		3,869
15	CG MODERNIZATION	356,958		356,958
16	LCAC	9,142		9,142
17	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	0		0
18	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	15,908		15,908
19	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	126,842	6,500	133,342
	Remote monitoring and troubleshooting		[2,900]	
	Helicopter hangar door upgrades		[3,600]	
20	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	7,470		7,470
21	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	13,016		13,016
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT			
22	REACTOR POWER UNITS	438,503		438,503
23	REACTOR COMPONENTS	266,469		266,469
	OCEAN ENGINEERING			
24	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	10,227		10,227
	SMALL BOATS			
25	STANDARD BOATS	27,725	4,400	32,125
	Range support vehicle		[4,400]	
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT			
26	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	16,094		16,094
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT			

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
27	OPERATING FORCES IPE		49,856				49,856
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
28	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		116,829				116,829
29	LCS MODULES		82,951				82,951
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT						
30	LSD MIDLIFE		106,612				106,612
	COMMUNICATIONS & ELECTRONICS EQUIP						
	SHIP RADARS						
31	RADAR SUPPORT		12,030				12,030
	SHIP SONARS						
32	SPQ-9B RADAR		8,887				8,887
33	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM		87,219				87,219
34	SSN ACOUSTICS		237,015				237,015
35	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		29,641				29,641
36	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		14,056				14,056
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
37	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		20,739				20,739
38	SSTD		2,206				2,206
39	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		57,481				57,481
40	SURTASS		8,468				8,468
41	TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER		18,586				18,586
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
42	AN/SLQ-32		49,677				49,677
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
43	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		105,624				105,624
44	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)		1,299				1,299
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
45	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG		71,558				71,558

	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
46	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	31,091	31,091
47	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)	338	338
48	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	33,358	33,358
49	ATDLS	2,273	2,273
50	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)	8,920	8,920
51	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	81,441	81,441
52	SHALLOW WATER MCM	9,236	9,236
53	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	9,319	9,319
54	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	3,328	3,328
55	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	4,248	4,248
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
56	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	29,061	29,061
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
57	MATCALs	16,747	16,747
58	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	7,658	7,658
59	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	15,169	15,169
60	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	17,531	17,531
61	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,851	6,851
62	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	8,551	8,551
63	ID SYSTEMS	29,572	29,572
64	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)	9,098	9,098
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
65	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT	8,542	8,542
66	TADIX-B	6,909	6,909
67	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE	9,832	9,832
68	DCGS-N	16,634	16,634
69	CANES	34,398	34,398
70	RADIAC	6,104	6,104
71	CANES-INTELL	10,432	10,432
72	GPETE	5,861	5,861
73	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	4,445	4,445
74	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	4,737	4,737
75	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	51,048	51,048

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
76	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS		0				0
77	PORTABLE RADIOS		0				0
78	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		260,551				260,551
79	MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS (MDA)		9,250				9,250
80	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER \$5M		39,846				39,846
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS						
81	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT		0				0
82	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		59,013				59,013
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
83	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		28,665				28,665
84	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)		161,021				161,021
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						
85	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		2,256				2,256
86	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		1,309				1,309
87	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		3,422				3,422
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
88	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		120,529				120,529
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT						
89	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		18,322				18,322
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT						
90	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT		20,189				20,189
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
91	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT		0				0
	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SONOBUOYS						
92	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES		87,846				87,846
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						

93	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	51,742	51,742
94	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	8,429	8,429
95	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	11,134	11,134
96	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	37,063	37,063
97	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	25,581	25,581
98	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	1,573	1,573
99	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	40,696	40,696
100	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	35,855	35,855
101	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	20,662	20,662
102	PORTABLE ELECTRONIC MAINTENANCE AIDS	12,812	12,812
103	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	12,018	12,018
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT		
104	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM	1,086	1,086
105	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	8,076	8,076
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT		
106	NATO SEASPARROW	11,121	11,121
107	RAM GMLS	11,805	11,805
108	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	54,290	54,290
109	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	162,307	162,307
110	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	88,698	88,698
111	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	5,698	5,698
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
112	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	184,034	184,034
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
113	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	88,004	88,004
114	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	5,282	5,282
115	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	8,323	8,323
116	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,121	7,121
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
117	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	58,288	58,288
118	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	3,546	3,546
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE		
119	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	36,588	36,588

