DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $98.8 billion for procurement. This represents a $4.8 billion increase over the amount authorized for fiscal year 2012.

The committee recommends authorization of $99.1 billion, an increase of $1.7 billion from the fiscal year 2013 request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 procurement program are identified in division D of this Act.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $5.9 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $5.9 billion, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Aircraft Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

UH–72A Lakota Helicopter

The committee notes that the UH–72A Lakota Helicopter has proven to be a capable multi-role aircraft used in support of the Army National Guard's unique set of missions including, border security, disaster response, medical evacuation, and troop transport. The committee is aware that the Army has completed a survivability analysis and initial cost assessment on modifications that, if made, would allow the UH–72 to operate in non-permissive environments. The results of the analysis indicate that the UH–72A could be an effective and cost-efficient option to be used in support of additional operations in the continental United States (CONUS) and outside the continental United States (OCONUS), and in combat zones in support of contingency operations. The committee believes that further assessment should be conducted to evaluate potential courses of action for expanding the operational spectrum for the utilization of the Light UH–72A.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, to include the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2013, that identifies where the UH–72A could provide operational efficiencies in support of permissive and non-permissive CONUS, OCONUS, and contingency missions. The report should include, at a minimum, a cost assessment that includes the costs associated with integrating aircraft survivability systems, testing costs to qualify the aircraft to operate in non-permissive environments, and costs associated with sustaining the aircraft in non-permissive environments.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $1.3 billion for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.4 billion, an increase of $60.0 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Missile Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Patriot Mods

The budget request contained $199.6 million for Patriot Mods in Missile Procurement, Army.

In view of the Department of Defense's decision regarding the Medium Extended Altitude Defense System as noted elsewhere in this title, the committee remains interested in ensuring that the Department takes all necessary and appropriate steps to maintain and improve the Patriot program.

The committee recommends $199.6 million, the full amount requested, for Patriot Mods.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $1.5 billion for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.9 billion, an increase of $382.5 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Heavy Brigade Combat Team Force Structure and Industrial Base

The committee notes that the Army has announced that it will decrease end strength over the next 5 years. The decrease in end strength has forced the Army to also announce plans to eliminate at least eight active component Brigade Combat Teams (BCT), reducing the total number from 45 to 37. The active Army has 17 Heavy BCTs (HBCT), 20 Infantry BCTs, and 8 Stryker BCTs. The Army has stated that at least two of the eight BCTs eliminated will be HBCTs. The committee notes that the HBCT, which is comprised of Abrams tanks and Bradley fighting vehicles, is the only full-spectrum force in the Army's force structure. With regard to the future utility of heavy forces, the committee notes a Rand Corporation report from 2010 that concluded, "Heavy forces—based on tanks and infantry fighting vehicles—are key elements of any force that will fight hybrid enemies that have a modicum of training, organization, and advanced weapons. Light and medium forces can complement heavy forces, particularly in urban and other complex

terrain; they do not provide the survivability, lethality, or mobility inherent in heavy forces. Quite simply, heavy forces reduce operational risks and minimize friendly casualties."

The committee is concerned that the Army may eliminate too many HBCTs based on resource constraints rather than meeting the needs of combatant commanders. The committee understands the Army is currently conducting a force structure and BCT mix analysis, however, it does not believe the results will be available in time to inform the committee. The committee also understands the Army is considering adding a third maneuver battalion back into the Heavy and Infantry BCTs which may also impact the total amount of BCTs. The committee is supportive of all BCTs having a third maneuver battalion and notes that the committee opposed the Army's original decision of two maneuver battalions per BCT in the committee report (H. Rept. 109–452) accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007.

In addition to the mix of BCTs, the committee is also concerned about the Army's proposal to let the HBCT vehicle production lines go "cold" for 3-to-4 years, beginning in fiscal year 2013, and the associated impact this decision will have on the industrial base at both the prime contractor and vendor level. The HBCT industrial base is not dependent upon one platform. The committee believes insufficient information is available to the Army and Congress to make an informed decision on what the potential risks would be of closing HBCT production lines. The committee needs to understand the ramifications to the future HBCT industrial base capabilities regarding the Abrams tank, Bradley fighting vehicle, Paladin howitzer, Hercules recovery vehicle, Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle, and the Ground Combat Vehicle. The committee needs to be informed of the Army's projected requirements in fiscal year 2017 to maintain a public and private workforce to sustain the current level of HBCTs, and what capabilities the Army will need in the future to produce new platforms. The committee also believes that Foreign Military Sales (FMS) may help to mitigate some of the risk to the industrial base, but believes FMS alone will not be enough to ensure that the HBCT industrial base is maintained at viable levels in the near term. In the absence of a force mix BCT analysis, and a detailed quantitative analysis of the impacts to the HBCT industrial base, the committee recommends adjustments to the Army's budget request elsewhere in this report.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, to brief the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the results of the recent force mix analysis. At a minimum, the briefing should include the assumptions and scenarios used to determine the type and mix of Brigade Combat Teams, the rationale for the force mix, and the risks involved with the recommended force mix. The committee also directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or his designee, to brief the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on how the Army's recent force structure and BCT mix analysis meet the needs of the combatant commanders, and what the Joint Staff believes are the potential risks regarding the adequacy of the force mix, if the assumptions behind the scenarios used do not materialize. In addition, the committee further directs the Secretary of the Army, in

coordination with the Chairman of the Joints Chief of Staff, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees to accompany the fiscal year 2014 budget request, on the results and impacts of the force mix analysis.

Abrams tank upgrades

The budget request contained $74.4 million for the Abrams tank upgrade program.

The committee notes that the Army must maintain the ability for its Heavy Brigade Combat Teams (BCT) to overmatch any possible threat in the future. The committee continues to be concerned that Abrams tank production is expected to shut down from fiscal year 2014–16, and that the Army is unsure that the production line and supporting industrial base would be available when it starts future upgrades to Abrams tanks. The Army has completed limited analysis of the impact that the shutdown will have on the industrial base and is scheduled to complete a comprehensive analysis in summer 2012. However, based on data the Army has provided, the committee believes that the cost to shut down and restart the Abrams production line will total almost $1.0 billion, and that the Army has not yet budgeted these funds. The committee believes that the best course of action would be a combination of the minimum economical sustainment rate and Foreign Military Sales. The committee notes that the cost of shutting down and then restarting the Abrams production line would be significant and yield nothing. However, for almost the same level of funding, the Army could keep the Abrams production line "warm" while at the same time modernizing a portion of National Guard Heavy BCTs to a digital tank capability. Finally, the committee believes that a viable Heavy BCT industrial base is critical to national security, and therefore has requested in a standalone letter that the Comptroller General of the United States review and report to the committee all of the current and ongoing RAND analyses as they pertain to the Abrams industrial base.

The committee recommends $255.4 million, an increase of $181.0 million, for the Abrams tank upgrade program.

Bradley fighting vehicle program

The budget request contained $148.2 million for the Bradley fighting vehicle program for procurement and installation of upgrade kits for engineering change proposal (ECP) plans.

The committee is concerned that even with the funds requested for fiscal year 2013, production of the Bradley fighting vehicle will shut down as early as 2013, for a minimum of 3 years, and that the Army is unsure that the production line and supporting industrial base will be available when it restarts production of upgraded Bradley fighting vehicles. Moreover, the committee is concerned about the Army's current plan to install ECP components in Bradley fighting vehicles only at unit field locations and its impact on the industrial base. The committee understands that the Army may have a fiscal year 2012 funded reset program for the Bradley fighting vehicle that will take place at the contractor's industrial base facility. The committee believes that the most prudent course of action is to execute a portion of the funds for installation of ECP components at the production base facility in conjunction with the

planned fiscal year 2012 funded reset program. The Army should also explore opportunities for accelerating some follow-on ECP capabilities into the current ECP plan. Additionally, the committee suggests that any Bradley fighting vehicles in storage at the contractor's facility, and not yet delivered to the Army, should be programmed to receive ECP kits prior to delivery to unit locations. The committee also believes that as part of the production contract any further production of the Bradley Operation Desert Storm-Situational Awareness vehicle for the National Guard should be given priority in fielding ECP kits.

The committee recommends $288.2 million, an increase of $140.0 million, for the Bradley fighting vehicle program.

Improved recovery vehicle

The budget request contained $107.9 million for the M88A2 improved recovery vehicle program.

The committee is aware that in order to provide greater protection for soldiers, the Army's current and future fleet of combat vehicles has grown significantly in weight. As a result, the M88A1 recovery vehicles are approaching their maximum capability with the current fleet, and its capability will be greatly exceeded by the future fleet. While the Army is examining the need to increase the number of M88A2 recovery vehicles to support these heavier combat vehicles, with the potential of adjusting their acquisition objective for M88A2's based on future force structure, the committee is concerned that a delay in a decision to either add to the M88A2 inventory or to completely pure-fleet the vehicles to an all-A2 configuration, could come after the M88 industrial base is closed. The committee supports the Army's decision to include funds in the budget request for the procurement of an additional 31 M88A2 vehicles, but believes additional funds are necessary to maintain production and reduce the impacts of stopping production. The committee believes this will provide the Army with ample time to finalize its force structure and Brigade Combat Team adjustments and to determine a more accurate requirement for the procurement of additional M88A2s.

The committee recommends $169.9 million, an increase of $62.0 million, for the M88A2 improved recovery vehicle program.

Paladin integrated management program

The budget request contained $206.1 million for the Paladin integrated management (PIM) program.

The PIM program is scheduled to receive milestone C authority in June 2013. The current acquisition strategy includes four years of low-rate initial production (LRIP), followed by eight years of full-rate production (FRP). The committee notes that the first FRP is not planned for delivery until fiscal year 2019, which is more than 6 years after the milestone C decision, and the last FRP is not planned for completion until fiscal year 2028. The committee believes this protracted build and fielding schedule will likely add significant cost to the overall program.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on various courses of actions for possible acceleration of the PIM program. At a min-

imum, the report should include the possibility and ramifications of a more realistic production schedule, and the associated funding requirements, that includes moving from 4 years of LRIP down to 2 years, and the acceleration of FRP to less than the planned 8 years of procurement. The report should also identify potential test efficiencies for efforts required, prior to a full-rate production decision, to move the FRP decision sooner than currently planned.

The committee recommends $206.1 million, the full amount requested, for the PIM program.

Small Arms Modernization and Sustainment

The budget request contained $4.9 million for M249 squad automatic weapons and modifications, and contained $6.8 million for M240 medium machine guns and modifications.

The committee understands that small arms modernization is a component of the U.S. Army's continued effort to modernize key weapon systems, including the M249 squad automatic weapon (SAW) and the M240 medium machine gun. The committee believes the Army has the responsibility to provide the soldier with the best individual and crew-served weapons, and to continuously modernize, adapt, and incrementally improve small arms weapon systems as the threat to deployed military personnel evolves. The committee notes that small arms are key components to the survivability and lethality of the warfighter. The committee is aware that most small arms programs are nearing the end of their procurement objectives. The committee notes the M249 SAW and M240 machine guns will complete procurement in fiscal year 2013, and the committee is concerned about the perceived lack of a long-term sustainment strategy for the small arms industrial base, specifically the light and medium machine gun industrial base.

The committee understands there has been significant investment by industry and the Army in training, infrastructure, and material required to develop and produce the highest quality light and medium machine gun weapon systems. The committee is concerned that any significant break in production could be detrimental to the small arms industrial base, and in turn to the readiness of the military services. The committee needs to better understand the ramifications to the small arms industrial base capabilities across the Future Years Defense Program in light of the constraints of the current fiscal environment. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to adequately resource the small arms industrial base in order to prevent any unnecessary breaks in production.

In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to perform an objective assessment of the Army's approach to satisfying light and medium machine gun capability requirements. The assessment should include a review of current and projected lightweight and medium machine gun requirements; assess performance of current systems against requirements; establish acquisition and life-cycle costs; evaluate cost and capability of current development and procurement plans; and consider future requirements and capabilities that can be acquired today, and those which require research and development. The committee further directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the congressional de-

fense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the results of the assessment.

The committee recommends $4.9 million, the full amount of the request, for M249 squad automatic weapons and modifications, and $6.8 million, the full amount of the request, for M240 medium machine guns and modifications.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $1.7 billion for Procurement of Ammunition, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.6 billion, a decrease of $107.8 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Procurement of Ammunition, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $6.3 billion for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $6.2 billion, a decrease of $80.0 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Other Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Army and Marine Corps Multi-Mission Radar Development

The budget request contained $316.3 million for development and procurement of 15 Enhanced AN/TPQ–36 (EQ–36) counterfire radar systems. The budget request also contained $33.4 million for upgrades to the AN/MPQ–64 Sentinel air surveillance radar system. Elsewhere in this title, the budget request also contained $165.4 million for development and procurement of the Ground/Air Task Oriented Radar (G/ATOR) program.

The committee notes that between fiscal years 2014–17, the Army plans to allocate $1.0 billion for the EQ–36 system, and $190.8 million for AN/MPQ–64 Sentinel radar upgrades. During that same time period, the Marine Corps plans to also allocate $1.0 billion for the G/ATOR program, which will perform both counterfire and air surveillance missions.

The committee notes that the Army and Marine Corps have very similar requirements for radars to perform counter-fire and air surveillance missions. The committee is concerned, however, that the Army remains committed to procuring and maintaining two separate radars to perform these tasks, while the Marine Corps is pursuing a single multi-mission radar system. The committee believes that the Marine Corps' approach could yield substantial operations and sustainment savings over the long-term.

The committee notes that the EQ–36 system is currently in low-rate initial production, and the G/ATOR program is just entering low-rate initial production. Therefore, the committee encourages

the Army and the Marine Corps to collaborate and identity overlapping requirements and determine if at some point in the future, the Army could shift to procurement of the G/ATOR multi-mission radar rather than having the each service continue to procure and maintain separate radar systems.

