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Summary

The current and planned size and composition of the Navy, the annual rate of Navy ship procurement, the prospective affordability of the Navy’s shipbuilding plans, and the capacity of the U.S. shipbuilding industry to execute the Navy’s shipbuilding plans have been oversight matters for the congressional defense committees for many years.

In December 2016, the Navy released a force-structure goal that calls for achieving and maintaining a fleet of 355 ships of certain types and numbers. The 355-ship goal was made U.S. policy by Section 1025 of the FY2018 National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 2810/P.L. 115-91 of December 12, 2017). The Navy and the Department of Defense (DOD) have been working since 2019 to develop a successor for the 355-ship force-level goal. The new goal is expected to introduce a new, more distributed fleet architecture featuring a smaller proportion of larger ships, a larger proportion of smaller ships, and a new third tier of large unmanned vehicles (UVs).

On December 9, 2020, the outgoing Trump Administration released a document that can be viewed as its own vision for future Navy force structure and/or a draft version of the FY2022 30-year Navy shipbuilding plan. The document presents an envisioned Navy force-level goal for achieving by 2045 a Navy with a more distributed fleet architecture, including 382 to 446 manned ships and 143 to 242 large UVs. The Biden Administration can choose to adopt, revise, or set aside this document. Biden Administration officials have stated Navy shipbuilding will be a top area of focus for the Administration’s review of the Trump Administration’s defense plans and programs.

The Biden Administration will submit the Navy’s proposed FY2022 budget later this year, and is required by law to additionally submit an FY2022 30-year (FY2022-FY2051) Navy shipbuilding plan in conjunction with its proposed FY2022 defense budget. Although the executive branch is required by law to submit a 30-year shipbuilding plan each year in conjunction with its annual budget submission, past Administrations have sometimes chosen to not submit a 30-year shipbuilding plan during their first year in office, on the grounds that they were spending that year reviewing and revising the previous Administration’s defense strategy, plans, and programs, so as to create a basis for subsequently devising a 30-year shipbuilding plan.

The issue for Congress is whether to approve, reject, or modify the Navy’s proposed FY2022 shipbuilding program and the Navy’s longer-term shipbuilding plans. Decisions that Congress makes on this issue can substantially affect Navy capabilities and funding requirements, and the U.S. shipbuilding industrial base. Key questions for Congress include the following:

- Does the Biden Administration plan to present a new force-level goal to replace the 355-ship goal, and, if so, when?
- Is the Navy’s force-level goal (either the existing 355-ship goal or a possible successor goal) appropriate for supporting U.S. national security strategy and U.S. defense strategy? Is the more distributed fleet architecture envisioned by the Navy the most cost effective fleet architecture for meeting future mission needs?
- Will the Navy’s proposed FY2022 shipbuilding funding request, five-year shipbuilding plan, and 30-year shipbuilding plan (if submitted) be consistent with the Navy’s force-level goal?
- Given finite defense resources and competing demands for defense funds, what is the prospective affordability of the Navy’s shipbuilding plans?
- Does the U.S. shipbuilding industry, including both shipyards and supplier firms, have adequate capacity for executing the Navy’s shipbuilding plans?
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Introduction

Issue for Congress

This report presents background information and issues for Congress concerning the Navy’s force structure and shipbuilding plans. The current and planned size and composition of the Navy, the annual rate of Navy ship procurement, the prospective affordability of the Navy’s shipbuilding plans, and the capacity of the U.S. shipbuilding industry to execute the Navy’s shipbuilding plans have been oversight matters for the congressional defense committees for many years.

The issue for Congress is whether to approve, reject, or modify the Navy’s proposed FY2022 shipbuilding program and the Navy’s longer-term shipbuilding plans. Decisions that Congress makes on this issue can substantially affect Navy capabilities and funding requirements and the U.S. shipbuilding industrial base.

CRS Reports on Individual Navy Shipbuilding Programs

Detailed coverage of certain individual Navy shipbuilding programs can be found in the following CRS reports:

- CRS Report R41129, Navy Columbia (SSBN-826) Class Ballistic Missile Submarine Program: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
- CRS In Focus IF11679, Navy DDG(X) Future Large Surface Combatant Program: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
- CRS Report RL32109, Navy DDG-51 and DDG-1000 Destroyer Programs: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
- CRS Report R44972, Navy Constellation (FFG-62) Class Frigate (Previously FFG[X]) Program: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
- CRS Report R43543, Navy LPD-17 Flight II and LHA Amphibious Ship Programs: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
- CRS In Focus IF11674, Navy Next-Generation Logistics Ship (NGLS) Program: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
- CRS Report R45757, Navy Large Unmanned Surface and Undersea Vehicles: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
Background

Navy’s Force-Level Goal

Navy’s Existing (355-Ship) Force-Level Goal

355-Ship Goal Released in December 2016

The Navy’s existing force-level goal, which the Navy released on December 15, 2016, calls for achieving and maintaining a fleet of 355 ships of the types and numbers shown in Table 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ship Category</th>
<th>Number of ships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack submarines (SSNs)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft carriers (CVNs)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large surface combatants (i.e., cruisers [CGs] and destroyers [DDGs])</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small surface combatants (i.e., frigates [FFGs], Littoral Combat Ships, and mine warfare ships)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibious ships</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Logistics Force (CLF) ships (i.e., at-sea resupply ships)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command and support ships</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>355</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


355-Ship Fleet Is a Goal to Be Attained in the Future

The 355-ship fleet is a goal to be attained in the future. As shown in Table G-1, the actual size of the Navy in recent years has generally been between 270 and 300 ships. Increasing the numerical size of the Navy from 300 ships to 355 would equate to an increase of about 18%.