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
120	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		7,337				7,337
121	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		34,519				34,519
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIP						
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
122	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		3,719				3,719
123	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		584				584
124	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		13,935				13,935
125	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		12,853				12,853
126	TACTICAL VEHICLES		31,741				31,741
127	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		3,132				3,132
128	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		5,154				5,154
129	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION		24,770				24,770
130	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES		1,128				1,128
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
131	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		15,504				15,504
132	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,655				6,655
133	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		6,315				6,315
134	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		66,549				66,549
	PERSONNEL & COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIP						
	TRAINING DEVICES						
135	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		11,429				11,429
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
137	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		47,306		5,900		53,206
	Man overboard indicators				[5,900]		
138	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,067				2,067
139	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,679				7,679
141	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,433				1,433
143	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		12,754				12,754

144	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		5,317		5,317
145	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		20,033		20,033
146	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		154,805		154,805
147	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		377,353		377,353
	OTHER				
148	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		0		0
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		19,767		19,767
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				
149	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		215,906		215,906
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		6,450,208	21,600	6,471,808
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS				
	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES				
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES				
1	AAV7A1 PIP		7,749		7,749
2	LAV PIP		41,277		41,277
3	M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS		0		0
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS				
4	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	10	9,723	10	9,723
5	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	2	10,356	2	10,356
6	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		22,230		22,230
7	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER \$5 MILLION		26,091		26,091
	WEAPONS				
8	MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM		0		0
	OTHER SUPPORT				
9	MODIFICATION KITS		40,916		40,916
10	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		13,115		13,115
	GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT				
	GUIDED MISSILES				
11	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE		5,175		5,175
12	JAVELIN		0		0
13	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW		21,570		21,570
14	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)		20,315		20,315

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OTHER SUPPORT						
15	MODIFICATION KITS		3,798				3,798
	COMMUNICATIONS & ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS						
16	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		10,776				10,776
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
17	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		25,636				25,636
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)						
18	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		32,877				32,877
19	MODIFICATION KITS		0				0
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
20	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		3,405				3,405
21	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		67,568				67,568
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
22	RADAR SYSTEMS		860				860
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
23	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		3,906				3,906
24	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		92,377				92,377
25	RQ-11 UAV	16	32,490			16	32,490
26	DCGS-MC		4,582				4,582
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
27	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		0				0
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
28	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		258,947				258,947
29	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		33,021				33,021
30	RADIO SYSTEMS		40,551				40,551
31	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		32,279				32,279
32	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		15,278				15,278

•S 3454 PCS

686

	SUPPORT VEHICLES			
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES			
33	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		1,157	1,157
34	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		12,696	12,696
	TACTICAL VEHICLES			
35	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	17	4,849	17 4,849
36	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS		5,253	5,253
37	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT		11,721	11,721
38	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	550	133,827	550 133,827
39	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		19,156	19,156
40	TRAILERS		8,075	8,075
	OTHER SUPPORT			
41	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		6,016	6,016
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT			
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT			
42	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		5,110	5,110
43	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		10,743	10,743
44	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		29,330	29,330
45	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		19,419	19,419
46	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		11,718	11,718
47	EOD SYSTEMS		64,093	64,093
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT			
48	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		16,419	16,419
49	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)		10,976	10,976
50	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		24,376	24,376
51	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		2,748	2,748
	GENERAL PROPERTY			
52	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		6,722	6,722
53	TRAINING DEVICES		5,668	5,668
54	CONTAINER FAMILY		897	897
55	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		18,261	18,261
56	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)		0	0
57	BRIDGE BOATS		12,567	12,567
58	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN		4,283	4,283