The committee recommends the full amount requested for Army and Marine Corps multi-mission radar development.

Civil Support Team Information Management System

The committee is aware that the National Guard Bureau Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (WMD CST) currently field an information management system that provides a common operating picture, promotes information sharing and real-time collaboration in an emergency situation, and supports the CST mission of assisting and advising first responders and facilitating communications with other Federal resources. The committee believes that this system should be expanded to follow-on forces, such as the Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High Explosive Enhanced Response Force Package and Homeland Defense Response Force units, to ensure the safety of military personnel and first responders, while supporting the interoperability necessary to effectively communicate and operate during large-scale domestic events.

Joint Tactical Radio System Handheld, Manpack, and Small Form Fit Radio Program

The budget request included $482.2 million for procurement of Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) Handheld, Manpack, and Small Form Fit (HMS) radios.

The committee understands that the JTRS HMS program of record includes full and open competition as part of the program's initial full-rate production. The committee believes that in the interest of increased competition, it is imperative that subsequent full-rate production procurements include a strategy for including any non-program of record vendors that meet appropriate qualification standards in accordance with section 141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). The committee encourages the Army to continue to assess performance requirements. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to ensure that all qualification standards are documented and approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology and available to vendors prior to any additional full-rate procurements. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by July 31, 2012, on the Army's plan for production competition for each element of the JTRS program including potential acquisition strategies for JTRS-tested capabilities that allow JTRS-tested products from non-program of record suppliers to be contracted through full and open competition with the Government in a streamlined manner.

The committee recommends $482.2 million, the full amount of the request, for JTRS HMS radios.

Network Integration Exercises

The committee applauds the Army's effort to encourage commercial solutions and innovation through Network Integration Exercises (NIE). The committee encourages the other military services to leverage the information gained from the Army's efforts and consider participating in future NIEs. The committee also believes that as a result of the lessons learned from NIEs, additional improvements in acquisition policy should be made to couple innovative testing with reduced acquisition time frames. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2013, that considers potential acquisition strategies for NIE-tested capabilities that allow Army NIE-tested products from non-program of record suppliers to be contracted through full and open competition with the Government in a streamlined manner.

Spider Alpha Remote Control Units

The budget request contained $36.4 million for procurement of Spider Alpha Remote Control Units for the Spider Networked Munitions (Spider) program.

The Spider program is the Army's next generation alternative anti-personnel landmine, specifically designed to provide improved flexible force protection capabilities to the warfighter and to minimize and/or eliminate non-combatant injuries or deaths resulting from landmines.

The committee notes the Spider Networked Munitions System program has experienced operational suitability problems during initial testing and operational evaluations conducted by the Office of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation. The committee notes that these problems have been primarily the result of software issues. The committee is aware that the most recent limited user test demonstrated progress toward resolving these deficiencies, but that follow-on operational tests (FOT) are still required. The committee also notes that the Spider program's full-rate production decision shifted from fiscal year 2008 to the third quarter of fiscal year 2012 and could be further delayed due to scheduled FOTs that resulted from recurring demonstrated performance deficiencies.

The committee recommends $21.4 million, a decrease of $15.0 million, for procurement of Spider Alpha Remote Control Units.

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $227.4 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund. The committee recommends a transfer of this funding to title XV of this Act.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund are identified in division D of this Act.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $17.1 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $17.2 billion, an increase of $99.0 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Aircraft Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

EA–18G Advance Procurement

The budget request contained no funds for advance procurement of EA–18G aircraft.

The EA–18G is an electronic attack aircraft that is replacing the EA–6B aircraft. The committee notes that the budget request included 12 EA–18G aircraft, which would complete the current Department of the Navy requirement for an inventory of 114 EA–18Gs. However, the committee understands that while the 114 EA–18Gs would replace Navy sea-based and shore-based EA–6B squadrons, it would not replace the Marine Corps four shore-based EA–6B squadrons which are planned to be inactivated by fiscal year 2019. Consequently, the committee believes the absence of a replacement for the Marine Corps EA–6B squadrons could result in a shortfall in the Department of Defense's airborne electronic attack capability, and the committee encourages the Department of the Navy to include additional EA–18G aircraft in its budget request for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommends $45.0 million for advance procurement of additional EA–18G aircraft.

Reporting of the April 8, 2000, MV–22 Mishap at Marana, Arizona

The committee notes that subsequent to an April 8, 2000, MV–22 mishap at Marana Northwest Regional Airport, Arizona, the Marine Corps released information on July 27, 2000, regarding the MV–22 accident investigation report. The statement indicated that a combination of "human factors" had caused the crash of a MV–22 tilt-rotor aircraft, which resulted in the loss of 19 Marines, and that, "Although the report stops short of specifying pilot error as a cause, it notes that the pilot of the ill-fated aircraft significantly exceeded the rate of descent established by regulations for safe flight." The committee understands that subsequent to the release of the July 27, 2000, statement, many media reports did not make a distinction between "human factors" and "pilot error" and reported that the mishap was the result of "pilot error" which, according to the Marine Corps July 27, 2000, public release, does not accurately describe the combination of human factors which caused the mishap. The result is potentially more of the causal factors being attributed to the pilot than "human factors" would warrant.

Consequently, the committee encourages the Commandant of the Marine Corps to continue to work with the committee to further clarify Marine Corps public statements about the April 8, 2000, MV–22 mishap at Marana Northwest Regional Airport, Arizona, so

that media reporting of the accident more accurately portrays the causal factors of the accident.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $3.1 billion for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $3.2 billion, an increase of $55.6 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Weapons Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $759.5 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $747.0 million, a decrease of $12.5 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps program are identified in division D of this Act.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $13.6 billion for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $14.5 billion, an increase of $893.0 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Littoral Combat Ship

The committee is aware of considerable issues that have plagued the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program over recent years. While the Navy has briefed the congressional defense committees on problems involving the LCS program, the committee believes that the Navy has not adequately informed Congress to the full extent possible on program deficiencies, including mechanical and structural failures. The committee is also concerned with the lack of transparency regarding these significant issues as was addressed in the annual report by the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation which stated that its assessment of the program was limited because the "program offices have not released any formal developmental T&E reports." Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a comprehensive briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the LCS program, in a classified or unclassified session.

Mine Warfare

The committee notes that at a recent symposium, the Chief of Naval Operations stated that over the years, the Navy's ability to counter mine warfare threats had "atrophied," and went on to say the testing of the counter-mine warfare module for the Littoral Combat Ship is re-establishing a capability in this area for the Navy.

The committee is pleased this capability is receiving added interest, but is concerned that the ability to conduct offensive mine warfare has atrophied as well. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to review the Navy's offensive mine warfare capabilities and establish an appropriate course of action to re-establish this capability in a cost-effective manner.

Navy Shipbuilding Program

The committee is concerned with the Navy's shipbuilding program. The budget request for fiscal year 2013 Shipbuilding and Conversion (SCN) account contained $13.7 billion, which is significantly lower than the $14.9 billion level appropriated for fiscal year 2012. In fiscal year 2012, it was forecast that the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) would include the start of construction of 57 ships. However, 16 of those ships have fallen out of the FYDP, reducing new construction starts to 41 ships. The Navy has indicated that they will no longer seek to build a 313 ship fleet. Additionally, the Navy has proposed retiring nine additional ships during the FYDP before the end of their service lives. The committee believes the following programs are crucial.

CVN–78 is the lead ship of the Ford class aircraft carrier. It incorporates improved performance and cost saving technologies, decreases the crew size by 1,200 personnel, and saves the Navy over $5.0 billion in total ownership costs for each ship. The Navy intends to start construction of the first three ships of the Ford class on a 5-year basis. The committee encourages the Navy to maintain this schedule with fiscal year 2013 as the first year of incremental funding for CVN–79. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would authorize an extension from the current 5-year period to 6 years for the incremental funding of CVN–79 and CVN–80. The committee also believes it is essential to keep the Nimitz class aircraft carriers on schedule for their mid-life Refueling and Complex Overhauls to ensure these ships reach their planned service life.

The Virginia class submarine program continues to deliver on cost and well ahead of contractual schedule. Having achieved a rate of two submarines a year starting in fiscal year 2011, the committee was concerned to see the rate decrease to one submarine in fiscal year 2014, and believes this would inject instability into a stable program. The committee recommends an increase in fiscal year 2013 advance procurement funds to facilitate restoring the second submarine in fiscal year 2014. To achieve that end, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter a multiyear procurement for up to 10 submarines and authorizes the Secretary to incrementally fund that multi-year contract.

The Marine Corps has a stated requirement of 38 amphibious ships but has made an agreement with the Navy that 33 amphib-

ious ships would be sufficient to provide the lift and forcible entry capabilities they require. There are currently only 29 amphibious ships in the fleet. Two large deck amphibious ships are under contract, LHA–6 and LHA–7. The fiscal year 2013 budget request slid the construction start of the next large deck amphibious ship, LHA–8, from 2016 to 2017. Prior to LHA–6, these ships had well decks, which would flood to launch landing craft. LHA–6 and LHA–7 are designed without well decks, but a well deck is going into LHA–8. The committee is concerned that the internal arrangements to accommodate a well deck are going to change construction significantly, requiring many drawing changes. The committee encourages the Navy to get an early start on LHA–8 design with the contractor. It has been proven that the greater the percentage of a design that is complete at the start of construction, the more successful the construction program. The LPD–27 is the last LPD–17 San Antonio class small deck amphibious ship until the replacement for the LSD starts. In the fiscal year 2013 plan, LSD construction has been delayed until after the FYDP. The committee is concerned that this delay may negatively affect the industrial base.

In the fiscal year 2013 budget request, the Department of the Navy has requested authority to begin a multi-year program for nine DDG–51 Arleigh Burke-class destroyers. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to award a contract for a multiyear procurement of up to 10 destroyers. In fiscal year 2016, the Navy intends to start procuring Block III DDG–51 destroyers. This block will incorporate the advanced Air and Missile Defense Radar (AMDR), which is currently being competitively evaluated. The committee views AMDR as essential to pacing the air and missile threat. The Navy has stated that the DDG–51 hull is sufficient to accommodate the increased power generation and cooling requirements that AMDR will need, yet the committee still views this as an area of risk.

With the first two Littoral Combat ships (LCS) delivered to the fleet, each of a different design, each has had various problems that are being addressed by the Navy. LCS–1 has had some cracking and shaft seal problems and LCS–2 has had problems with galvanic corrosion within the water jets. The committee is aware that the Navy intends to forward stage up to four LCS to Singapore, and while supporting the budget request for four LCS in fiscal year 2013, it encourages the Navy to ensure the problems discovered to date have technical solutions and that these solutions are incorporated on forthcoming ships.

Perhaps the most troubling aspect of the Navy shipbuilding plan is how it will be able to afford the Ohio class replacement ballistic missile submarine and still have a viable program for other ships. This will have to be addressed in coming years. The budget request delayed the start of construction of the first submarine by 2 years until fiscal year 2021. This delay means that the ballistic missile submarine force dips to 10 submarines for almost 10 years in a couple of decades. To maintain a credible undersea nuclear deterrent, the committee recommends restoring the research and development funding that was reduced in the fiscal year 2013 budget request to allow the Department of Defense time to determine how to keep the program on track. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee

includes a provision that would prevent the Secretary of the Navy from having fewer than 12 ballistic missile submarines at a time.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $6.2 billion for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $6.3 billion, an increase of $102.7 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Other Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $1.6 billion for Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $1.5 billion, a decrease of $140.9 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Procurement, Marine Corps program are identified in division D of this Act.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $11.0 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $11.3 billion, an increase of $313.7 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Aircraft Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

F–35 Aircraft Program

The budget request contained $2.7 billion in PEs 64800F, 64800N, and 64800M for development of the F–35 aircraft. The budget request also contained $5.5 billion in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force and Aircraft Procurement, Navy for procurement of 19 F–35As, 6 F–35Bs, and 4 F–35Cs.

The F–35 aircraft program is the largest acquisition program within the Department of Defense (DOD), with a current planned procurement of 2,443 aircraft for the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force to meet fifth generation U.S. fighter requirements. The committee continues to support the requirement for fifth generation fighter aircraft due to projected increases in the effectiveness and quantities of threat anti-aircraft systems. The committee notes that without advanced fifth generation aircraft that the United States may be significantly limited in its ability to project power in the future. In addition, the committee believes that the 187 F–22 Raptors currently planned for may not alone provide enough of this capability.

The F–35 entered engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) in the first quarter of fiscal year 2002 and is currently estimated to complete EMD in 2018. Low-rate initial production of the F–35 began in 2007, with 121 aircraft having been approved by Congress for production through fiscal year 2012. As the program has progressed through the EMD phase, a recurring concern of the committee has been a desire by the Department to begin aircraft production too early in the EMD phase and to significantly increase each subsequent year's production, resulting in a high degree of development and production concurrency, and the production of a significant number of aircraft before sufficient demonstration of required technologies, flight testing and aircraft design stability. The committee notes that for fiscal year 2006, the Department of Defense requested $152.4 million for advance procurement for the first five F–35A aircraft in fiscal year 2007, and that in its report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (H. Rept.109–89), the committee recommended no funds for this purpose, believing that procurement of F–35A aircraft was premature.

Subsequently, the F–35 aircraft program has experienced several changes in the EMD and production schedules due to lagging technology development, design instability, and late delivery of aircraft. The result has been a rebase-lining of the program in 2007 and several cost and schedule changes. The 2012 Government Accountability Office analysis of DOD data indicates that the cumulative number of aircraft projected to be procured through 2017 has been reduced by 1,226 aircraft, or 77 percent since EMD began in fiscal year 2002. Further, the committee notes that the most recent F–35 aircraft program DOD selected acquisition report includes an acquisition program estimate of $395.7 billion. This most recent estimate has increased $13.2 billion since June 2010 and $117.2 billion since March 2007, when the program's estimated cost and schedule was rebase-lined.

