

---

## In the News

### ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND PUBLIC AFFAIRS (FEB. 29, 2008) ARMY ANNOUNCES ARMY CONTRACTING CAMPAIGN PLAN

Secretary of the Army Pete Geren announced Feb. 29 his Army Contracting Campaign Plan to address findings and recommendations from two previous independent reviews—the Gansler Commission and the Army Contracting Task Force. Under the leadership of Acting Under Secretary of the Army Nelson M. Ford, the ACCP will enable the Secretary of the Army to execute recommended improvements to Army contracting.

The ACCP will continue ongoing efforts to identify and implement needed changes in doctrine, organization, training, leader development, materiel, personnel, and facilities, while coordinating efforts across the Army's force development process. The ACCP will also comply with Congressional reporting requirements outlined in Section 849 (b) (1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Pub. L. 110-181). The ACCP will be used to integrate Army efforts with similar initiatives under the purview of Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Further, Geren recently directed the establishment of the U.S. Army Contracting Command as a major subordinate command of the Army Materiel Command and the realignment of the U.S. Army Contracting Agency under the AMC. This decision immediately implements the Gansler Commission recommendation to restructure Army contracting efforts and assign responsibility to facilitate contracting and contract management in expeditionary and U.S.-based operations.

The ACA presently provides contracting services for installation-level services and supplies, and common-use information technology hardware, software, and services. The realignment of ACA to AMC places the majority of the Army's contracting resources into one Army command, which will provide a full range of contracting services.

The ACC will be a two-star-level command with two one-star-level subordinate commands: an expeditionary contracting command and an installation contracting command. Specifics regarding the new command, its geographic locations, organizational structure, and milestones for staffing these organizations with qualified persons are still being developed.

For further information, contact Department of Army Public Affairs, 703-697-7591 or 5344; or U.S. Army Materiel Command Public Affairs at 703-806-8010.

### ARMY NEWS SERVICE (MARCH 4, 2008) PEO SOLDIER: MODERNIZATION AT GOOD VALUE

*C. Todd Lopez*

WASHINGTON—The Army is now modernizing what soldiers wear, carry, and fight with at a rate faster than at any time in history. “Modernization is occurring at mach speed in the soldier's world,” said Brig. Gen. Robert M. Brown, Program Executive Officer, Soldier, and commanding general, U.S. Army Soldier Systems Center, during a session at the Association of the United States Army's Institute of Land Warfare Winter Symposium and Exposition in Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

#### 400 Programs Under Way

The general said body armor has undergone nine changes in the past four years, while the helmet has undergone four changes in the past three years. And today, PEO Soldier is fielding a brigade with the 4th Infantry Division with a computer chip in the helmet to monitor the effects of blast and overpressure on mild traumatic brain injury.

“We are modernizing the soldier faster than we have at any time in the U.S. Army,” he said. “It is our belief that the U.S. Army soldier today is the most survivable, lethal, capable soldier in the history of warfare. We need to keep it that way, and we need to improve it.”

PEO Soldier views the soldier as part of an integrated system, and ensures that the soldier and everything he or she wears or carries works together as part of that integrated system.

While the technology PEO delivers to the soldier is groundbreaking, so is the amount of money being spent to put that technology in soldiers' hands. Brown told generals and defense industry insiders at the symposium that he believed the cost of equipping soldiers with the best technology is worth it.

“We are spending much more on the U.S. soldier than we ever have before—is that a good value?” Brown asked. “If you believe that fewer soldiers, doing more, and coming home alive is a good value—then this is a bargain. It'd be a bargain at two or three times the price.”

Some of the 400 programs championed by PEO Soldier include the Land Warrior system, the body armor program, and the M-4 Carbine rifle.

## ***In the News***

### **M-4 Carbine**

“All the scientific test results show the M-4 Carbine is a world-class weapon,” said Brown. “And in many applications, it performs better than its peers.”

The M-4 Carbine can replace such weapons as the M-3 submachine gun, the M-9 pistol, and the M-16A2 rifle. The weapon brings improved firepower compared to the weapons it replaces, and is a pound lighter than the M-16.

Brown said surveys on the M4 show soldiers have high confidence in the weapon and that it will remain the Army’s primary weapon until the technologies PEO Soldier is currently working on have matured.

The general said the rifle has undergone some 68 substantive changes since it was first fielded: “The M-4 Carbine is not your dad’s M-4 Carbine.”

### **Body Armor**

For protecting soldiers, PEO Soldier has brought on what Brown says is the best armor available today.

“We know that because we live-fire test every single solution,” he said. “We don’t give a solution to the soldier unless it’s passed the live-fire test. We know it because it’s battle-proven. We have vignette upon vignette of the body armor performing well beyond specification. And we have continually improved that body armor.”

The most recent improvements to soldier’s body armor include the fielding of the improved outer tactical vest. The side-opening vest increases soft ballistic coverage and adjusts for better comfort. The vest also includes an emergency quick-release that allows soldiers to remove the vest in emergency situations.

Depending on the size of the vest, the weight of the body armor system has been decreased by as much as 3.8 pounds.