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
OTHER SUPPORT							
59	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		7,572				7,572
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS							
60	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		13,524				13,524
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		1,344,044		0		1,344,044
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE							
COMBAT AIRCRAFT							
TACTICAL FORCES							
1	F-35	22	4,007,842			22	4,007,842
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-278,600				-278,600
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		257,000				257,000
3	F-22A		158,039				158,039
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		0				0
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT							
TACTICAL AIRLIFT							
5	C-17A (MYP)		14,283		114,400		128,683
	USAF-requested transfer from C-17 post production support (APAF 88)				[114,400]		
OTHER AIRLIFT							
6	C-130J	8	566,167			8	566,167
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-102,900				-102,900
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		48,000				48,000
8	HC-130J	4	349,300			4	349,300
9	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		10,000				10,000
10	MC-130J	5	467,465			5	467,465
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		60,000				60,000

•S 3454 PCS

688

12	HC/MC-130 RECAP		137,360		137,360	
12	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-137,360		-137,360	
13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0		0	
14	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT	8	351,200	8	351,200	
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT					
	UPT TRAINERS					
15	LIGHT MOBILITY AIRCRAFT	15	65,699	15	65,699	
16	USAFA POWERED FLIGHT PROGRAM	12	4,099	12	4,099	
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS					
17	JPATS		0		0	
	OTHER AIRCRAFT					
	HELICOPTERS					
18	COM VERT LIFT SPT PLATFORM (UH-1N Replace) ADVANCE PROCURE- MENT (CY)		6,432		6,432	
19	V22 OSPREY	5	415,150	5	415,150	
19	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-22,052		-22,052	
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		13,621		13,621	
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT					
21	C-29A FLIGHT INSPECTION ACFT		0		0	
22	C-12 A		0		0	
23	C-40		0		0	
24	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C		2,424		2,424	
25	HH-60M OPERATIONAL LOSS REPLACEMENT	3	104,447	3	104,447	
26	RQ-11		0		0	
27	STUASL0		3,253		3,253	
	OTHER AIRCRAFT					
28	TARGET DRONES	9	85,505	9	85,505	
29	C-37A	2	52,000	2	52,000	
30	RQ-4 UAV	4	762,678	4	762,678	
30	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-113,049		-113,049	
31	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		90,200		90,200	
32	MC 130 IN BA 04		9,932		9,932	
33	MQ-1		0		0	
34	MQ-9	36	863,595	-18,300	36	845,295

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized		
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	
	Airborne signals intelligence payload							[-18,300]
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT							
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT							
35	B-2A		63,371					63,371
35	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		0					0
36	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0					0
37	B-1B		200,090					200,090
38	B-52		69,074					69,074
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT							
39	A-10		165,361					165,361
40	F-15		302,235					302,235
41	F-16		167,188					167,188
42	F-22A		492,199					492,199
43	F-35 MODIFICATIONS		123,936					123,936
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT							
44	C-5		848,669					848,669
44	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-108,300					-108,300
45	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		166,900					166,900
46	C-9C		10					10
47	C-17A		351,614					351,614
48	C-21		339					339
49	C-32A		12,113					12,113
50	C-37A		12,162					12,162
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT							
51	GLIDER MODS		120					120
52	T-6		24,644					24,644
53	T-1		83					83
54	T-38		28,288					28,288