The F–35 program is approximately 20 percent through its flight test program. While remaining technology, design stability, and software development issues are of significant concern to the committee, the Department of Defense has made a major reduction in the research and development and production concurrency in the program. As a result, the projected reduction in the number of F–35 aircraft to be produced through 2017 will reduce post-production modifications that could otherwise need to be accomplished on a much larger number of aircraft. The committee supports the most recent actions of the F–35 Joint Program Office leadership to reduce development and production concurrency and focus on EMD issues, but remains concerned about future increases in program acquisition costs, and expects that the Department of Defense will continue to take the necessary measures to curtail future increases in the program's acquisition cost.

Global Hawk Block 30 Aircraft

The budget request contained no funds for Global Hawk Block 30 unmanned aerial intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support for the combatant commanders.

On June 14, 2011, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics provided certification to Congress

that continuation of the Global Hawk Block 30 program was essential to national security, and that there were no alternatives to the program which will provide acceptable capability to meet the joint military requirement at less cost. Further, the certification indicated that the Global Hawk Block 30 costs $220.0 million per year less than the U–2 to operate and sustain. Based on this certification, the committee provided all requested fiscal year 2012 funding for the Global Hawk Block 30 Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS), including $323.9 million for 3 additional systems.

In contrast, the fiscal year 2013 budget would terminate the Global Hawk Block 30 program and cancel the 10 remaining aircraft previously planned for procurement. In addition, the Department of the Air Force has stated its intention to place the current 14 systems in storage, each aircraft having been procured at a cost of approximately $100.0 million. Additional information provided by the Air Force indicates that the 4 additional systems currently in production would be placed into storage upon delivery. The committee notes that the Global Hawk Block 30 achieved initial operability capability in August, 2011. The committee does not believe there is any precedent for the Department of Defense (DOD) placing a system this expensive into storage without being used, and does not support this proposal.

In addition, the committee does not believe that the proposal to suspend Global Hawk Block 30 operations is consistent with the Department's new military strategy. The committee notes that the Department's new strategy is focused on operations in the Middle East and Western Pacific in an anti-access/area-denial environment that places a premium on long-range, long-duration intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capability. The Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft currently in service are in high demand by combatant commanders, and are currently flying precisely such missions for U.S. Central Command, U.S. European Command, and U.S. Pacific Command. In addition, most missions being flown are at ranges where the Global Hawk Block 30 is less costly to operate than the U–2, because of the relatively long mission duration of the Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft. The committee believes that the Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft provide a unique capability and should be retained and operated through at least December 31, 2014, in support of current operational requirements of the combatant commanders. Beyond that date, the committee believes the Air Force should continue to fund both the Global Hawk Block 30 and the U–2 if there is sufficient ISR demand from combatant commanders.

The committee recommends $105.2 million, an increase of $105.2 million, in Aircraft Procurement Air Force, for maintaining Global Hawk Block 30 operations. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends $133.0 million, an increase of $133.0 million, in title 3, and recommends $22.2 million, an increase of $22.2 million in title 4, for a total of an additional $260.4 million to fund Global Hawk Block 30 operations for fiscal year 2013. In addition, the committee expects the Secretary of the Air Force to fully execute the fiscal year 2012 Global Hawk Block 30 program, including the procurement of 3 additional aircraft, in accordance with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law

112–81) and the Consolidated Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–74).

Inter-Theater Airlift Aircraft

The budget request contains $1.7 billion for C–17 and C–5 inter-theater airlift aircraft programs. The budget request also contains a legislative proposal from the Department of Defense (DOD) to lower the inter-theater airlift aircraft minimum floor from 301 to 275 aircraft.

Air Force officials state that "Case 3" of the Mobility Capability and Requirements Study 2016 (MCRS–16) was the analytical underpinning for the new mobility force structure associated with the new 2012 Defense Strategy and that a strategic airlift fleet of 275 aircraft would support it. Of note, Case 3 is the least demanding scenario that was modeled in MCRS–16. The Case 3 results indicated that the Department would be required to provide 29.1 million-ton-miles per day (MTM/D). Of note, unlike past studies, the Department of Defense also levied an additional 5.0 MTM/D on the Civil Reserve Aircraft Fleet (CRAF) program and increased its requirement of provided airlift to 25.5 MTM/D. Past studies have only assumed that CRAF could provide 20.5 MTM/D because of the number of participants and quantity/type of aircraft in the commercial program. No significant improvements have occurred within the CRAF program that would signify that an increase from 20.5 to 25.5 MTM/D could actually be supported. Furthermore, the largest provider of commercial airlift to DOD as a CRAF participant recently declared bankruptcy.

According to the MCRS–16 summary, the study recognized the reality of long-term U.S. involvement in globally dispersed operations which may include lengthy commitments to major campaigns. MCRS–16 realized important fact-of-life changes that placed new demands on the mobility system since the last mobility study, MCS–05, completed in 2006. The changes included a higher level of engagement around the world, increased reliance on the Reserve Components, increased reliance on airlift to move equipment and supplies that were once moved almost exclusively by surface transport, the introduction of new specialized equipment, the continued growth of Special Operations Forces, and the establishment of U.S. Africa Command. In response to these changes, the Department said that MCRS–16 provided an opportunity to make informed investment decisions designed to maintain the right mix of strategic and intra-theater transportation capabilities. All of which remain valid today, and into the foreseeable future, despite the new 2012 defense strategy.

Officials from the Government Accountability Office noted in testimony on March 7, 2012, before the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces that MCRS–16 did not sufficiently characterize incurred operational risk, nor did MCRS–16 adequately articulate capability gaps or inventory excesses. Additionally, the committee notes that certain assumptions regarding prepositioned stock locations and inter-theater airlift aircraft operational metrics, such as aircraft availability and mission capability, are no longer valid and that actual aircraft performance metrics are notably less than those modeled during MCRS–16 scenario execution.

During the time period between fiscal year 2002 and 2011, there has been a heavy demand on mobility airlift. The C–17 has over flown its planned program of record by 106 percent, or 103,581 hours, and the C–5 fleet has over flown its planned program of record by 134 percent, or 151,570 hours. An Air Force mobility study, completed in September 2010 by the Air Force Office of Lessons Learned when the Air Force program of record was 316 inter-theater airlift aircraft, analyzed Afghanistan mobility operations and found that that "the Air Force does not own enough large and outsize airlift to execute Operation Enduring Freedom surge and sustainment without substantial utilization of contracted and tendered commercial carriers. These aircraft, chartered in their entirety by U.S. Transportation Command at a price tag that sometimes exceeded $1.0 million per mission, deliver unmatched and irreplaceable outsize commodity capability to the warfighter." Between 2006–11, the Department of Defense spent $2.2 billion on foreign contracted strategic airlift.

In its February 2012 Air Force White Paper provided to Congress outlining the Air Force's fiscal year 2013 force structure reorganization, the Air Force stated that "although the U.S. has removed all combat forces from Iraq and the new strategic guidance reduces the steady state requirement for ground forces, we expect Air Force steady state rotational requirements to remain nearly constant, or perhaps increase, under the new strategy." DOD officials also stated to the committee during a briefing on February 23, 2012, that there will need to be further analysis of what the lift requirement, both inter-theater and intra-theater, will be for the new force laydown plan in the Asia-Pacific Area of Responsibility.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would require the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, to provide to the congressional defense committees an operational risk assessment for meeting geographical combatant commander airlift requirements with an organic fleet of less than 301 inter-theater airlift aircraft.

Intra-Theater Airlift Aircraft

The budget request contained $234.1 million for C–130 airlift aircraft and no funding for C–27J aircraft. The budget request also includes no funding for the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program (C–130 AMP) and reduces the intra-theater aircraft inventory by 65 C–130H and 38 C–27J aircraft.

For the past 6 years, Air Force leadership has vigorously advocated the need for the C–27J program to meet the Army's time-sensitive/mission-critical (TS/MC) airlift requirements, in a cost-effective and efficient manner. On February 27, 2008, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics certified to Congress that "there is, within the Department of the Army, Department of the Air Force, Army National Guard, or Air National Guard, a capability gap or shortfall with respect to intra-theater airlift, and validated requirements exist to fill that gap or shortfall through procurement of the Joint Cargo Aircraft (JCA)." On the same date, the Chiefs of Staff for both the Air Force and the Army sent a letter to the congressional defense committees that stated "[we] stand together in support of the JCA. Time-sensitive/mission-critical resupply is crucial to our success as warfighters."

On March 30, 2011, the Secretary of the Air Force testified to the Senate Appropriations Committee on Defense that "we continued C–27J procurement as an investment in overall [tactical airlift] fleet viability. Efforts to increase direct support airlift continue, with plans to beddown 38 C–27Js in the Air National Guard." And the 2012 Air Mobility Command Master Plan, published November 2011, states that "the C–27J is intended to provide an efficient means of accomplishing the direct support role for distributed ground forces . . . lessons learned from Southwest Asia operations reveal the need for a smaller than C–130 aircraft. It must provide a responsive, small-scale airlift capability to better support time sensitive, mission critical needs of Joint operations, deployed Special Forces, coalition troops, or host nations. It must also be able to operate on remote, austere airfields or via airdrop. The C–27J fulfills these requirements and will be a superb complement to the C–130 and C–17 fleet capabilities . . . the C–27J's capabilities are tailored for these future scenarios."

Despite the Air Force's unwavering support for C–27J to date, the Air Force decided for fiscal year 2013 that the C–27J was no longer affordable and provided a business-case analysis (BCA) in February 2011 to the congressional defense committees explaining the new Air Force position. In the review of the BCA, the committee notes that the Air Force had to use many assumptions for estimated costs in lieu of historical and fact-based C–27J cost data. Without a sufficient amount of reliable program execution data for C–27J, life-cycle costs per aircraft for personnel, operations, maintenance, and depot activities to support the Air Force position that the C–27J will be more expensive to own and operate than either the C–130H and C–130J may be premature. Furthermore, the committee believes that a prudent, cost-effective basing strategy for 38 C–27J aircraft, and a comparison of the C–27J manning estimate requirement document to actual unit personnel today being used to own and operate the C–27J, may reduce the projected ownership costs of the C–27J below the Air Force estimate. Such a review may assist the Air Force in realizing a tax-payer return on investment by not having to send brand-new C–27J aircraft from the production line directly into long-term storage.

The committee also believes that a large reduction to the intra-theater airlift inventory puts at significant risk the Air Force's ability to meet both title 10 and title 32, United States Code, intra-theater airlift requirements for both steady-state and contingency operations. In its February 2012 Air Force White Paper provided to Congress outlining the Air Force's fiscal year 2013 force structure reorganization, the Air Force stated that "although the U.S. has removed all combat forces from Iraq and the new strategic guidance reduces the steady state requirement for ground forces, we expect Air Force steady state rotational requirements to remain nearly constant, or perhaps increase, under the new strategy." The Chief of Staff of the Air Force stated during a briefing to the committee on January 25, 2012, that his greatest concern with the new defense strategy was not having the capacity in the mobility and combat air forces to support and execute the new strategy. Department of Defense officials also stated to the committee during a briefing on February 23, 2012, that there will need to be further analysis of what the lift requirement, both inter-theater and intra-

theater, will be for the new force lay-down plan in the Asia-Pacific Area of Responsibility. Compounding the issue is that fulfillment of the Army's direct-support/mission-critical airlift requirements could be placed at risk given the Army's plans to divest all of its C–23 Sherpa inventory over the Future Years Defense Program and the aged condition of its rotary-wing fleet of CH–47 rotorcraft.

Specifically pertaining to execution of the C–130J aircraft acquisition program, the committee is discouraged that the Secretary of the Air Force continues to foster procurement instability by annually altering forecasted procurement quantity rates that are significantly different from the preceding year's budget procurement quantity forecasted in future years. A continuous strategy of inconsistent quantity adherence and lack of advance procurement funding preceding the year of full funding for the aircraft induces: program instability; inefficient use of taxpayer's dollars; second and third order effects on subcontractor stability; touch-labor workforce perturbations; and, adverse aircraft pricing fluctuations. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to stabilize C–130J procurement and properly budget for advance procurement funding in future budget submissions.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes provisions that would: preclude divestment of any C–27J aircraft during fiscal year 2013; require the Secretary of the Air Force, after fiscal year 2013, to wait 180 days after submitting the report required by section 112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) and the Director, Congressional Budget Office submits a detailed life-cycle cost analysis for C–27J, C–130H and C–130J aircraft, before retirement, divestment or transfer of any C–27J aircraft; require the Secretary of the Air Force to continue the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program for the C–130 until the Institute for Defense Analyses conducts a business-case analysis; require an annual report from the Secretary of the Army regarding TS/MC airlift requirements fulfillment by the Air Force; and, require the Secretary of the Air Force to provide the congressional defense committees a report by March 1, 2013, that explains the rationale and planning for any proposed retirement, divestment, or transfer of any C–130 aircraft in fiscal years 2014 through 2017.

Long Range Stand-Off

The committee notes persistent confusion about whether the next generation bomber and next-generation cruise missile (otherwise known as the "Long Range Stand-Off weapon") will be nuclear capable in order to preserve the nuclear triad into the future. The committee addresses the next generation bomber in another section of this bill.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Administrator of Nuclear Security, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 4, 2013, concurrent with the delivery of the fiscal year 2014 budget submission, on the Department's plans, including costs and program impact, to ensure that the long-range strike bomber possesses a nuclear warhead equipped air-launched cruise missile capability, and that such system is available to be deployed, upon declaration of initial operating capability of the long-range strike bomber.

Long-Range Strike Bomber Programs

The budget request contained $983.1 million for B–1, B–2, B–52 and the new long-range strike bomber programs.