### **Land Warrior System**

Finally, Brown discussed the Land Warrior system, an integrated digital fighting system that improves situational awareness and survivability for dismounted soldiers. The system provides digital imagery and global positioning system (GPS) location information that provides soldiers exact locations of enemies or improvised explosive devices.



The Land Warrior system is an integrated digital fighting system that improves situational awareness and survivability for dismounted soldiers. The system provides digital imagery and GPS location information that provides soldiers exact locations of enemies or improvised explosive devices. Land Warrior has gone to battle in spring 2007 with the 4th Battalion, 9th Infantry Regiment, 4th (Stryker) Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division. Before being fielded in Iraq, the system’s weight was reduced by 7 pounds.

Photo by PEO Soldier

## In the News

The Land Warrior system was sent into battle in spring 2007 with the 4th Battalion, 9th Infantry Regiment, 4th (Stryker) Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division.

“The 4-9th ‘Manchus’ requested to take this system with them to Iraq in their deployment,” Brown said. “As it turns out, they have been very pleased with the performance of that system, and I think one of the things that pleases them most is the rapid improvement in the system.”

In September 2006, about half a year before the Manchus prepared to deploy, the Ground Warrior system underwent user testing. Then, the system weighed 17 pounds.

“That’s far too much for a dismounted infantryman,” Brown said. “But with feedback from the Manchus, we were able to knock that weight down in a very short period of time from 17 to 10 pounds. They took it into battle; the reliability was very high, and they found out they like all the situational awareness capabilities it brought to the table.”

Even as the Manchus used the system in Iraq, PEO Solider worked to further reduce the weight of the system. The weight has been dropped to seven pounds, and Brown said they expect to reduce it even further.

Brown also said other Army units are interested in the system, and the Army is working with the Marine Corps with the expectation they too will be interested in the future.

### AIR FORCE PRINT NEWS (MARCH 5, 2008) **REPLACE AGING AIRCRAFT OR RISK IRRELEVANCY, GENERAL SAYS**

*Staff Sgt. Jason Lake, USAF*

MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, Ala.—The commander of Air Force Materiel Command, which is responsible for delivering war-winning capabilities to the rest of the Air Force, said during a visit to Air University here that Air Force officials must develop and buy new aircraft or risk the Service becoming irrelevant.

The Air Force must be careful not to be out-classed in the next war, said Gen. Bruce Carlson shortly after speaking with Air War College and Squadron Officer School students Feb. 27 about

the importance of recapitalizing the Air Force’s aging fleet to maintain air dominance.

“Soon we could be flying against aircraft and air defense systems that our older aircraft were not intended to fly against,” Carlson said. “And if we don’t have the freedom to operate in hostile territories, we risk fighting the next conflict on our home territory.”

The recapitalization crisis Air Force leaders see today is a side effect of the United States winning the Cold War, Carlson said. After the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, the United States took on the title of the world’s only remaining superpower. As a result, national priorities shifted away from defense projects.

“The decision was made to reduce the defense budget for more domestic priorities because there was no longer a



Gen. Bruce Carlson, commander of Air Force Materiel Command, says he will work to “reinvigorate” the acquisition process and to focus on development, acquisition, and sustainment programs that will follow the life span of Air Force airframes from cradle to grave.  
U.S. Air force photo

threat,” the general explained. “This is when we went on what has been called a ‘procurement holiday.’”

Unlike Army and Marine Corps assets that were able to reconstitute after Operation Desert Storm in 1991, Carlson said the Air Force has remained in an almost constant state of “war” for more than 17 years.

Leading up to Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003, Air Force aircraft were charged with enforcing the no-fly zones in Iraq for more than a decade as part of operations Northern and Southern Watch. Additionally, Air Force aircraft also spearheaded NATO’s strategic bombing campaign against the Serbian government in the Balkans in the late 1990s.

In recent years, Carlson said, required maintenance on the F-15 Eagle has skyrocketed to 600-700 hours more than official estimates. Last November, one of the older F-15 models assigned to the Missouri Air National Guard broke in half during a routine training mission, prompting the Air Force to ground the entire F-15 fleet for several weeks.

“We’re getting into unknown territory because we’ve been flying airframes longer than expected,” Carlson said. “We didn’t build these aircraft to last this long, and we didn’t expect to see corrosion of this magnitude. The F-15 is expected to remain in service until it’s more than 40 years old. At this rate, maintenance costs are going to kill us.”

In an Associated Press report last week, one senior Air Force official talked about the serious effects caused by the high operations tempo and G-force stress on older fighters. Gen. John Corley, Air Combat Command commander, said flight hours on aircraft like the F-15 could be compared to “dog years.”

As China continues to modernize its military forces and Russian aircraft continue to test American responses near Alaska and Japan, the Air Force is at a critical point in maintaining air, space, and cyberspace dominance, Carlson said.

“There are others out there who are trying to build up their airpower so they can exert their will over us,” he said.

On the aerial refueling front, Air Force leaders made a major announcement Feb. 29 that Northrop Grumman had been awarded a contract to produce up to 179 tanker aircraft at a cost of approximately \$35 billion. The new KC-45A aerial refueling aircraft is slated to replace the 50-

year-old KC-135 Stratotanker that currently provides air bridge capabilities for the entire Air Force inventory.