•S 3454 PCS

55	T-43	0		0
	OTHER AIRCRAFT			
56	KC-10A (ATCA)	13,777		13,777
57	C-12	7,645		7,645
58	MC-12W	10,826		10,826
59	C-20 MODS	736		736
60	VC-25A MOD	13,175		13,175
61	C-40	10,697		10,697
62	C-130	257,339		257,339
63	C-130 MODS INTEL	3,963		3,963
64	C130J MODS	80,205		80,205
65	C-135	44,228	6,000	50,228
	LAIRCM for KC-135 aircraft		[11,000]	
	Delay in starting Block 45 upgrade program		[-5,000]	
66	COMPASS CALL MODS	176,558		176,558
67	DARP	105,540		105,540
68	E-3	195,163		195,163
69	E-4	37,526		37,526
70	E-8	188,504	102,500	291,004
	Maintain JSTARS re-engining at original plan level		[102,500]	
71	H-1	2,457		2,457
72	H-60	11,630		11,630
73	RQ-4 UAV MODS	119,415		119,415
74	HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS	1,944		1,944
75	OTHER AIRCRAFT	159,423	-116,400	43,023
	Transfer FAB-T funds to PE 33601F (RDAF 180)		[-116,400]	
76	MQ-1 MODS	208,213		208,213
77	MQ-9 MODS	108,922		108,922
78	MQ-9 PAYLOAD—UAS	115,383		115,383
79	CV-22 MODS	13,964		13,964
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS			
80	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	622,020		622,020
	AIRCRAFT SUPT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES			
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
81	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP		91,701				91,701
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
82	B-1		6,791				6,791
83	B-2A		26,217				26,217
84	B-52		3,443				3,443
85	C-5		195				195
86	C-5		0				0
87	KC-10A (ATCA)		5,702				5,702
88	C-17A		153,347		-114,400		38,947
	USAF-requested transfer to C-17 procurement (APAF 5)				[-114,400]		
89	C-130		28,295				28,295
90	EC-130J		0				0
91	F-15		21,599				21,599
92	F-16		17,838				17,838
93	T-6		9,450				9,450
94	OTHER AIRCRAFT		53,953				53,953
95	T-1		0				0
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
96	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		24,619				24,619
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
97	WAR CONSUMABLES		92,939				92,939
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
98	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		1,079,742				1,079,742
99	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES—MQ-1		37,500				37,500
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES—SOF						
103	CANCELLED ACCT ADJUSTMENTS		0				0
	DARP						

692

104	DARP		19,117		19,117
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		12,981		12,981
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		15,366,508	-26,200	15,340,308
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
	BALLISTIC MISSILES				
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC				
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		60,647		60,647
	OTHER MISSILES				
	TACTICAL				
2	JASSM	171	215,825	171	215,825
3	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	178	64,523	178	64,523
4	AMRAAM	246	355,358	246	355,358
5	PREDITOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	460	44,570	460	44,570
6	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	2,985	134,884	2,985	134,884
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES				
7	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS/POL PREVENTION		833		833
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES				
	CLASS IV				
8	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		48		48
9	MM III MODIFICATIONS		123,378		123,378
10	AGM-65D MAVERICK		260		260
11	AGM-88A HARM		4,079		4,079
12	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)		10,795		10,795
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				
13	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		43,192		43,192
	OTHER SUPPORT				
	SPACE PROGRAMS				
14	ADVANCED EHF		38,078		38,078
14	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		0		0
15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		208,520		208,520
16	WIDEBAND GAFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)	1	579,802	1	579,802
16	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-62,201		-62,201

**PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)**

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		58,110				58,110
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		122,490				122,490
19	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		14,894				14,894
20	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		64,609				64,609
20	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		0				0
21	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0
22	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM		0				0
23	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		88,719				88,719
24	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	3	1,153,976		24,000	3	1,177,976
	Crew augmentation				[14,000]		
	GPS metric tracking				[10,000]		
25	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)		0				0
26	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)	1	979,249			1	979,249
26	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-278,545				-278,545
27	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		270,000				270,000
28	NATL POLAR-ORBITING OP ENV SATELLITE		26,308		-16,308		10,000
	Early to need				[-16,308]		
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
29	DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM		0				0
33	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		247,584				247,584
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		893,287				893,287
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		5,463,272		7,692		5,470,964
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
1	ROCKETS		19,106				19,106
	CARTRIDGES						