The budget request is a decrease of $236.7 million below the amount the Air Force had planned for the fiscal year 2013 budget in the Future Years Defense Program. The committee notes significant changes to critical bomber modernization programs, such as B–52 Combat Network Communications Technology (CONECT), B–52 Strategic Radar Replacement, and B–52 and B–2 Extremely High Frequency communication upgrades that the Air Force will no longer undertake due to affordability issues. The committee believes that as a result of these cancellations, the ability of the Air Force to meet combatant commander warfighting requirements and maintain reasonable operations and sustainment costs for the legacy bomber fleet is at risk.

The committee is disappointed that despite the successful completion of all engineering, manufacturing, and development (EMD) efforts on the B–52 CONECT program, the Secretary of the Air Force has decided to forfeit the taxpayer's investment in EMD by not continuing the procurement and fielding phases of the program. The committee believes that if the B–52 CONECT procurement program is continued, modernization of the B–52 fleet with B–52 CONECT would increase B–52's combat capability, flexibility, and maintainability; reduce in-flight crew workload; and provide the warfighter with more precise, timely, and effective close-air support.

The committee is also discouraged that the Air Force is unable to clearly articulate when the new long-range strike bomber will become certified for nuclear operations after attaining initial operating capability status. The committee does not believe that test and evaluation master plan affordability should be the limiting factor for certification. However, the committee supports the Air Force's plan to maintain the legacy bomber fleet inventory at current fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2013 combat-coded levels for each of the bomber fleets.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would support the Air Force's plan to maintain the legacy bomber fleet inventory at current levels. In addition, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require the Air Force to ensure the new long-range strike bomber is capable of nuclear operations upon declaration of the initial operating capability (IOC) status and certified for nuclear capable operations within two years after declaration of the IOC status. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to obligate fiscal year 2012 appropriations procurement funds for the B–52 CONECT program, and directs the Secretary to conduct a risk-based, mission-effectiveness analysis regarding the advantages and disadvantages of not continuing the B–52 CONECT procurement program and maintaining the B–52 fleet of aircraft in the current configuration and to provide a report on the findings to the congressional defense committees by February 5, 2013. The report should include an evaluation of various procurement quantities and pricing options that would enhance the affordability of the B–52 CONECT procurement program in order to garner a sufficient return on investment resulting from the EMD efforts to date.

The committee recommends $983.1 million, the full amount requested, for B–1, B–2, B–52 and the new long-range strike bomber programs.

Reaper Unmanned Aircraft System

The budget request contained $553.5 million for 24 Reaper unmanned aircraft systems (UAS), and also contained $72.3 million for additional spares in Aircraft Procurement Air Force.

Beginning in fiscal year 2011, the Air Force projected an annual procurement of 48 Reaper UAS each year through the completion of procurement in 2016. The committee understands that, as a consequence, this schedule would require the Reaper UAS contractor to produce 48 aircraft for 2 fiscal years, increase its production capacity to meet the higher production rate, and would then request funds for 24 aircraft in the third and subsequent years, through completion of procurement, in approximately 2020. The committee understands that procurement of an additional 12 aircraft in fiscal year 2013 would reduce the unit cost of each vehicle by approximately $1.0 million.

The committee recommends $712.4 million, an increase of $158.9 million, in Aircraft Procurement Air Force, for 12 additional Reaper UAS. The committee also recommends $93.9 million, an increase of $21.6 million, in Aircraft Procurement Air Force, for initial spares to support the procurement of 36 Reaper UAS.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $599.2 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $599.2 million, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $5.5 billion for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $5.5 billion, an increase of $15.0 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Missile Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $16.7 billion for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $16.7 billion, no change to the budget request, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Other Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 contained $4.2 billion for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authorization of $4.6 billion, an increase of $436.2 million, for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Aircraft Survivability Equipment

The committee is aware that in 2009, in an effort to improve rotor aircraft safety and survivability, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics issued an Aircraft Survivability Equipment (ASE) Acquisition Directive Memorandum directing the Department of the Navy, as the lead military service for the program, to develop a modular and open operating system to enable upgrades and platform integration, and thus promote a cost-effective common ASE system and eliminate the need for similar, duplicative systems for each of the military service's rotorcraft inventory.

The committee is encouraged that the military services are coordinating on ASE efforts, but is concerned that duplicate efforts may still exist. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to conduct a review of ongoing and planned rotorcraft threat warning and countermeasure programs, and to brief the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2012, on specific steps the Department will take to ensure that aircraft survivability equipment meets current military service requirements.

Aviation Foreign Internal Defense and Non-Standard Aviation Program

The budget request contained $97.7 million for the Non-Standard Aviation program, and also contained $7.5 million for the U–28 program.

The committee supports and approves of the recent changes to the U.S. Special Operations Command Aviation Foreign Internal Defense (AvFID) program as directed by reporting requirements in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). The committee supports combining the Non-Standard Aviation (NSAv) light program with the AvFID program and the resultant efficiencies in training, maintaining, and supporting of forward deployed combined units. The committee believes that combining these two programs will reduce start-up costs, leverage logistical and operational experiences already gained in the Air Force Special Operations Active and Reserve Components, and field more rapidly a persistent and highly capable

fixed-wing AvFID program. Further, the committee is pleased that the overall program realignment of assets will result in an estimated reduction of Contractor Logistics Support costs by approximately $53.0 million between fiscal years 2013–17.

The committee encourages the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command and the Commander, Air Force Special Operations Command to continually and comprehensively validate geographic combatant commander requirements for AvFID and NSAv, and to prioritize them in a way that will ensure a globally persistent and effective presence that contributes comprehensively to security force assistance and national security objectives. The committee also encourages the Commander, Air Force Special Operations Command to: refine global site selection to optimize operational and logistical support; continue efforts to reduce Contracted Logistics Support across the Future Years Defense Program; and leverage U.S. Air Force Reserve assets to further reduce sustainment costs.

To facilitate the implementation of the proposed changes to the AvFID and NSAv programs the committee supports the proposed modifications required to convert four Non-Standard Aviation (NSAv) light PC–12 aircraft into U–28 aircraft and adjusts authorized funding levels to permit these changes.

The committee recommends $34.9 million, a decrease of $62.8 million, for the AvFID program, and $70.3 million, an increase of $62.8 million, for the U–28 program.

Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund

The budget request contained $99.5 million for the Joint Urgent Operational Needs (JUON) Fund; $100.0 million for the Overseas Contingency Operations JUON Fund; $158.3 million in PE 63648D8Z for Joint Capability Technology Demonstrations; $227.4 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat (JIEDD) Fund; and $1.7 billion for the Overseas Contingency Operations JIEDD Fund.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military services have established a number of organizations and programs to respond to requests from units in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), units supporting other combatant commands, and from combatant commanders to rapidly develop and field solutions to a variety of capabilities, including development and transition of new technologies to the warfighter; support for Joint Experimentation Range Complexes; counter-improvised explosive detection and destroy; and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance sensors and systems. The committee notes each of these programs requests amounts for unspecified purposes for hundreds of projects in anticipation of requests from OEF units, other units in other combatant commands, and combatant commanders. The committee believes that this request lacks proper justification and is duplicative with other requests for rapid acquisition capabilities to address urgent operational needs.

At the request of Congress, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has completed a number of reviews of Department of Defense (DOD) rapid acquisition, quick reaction, and counter-improvised explosive device (C-IED) programs. In each review, GAO con-

cluded that the Department does not have a comprehensive policy or process to oversee the variety of programs and projects established to respond to OEF requested capabilities. The committee notes that GAO has identified 31 entities and over one thousand projects within the Department of Defense, the military services, and U.S. Special Operations Command to respond to urgent operational needs from combat theaters of operation and each have separate budgets used to develop equip and field solutions to the warfighter. The committee believes that significant efficiencies could be achieved by consolidating these accounts and instituting processes and systems that provide visibility of all projects being considered for funding.

Section 804 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) required the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of the Department's urgent operational needs and rapid acquisition processes and report the findings to the congressional defense committees by January 2012. The committee notes this review is still ongoing and is scheduled to be complete by August 2012. The committee believes that the Department should complete this required comprehensive evaluation of its urgent operational needs processes before requesting approval for a separate funding account such as the JUON Fund. The committee also expects the Secretary of Defense to establish policies and processes to provide comprehensive oversight of these programs as part of this required review. Further, the committee recommends consolidating programs established to rapidly develop and field solutions for units in combat and combatant commanders.

The committee appreciates that the Department must find ways to rapidly fund urgent needs to address near-term and high-risk scenarios. As such, Congress provided the Department with Rapid Acquisition Authority in section 806(c) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), as amended by section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) and section 803 of Public Law 111–383 which provides the Secretary of Defense $200.0 million in authority, per fiscal year, to waive any statute hindering quick response to immediate warfighter capability requirements in response to combat fatalities. The committee understands the Department has rarely used this authority.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $99.5 million, for the JUON Fund. In title XV of this Act, the committee recommends $50.0 million, a decrease of $50.0 million, for the JUON fund within the budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations. In title II in this Act, the committee recommends $158.3 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63648D8Z for Joint Capability Technology Demonstrations. In title XV of this Act, the committee recommends $1.9 billion, the full amount requested, within the budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations for the JIEDD Fund.

Metrics for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Capabilities for Manned and Unmanned Medium Altitude Systems

The committee notes the significant differences among and within the military services for measuring, evaluating, and describing the level of capability provided by their manned and unmanned system of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) for medium altitude systems. The metric often used is combat air patrol (CAP), but definitions vary for CAP for different aircraft types, even within the military services, and provides limited utility as a metric in describing system capability, utility, or relative capabilities. The committee also notes that the Army has made significant progress in defining its ISR requirements in terms of capability to satisfy its mission by developing the Integrated Sensor Coverage Area construct.

The committee understands the Joint Staff intends to complete a strategic portfolio review of the Department of Defense's current and programmed medium altitude ISR systems portfolio. In completing this strategic portfolio review, the committee recommends the Director of the Joint Staff develop and use a common set of metrics that will provide a common measurement of manned and unmanned system capabilities for each medium altitude platform and differing sensor configurations within platforms, within each of the ISR primary mission areas to include, but not limited to, full motion electro-optical-infrared (EO-IR) video, EO-IR imagery, wide area surveillance, synthetic aperture radar, signals intelligence, hyper-spectral imagery, moving target indicator, dismounted moving target indicator, and foliage penetration.

Terminal High Altitude Area Defense

The committee is concerned that the budget request results in a reduction of 3 Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) batteries and 66 interceptors across the Future Years Defense Program when compared to the fiscal year 2012 budget request.

The committee is also concerned that their decrease in interceptors and the current production rate, which is below capacity, creates a gap between the time when six fully operational THAAD batteries are delivered to the U.S. Army, and when those batteries will be fully outfitted with interceptors. The committee recommends the full amount requested for procurement of THAAD interceptors. The committee also recommends an increase of $127.0 million, to increase the production in fiscal year 2013 by 12 interceptors to a total of 48 interceptors. The committee also urges the Missile Defense Agency to realign interceptor production to better match the availability of THAAD batteries in its future budget submissions.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize appropriations for Procurement at the levels identified in section 4101 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Army CH–47 Helicopters

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into one or more multiyear procurement contracts in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, for up to 5 years for CH–47F helicopters.

Section 112—Reports on Airlift Requirements of the Army

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by October 31, 2012, and annually thereafter until 2017, a report that shall include the following information from the preceding fiscal year: (1) the total number of Time-Sensitive/Mission-Critical cargo airlift movements that were required for training, steady-state and contingency operations; (2) the total number of Time-Sensitive/Mission-Critical cargo airlift sorties executed for training, steady-state, and contingency operations; and (3) the total number of Time-Sensitive/Mission-Critical cargo sorties executed for training, steady-state, and contingency operations, aggregated by Department of the Army aircraft, Department of the Air Force aircraft, and contractor-provided airlift aircraft. This section would also require the Secretary of the Army to provide for each Time-Sensitive/Mission-Critical cargo airlift sortie not executed by Department of the Air Force aircraft, the reason(s) Department of the Air Force aircraft were not utilized to support the mission.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Section 121—Retirement of Nuclear-Powered Ballistic Submarines

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to maintain a minimum of 12 ballistic missile submarines in the fleet.

Section 122—Extension of Ford-Class Aircraft Carrier Construction Authority

This section would amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) by extending the incremental funding of the Ford class aircraft carriers (CVN–79 and CVN–80) from a 5-year period to a 6–year period.

Section 123—Extension of Multiyear Procurement Authority for F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G Aircraft

This section would amend section 128 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), as amended by the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–238), to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to add a fifth production year to the multiyear procurement contract for F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G aircraft.

Section 124—Multiyear Procurement Authority for V–22 Joint Aircraft Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear contract, beginning with the fiscal year 2013 program year, for the procurement of V–22 aircraft for the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and U.S. Special Operations Command. This section would also require that the V–22 multiyear contract provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under the contract for a fiscal year, after fiscal year 2013, be subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose for such later fiscal year.

Section 125—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Arleigh Burke Class Destroyers and Associated Systems

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear procurement contract for up to 10 Arleigh Burke class destroyers (DDG–51). The budget request included $3.0 billion for the procurement of two Arleigh Burke class destroyers. For many years, this class of ships was efficiently procured through multiyear procurement contracts, until the restart of production. The DDG–51 Flight IIA possesses a stable design and the committee supports the budget request to continue DDG–51 production through the Future Years Defense Program.

Section 126—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Virginia-Class Submarine Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear contract for the procurement of up to 10 Virginia class submarines beginning in fiscal year 2014. This section would also authorize the Secretary of the Navy to fund this contract through the use of incremental funding.

Section 127—Refueling and Complex Overhaul of the U.S.S. Abraham Lincoln

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for the refueling and complex overhaul of the USS Abraham Lincoln (CVN–72). This section would also set a limit of $1.6 billion for this purpose in fiscal year 2013, since it is the first year of 2-year incremental funding.

Section 128—Report on Littoral Combat Ship Designs

This section would require a report on the two Littoral Combat Ship designs for comparative cost and effectiveness.