“It is the first step in our critical commitment to recapitalize our aging fleet to move, supply, and position assets anywhere. In this global Air Force business, the critical element for air bridge, global intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, and global strike is the tanker,” said Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force Gen. Duncan McNabb in making the announcement.

“The tanker is the number one procurement priority for us right now,” McNabb said during the announcement of the tanker contract award. “Buying the new KC-45A is a major step forward and another demonstration of our commitment to recapitalizing our Eisenhower-era inventory of these critical national assets. Today is not just important for the Air Force, however. It’s important for the entire joint military team and important for our coalition partners as well. The KC-45A will revolutionize our ability to employ tankers and will ensure the Air Force’s future ability to provide our nation with truly global vigilance, reach, and power.”

While senior Air Force officials continue to ask Congress for approximately \$20 billion in additional funding over the next few years, Carlson said he will be working to reinvigorate the acquisition process and to focus on development, acquisition, and sustainment programs that will follow the life span of Air Force airframes from cradle to grave.

*Lake writes for Air University Public Affairs.*

### ARMY NEWS SERVICE (MARCH 11, 2008) **JLTV ONE STEP CLOSER TO ENTERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT**

*David M. Branham*

The U.S. Army and Marine Corps co-hosted a three-day preproposal conference at Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mich., Feb. 19-21, to inform industry of the U.S. government’s acquisition strategy for the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle Program.

JLTV is a joint U.S. Army/U.S. Marine Corps program with the U.S. Army designated as the lead Service.

The conference came two weeks on the heels of the U.S. Army’s Feb. 5 release of a request for proposal that invited suppliers, through a full and open competition process, to submit proposals for the development of a JLTV Family of Vehicles. The JLTV FoV and companion trailers will

## In the News

be capable of performing multiple mission roles and will be designed to provide protected, sustained, networked mobility for personnel and payloads across the full range of military operations.

JLTV provides a vehicle platform that will utilize, to the maximum degree possible, solutions and technology being developed in the Army's Future Combat Systems program, the Tank Automotive Research Development and Engineering Center, the Army Research Lab, and the Office of Naval Research as well as commercial industry advances. The JLTV FoV will be used by all U.S. Services. Several foreign governments have already expressed a strong interest in joining the development of the JLTV vehicles.

The conference included numerous presenters from all program areas of expertise who provided industry with detailed guidance on how to craft their proposal to address the four important evaluation factors (technical, logistics commonality, cost, and past performance/small business participation).

Additionally, the government shared lessons learned from various research efforts and displayed vehicles developed under the Army's Future Tactical Truck System Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration and the Office of Naval Research Combat Tactical Vehicle Technology Demonstrator.

Over 200 industry representatives attended the conference, along with some international attendees.

"Today was a great meeting at Selfridge, and we are excited to be part of this program," said Kenneth G. Juergens, JLTV program director, Northrop Grumman/Oshkosh

Truck Corporation Team, who traveled to the conference from Oshkosh, Wis.

Northrop Grumman and Oshkosh Corporation announced a teaming arrangement last fall.

To the extent that Army and Marine Corps are aware, several industry teaming efforts have been formed to compete for JLTV contracts along with a few companies whose partnering plans are yet unannounced. They are:

- Northrop Grumman and Oshkosh Corp
- General Tactical Vehicle, a joint venture between AM General and General Dynamics Land Systems



The Office of Naval Research Combat Tactical Vehicle (Technology Demonstrator) rests on its hydraulic system at the shipping clearance height of 76.4 inches at the Nevada Automotive Testing Center (NATC), outside Carson City, Nev. NATC and military contractors displayed possible vehicle replacements for the Marine Corps to the motor transportation community on Feb. 7. U.S. Marine Corps photo by Cpl. Eric C. Schwartz, USMC

- Lockheed Martin and BAE (formerly Armor Holdings)
- BAE Systems and International Military and Government, LLC, an affiliate of Navistar International Corporation (International Military and Government LLC is a wholly owned subsidiary of International Truck and Engine Corporation)
- Boeing, Textron, and SAIC

---

## In the News

- DRS Sustainment Systems Inc. and Force Protection Inc.

"I personally got a lot out of this," said Michael Franklin, a member of the BAE Systems Team, who traveled from just outside Los Angeles to attend the conference. "You can only get so much information from a [U.S. Army JLTV] Web site," said Franklin.

"This was an important investment of time for key industry representatives to come to Selfridge in order to fully understand the entire scope and direction of the JLTV effort and hear the government's lessons learned during more than three years of precursor research and development efforts," said Col. John "Steve" Myers, project manager, Joint Combat Support Systems.

Asked what's next in the JLTV way ahead, Myers indicated the government will convene an evaluation board in April to review industry proposals to the JLTV RFP.

"The board, composed of subject matter experts from across the Department of Defense, will evaluate submitted proposals, and we expect to make three contract awards based on best value to the government in July 2008," said Myers. "This will then launch the planned contract performance of the technology development phase wherein the JLTV prototypes will be developed and tested."

A JLTV system development demonstration phase is currently planned to begin in 2011, at which point two contractors will complete the design and development of the JLTV FoV and companion trailers and ultimately compete to produce and field multiple JLTV variants.