694

2	CARTRIDGES		141,049		141,049
	BOMBS				
3	PRACTICE BOMBS		34,094		34,094
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		183,845		183,845
5	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	3,500	104,642	3,500	104,642
	FLARE, IR MJU-7B				
6	CAD/PAD		37,016		37,016
7	EXPLOSIVE ORDINANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		3,383		3,383
8	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,000		1,000
9	MODIFICATIONS		1,112		1,112
10	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000		5,015		5,015
	FUZES				
11	FLARES		72,758		72,758
12	FUZES		57,337		57,337
	WEAPONS				
	SMALL ARMS				
13	SMALL ARMS		7,063		7,063
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		667,420	0	667,420
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
	VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT				
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES				
1	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		29,207		29,207
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES				
2	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		45,618		45,618
3	CAP VEHICLES		902		902
4	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000 (CARGO)		31,773		31,773
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES				
5	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES		52,867		52,867
6	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000 (SPECIAL)		18,358		18,358
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT				
7	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES		26,924		26,924
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT				

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
8	HALVERSEN LOADER		0				0
9	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000		14,501				14,501
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
10	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU		25,404				25,404
11	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000(VEHICLES)		54,570				54,570
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTM						
12	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (BPA		0				0
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP						
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						
13	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		216,381				216,381
14	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		1,582				1,582
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
15	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		2,634				2,634
16	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		30,685				30,685
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
17	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS		6,517				6,517
18	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		112,056				112,056
19	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMEN		55,326				55,326
20	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		21,018				21,018
21	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		28,164				28,164
22	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		18,416				18,416
23	TAC SIGNIT SPT		377				377
24	DRUG INTERDICTION SPT		0				0
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
25	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		74,285				74,285
26	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS		9,210				9,210
27	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL		8,688				8,688
28	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		99,281				99,281

29	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	29,637	7,500	37,137
	Joint threat emitter		[7,500]	
30	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	11,112		11,112
31	GCSS-AF FOS	53,349		53,349
32	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM	20,525		20,525
33	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS	58,284		58,284
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS			
34	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS	101,993		101,993
35	BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE	193,830		193,830
36	AFNET	151,643		151,643
37	VOICE SYSTEMS	25,399		25,399
38	USCENTCOM	36,020		36,020
	DISA PROGRAMS			
39	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE	24,804		24,804
40	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	5,279		5,279
41	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE	5,926		5,926
42	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	60,383		60,383
43	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	91,004	23,500	114,504
	Eastern Processing Facility		[14,000]	
	Kodiak Launch Complex		[9,500]	
44	MILSATCOM SPACE	221,545		221,545
45	SPACE MODS SPACE	18,384		18,384
46	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	18,801		18,801
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE			
47	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	268,140		268,140
48	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER	34,925		34,925
49	RADIO EQUIPMENT	14,541		14,541
50	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	11,613		11,613
51	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	108,308		108,308
	MODIFICATIONS			
52	COMM ELECT MODS	74,356		74,356
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP			
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP			
53	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	20,873		20,873

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
54	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000 (SAFETY)		14,292				14,292
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ						
55	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		12,853				12,853
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
56	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		4,788				4,788
57	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		28,390				28,390
58	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT		1,879				1,879
59	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		38,558				38,558
60	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000 (BASE S)		4,989				4,989
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
62	DARP RC135		23,296				23,296
63	DCGS-AF		271,015				271,015
65	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		489,680				489,680
66	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		32,668				32,668
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		14,258,508				14,258,508
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
70	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		19,046				19,046
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		17,845,380		31,000		17,876,380
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA						
1	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA		4,000				4,000
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
2	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		1,477				1,477
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA						
3	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		2,052				2,052