Section 129—Comptroller General Reviews of Littoral Combat Ship Program

The section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the Littoral Combat Ship program's quality, and a review of the U.S. Navy's operational and sustainment support strategy for the program.

Section 130—Sense of Congress on Importance of Engineering in Early Stages of Shipbuilding

This section would state the sense of Congress encouraging the Navy to prioritize early engineering in large ship construction.

Section 131—Sense of Congress on Marine Corps Amphibious Lift and Presence Requirements

This section would provide the sense of Congress on Amphibious Lift and Presence Requirements.

SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Section 141—Retirement of B–1 Bomber Aircraft

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to maintain 36 combat-coded B–1 bomber aircraft beyond fiscal year 2013.

Section 142—Maintenance of Strategic Airlift Aircraft

This section would also require the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command to submit to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2013, a report assessing the operational risk for meeting the geographical combatant commanders' airlift requirements with a fleet of less than 301 inter-theater airlift aircraft.

Section 143—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Divestment or Retirement of C–27J Aircraft

This section would prevent the Secretary of the Air Force from divesting or retiring C–27J aircraft from the Air Force's inventory after fiscal year 2013 until 180 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits the report required by section 112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) submits to the congressional defense committees a life-cycle cost analysis of C–27J aircraft, C–130H aircraft, and C–130J aircraft. This section would also require the Director to conduct the analysis, which would take into account all upgrades and modifications required to sustain the aircraft through a 40–year service-life. The Director would also provide an assessment of the most cost-effective and mission-effective options for which C–27J aircraft could be affordably fielded by the Air National Guard with regard to the number of basing locations, the number of authorized personnel associated with a unit's manning document, and the maintenance and sustainment strategy. The cost-analysis would also outline any limiting factors regarding the assessment of the C–27J aircraft cost data as it relates to deriving cost ground rules and assumptions, and actual data derived from costs incurred for currently fielded aircraft. The Department of Defense would also be required to provide to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office all requested and all original source documentation needed to conduct the life-cycle cost analyses in a prompt and timely manner.

Section 144—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Termination of C–130 Avionics Modernization Program

This section would prevent the Secretary of the Air Force from terminating the C–130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) until 180 days after the Institute for Defense Analyses submits to the congressional defense committees a cost-benefit analysis of modernizing the legacy C–130 airlift fleet with C–130 AMP as compared to only modernizing the legacy C–130 airlift fleet with a reduced scope program for avionics and mission planning systems. The cost-benefit analysis would take into account the impact of lifecycle costs for both C–130s upgraded with C–130 AMP and C–130s not upgraded with C–130 AMP, and for legacy C–130 aircraft that are not upgraded with C–130 AMP, the impacts to future sustainment and maintenance costs associated with certain avionics and mission systems upgrades that may be required in the future for legacy C–130 aircraft to remain relevant and mission effective throughout the full service-life of the aircraft.

Section 145—Review of C–130 Force Structure

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a review of current and future plans for C–130 force structure and provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than the date upon which the President submits the fiscal year 2014 budget request to Congress. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a sufficiency review of the Secretary's report and provide the results of that review to the congressional defense committees no later than 60 days after submission of the Secretary's report to the congressional defense committees.

Section 146—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program

This section would express the sense of Congress that assured access to space remains critical to national security, and that the United States Air Force plan, starting in fiscal year 2013, to commit to an annual production rate of launch vehicle booster cores should maintain mission assurance, stabilize the industrial base, reduce costs, and provide opportunities for competition.

The committee notes that the cost of space launch has increased significantly and it believes that economic order quantity purchases and opportunities for competition will help secure the most cost-effective high mission assurance space launch capability for the taxpayer. The committee notes that the Air Force's detailed acquisition strategy will not be finalized at the time of publication. The committee expects this acquisition strategy will adequately balance mission assurance, cost savings, and opportunities for certified new entrants to compete.

This section would limit 10 percent of the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2013 for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program until the Secretary of the Air Force submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees describing the details of the acquisition approach. The report should include the anticipated savings, the planned number of launch vehicle booster cores

to be procured, the number of years that the contract will last, an assessment of when new entrants will be certified to compete for evolved expendable launch vehicle class launches, the projected launch manifest with possible opportunities for new entrants to compete, and any other relevant analysis used to inform the acquisition strategy. The Secretary of the Air Force should also provide written certification that the strategy maintains assured access to space, achieves substantial cost savings, and provides opportunities for competition.

The committee also directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the final acquisition plan and submit its findings to the appropriate congressional committees, within 30 days of the Air Force submittal. The findings may be communicated to these committees in the form of a briefing.

In this section, the appropriate congressional committees are defined as the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Section 147—Procurement of Space-Based Infrared Systems

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into a fixed price contract to procure two Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS) satellites, authorize incremental funding of the two SBIRS satellites over a period not to exceed 6 years, and establish a limitation on the total funds to be obligated and expended for the procurement. This section would also require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on contract details, cost savings, and plans for reinvesting the cost savings into capability improvements for future blocks of SBIRS satellites.

The Air Force proposes to procure two SBIRS satellites over 6 years using advanced appropriations authority as part of its Efficient Space Procurement (ESP), formerly Evolutionary Acquisition for Space Efficiency, approach to space acquisition. The Air Force believes a block buy of two satellites can drive down costs, improve stability in the space industrial base, and allow for investments in technology that will lower risk for future programs. However, such an approach, if fully funded in a single fiscal year, would consume a large portion of the overall space budget and negatively impact other mission-critical programs.

While the committee supports the objectives of ESP, it has reservations about its implementation. The committee does not support the request for advanced appropriations authority and notes that such authority has not been provided to the Department in the past and would limit the oversight ability of future Congresses. Therefore, the committee recommends incremental funding authority over a period not to exceed 6 years for the procurement of the two SBIRS satellites.

The committee expects the Air Force to realize substantial savings from the ESP block buy approach, enabled by a fixed-price contract and fixed requirements. The committee also expects the Air Force to reinvest any savings into a spacecraft modernization initiative, where research and development activities are competitively awarded and new technologies are matured for insertion into future blocks of SBIRS satellites or other space-based infrared sen-

sors. Further, the committee believes that the ESP approach must be viewed as a longer-term strategy for space acquisition to fully realize the benefits of the spacecraft modernization initiative and to provide longer-term stability in the industrial base.

The committee discourages the use of advanced appropriations in future budget requests for space programs.

SUBTITLE E—JOINT AND MULTISERVICE MATTERS

Section 151—Requirement To Set F–35 Aircraft Initial Operational Capability Dates

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to establish the initial operational capability date for the F–35A aircraft and submit a report on the details of such initial operational capability to the congressional defense committees not later than December 31, 2012. This section would also require the Secretary of the Navy to establish initial operational capability dates for the F–35B and F–35C aircraft and submit a report on the details of such initial operational capabilities for both variants not later than December 31, 2012.

Section 152—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Retirement of RQ–4 Global Hawk Unmanned Aircraft Systems

This section would limit the use of funds to retire Global Hawk Block 30 Unmanned Aircraft Systems and require the Secretary of the Air Force to take all actions necessary to maintain RQ–4 Block 30 Global Hawk operational capability through December 31, 2014.

Section 153—Common Data Link for Manned and Unmanned Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Systems

This section would amend section 141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), to require that in carrying out a solicitation for a common data link (CDL), the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that such solicitation complies with the most recently issued CDL specification standard of the Department of Defense, and does not include any proprietary or undocumented interface or waveform as a requirement or evaluation criterion of such solicitation.

The committee is aware that the Department continues to implement a standard specification for CDL for manned and unmanned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems. In his March 29, 2012, confirmation hearing before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics reiterated the Department's advocacy for open competition in system procurements. The Acting Under Secretary also noted that an assessment was underway to examine CDL procurements over the next 2 years to find ways to improve competition, increase qualified vendors, eliminate the use of proprietary interfaces, and promote open standards, interfaces, and interoperability between vendor products. The committee supports the goals of this assessment, and encourages the Department to implement this policy as expeditiously as possible.

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
1	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT	2	18,639			2	18,639
3	MQ–1 UAV	19	518,088			19	518,088
4	RQ–11 (RAVEN)	234	25,798			234	25,798
	ROTARY						
6	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	34	271,983			34	271,983
7	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	40	577,115			40	577,115
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		107,707				107,707
9	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIB NEW BUILD	8	153,993			8	153,993
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		146,121				146,121
13	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	59	1,107,087			59	1,107,087
14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		115,113				115,113
15	CH–47 HELICOPTER	38	1,076,036			38	1,076,036
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		83,346				83,346
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
18	MQ–1 PAYLOAD—UAS		231,508				231,508
20	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)		16,272				16,272
21	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)		4,294				4,294
22	AH–64 MODS		178,805				178,805

23	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)		39,135			39,135	
24	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		24,842			24,842	
26	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS		73,804			73,804	
27	KIOWA WARRIOR MODS		192,484			192,484	
29	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN		190,789			190,789	
30	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE		133,191			133,191	
31	GATM ROLLUP		87,280			87,280	
32	RQ–7 UAV MODS		104,339			104,339	
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
34	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		34,037			34,037	
36	CMWS		127,751			127,751	
	OTHER SUPPORT						
37	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,886			4,886	
38	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		82,511			82,511	
39	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		77,381			77,381	
40	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		47,235			47,235	
41	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,643			1,643	
42	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		516			516	
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**434**	**5,853,729**		**434**	**5,853,729**	
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
1	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	84	646,590	50,000	84	696,590	
	Additional PAC–3 missiles			[50,000]			
2	MSE MISSILE		12,850			12,850	
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY		1,401	10,000		11,401	
	Program increase			[10,000]			
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS						
5	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	400	81,121		400	81,121	
6	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	1,403	64,712		1,403	64,712	
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		19,931			19,931	

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
8	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	1,608	218,679			1,608	218,679
9	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	2,430	18,767			2,430	18,767
10	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		12,051				12,051
	MODIFICATIONS						
11	PATRIOT MODS		199,565				199,565
13	MLRS MODS		2,466				2,466
14	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		6,068				6,068
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
16	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		7,864				7,864
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
17	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		3,864				3,864
18	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MISSILES)		1,560				1,560
19	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		5,200				5,200
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**5,925**	**1,302,689**		**60,000**	**5,925**	**1,362,689**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1	STRYKER VEHICLE	58	286,818			58	286,818
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
3	STRYKER (MOD)		60,881				60,881
4	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		57,257				57,257
5	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)		148,193		140,000		288,193
	Program increase				[140,000]		
6	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		10,341				10,341
7	PALADIN PIM MOD IN SERVICE	17	206,101			17	206,101
8	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	31	107,909	20	62,000	51	169,909

	Program increase			[20]	[62,000]		
9	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE	10	50,039			10	50,039
10	M88 FOV MODS		29,930				29,930
11	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		129,090				129,090
12	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM		74,433		181,000		255,433
	Program increase				[181,000]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
13	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		1,145				1,145
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
14	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY		506		–506		0
	XM25 funding ahead of need				[–506]		
17	LIGHTWEIGHT .50 CALIBER MACHINE GUN	610	25,183			610	25,183
19	MORTAR SYSTEMS		8,104				8,104
21	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	2,280	14,096			2,280	14,096
24	CARBINE	12,000	21,272			12,000	21,272
25	SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS)	2,107	6,598			2,107	6,598
26	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION	240	56,725			240	56,725
27	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)		13,827				13,827
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						
29	M777 MODS		26,843				26,843
30	M4 CARBINE MODS		27,243				27,243
31	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS		39,974				39,974
32	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		4,996				4,996
33	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		6,806				6,806
34	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS		14,113				14,113
35	M119 MODIFICATIONS		20,727				20,727
36	M16 RIFLE MODS		3,306				3,306
37	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		3,072				3,072
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
38	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (WOCV-WTCV)		2,026				2,026
39	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		10,115				10,115
40	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		442				442

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
41	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		2,378				2,378
	SPARES						
42	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)		31,217				31,217
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	**17,353**	**1,501,706**	**20**	**382,494**	**17,373**	**1,884,200**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		158,313		–34,800		123,513
	Unit cost savings				[–34,800]		
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		91,438				91,438
3	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		8,954				8,954
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		109,604				109,604
5	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES		4,041				4,041
6	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		12,654				12,654
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		72,154		–18,000		54,154
	Pricing adjustments for target practice round and light-weight dual-purpose round.				[–18,000]		
8	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		60,138				60,138
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
9	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		44,375				44,375
10	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		27,471				27,471
11	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		87,811				87,811
	TANK AMMUNITION						
12	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES		112,380				112,380
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
13	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM AND 105MM, ALL TYP		50,861				50,861

14	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	26,227		26,227
15	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982	110,329	–55,000	55,329
	Excalibur I-b round schedule delay		[–55,000]	
16	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL	43,924		43,924
	MINES			
17	MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES	3,775		3,775
	NETWORKED MUNITIONS			
18	SPIDER NETWORK MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	17,408		17,408
	ROCKETS			
19	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	1,005		1,005
20	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	123,433		123,433
	OTHER AMMUNITION			
21	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	35,189		35,189
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	33,477		33,477
23	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	9,991		9,991
24	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	10,388		10,388
	MISCELLANEOUS			
25	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	19,383		19,383
26	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES	7,336		7,336
27	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	6,641		6,641
28	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	15,092		15,092
29	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	15,692		15,692
30	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	14,107		14,107
31	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES	106		106
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT			
32	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	220,171		220,171
33	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL	182,461		182,461
34	ARMS INITIATIVE	3,377		3,377
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	**1,739,706**	**–107,800**	**1,631,906**