"Pre-proposal conferences like this one are essential in ensuring that we are as open and transparent as we possibly can be," stated Lt. Col. Wolfgang Petermann, JLTV Army product manager.

"Every large, medium, and small business that was represented here now goes away with the same amount of information knowing it is a level playing field," said Petermann.

"It is exciting to see how far we have already come in this program," said Lt. Col. Ben Garza, U.S. Marine Corps JLTV program manager. "We have an achievable schedule, and the overwhelming turnout by industry is indicative of how successful this program is going to be."

For more information about JLTV, contact Don Jarosz, TACOM LCMC Public Affairs at 586-574-8820, or David M. Branham, PEO Land Systems, Marine Corps, at 703-432-4956, or <[www.marcorsyscom.usmc.mil/peolandsystems/](http://www.marcorsyscom.usmc.mil/peolandsystems/)> .

*Branham is with PEO Land Systems, Marine Corps.*

### PROJ MGR, DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS & ARMY TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS (PM DCATS) **PD SCS UPGRADES SATELLITE 'HOTLINE' LINK BETWEEN U.S. AND RUSSIAN PRESIDENTS**

*Stephen Larsen*

FORT DETRICK, Md.—The Detrick Earth Station (DES), which provides satellite communications capabilities including the Direct Communications Link (DCL), commonly known as the Washington-Moscow hotline, between the presidents of the United States and Russia, now has significantly enhanced capabilities, which should extend its life for another 10 years. This is thanks to a modernization and upgrade project completed in December 2007 by a multi-agency team led by the product director, Satellite Communications Systems (PD SCS), part of the Army's Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems' (PEO EIS) Project Manager, Defense Communications and Army Transmission Systems (PM DCATS).

In addition to the DCL, the DES provides a number of other dedicated, secure, and reliable satellite communications links between the United States and Russia, including a link for the U.S. State Department's Nuclear Risk Reduction Center, which is used to exchange information in support of arms control treaties and security-building agreements; a link supporting the U.S. Strategic Command's Joint Data Exchange Center initiative to share early warning information on missile and space launches to reduce the risk that a test, experiment, or space launch could be misread as a ballistic missile attack; and links for the White House Communications Agency and the Secretary of Defense.

"Thanks to the modernization and upgrade, the DES has a multi-carrier, multi-satellite capability, while before they had a point-to-point, single-satellite, single-carrier system," said Dan Singleton, project leader for PD SCS.

According to Vern Combs, the contracting officer representative for the project for the U.S. Army Network Enterprise Technology Command/9<sup>th</sup> Army Signal Command's (NETCOM/9<sup>th</sup> ASC) 302<sup>nd</sup> Signal Battalion, the upgrade has

more than doubled the station's communications capacity. He explained that before the upgrade, the DES was only capable of transmitting and receiving one carrier on one polarization, either left-hand circular polarization or right-hand circular polarization. Now, he said, both terminals can transmit or receive multiple carriers using both LHCP and RHCP at the same time. Translated, this means that the two terminals can both transmit or receive at the same frequency at the same time without interfering with each other—which means more than double the throughput, or the amount of digital data the two terminals can transmit or receive per time unit.

Chris Potter of NETCOM's 21<sup>st</sup> Signal Brigade said because the upgrade employed state-of-the-art, supportable equipment, it will help to ensure the system's availability. "The DCL is not a normal, run-of-the-mill system," he said. "The purpose of this system is to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war; the customer is the president of the United States. The availability must be 99.99 percent."

The 302<sup>nd</sup> Signal Battalion hosted a ribbon cutting ceremony on March 26, and Lt. Col. Marie Grimmer, commander of the 302<sup>nd</sup> Signal Battalion, noted that the project was originally scheduled to take two years and that the team completed it in one year, replacing unsupportable equipment with state-of-the-art, depot-supported electronics of the same type employed at one of the DoD teleport sites or a commercial facility and increasing capacity. She added that now one of the two DES terminals can perform the current DCL mission, freeing up the second terminal for other missions, as needed.

Grimmer also thanked Honeywell Technology Solutions, which has operated the DCL for 28 out of the last 30 years. "The DCL has been operating with an unprecedented reliability rate for more than 30 years," said Grimmer. "There has not been an outage of the DCL attributed to the DES since 1991, the last upgrade. That didn't just happen; it took the commitment, the dedication, the professionalism of a team of experts."

Grimmer noted that when the twin towers of the World Trade Center collapsed on 9/11, commercial overseas communications lines via undersea cables were severed, but the DCL remained in operation.

"For those of you that were unaware, after 9/11, the first phone call from a foreign leader to President Bush was processed through the DCL from President Putin," said Grimmer. "This is truly an example of the DCL's motto in action: 'Peace through communications.'"

Media contact is Stephen Larsen, 732-427-6756 or [stephen.larsen@us.army.mil](mailto:stephen.larsen@us.army.mil).

