

FY 2016 Budget Request for Defense Department Replacement Nuclear Delivery Systems and Energy Department Nuclear Weapons Activities

<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2015 appropriation</i>	<i>FY 2016 request</i>	<i>Program Description</i>	<i>Estimated Total Program Cost</i>
Ohio class replacement program	\$1.29 billion	\$1.4 billion (+\$100 million)	Would replace the current fleet of 14 Ohio class submarines with 12 new submarines. The Pentagon's FY 2013 budget request delayed the program by two years meaning the first new submarine won't enter service until 2031.	A December 2014 CBO report estimated the total acquisition cost for the program at over \$110 billion. A 2011 Pentagon estimate put the total life-cycle cost for the program at \$347 billion.
Long-Range Strike Bomber (LRS-B)	\$914 million	\$1.25 billion (+\$332 million)	Would first complement and then replace the B-52, B-1, and B-2 bombers. The current plan has the Air Force procuring 80-100 new bombers that would begin to enter service in the mid-2020s. A nuclear capability is planned for the new bomber but certification for the nuclear mission is not planned until two years after initial operating capability. The FY 2016 request is actually less than last year's projection of \$1.6 billion.	The Pentagon estimates each new bomber will cost \$550 million. Research and development costs could exceed \$30 billion. The CBO attributes 25% of the development cost of the bomber to the nuclear mission.
ICBM Follow-On (GBSD)	\$6.9 million	\$75.2 million (+\$68.3 million)	Would modernize the ICBM-leg of the nuclear triad by examining follow-on options including extending the life of the existing Minuteman III missile beyond 2030 or replacing it with a new ICBM. An analysis of alternatives for the program began in September 2013 and was slated for completion in June 2014.	CBO estimates that modernizing the ICBM leg of the triad (including building a new ICBM) and its associated warheads will cost \$10 billion between FY 2014 and FY2023. A 2014 RAND report estimates the 39-year life-cycle costs of four possible future ICBM options (ranging from sustaining the existing Minuteman III to building a new mobile ICBM) at \$60-\$219 billion.
Air Launched Cruise Missile Follow-On (LRSO)	\$3.4 million	36.6 million (+\$33.2 million)	Would develop a system to replace the nuclear-capable air launched cruise missile. An analysis of alternatives was completed in early 2013. While the FY 2015 budget request deferred program funding by three years, the FY 2016 request speeds up development by two years. Last year's projection for FY 2016 was only \$9.9 million. The funding for the NNSA cruise missile life extension program is \$167 million more than last year's projection.	The Monterrey Institute for International Studies has estimated the cost of the program at \$10-\$20 billion.
Nuclear Capability for F-35A Joint Strike Fighter	\$15.6 million	Not yet available	Would allow the Air Force to retain and forward deploy a dual-capable fighter aircraft, a role currently filled by the F-15E and F-16 in support of NATO commitments. The Air Force plans to provide Block 4A and Block 4B versions of the F-35A with the ability to carry the B61 mod 12 by 2022.	CBO estimates that it would cost about \$350 million to finish developing the modifications to make the F-35 nuclear-capable. This does not include the costs for implementing those modifications, the plan for which is still being developed.
B61 Life Extension Program (tailkit)	\$168.4 million	\$212.1 million (\$43.7 million)	Would provide the B61 mod 12 (a life extension program overseen by NNSA, with a new guided tailkit that would increase the accuracy of the weapon. The Air Force is currently planning to procure over 800 tailkits. The program also supports integration of the mod 12 on existing long-range bombers and short-range fighter aircraft.	The Pentagon estimates the tailkit will cost \$1.1 billion to develop. A 2013 Pentagon report put the total life-cycle cost for the program at \$3.7 billion.
Nuclear Force Improvement Program	\$21.6 million	Not yet available	In the wake of professional and ethical lapses and poor morale in the U.S. nuclear force, Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel announced last November numerous steps intended to fix the problems plaguing the force. Hagel also said DoD will request a 10% annual increase in funding for nuclear weapons over the next five years.	The planned force improvement spending increases could cost \$6-\$7 billion over the next five years.
NNSA Weapons Activities	\$8.18 billion	\$8.85 billion (+\$667 million)	Maintains and enhances the safety, security and reliability of the U.S. nuclear warhead stockpile and its supporting infrastructure. All of the programs listed below are part of the NNSA weapons activities account. The FY 2016 request exceeds the projection of \$8.9 billion for this year in last year's budget because nearly \$250 million in funding for nuclear counterterrorism was moved to a different account.	NNSA's FY 2015 Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan projects at least \$280 billion in spending on weapons activities between FY 2015 and FY 2040.