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY
TACTICAL VEHICLES

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
1	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	27	7,097			27	7,097
2	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	1,248	346,115			1,248	346,115
3	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP		19,292				19,292
4	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	1,534	52,933			1,534	52,933
5	PLS ESP		18,035				18,035
9	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	12	3,619			12	3,619
10	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	60	26,859			60	26,859
12	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS	950	69,163			950	69,163
13	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		91,754				91,754
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
18	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		2,548				2,548
19	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		16,791				16,791
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
20	JOINT COMBAT IDENTIFICATION MARKING SYSTEM	7,038	10,061			7,038	10,061
21	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	2,166	892,635		–20,000	2,166	872,635
	Program adjustment				[–20,000]		
22	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		45,626				45,626
23	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		5,143				5,143
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
24	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS	23	151,636			23	151,636
25	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS		6,822				6,822
26	SHF TERM		9,108				9,108
28	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	3,592	27,353			3,592	27,353
29	SMART-T (SPACE)		98,656				98,656
31	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS		47,131				47,131
32	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	39	23,281			39	23,281

	COMM—C3 SYSTEM					
34	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		10,848			10,848
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS					
35	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)		979			979
36	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	11,059	556,250	–35,000	11,059	521,250
	Program adjustment			[–35,000]		
37	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)		86,219	–10,000		76,219
	Program adjustment			[–10,000]		
38	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		7,798			7,798
39	SINCGARS FAMILY		9,001			9,001
40	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2	108	24,601		108	24,601
41	TRACTOR DESK		7,779			7,779
43	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT		34,365	–15,000		19,365
	Program delay			[–15,000]		
44	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS		1,833			1,833
45	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM		12,984			12,984
47	GUNSHOT DETECTION SYSTEM (GDS)	46	2,332		46	2,332
48	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY		1,132			1,132
49	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	2,535	22,899		2,535	22,899
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM					
51	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,564			1,564
52	RESERVE CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT	1,540	28,781		1,540	28,781
	INFORMATION SECURITY					
53	TSEC—ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	6,087	23,432		6,087	23,432
54	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	2,469	43,897		2,469	43,897
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS					
56	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		2,891			2,891
57	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		13,872			13,872
58	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)		9,595			9,595
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS					
59	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		142,133			142,133
61	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		57,727			57,727

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
62	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM		5,000				5,000
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						
65	JTT/CIBS-M		1,641				1,641
66	PROPHET GROUND	13	48,797			13	48,797
69	DCGS-A (MIP)	1,743	184,007			1,743	184,007
70	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	5	2,680			5	2,680
71	TROJAN (MIP)		21,483				21,483
72	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)		2,412				2,412
73	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRINTING AND COLLECTION		7,077				7,077
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
75	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	43	72,594			43	72,594
76	CREW		15,446				15,446
78	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		1,470				1,470
79	CI MODERNIZATION		1,368				1,368
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
80	FAAD GBS		7,980				7,980
81	SENTINEL MODS	70	33,444			70	33,444
82	SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STTW)		6,212				6,212
83	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	8,687	166,516			8,687	166,516
85	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT		82,162				82,162
86	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF		20,717				20,717
89	GREEN LASER INTERDICTION SYSTEM (GLIS)		1,014				1,014
90	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS		29,881				29,881
91	PROFILER	136	12,482			136	12,482
92	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		3,075				3,075
94	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)	1,032	141,385			1,032	141,385

96	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)		22,403		22,403
98	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		29,505		29,505
99	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	13	244,409	13	244,409
100	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM (WMD)		2,426		2,426
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS				
101	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	133	30,196	133	30,196
102	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	1,642	58,903	1,642	58,903
103	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM	445	8,111	445	8,111
104	FAAD C2		5,031		5,031
105	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	12	64,144	12	64,144
106	KNIGHT FAMILY		11,999		11,999
107	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		1,853		1,853
108	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY		14,377		14,377
111	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE		59,821		59,821
112	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	721	51,228	721	51,228
113	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)	5,976	176,901	5,976	176,901
114	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET		15,209		15,209
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION				
115	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		8,866		8,866
116	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		129,438		129,438
117	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYS FAM		9,184		9,184
118	CSS COMMUNICATIONS	2,062	20,639	2,062	20,639
119	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		35,493		35,493
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)				
120	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (A/V)		8,467		8,467
121	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	89	5,309	89	5,309
	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT				
122	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		586		586
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
124A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		3,435		3,435
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT				
126	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)	1,562	3,960	1,562	3,960

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
127	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)	637	4,374			637	4,374
128	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION	219	9,259			219	9,259
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
130	TACTICAL BRIDGING	7	35,499			7	35,499
131	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	68	32,893			68	32,893
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
134	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)		29,106				29,106
135	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	522	25,459			522	25,459
136	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS	364	8,044			364	8,044
137	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT		3,698				3,698
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
138	HEATERS AND ECU'S	1,332	12,210			1,332	12,210
139	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		6,522				6,522
140	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)		11,222				11,222
141	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM	5,226	103,317			5,226	103,317
144	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	228	27,417			228	27,417
145	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	8,891	52,065			8,891	52,065
146	MORTUARY AFFAIRS SYSTEMS		2,358				2,358
147	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS	266	31,573			266	31,573
148	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	818	14,093			818	14,093
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
149	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	208	36,266			208	36,266
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
150	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	1,938	34,101			1,938	34,101
151	MEDEVAC MISSON EQUIPMENT PACKAGE (MEP)		20,540				20,540
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						

152	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	20	2,495	20	2,495
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT				
154	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		2,028		2,028
156	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	9	6,146	9	6,146
157	MISSION MODULES—ENGINEERING	40	31,200	40	31,200
161	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	61	20,867	61	20,867
162	ALL TERRAIN CRANES	1	4,003	1	4,003
163	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	1	3,679	1	3,679
164	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)	76	30,042	76	30,042
165	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPA	182	13,725	182	13,725
166	CONST EQUIP ESP	47	13,351	47	13,351
167	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (CONST EQUIP)		9,134		9,134
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT				
170	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (FLOAT/RAIL)		10,552		10,552
	GENERATORS				
171	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	2,074	60,302	2,074	60,302
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
173	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	64	5,895	64	5,895
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT				
175	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	339	104,649	339	104,649
176	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		125,251		125,251
177	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	8	19,984	8	19,984
178	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER		10,977		10,977
179	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING		4,056		4,056
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)				
180	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	3	10,494	3	10,494
181	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	1,674	45,508	1,674	45,508
182	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	2,786	24,334	2,786	24,334
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
183	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,078		5,078
184	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		46,301		46,301
185	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT		1,373		1,373

(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
186	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA–3)	248	59,141			248	59,141
187	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		2,446				2,446
188	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	206	12,920			206	12,920
189	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3	1,141	19,180			1,141	19,180
190	TRACTOR YARD		7,368				7,368
191	UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE	311	83,937			311	83,937
	OPA2						
193	INITIAL SPARES—C&E	34	64,507			34	64,507
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**94,966**	**6,326,245**		**–80,000**	**94,966**	**6,246,245**
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND						
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
04	OPERATIONS		227,414		–227,414		0
	Transfer of funds to title 15				[–227,414]		
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		**227,414**		**–227,414**		**0**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
1	EA–18G	12	1,027,443		–30,000	12	997,443
	Cost growth-CFE electronics, non-recurring costs				[–30,000]		
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				45,000		45,000
	Program increase				[45,000]		
3	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET	26	2,035,131		–46,000	26	1,989,131
	Cost growth-CFE electronics, support costs				[–46,000]		
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		30,296				30,296
5	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	4	1,007,632			4	1,007,632

6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		65,180				65,180
7	JSF STOVL	6	1,404,737			6	1,404,737
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		106,199				106,199
9	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	17	1,303,120			17	1,303,120
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		154,202				154,202
11	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	27	720,933			27	720,933
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		69,658				69,658
13	MH–60S (MYP)	18	384,792			18	384,792
14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		69,277				69,277
15	MH–60R (MYP)	19	656,866	5	170,000	24	826,866
	Cruiser Retention—Restore 5 helicopters			[5]	[170,000]		
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		185,896				185,896
17	P–8A POSEIDON	13	2,420,755			13	2,420,755
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		325,679				325,679
19	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE	5	861,498			5	861,498
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		123,179				123,179
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
22	JPATS	33	278,884			33	278,884
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
23	KC–130J		3,000				3,000
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		22,995				22,995
25	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		51,124				51,124
26	MQ–8 UAV	6	124,573			6	124,573
27	STUASL0 UAV	5	9,593			5	9,593
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
28	EA–6 SERIES		30,062				30,062
29	AEA SYSTEMS		49,999				49,999
30	AV–8 SERIES		38,703				38,703
31	ADVERSARY		4,289				4,289
32	F–18 SERIES		647,306				647,306
33	H–46 SERIES		2,343				2,343
34	AH–1W SERIES		8,721				8,721

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
35	H–53 SERIES		45,567				45,567
36	SH–60 SERIES		83,527				83,527
37	H–1 SERIES		6,508				6,508
38	EP–3 SERIES		66,374				66,374
39	P–3 SERIES		148,405				148,405
40	E–2 SERIES		16,322				16,322
41	TRAINER A/C SERIES		34,284				34,284
42	C–2A		4,743				4,743
43	C–130 SERIES		60,302				60,302
44	FEWSG		670				670
45	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		26,311				26,311
46	E–6 SERIES		158,332				158,332
47	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		58,163				58,163
48	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		12,421				12,421
49	T–45 SERIES		64,488				64,488
50	POWER PLANT CHANGES		21,569				21,569
51	JPATS SERIES		1,552				1,552
52	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		2,473				2,473
53	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		114,690				114,690
54	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		96,183				96,183
56	ID SYSTEMS		39,846				39,846
57	P–8 SERIES		5,302				5,302
58	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION		34,127				34,127
59	RQ–7 SERIES		49,324				49,324
60	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		95,856				95,856
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						

61	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,166,430		–40,000		1,126,430
	Spares cost growth—F–35C, F–35B, E–2D				[–40,000]		
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES						
62	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		387,195				387,195
63	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		23,469				23,469
64	WAR CONSUMABLES		43,383				43,383
65	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		3,399				3,399
66	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		32,274				32,274
67	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,742				1,742
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**191**	**17,129,296**	**5**	**99,000**	**196**	**17,228,296**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
1	TRIDENT II MODS		1,224,683				1,224,683
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
2	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		5,553				5,553
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
3	TOMAHAWK	196	308,970			196	308,970
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
4	AMRAAM	67	102,683		10,000	67	112,683
	Program increase				[10,000]		
5	SIDEWINDER	150	80,226			150	80,226
6	JSOW	280	127,609		10,200	280	137,809
	Program increase				[10,200]		
7	STANDARD MISSILE	94	399,482			94	399,482
8	RAM	62	66,769			62	66,769
9	HELLFIRE	998	74,501		17,400	998	91,901
	Program increase				[17,400]		
11	AERIAL TARGETS		61,518				61,518
12	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		3,585				3,585
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
13	ESSM	37	58,194			37	58,194

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
14	HARM MODS	100	86,721			100	86,721
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
16	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		2,014				2,014
17	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON		21,454				21,454
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
18	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		54,945				54,945
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
19	SSTD		2,700				2,700
20	ASW TARGETS		10,385				10,385
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
21	MK–54 TORPEDO MODS	75	74,487			75	74,487
22	MK–48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	94	54,281			94	54,281
23	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		6,852				6,852
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
24	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		46,402				46,402
25	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		11,927				11,927
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
26	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,614				3,614
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
27	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		12,594				12,594
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
28	CIWS MODS		59,303				59,303
29	COAST GUARD WEAPONS		19,072				19,072
30	GUN MOUNT MODS		54,706				54,706
31	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS		1,591		18,031		19,622
	Cruiser retention—5″/62 Upgrade				[18,031]		

32	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		20,607			20,607
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
34	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		60,150			60,150
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**2,153**	**3,117,578**	**55,631**	**2,153**	**3,173,209**
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY					
	OTHER WARSHIPS					
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	1	608,195		1	608,195
3	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	2	3,217,601		2	3,217,601
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		874,878	778,000		1,652,878
	Advance procurement			[778,000]		
5	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	1	1,613,392		1	1,613,392
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		70,010			70,010
8	DDG 1000		669,222			669,222
9	DDG–51	2	3,048,658		2	3,048,658
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		466,283	115,000		581,283
	Advance procurement			[115,000]		
11	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	4	1,784,959		4	1,784,959
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS					
15	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL	1	189,196		1	189,196
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST					
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		307,300			307,300
18	OUTFITTING		309,648			309,648
20	LCAC SLEP	2	47,930		2	47,930
21	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		372,573			372,573
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	**13**	**13,579,845**	**893,000**	**13**	**14,472,845**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC					
	NAVY AMMUNITION					
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		27,024			27,024
2	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		56,575			56,575
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		21,266			21,266

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
4	PRACTICE BOMBS		34,319				34,319
5	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		53,755				53,755
6	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		61,693				61,693
7	JATOS		2,776				2,776
8	LRLAP 6″ LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE		7,102				7,102
9	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		48,320				48,320
10	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION		25,544				25,544
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		41,624				41,624
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		65,893				65,893
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		11,176				11,176
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,116				4,116
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		83,733				83,733
16	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		24,645				24,645
17	40MM, ALL TYPES		16,201				16,201
19	81MM, ALL TYPES		13,711		–10,000		3,711
	Excess to need				[–10,000]		
20	120MM, ALL TYPES		12,557				12,557
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		7,634		–500		7,134
	Excess to need				[–500]		
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		27,528				27,528
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		93,065				93,065
25	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		2,047		–2,047		0
	Excess to need				[–2,047]		
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES		5,297				5,297
27	NON LETHALS		1,362				1,362