### U.S. ARMY DEVELOPMENTAL TEST COMMAND PUBLIC AFFAIRS (FEB. 6, 2008) **TESTING TO MAINTAIN FUTURE MILITARY EFFECTIVENESS—THE COLD REGIONS TEST CENTER**

Linda Spears

Terrorists today pay little attention to national borders or world environments. As such, areas that were once considered too extreme for large-scale military operations are now areas of military engagement. Extremes such as high temperature, low humidity, and heavy dust are now normal military operating environments.

The Developmental Test Command (DTC) supports warfighter by maintaining test centers located in and representative of the four main climatic regions of the world: polar, humid temperate, dry, and humid tropic. DTC's natural environment test centers are analogs to broadly defined environmental regions of the world. The Cold Regions Test Center (CRTC) is located in the polar climatic region and represents the world's cold regions.

Cold regions are generally cool, with minimum winter temperatures below -46°C (-50° F). Soils are seasonally frozen and may contain areas of permanently frozen soil (permafrost) in the high latitudes of the polar region. Surface and subsurface drainage can be poor, creating muddy summertime conditions and numerous lakes, ponds, peat bogs, and swamps. Where permafrost exists, vegetation consists of low-growing grasses and brush. In other areas, vegetation consists of needle leaf forests and open woodlands.

Developed as a site for testing equipment for winter battlefield conditions, CRTC is unique among the Army's test facilities in that it provides a testing environment that combines the interacting effects of climate, terrain, and vegetation found in a cold region.

After difficulties encountered in World War II, the Army recognized that operating in a cold environment required dedicated testing and training ranges to develop soldier skills as well as test equipment that performs well in the environment. Today, CRTC provides cold weather expertise and a wide array of natural environmental test services for the materiel and doctrinal developers of Army equipment and munitions. It is also used by other government agencies, universities, and commercial companies to address the design and performance of items in a cold

## In the News

environment. CRTC conducts technical tests of equipment in operational conditions that can represent temperate and high altitude winters as well as the cold operating environment.

To take advantage of the natural climate and related environmental features, DTC developed facilities and instrumentation at CRTC to provide support and access to the more than 670,000 acres of range, and associated controlled airspace. This infrastructure leverages environmental conditions that encompass the extreme cold found in a cold region, the more moderate winter conditions generally found in a temperate area, and summertime moderate conditions with close to 20 hours of daylight. Support facilities include an administrative and test complex with barracks for 72 military personnel, a dining facility, and staff offices, as well as the staff and shops for instrumentation, audiovisual, technical editing, network operations, heavy and light equipment maintenance, and fabrication.

A 3.2 mile asphalt test track, paved slopes, skid and lateral acceleration pads, as well as maintenance and office buildings make up the mobility test complex. The fenced and secure area also has cross country and secondary roads providing a full complement of mobility courses for winter reliability, road handling, and brake testing.

Among the many systems tested at CRTC are those that demonstrate the Army's commitment to being prepared for conflict in any environment, including the Stryker Nuclear, Chemical, Biological Reconnaissance Vehicle (NBCRV); Stryker Mobile Gun System (MGS); Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GLMRS); and the Excalibur 155mm artillery projectile.

Testing for the cold environment means operating the vehicle in ambient air temperatures ranging from -42° to 67° F over a variety of paved and unpaved roads and



Soldiers train on artillery in the winter at the Cold Regions Test Center (CRTC) at Fort Greely, Alaska. This Developmental Test Command center experiences more consistently frigid days in the winter than any region of the lower 48 states, making CRTC a good place for winter training as well as testing.

Photo courtesy of CRTC

cross country trails in typical winter conditions of snow and ice, accumulating more than 4,000 miles. During these test miles, all subsystems—e.g., safety, ergonomics, automotive performance, position/navigation capabilities, mobility, reliability, the remote weapon station, and the system sensor suite, to name a few—are tested and assessed for cold weather performance. When necessary, CRTC assists the program manager with the development of design changes to improve the system performance. These changes, whether simple procedural alterations, complex engineering modifications, or changes in tactics, techniques and procedures, increase the overall effectiveness of the system.

Among the most advanced weapons are those that use inertial guidance systems, have integrated global positioning systems, increased range, and precision accuracy like the GLMRS. This system has proved itself in desert testing and operation and it continues to be proven through cold weather testing. The GLMRS was tested at CRTC in the winter of 2006. During this test, six rockets were launched in temperatures between -23 F and -18 F. The effects of the rocket and its warhead in both proximity and point detonate fuse modes, the warhead effectiveness, and the

## In the News

rocket and guidance performance were characterized in the cold environment.

The Army's weapon systems are developed to perform in any environment. This level of performance is critical to protecting American freedoms by maintaining the ability to take the fight anywhere in the world. As a natural environment test center, CRTC assesses performance of military equipment in the cold environment. Through the work of CRTC and the other natural environment test centers, DTC ensures that Army systems are exposed to the natural environment before being relied on to support the soldier's mission in the world.

*Spears is the Developmental Test Command's chief of business and technology*

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NEWS RELEASE (APRIL 7, 2008) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RELEASES SELECTED ACQUISITION REPORTS

The Department of Defense (DoD) has released details on major defense acquisition program cost, schedule, and performance changes since the September 2007 reporting period. This information is based on the Selected Acquisition Reports submitted to the Congress for the December 2007 reporting period.