698

	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA					
4	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		32,263			32,263
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA					
5	DIA SUPPORT TO CENTCOM INTELLIGENCE ACT		0			0
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA					
17	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		14,625			14,625
18	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM		5,275			5,275
19	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,803			2,803
20	TELEPORT PROGRAM		78,227			78,227
21	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		153,288			153,288
22	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		4,391			4,391
23	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK		86,206			86,206
24	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE		1,710			1,710
25	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT		0			0
26	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM		0			0
27	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		22,493			22,493
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA					
28	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		4,846			4,846
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT					
29	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	4	10,478		4	10,478
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA					
30	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,451			1,451
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGE					
31	VEHICLES		50			50
32	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		12,007			12,007
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DTSA					
33	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		0			0
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY					
34	TERMINAL HIGH ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE FIELDING	67	858,870	-25,000	67	833,870
	Production delay			[-25,000]		
35	AEGIS FIELDING	8	94,080		8	94,080
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INTEL AG					
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA					
45	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		2,546			2,546

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

•S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD						
50	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		124,050				124,050
51	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE		20,138				20,138
	UNDISTRIBUTED						
52	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE		0				0
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
53	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		11,526				11,526
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS						
54	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		27,179				27,179
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		678,531				678,531
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND						
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
55	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		79,840				79,840
56	MH-47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM		107,934				107,934
57	MH-60 SOF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		179,375				179,375
58	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	9	179,949			9	179,949
59	UNMANNED VEHICLES		0				0
60	SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION		19,996				19,996
61	SOF U-28		404				404
62	RQ-11 UAV		2,090				2,090
63	CV-22 SOF MOD	5	124,035			5	124,035
64	MQ-1 UAS		1,948				1,948
65	MQ-9 UAV		1,965				1,965
66	STUASL0 UAV		12,148				12,148
67	C-130 MODIFICATIONS		22,500				22,500
68	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		489				489
	SHIPBUILDING						
69	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS)		0				0

70	MK8 MOD1 SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE	823		823
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS			
71	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	79,608		79,608
72	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	24,215		24,215
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS			
73	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS	58,390	28,000	86,390
	Special Operations Force deployable nodes		[28,000]	
74	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	75,892		75,892
75	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	30,094	4,600	34,694
	Enhanced combat optical sight		[3,000]	
	SOF combat assault rifle (SCAR)		[1,600]	
76	DCGS-SOF	5,225		5,225
77	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS	206		206
78	SPEC APPLICATION FOR CONT	0		0
79	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	11,706		11,706
80	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	977		977
81	TACTICAL VEHICLES	30,965	55,000	85,965
	Ground mobility vehicle modification kits		[55,000]	
82	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS	28,354		28,354
83	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS	20,000		20,000
84	MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT	102,556		102,556
88	SOF AUTOMATION SYSTEMS	52,353		52,353
89	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	9,714		9,714
90	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	30,900		30,900
91	SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	221		221
92	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR	18,626	25,800	44,426
	Special operations binocular/monocular visual augmentation devices		[20,900]	
	Clip-on thermal imager		[4,900]	
93	SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS	35,234		35,234
94	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT	804		804
95	DRUG INTERDICTION	0		0
96	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	7,774		7,774
97	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	269,182		269,182
98	PSYOP EQUIPMENT	25,266		25,266

PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

S 3454 PCS

Line	Item	FY 2011 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		4,112				4,112
	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE						
	CBDP						
99	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION		90,635				90,635
100	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION		74,686				74,686
101	DECONTAMINATION		21,570				21,570
102	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM (MEDICAL)		19,389				19,389
103	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION		27,542				27,542
104	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE		136,114				136,114
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		4,280,368		88,400		4,368,768
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	ARMY RESERVE						
1	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0
	NAVY RESERVE						
2	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0
	MARINE CORPS RESERVE						
3	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0
	AIR FORCE RESERVE						
4	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0
	NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT						
	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD						
5	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0
	AIR NATIONAL GUARD						
6	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0