28	AMMO MODERNIZATION	4,566		4,566
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	6,010		6,010
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	**759,539**	**–12,547**	**746,992**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY			
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT			
1	LM–2500 GAS TURBINE	10,658		10,658
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	8,469		8,469
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT			
3	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	23,392		23,392
	PERISCOPES			
4	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	53,809		53,809
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT			
5	DDG MOD	452,371		452,371
6	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	16,958		16,958
7	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	2,492		2,492
8	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	20,707		20,707
9	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	12,046		12,046
10	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	79,870		79,870
11	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	19,865		19,865
12	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	41,522		41,522
13	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	30,543		30,543
14	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	16,257		16,257
15	DSSP EQUIPMENT	3,630		3,630
16	CG MODERNIZATION	101,000	83,972	184,972
	Cruiser retention		[83,972]	
17	LCAC	16,645		16,645
18	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	35,446		35,446
19	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	65,998		65,998
20	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	4,359		4,359
21	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	10,218		10,218
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT			

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
22	REACTOR POWER UNITS		286,859				286,859
23	REACTOR COMPONENTS		278,503				278,503
	OCEAN ENGINEERING						
24	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		8,998				8,998
	SMALL BOATS						
25	STANDARD BOATS		30,131				30,131
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
26	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		29,772				29,772
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT						
27	OPERATING FORCES IPE		64,346				64,346
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
28	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		154,652				154,652
29	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT		31,319				31,319
30	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES		38,392				38,392
31	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES		32,897				32,897
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT						
32	LSD MIDLIFE		49,758				49,758
	SHIP SONARS						
34	SPQ–9B RADAR		19,777				19,777
35	AN/SQQ–89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM		89,201				89,201
36	SSN ACOUSTICS		190,874				190,874
37	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		17,035				17,035
38	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		13,410				13,410
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
40	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		21,489				21,489
41	SSTD		10,716				10,716

42	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	98,896		98,896
43	SURTASS	2,774		2,774
44	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNAISSANCE FORCE	18,428		18,428
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT			
45	AN/SLQ–32	92,270		92,270
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT			
46	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	107,060	1,125	108,185
	Cruiser Retention		[1,125]	
47	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)	914		914
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT			
48	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	34,050		34,050
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT			
49	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	27,881		27,881
50	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)	448		448
51	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	35,732		35,732
53	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)	9,533		9,533
54	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	60,111		60,111
55	SHALLOW WATER MCM	6,950		6,950
56	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	9,089		9,089
57	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE	7,768		7,768
58	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	3,614		3,614
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT			
59	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	42,911		42,911
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT			
60	MATCALS	5,861		5,861
61	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	8,362		8,362
62	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	15,685		15,685
63	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	16,919		16,919
64	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS	6,828		6,828
65	LANDING SYSTEMS	7,646		7,646
66	ID SYSTEMS	35,474		35,474
67	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	9,958		9,958

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
68	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT		9,064				9,064
69	MARITIME INTEGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM		16,026				16,026
70	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS		11,886				11,886
71	DCGS-N		11,887				11,887
72	CANES		341,398		3,450		344,848
	Cruiser Retention				[3,450]		
73	RADIAC		8,083				8,083
74	CANES-INTELL		79,427				79,427
75	GPETE		6,083				6,083
76	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY		4,495				4,495
77	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION		4,767				4,767
78	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		81,755				81,755
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
80	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		56,870		1,153		58,023
	Cruiser Retention				[1,153]		
81	MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS (MDA)		1,063				1,063
82	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M		28,522				28,522
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS						
83	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT		4,183				4,183
84	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		69,025				69,025
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
85	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		49,294				49,294
86	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)		184,825		1,715		186,540
	Cruiser Retention				[1,715]		
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						

87	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	2,180	2,180
88	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS	1,354	1,354
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		
90	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	144,104	144,104
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT		
91	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	12,604	12,604
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT		
92	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT	6,680	6,680
	SONOBUOYS		
95	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES	104,677	104,677
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
96	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	70,753	70,753
97	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	8,678	8,678
98	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	11,349	11,349
99	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	82,618	82,618
100	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	18,339	18,339
101	DCRS/DPL	1,414	1,414
102	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	40,475	40,475
103	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	61,552	61,552
104	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	18,771	18,771
105	PORTABLE ELECTRONIC MAINTENANCE AIDS	7,954	7,954
106	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,023	10,023
107	AUTONOMIC LOGISTICS INFORMATION SYSTEM (ALIS)	3,826	3,826
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT		
108	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM	3,472	3,472
109	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	4,528	4,528
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT		
110	NATO SEASPARROW	8,960	8,960
111	RAM GMLS	1,185	1,185
112	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	55,371	55,371
113	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	81,614	81,614
114	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	77,767	77,767

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
115	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS		754				754
116	MARITIME INTEGRATED PLANNING SYSTEM-MIPS		4,965				4,965
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
117	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP		181,049				181,049
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
118	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS		71,316				71,316
119	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,018				4,018
120	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,465				6,465
121	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		47,930				47,930
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
122	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		3,579				3,579
123	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		3,125				3,125
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE						
124	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM		31,743		11,238		42,981
	Cruiser Retention				[1,238]		
	Program increase for NULKA decoys				[10,000]		
125	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		34,174				34,174
126	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		23,450				23,450
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
127	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		7,158				7,158
128	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		3,325				3,325
129	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		8,692				8,692
130	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		14,533				14,533
131	TACTICAL VEHICLES		15,330				15,330
132	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		10,803				10,803
133	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		7,265				7,265

134	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	15,252		15,252
135	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES	1,161		1,161
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
136	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	15,204		15,204
137	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,330		6,330
138	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	6,539		6,539
139	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	34,804		34,804
	TRAINING DEVICES			
140	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	25,444		25,444
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
141	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	43,165		43,165
142	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	2,251		2,251
143	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,148		3,148
146	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,502		3,502
148	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	15,696		15,696
149	C4ISR EQUIPMENT	4,344		4,344
150	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	19,492		19,492
151	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	177,149		177,149
152	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	183,995		183,995
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			
152A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	13,063		13,063
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS			
153	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	250,718		250,718
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**6,169,378**	**102,653**	**6,272,031**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS			
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES			
1	AAV7A1 PIP	16,089		16,089
2	LAV PIP	186,216	–140,900	45,316
	Budget adjustment per USMC		[–140,900]	
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS			
3	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	2,502		2,502

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
4	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER		17,913				17,913
5	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		47,999				47,999
6	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION		17,706				17,706
	OTHER SUPPORT						
7	MODIFICATION KITS		48,040				48,040
8	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		4,537				4,537
	GUIDED MISSILES						
9	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE		11,054				11,054
11	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW		19,650				19,650
12	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)		20,708				20,708
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS						
14	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		1,420				1,420
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
15	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		25,127				25,127
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)						
16	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		25,822				25,822
17	MODIFICATION KITS		2,831				2,831
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
18	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		5,498				5,498
19	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		11,290				11,290
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
20	RADAR SYSTEMS		128,079				128,079
21	RQ–21 UAS	5	27,619			5	27,619
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
22	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		7,319				7,319
23	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,466				7,466

25	RQ–11 UAV		2,318		2,318
26	DCGS-MC		18,291		18,291
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
29	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		48,084		48,084
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)				
30	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		206,708		206,708
31	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		35,190		35,190
32	RADIO SYSTEMS		89,059		89,059
33	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		22,500		22,500
34	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		42,625		42,625
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
035A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,290		2,290
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES				
35	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		2,877		2,877
36	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		13,960		13,960
	TACTICAL VEHICLES				
37	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)		8,052		8,052
38	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS		50,269		50,269
40	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	8	37,262	8	37,262
41	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		48,160		48,160
	OTHER SUPPORT				
43	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		6,705		6,705
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT				
44	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		13,576		13,576
45	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		16,869		16,869
46	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		19,108		19,108
47	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		56,253		56,253
48	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,089		13,089
49	EOD SYSTEMS		73,699		73,699
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
50	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		3,510		3,510
51	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)		11,490		11,490

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
52	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		20,659				20,659
53	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		132				132
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
54	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		31,068				31,068
55	TRAINING DEVICES		45,895				45,895
56	CONTAINER FAMILY		5,801				5,801
57	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		23,939				23,939
60	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN		8,365				8,365
	OTHER SUPPORT						
61	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		7,077				7,077
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
62	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		3,190				3,190
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**13**	**1,622,955**		**–140,900**	**13**	**1,482,055**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	TACTICAL FORCES						
1	F–35	19	3,124,302			19	3,124,302
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		293,400		–64,000		229,400
	Excess advance procurement				[–64,000]		
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
5	C–130J		68,373				68,373
7	HC–130J	1	152,212			1	152,212
9	MC–130J	4	374,866			4	374,866
12	C–27J				115,000		115,000
	C–27J buy-back				[115,000]		
	HELICOPTERS						

15	HH–60 LOSS REPLACEMENT/RECAP		60,596				60,596
17	CV–22 (MYP)	4	294,220			4	294,220
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		15,000				15,000
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
19	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	5	2,498			5	2,498
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
24	TARGET DRONES	15	129,866			15	129,866
26	RQ–4		75,000		105,200		180,200
	Sustain current force structure				[105,200]		
28	AC–130J	2	163,970			2	163,970
30	MQ–9	24	553,530	12	158,900	36	712,430
	Additional aircraft			[12]	[158,900]		
31	RQ–4 BLOCK 40 PROC		11,654				11,654
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
32	B–2A		82,296				82,296
33	B–1B		149,756				149,756
34	B–52		9,781				9,781
35	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES		28,800				28,800
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
36	A–10		89,919				89,919
37	F–15		148,378				148,378
38	F–16		6,896				6,896
39	F–22A		283,871				283,871
40	F–35 MODIFICATIONS		147,995				147,995
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
41	C–5		6,967				6,967
43	C–5M		944,819				944,819
44	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		175,800				175,800
46	C–17A		205,079				205,079
47	C–21		199				199
48	C–32A		1,750				1,750
49	C–37A		445				445

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
51	GLIDER MODS		126				126
52	T–6		15,494				15,494
53	T–1		272				272
54	T–38		20,455				20,455
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
56	U–2 MODS		44,477				44,477
57	KC–10A (ATCA)		46,921				46,921
58	C–12		1,876				1,876
59	MC–12W		17,054				17,054
60	C–20 MODS		243				243
61	VC–25A MOD		11,185				11,185
62	C–40		243				243
63	C–130		67,853				67,853
65	C–130J MODS		70,555				70,555
66	C–135		46,707				46,707
67	COMPASS CALL MODS		50,024				50,024
68	RC–135		165,237				165,237
69	E–3		193,099				193,099
70	E–4		47,616				47,616
71	E–8		59,320				59,320
72	H–1		5,449				5,449
73	H–60		26,227				26,227
74	RQ–4 MODS		9,257				9,257
75	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS		22,326				22,326
76	OTHER AIRCRAFT		18,832				18,832

77	MQ–1 MODS		30,861				30,861
78	MQ–9 MODS		238,360				238,360
79	MQ–9 UAS PAYLOADS		93,461				93,461
80	CV–22 MODS		23,881				23,881
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
81	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		729,691		–1,400		728,291
	Premature request for deployment spares packages for F–35				[–23,000]		
	Support additional MQ–9 aircraft				[21,600]		
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
82	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP		56,542				56,542
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
83	A–10		5,100				5,100
84	B–1		965				965
86	B–2A		47,580				47,580
88	KC–10A (ATCA)		13,100				13,100
89	C–17A		181,703				181,703
90	C–130		31,830				31,830
91	C–135		13,434				13,434
92	F–15		2,363				2,363
93	F–16		8,506				8,506
96	OTHER AIRCRAFT		9,522				9,522
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
97	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		20,731				20,731
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
98	WAR CONSUMABLES		89,727				89,727
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
99	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		842,392				842,392
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
103A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		20,164				20,164
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**74**	**11,002,999**	**12**	**313,700**	**86**	**11,316,699**

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	ROCKETS						
1	ROCKETS		8,927				8,927
	CARTRIDGES						
2	CARTRIDGES		118,075				118,075
	BOMBS						
3	PRACTICE BOMBS		32,393				32,393
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		163,467				163,467
5	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	3,259	101,921			3,259	101,921
	FLARE, IR MJU–7B						
6	CAD/PAD		43,829				43,829
7	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		7,515				7,515
8	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,003				1,003
9	MODIFICATIONS		5,321				5,321
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		5,066				5,066
	FUZES						
11	FLARES		46,010				46,010
12	FUZES		36,444				36,444
	SMALL ARMS						
13	SMALL ARMS		29,223				29,223
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**3,259**	**599,194**			**3,259**	**599,194**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC						
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		56,906				56,906
	TACTICAL						
2	JASSM	157	240,399			157	240,399

3	SIDEWINDER (AIM–9X)	164	88,020		164	88,020	
4	AMRAAM	113	229,637	15,000	113	244,637	
	Program increase			[15,000]			
5	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	413	47,675		413	47,675	
6	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	144	42,000		144	42,000	
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
7	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION		744			744	
	CLASS IV						
9	MM III MODIFICATIONS		54,794			54,794	
10	AGM–65D MAVERICK		271			271	
11	AGM–88A HARM		23,240			23,240	
12	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)		13,620			13,620	
13	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB		5,000			5,000	
	MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
14	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		74,373			74,373	
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
15	ADVANCED EHF		557,205			557,205	
17	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)		36,835			36,835	
19	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	2	410,294		2	410,294	
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		82,616			82,616	
21	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		10,554			10,554	
22	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		58,147			58,147	
23	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		89,022			89,022	
24	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	4	1,679,856		4	1,679,856	
25	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)	2	454,251		2	454,251	
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
30	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		138,904			138,904	
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
030A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		1,097,483			1,097,483	
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**999**	**5,491,846**	**15,000**	**999**	**5,506,846**	

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
1	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		1,905				1,905
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES						
2	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		18,547				18,547
3	CAP VEHICLES		932				932
4	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,699				1,699
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
5	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES		10,850				10,850
6	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,246				9,246
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
7	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES		23,148				23,148
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
8	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		18,323				18,323
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
9	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU		1,685				1,685
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		17,014				17,014
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						
12	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		166,559				166,559
13	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		1,133				1,133
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
14	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		2,749				2,749
15	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		32,876				32,876
16	ADVANCE TECH SENSORS		877				877
17	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS		15,295				15,295
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
18	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS		21,984				21,984