SARs summarize the latest estimates of cost, schedule, and performance status. These reports are prepared annually in conjunction with the president's budget. Subsequent quarterly exception reports are required only for those programs experiencing unit cost increases of at least 15 percent or schedule delays of at least six months. Quarterly SARs are also submitted for initial reports, final reports, and for programs that are rebaselined at major milestone decisions.

The total program cost estimates provided in the SARs include research and development, procurement, military construction, and acquisition-related operation and maintenance (except for pre-Milestone B programs, which are limited to development costs pursuant to 10 U.S.C. §2432). Total program costs reflect actual costs to date as well as future anticipated costs. All estimates include anticipated inflation allowances.

The current estimate (shown above) of program acquisition costs for programs covered by SARs for the prior reporting period (September 2007) was \$1,702,133.0 million. After subtracting the costs for two final reports

	Current Estimate (\$ in millions)
<b>September 2007 (94 programs)</b>	<b>\$1,702,133.0</b>
Less final reports on two programs (EELV and WIN-T)	-52,090.3
Plus two new programs (WIN-T Increment 1 and WIN-T Increment 2)	+ 7,786.7
<b>September 2007 Adjusted (94 programs)</b>	<b>\$ 1,657,829.4</b>
Less one program to reflect the consolidation of Chem Demil-CMA Newport into Chem Demil-CMA report	0.0
<b>Changes Since Last Report</b>	
Economic	\$ -4,300.5
Quantity	-7,765.0
Schedule	-1,717.9
Engineering	+ 1,856.6
Estimating	+ 15,384.9 <sup>1</sup>
Other	+ 765.1
Support	-19,079.1 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Net Cost Change</b>	<b>\$ -14,855.9</b>
<b>December 2007 (93 programs)</b>	<b>\$1,642,973.5</b>

<sup>1</sup>The large increase in Estimating and the large decrease in Support include an F-35 transfer of \$9,151.0 million, primarily to recategorize Diminishing Manufacturing Sources and Technology Refresh costs from Support to Estimating (nonrecurring flyaway).

for Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) and Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-T) and adding the costs for two new programs, WIN-T Increment 1 and WIN-T Increment 2, from the September 2007 reporting period, the adjusted current estimate of program acquisition costs is \$1,657,829.4 million. For the December 2007 reporting period, Chemical Demilitarization-Chemical Materials Agency Newport (Chem Demil-CMA Newport) was consolidated into Chem Demil-CMA.

## In the News

For the December 2007 reporting period, there was a net cost decrease of \$14,855.9 million or -0.9 percent for the programs that have reported previously. The cost decrease was due primarily to a net decrease in planned quantities (-\$7,765.0 million), the application of lower escalation rates (-\$4,300.5 million), and a net decrease in support requirements (-\$9,928.1 million). These decreases were partially offset by additional engineering changes (hardware/ software) (+ \$1,856.6 million) and a net increase in program cost estimates (+ \$6,233.9 million). Further details of the most significant changes are summarized below by program.

There are three programs with Nunn-McCurdy unit cost breaches to their current Acquisition Program Baseline: AEHF (Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellite), JAVELIN, and JTRS GMR (Joint Tactical Radio System Ground Mobile Radios). That is, the program acquisition or average procurement unit costs for these programs have increased by 15 percent or more to their current APB. For significant Nunn-McCurdy breaches, notification and unit cost breach information will be provided to the Congress, but there are no certification requirements.

### New SARs (As of December 2007)

The Department of Defense has submitted initial SARs for the following programs (see top chart) for the December 2007 reporting period. These reports do not represent cost growth. Baselines established on these programs will be the point from which future changes will be measured.

### Summary Explanations of Significant SAR Cost Changes as of Dec. 31, 2007

#### Army

**ATIRCM/CMWS (Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasure/Common Missile Warning System)**—Program costs decreased \$851.0 million (-15.0 percent) from \$5,666.9 million to \$4,815.9 million, due primarily to quantity decreases of 634 B-kits from 1,710 to 1,076 B-kits (-\$675.4 million), reduced support costs resulting from the B-kit quantity reduction (-\$186.5 million), economic savings from completing the buy of A-kits by fiscal 2010 (-\$52.2 million), and unit cost reductions from accelerating the buy of CMWS mission kits (-\$52.2 million). These savings were partially offset by increased costs of adding a fifth Electro-Optic Missile Sensor to each CMWS (+ \$181.6 million) and supporting integration of Inertial Navigation System data into CMWS in fixed wing aircraft applications (+ \$14.7 million).

Program	Current Estimate (\$ in Millions)
LAIRCM (Large Altitude Infrared Countermeasures)	\$ 366.0
MRAP (Mine Resistant Ambush Protected)	\$ 22,415.0
SBSS B10 (Space Based Space Surveillance Block 10)	\$ 823.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$23,604.9</b>

**FBCB2 (Force XXI Battle Command Brigade and Below)**—Program costs increased \$685.0 million (+ 25.5 percent) from \$2,686.1 million to \$3,371.1 million, due primarily to a quantity increase of 28,895 systems from 44,568 to 73,463 systems to support Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom (+ \$683.0 million) and associated schedule, engineering, and estimating allocations\* (+ \$99.0 million). There was an additional increase in other support for retrofit of Type I encryption for the increased quantities (+ \$114.1 million). These increases were partially offset by lower unit costs from beneficial contract pricing of the increased quantities (-\$131.3 million) and lower estimates for the aviation A-kits (i.e., modification kits) based on current contract data (-\$45.7 million).