19	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	30,698	30,698
20	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED	17,368	17,368
21	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS	23,483	23,483
22	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	17,864	17,864
23	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	53,995	53,995
24	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	14,578	14,578
25	TAC SIGINT SPT	208	208
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS		
27	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	69,743	69,743
28	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	15,829	15,829
29	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	11,023	11,023
30	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	64,521	64,521
31	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	18,217	18,217
32	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	11,899	11,899
33	GCSS-AF FOS	13,920	13,920
34	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM	9,365	9,365
35	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS	33,907	33,907
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS		
36	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS	52,464	52,464
38	AFNET	125,788	125,788
39	VOICE SYSTEMS	16,811	16,811
40	USCENTCOM	32,138	32,138
	DISA PROGRAMS		
41	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE	47,135	47,135
42	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	2,031	2,031
43	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE	5,564	5,564
44	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	44,219	44,219
45	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	109,545	109,545
46	MILSATCOM SPACE	47,592	47,592
47	SPACE MODS SPACE	47,121	47,121
48	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	20,961	20,961
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
49	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		126,131				126,131
50	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER		23,707				23,707
51	RADIO EQUIPMENT		12,757				12,757
52	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		10,716				10,716
53	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		74,528				74,528
	MODIFICATIONS						
54	COMM ELECT MODS		43,507				43,507
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP						
55	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		22,693				22,693
56	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		30,887				30,887
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ						
57	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		2,850				2,850
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
58	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		8,387				8,387
59	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		10,358				10,358
60	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT		3,473				3,473
62	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		14,471				14,471
63	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,894				1,894
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
65	DARP RC135		24,176				24,176
66	DCGS-AF		142,928				142,928
68	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		479,446				479,446
69	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		39,155				39,155
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
069A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		14,331,312				14,331,312
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						

71	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		14,663				14,663
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**16,720,848**				**16,720,848**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD						
42	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		45,938				45,938
43	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE		17,582				17,582
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
41	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		6,770				6,770
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS						
45	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		26,550				26,550
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
12	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		12,708				12,708
14	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		3,002				3,002
15	TELEPORT PROGRAM		46,992				46,992
16	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		108,462				108,462
17	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		2,865				2,865
18	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK		116,906				116,906
19	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE		1,827				1,827
21	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		10,319				10,319
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
22	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		9,575				9,575
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS						
26	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		2,522				2,522
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
02	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,486				1,486
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
44	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		21,878				21,878
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY						
30	THAAD	36	460,728	12	127,000	48	587,728
	Procure 12 additional interceptors			[12]	[127,000]		
31	AEGIS BMD	29	389,626			29	389,626

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
32	BMDS AN/TPY–2 RADARS	1	217,244	1	170,000	2	387,244
	Procure additional AN/TPY–2 radar			[1]	[170,000]		
33	RADAR SPARES		10,177				10,177
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA						
05	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		6,147				6,147
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY						
27	VEHICLES	1	50			1	50
28	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	3	13,096			3	13,096
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA						
24	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,458				1,458
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA						
03	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		2,129				2,129
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT						
23	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	6	15,179			6	15,179
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
045A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		555,787				555,787
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
46	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		74,832				74,832
48	MH–60 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		126,780				126,780
49	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	7	99,776		–62,800	7	36,976
	Transfer to Line 051—Mission Shift				[–62,800]		
51	U–28		7,530		109,400		116,930
	Program increase				[46,600]		
	Transfer from Line 049—Mission Shift				[62,800]		
52	MH–47 CHINOOK	7	134,785			7	134,785
53	RQ–11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		2,062				2,062

54	CV–22 MODIFICATION	4	139,147		4	139,147
55	MQ–1 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		3,963	23,000		26,963
	Program increase			[23,000]		
56	MQ–9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		3,952	35,400		39,352
	Program increase			[35,400]		
58	STUASL0		12,945			12,945
59	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE		73,013			73,013
60	AC/MC–130J		51,484			51,484
62	C–130 MODIFICATIONS		25,248			25,248
63	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		5,314			5,314
	SHIPBUILDING					
64	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS		23,037			23,037
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS					
66	ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT		113,183			113,183
67	ORDNANCE ACQUISITION		36,981			36,981
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS					
68	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS		99,838	3,900		103,738
	Program increase			[3,900]		
69	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		71,428			71,428
70	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		27,108			27,108
71	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS		12,767			12,767
74	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		42,348			42,348
75	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		600			600
77	TACTICAL VEHICLES		37,421			37,421
78	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS		36,949	5,000		41,949
	Program increase			[5,000]		
79	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS		20,255			20,255
80	MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT		17,590			17,590
82	AUTOMATION SYSTEMS		66,573			66,573
83	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES		6,549			6,549
84	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE		32,335			32,335
85	SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS		15,153			15,153

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
86	VISUAL AUGMENTATION LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS		33,920				33,920
87	TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS		75,132				75,132
90	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		6,667				6,667
91	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		217,972		25,300		243,272
	Program increase				[25,300]		
92	MILITARY INFORMATION SUPPORT OPERATIONS		27,417				27,417
	CBDP						
93	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION		24,025				24,025
94	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION		73,720				73,720
95	DECONTAMINATION		506				506
96	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM (MEDICAL)		32,597				32,597
97	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION		3,144				3,144
98	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE		164,886				164,886
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**94**	**4,187,935**	**13**	**436,200**	**107**	**4,624,135**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
01	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		99,477		–99,477		0
	Program reduction				[–99,477]		
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		**99,477**		**–99,477**		**0**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**125,474**	**97,432,379**	**50**	**1,689,540**	**125,524**	**99,121,919**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	ROTARY						
9	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIB NEW BUILD	2	71,000			2	71,000
12	KIOWA WARRIOR (OH–58F) WRA	16	183,900			16	183,900
15	CH–47 HELICOPTER	6	231,300			6	231,300
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**24**	**486,200**			**24**	**486,200**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	161	29,100			161	29,100
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS						
8	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	186	20,553			186	20,553
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**347**	**49,653**			**347**	**49,653**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						
36	M16 RIFLE MODS		15,422				15,422
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		**15,422**				**15,422**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
3	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		1,500				1,500
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		10,000				10,000
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		80,000		–19,000		61,000

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	Pricing adjustments for target practice round and light-weight dual purpose round.				[–19,000]		
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
9	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		14,000				14,000
10	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		6,000				6,000
11	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		56,000				56,000
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
13	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM AND 105MM, ALL TYP		29,956				29,956
14	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		37,044				37,044
15	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982		12,300				12,300
16	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL		17,000				17,000
	MINES						
17	MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES		12,000				12,000
	ROCKETS						
20	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		63,635				63,635
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
23	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		16,858				16,858
	MISCELLANEOUS						
28	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,200				1,200
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**357,493**		**–19,000**		**338,493**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
2	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	223	28,247			223	28,247
4	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		2,050				2,050
11	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM	2,128	271,000			2,128	271,000

14	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		927,400		927,400
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM				
52	RESERVE CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT		8,000		8,000
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS				
61	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		25,000		25,000
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)				
69	DCGS–A (MIP)	960	90,355	960	90,355
73	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRINTING AND COLLECTION		6,516		6,516
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)				
75	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR		27,646		27,646
77	FMLY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES		52,000		52,000
78	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		205,209		205,209
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)				
92	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		14,600		14,600
99	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	4	54,585	4	54,585
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS				
102	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY		22,430		22,430
103	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,400		2,400
112	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		6,400		6,400
113	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)		5,160		5,160
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT				
126	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)		15,000		15,000
127	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)	7,193	66,100	7,193	66,100
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT				
135	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)		3,565		3,565
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
143	FORCE PROVIDER	1	39,700	1	39,700
145	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	15	650	15	650
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT				
149	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	13	2,119	13	2,119
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT				
152	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	4	428	4	428

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
153	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MAINT EQ)		30				30
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
175	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT		7,000				7,000
176	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	1,275	27,250			1,275	27,250
178	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER		1,000				1,000
179	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING		5,900				5,900
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
183	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		98,167		–38,000		60,167
	Rapid equipping force delayed execution rates				[–38,000]		
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**11,816**	**2,015,907**		**–38,000**	**11,816**	**1,977,907**
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND						
	NETWORK ATTACK						
1	ATTACK THE NETWORK		950,500				950,500
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT						
2	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		400,000				400,000
	FORCE TRAINING						
3	TRAIN THE FORCE		149,500				149,500
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
4	OPERATIONS		175,400		227,400		402,800
	Transfer from title 1				[227,400]		
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		**1,675,400**		**227,400**		**1,902,800**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
11	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	1	29,800			1	29,800

	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT				
30	AV–8 SERIES		42,238		42,238
32	F–18 SERIES		41,243		41,243
35	H–53 SERIES		15,870		15,870
38	EP–3 SERIES		13,030		13,030
43	C–130 SERIES		16,737		16,737
48	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		2,714		2,714
54	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		570		570
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES				
62	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		2,380		2,380
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**1**	**164,582**	**1**	**164,582**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY				
	TACTICAL MISSILES				
9	HELLFIRE	212	17,000	212	17,000
10	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	50	6,500	50	6,500
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**262**	**23,500**	**262**	**23,500**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC				
	NAVY AMMUNITION				
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		18,000		18,000
2	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		80,200		80,200
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		21,500		21,500
6	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		20,303		20,303
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		532		532
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		2,643		2,643
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		2,322		2,322
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		6,308		6,308
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION				
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		10,948		10,948
16	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		9,940		9,940
17	40 MM, ALL TYPES		5,963		5,963

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
20	120MM, ALL TYPES		11,605				11,605
21	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		2,831				2,831
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		2,359				2,359
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		3,051				3,051
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		54,886				54,886
25	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		1,391				1,391
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES		30,945				30,945
27	NON LETHALS		8				8
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		12				12
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		**285,747**				**285,747**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
70	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS		3,603				3,603
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
97	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		58,200				58,200
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
127	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		3,901				3,901
128	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		852				852
129	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		2,436				2,436
130	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		3,798				3,798
131	TACTICAL VEHICLES		13,394				13,394
134	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION		375				375
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
149	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		3,000				3,000
151	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		9,323				9,323

	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**98,882**		**98,882**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS				
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES				
2	LAV PIP		10,000		10,000
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS				
5	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		108,860		108,860
	GUIDED MISSILES				
10	JAVELIN		29,158		29,158
	OTHER SUPPORT				
13	MODIFICATION KITS		41,602		41,602
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT				
15	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		13,632		13,632
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)				
17	MODIFICATION KITS		2,831		2,831
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)				
19	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	51	15,575	51	15,575
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
20	RADAR SYSTEMS		8,015		8,015
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
23	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		35,310		35,310
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
29	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	332	652	332	652
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)				
30	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	25	19,807	25	19,807
32	RADIO SYSTEMS	74	36,482	74	36,482
33	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	4	41,295	4	41,295
	TACTICAL VEHICLES				
39	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	32	10,466	32	10,466
41	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		7,642		7,642
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT				
45	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		18,239		18,239

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
46	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		51,359				51,359
47	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		20,247				20,247
49	EOD SYSTEMS	207	362,658			207	362,658
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
50	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		55,500				55,500
52	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		19,100				19,100
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
54	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		15,751				15,751
55	TRAINING DEVICES		3,602				3,602
57	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		15,900				15,900
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**725**	**943,683**			**725**	**943,683**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
35	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES		139,800				139,800
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
55	U–2 MODS		46,800				46,800
63	C–130		11,400				11,400
67	COMPASS CALL MODS		14,000				14,000
68	RC–135		8,000				8,000
75	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS		4,700				4,700
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
81	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		21,900				21,900
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
99	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		59,000				59,000
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**305,600**				**305,600**

	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE				
	CARTRIDGES				
2	CARTRIDGES		13,592		13,592
	BOMBS				
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		23,211		23,211
5	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	1,419	53,923	1,419	53,923
	FLARE, IR MJU–7B				
6	CAD/PAD		2,638		2,638
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,600		2,600
	FUZES				
11	FLARES		11,726		11,726
12	FUZES		8,513		8,513
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**1,419**	**116,203**	**1,419**	**116,203**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
	TACTICAL				
5	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	304	34,350	304	34,350
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**304**	**34,350**	**304**	**34,350**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES				
2	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		2,010		2,010
4	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,675		2,675
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES				
6	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,557		2,557
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
8	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,329		4,329
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT				
9	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU		984		984
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,120		9,120
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS				

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
22	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		5,600				5,600
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
27	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		11,157				11,157
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
49	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		7,000				7,000
53	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		10,654				10,654
	MODIFICATIONS						
54	COMM ELECT MODS		8,000				8,000
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP						
55	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		902				902
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
59	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		60,090				60,090
62	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		9,400				9,400
63	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,175				9,175
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
069A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,672,317				2,672,317
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
71	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		2,300				2,300
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**2,818,270**				**2,818,270**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
15	TELEPORT PROGRAM		5,260				5,260
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
045A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		126,201				126,201
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						

61	MQ–8 UAV		16,500			16,500
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS					
68	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS	4	151		4	151
69	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	41	30,528		41	30,528
77	TACTICAL VEHICLES	54	1,843		54	1,843
82	AUTOMATION SYSTEMS	1	1,000		1	1,000
86	VISUAL AUGMENTATION LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS	12	108		12	108
91	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	31	14,758		31	14,758
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**143**	**196,349**		**143**	**196,349**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND					
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND					
1	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		100,000	–50,000		50,000
	Program reduction			[–50,000]		
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		**100,000**	**–50,000**		**50,000**
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT					
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
999	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT			500,000		500,000
	Program increase			[500,000]		
	TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT			**500,000**		**500,000**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**15,041**	**9,687,241**	**620,400**	**15,041**	**10,307,641**