**FCS (Future Combat System)**—Program costs decreased \$2,609.9 million (-1.6 percent) from \$161,930.1 million to \$159,320.2 million, due primarily to the application of revised escalation indices (-\$1,331.0 million) and a correction of previously reported costs that were overstated due to the use of incorrect escalation indices (-\$913.2 million). There were additional decreases in other support (-\$190.6 million) and Congressional statutory reductions and budget decrements (-\$146.5 million).

**GMLRS (Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System)**—Program costs decreased \$764.2 million (-11.3 percent) from \$6,772.5 million to \$6,008.3 million, due primarily to lower estimates of hardware costs for the unitary variant at the production decision (Milestone C) (-\$496.6 million) and an acceleration in the procurement buy profile (-\$68.9 million). Because of the shorter buy schedule, there were lower estimates for systems engineering/program management costs (-\$84.5 million), engineering services (-\$44.8 million), and government production verification testing (-\$19.4 million).

---

## In the News

**LUH (Light Utility Helicopter)**—Program costs increased \$208.4 million (+ 11.1 percent) from \$1,881.8 million to \$2,090.2 million, due primarily to a quantity increase of 23 aircraft from 322 to 345 aircraft (\$139.3 million). There was an additional cost increase for modifications to address issues identified during the initial operational test (+ \$171.1 million). These modifications included ARC-231 secure radios and cabin ventilation kits for all 345 aircraft, engine inlet (air) filters for 66 aircraft, and medical evacuation kits for 84 aircraft.

**STRYKER**—Program costs increased by \$2,560.2 million (+ 19.5 percent) from \$13,130.9 million to \$15,691.1 million, due primarily to a quantity increase of 640 vehicles from 2,887 to 3,527 vehicles (+ \$1,907.2 million) and associated schedule, engineering, and estimating allocations\* (+ \$621.8 million), and spares and support associated with the quantity increase (+ \$425.1 million). There were additional increases for survivability enhancements (+ \$502.6 million), revised testing and management costs (+ \$375.7 million), and updated MILCON estimates (+ \$340.9 million). These increases were partially offset by a change in the mix of models procured and new cost estimates (-\$797.1 million) and removal of Stryker Product Improvement Program funding (-\$816.0 million).

### Navy

**DDG 1000**—Program costs decreased \$7,135.4 million (-19.8 percent) from \$36,022.1 million to \$28,886.7 million, due primarily to a quantity decrease of 3 ships from 10 to 7 ships (-\$8,495.0 million) and revised estimates for budget reductions and inflation impacts on future ships (-\$275.8 million). These decreases were partially offset by increases in fiscal year 2009 to fully fund ships 5-7 (+ \$693.6 million), quantity allocations\* for schedule, engineering, and estimating (+ \$603.7 million), additional funding for the Advanced Gun System Pallets and Sea Strike capabilities (+ \$308.3 million), and the application of revised escalation indices (+ \$291.0 million).

**LCS (Littoral Combat Ship)**—Program costs increased \$909.7 million (+ 46.9 percent) from \$1,938.9 million to \$2,848.6 million, due primarily to a revised estimate in Seaframe pricing that reflects substantial cost growth and post delivery work (+ \$496.1 million) and a revised estimate for mission module development and phasing due to maturation of the definition of the mission modules (+ \$271.2 million). Costs also increased due to a lengthening of the Flight 0 schedule to incorporate additional effort (+ \$71.3 million), a revised estimate for program development of Flight 0 and Flight 0 + planning and ex-

ecution (+ \$42.3 million), and additional scope for mission module development (+ \$40.7 million).

**SSN 774 (Virginia Class)**—Program costs decreased by \$1,043.0 million (-1.1 percent) from \$93,008.2 million to \$91,965.2 million, due primarily to a lower estimate for labor and material costs (-\$773.7 million) and an acceleration of the procurement buy profile that moved the fiscal year 2020 ship up to fiscal year 2111 (-\$281.2 million).

**T-AKE (Dry Cargo/Ammunition Ship)**—Program costs increased by \$1,086.4 million (+ 23.5 percent) from \$4,628.8 million to \$5,715.2 million, due primarily to the addition of one ship from 11 to 12 ships (+ \$471.0 million), associated outfitting and post delivery costs (+ \$84.5 million), and cost growth on previous ships (+ \$520.6 million).

### Air Force

**AEHF (Advanced Extremely High Frequency)**—Program costs increased \$940.5 million (+ 14.6 percent) from \$6,421.5 million to \$7,362.0 million, due primarily to a quantity increase of one satellite from three to four satellites (+ \$946.0 million). Congress appropriated advance procurement for Space Vehicle 4 (SV-4) in the fiscal year 2008 Appropriations Act. The Department added SV-4 full procurement in fiscal year 2010, with a launch capability targeted in fiscal year 2014.

**C-130J**—Program costs increased \$3,958.2 million (+ 49.0 percent) from \$8,071.1 million to \$12,029.3 million, due primarily to a quantity increase of 52 aircraft from 82 to 134 aircraft (+ \$2,937.8 million) and associated estimating and schedule allocations\* (+ \$399.6 million). There were additional increases in initial spares (+ \$85.7 million) and other support costs (+ \$546.9 million) associated with the higher aircraft quantity. These increases were partially offset by decreases from the acceleration of the procurement buy profile (-\$18.1 million) and withholds for higher Air Force priorities and programing changes (-\$12.6 million).

**C-5 RERP (Reliability Enhancement and Re-engineing Program)**—Program costs decreased \$6,375.3 million (-36.4 percent) from \$17,506.2 million to \$11,130.9 million, due primarily to net reductions in the Air Force cost estimate for equipment (-\$3,332.0 million), installation (-\$1,602.2 million), engineering change order estimates (-\$505.5 million), and government-furnished equipment (-\$210.2 million). Additionally, program costs decreased due to the application of revised escalation indices (-\$41.0 mil-

---

## In the News

lion), a decrease in advance procurement costs (-\$192.1 million), and decreases in initial spares (-\$414.2 million) and other support and training costs (-\$417.6 million).

**FAB-T (Family of Advanced Beyond Line-of-Sight Terminals)**—Program costs increased \$454.8 million (+ 14.4 percent) from \$3,167.4 million to \$3,622.2 million, due primarily to a revised cost estimate resulting from analysis by the Office of the Secretary of Defense Cost Analysis Improvement Group (+ \$348.8 million). Costs also increased due to a net quantity increase of 6 terminals from 216 to 222 terminals (+ \$44.7 million), adjustments in real and predicated escalation (+ \$26.6 million), an increase in initial spares (+ \$25.5 million), and a net stretch-out of the procurement buy profile (+ \$9.2 million).

**NAVSTAR GPS (Global Positioning System) User Equipment**—Program costs increased \$718.4 million (+ 52.2 percent) from \$1,375.3 million to \$2,093.7 million due to an increase to allow for continuation of a multi-vendor strategy through delivery of prototype cards and to facilitate transitioning the prototype program into a full development/production program focusing on integration of military code (M-Code)-capable receivers into Service-nominated lead platforms.

**SBIRS (Space Based Infrared Systems) High**—Program costs increased \$1,675.0 million (+ 17.0 percent) from \$9,879.5 million to \$11,554.5 million, due primarily to a quantity increase of one Geosynchronous Earth Orbit (GEO) satellite (+ \$821.6 million) from three to four GEO satellites and to fully fund the latest Office of the Secretary of Defense Cost Analysis Improvement Group cost estimate (+ \$866.1 million), which includes increased costs for flight software system schedule slips and follow-on production efforts for host support, launch support, and other government costs.

### DoD

**Chem Demil-CMA (Chemical Demilitarization—Chemical Materials Agency)**—Program costs decreased \$1,220.5 million (-4.3 percent) from \$28,643.1 million to \$27,422.6 million, due primarily to adjustments to disposal facility schedules to reflect the latest operational processing rates and reduced closure durations for sites where secondary wastes can be shipped offsite or destroyed during operations (-\$1,138.3 million), and the application of revised escalation indices (-\$127.9 million).

**F-35 (Joint Strike Fighter)**—Program costs decreased by \$981.3 million (-0.3 percent) from \$299,824.1 million to \$298,842.8 million, due primarily to the application of revised escalation indices (-\$1,955.8 million), lower material estimates because of prime contractor's material agreements (-\$1,650.6 million), and incorporation of revised prime/subcontractor labor rates (-\$879.4 million). There was an additional reduction for a revised estimate of support costs (-\$7,445.0 million). These decreases were partially offset by higher estimates for elements of procurement nonrecurring costs (+ \$4,369.0 million), an adjustment to reflect manufacturing actuals for the system demonstration and development flight test articles (+ \$3,849.9 million), and a revised propulsion estimate to include additional hardware and increased lift fan cost (+ \$2,769.1 million). Overall, it should be noted that the Nunn-McCurdy unit costs are stable relative to the current and original baseline estimates.

**JTRS HMS (Joint Tactical Radio System Handheld, Man-pack, and Small Form Fit)**—Program costs decreased \$8,421.7 million (-71.4 percent) from \$11,788.6 million to \$3,366.9 million, due primarily to a quantity decrease of 232,963 radios from 328,924 to 95,961 radios (-\$5,444.4 million), a reduction in costs because of a change in the type of radios purchased (i.e., change in model mix) (-\$2,554.7 million), and a decrease in initial spares and other support associated with the reduced quantities (-\$842.2 million). These decreases were partially offset by the addition of porting efforts for the Mobile User Objective System waveform (+ \$219.3 million) and a net stretchout of the procurement buy profile (+ \$157.6 million).

\*Note: Quantity changes are estimated based on the original SAR baseline cost-quantity relationship. Cost changes since the original baseline are separately categorized as schedule, engineering, or estimating allocations. The total impact of a quantity change is the identified quantity change plus all associated allocations.