355-Ship Goal Made U.S. Policy by FY2018 NDAA


---

1 For previous Navy force-level goals, see Appendix A.
2 Section 1025 of P.L. 115-91 states

SEC. 1025. Policy of the United States on minimum number of battle force ships.
(a) Policy.—It shall be the policy of the United States to have available, as soon as practicable, not fewer than 355 battle force ships, comprised of the optimal mix of platforms, with funding subject to the availability of appropriations or other funds.
(b) Battle force ships defined.—In this section, the term “battle force ship” has the meaning given the term in Secretary of the Navy Instruction 5030.8C.
355-Ship Goal Resulted from a Force Structure Assessment (FSA) Done in 2016

The 355-ship force-level goal is the result of a Force Structure Assessment (FSA) conducted by the Navy in 2016. An FSA is an analysis in which the Navy solicits inputs from U.S. regional combatant commanders (CCDRs) regarding the types and amounts of Navy capabilities that CCDRs deem necessary for implementing the Navy’s portion of the national military strategy, and then translates those CCDR inputs into required numbers of ships, using current and projected Navy ship types. The analysis takes into account Navy capabilities for both warfighting and day-to-day forward-deployed presence.3

The Navy conducts a new FSA or an update to the existing FSA every few years, as circumstances require, to determine its force-level goal. Previous Navy force-level goals that resulted from earlier FSA are shown in Appendix A.

Navy’s Force-Level Goal Is Not Just a Single Number

Although the result of an FSA is often reduced for convenience to single number (e.g., 355 ships), FSAs take into account a number of factors, including types and capabilities of Navy ships, aircraft, unmanned vehicles, and weapons, as well as ship homeporting arrangements and operational cycles. Thus, although the number of ships called for by an FSA might appear to be a one-dimensional figure, it actually incorporates multiple aspects of Navy capability and capacity.

355-Ship Goal Includes Only Manned Ships

The 355-ship force-level goal, like previous Navy force-level goals, includes manned ships only. The Navy has operated smaller unmanned surface vehicles (USVs) and unmanned underwater vehicles (UUVs) for many years, but because these unmanned vehicles (UVs) are launched from manned ships to act essentially as extensions of the manned ships, they have not been considered ships in their own right and consequently have not been included in the top-level expression of the Navy’s force-level goal or the publicly cited figure for the number of ships in the Navy.

Navy’s Next Force-Level Goal Might Include Large Unmanned Vehicles (UVs)

In the years since the 2016 FSA, the Navy has developed plans to acquire large USVs and UUVs. Because of their size and projected capabilities, these large UVs are to be deployed directly from pier, rather than from manned ships, to perform missions that might otherwise be assigned to manned ships and submarines.4 In view of this, some observers have raised a question as to whether these large UVs should be included in the top-level expression of the Navy’s next force-level goal (see next section) and the publicly cited figure for the number of ships in the Navy.

Department of Defense (DOD) officials since late 2019 have sent mixed signals on this question,

The term battle force ships in the above provision refers to the ships that count toward the quoted size of the Navy in public policy discussions about the Navy. The battle force ships method for counting the number of ships in the Navy was established in 1981 by agreement between the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Defense, and has been modified somewhat over time, in part by Section 1021 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (H.R. 3979/P.L. 113-291 of December 19, 2014).

3 For further discussion, see U.S. Navy, Executive Summary, 2016 Navy Force Structure Assessment (FSA), December 15, 2016, pp. 1-2.

4 For further discussion of these large UVs, see CRS Report R45757, Navy Large Unmanned Surface and Undersea Vehicles: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
but September 2020 indicated that the Navy’s next force-level goal (see next section) will include large UVs.5

**Navy’s Next Force-Level Goal**

**Work on Navy’s Next Force-Level Goal Underway Since 2019**

The Navy and DOD since 2019 have been working to develop a new force-level goal to replace the current 355-ship force-level goal. The conclusion of this work and the release of its results to Congress have been delayed repeatedly since late-2019.

**Next Navy Force-Level Goal Will Introduce More Distributed Fleet Architecture**

Remarks from Navy and DOD officials since 2019 have indicated that the Navy’s next force-level goal will introduce a once-in-a-generation change in fleet architecture, meaning basic the types of ships that make up the Navy and how these ships are used in combination with one another to perform Navy missions. This new fleet architecture is to be more distributed than the fleet architecture reflected in the 355-ship goal or previous Navy force-level goals. In particular, the new fleet architecture is expected to feature

- a smaller proportion of larger ships (such as large-deck aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, large amphibious ships, and large resupply ships);
- a larger proportion of smaller ships (such as frigates, corvettes, smaller amphibious ships, smaller resupply ships, and perhaps smaller aircraft carriers); and
- a new third tier of surface vessels about as large as corvettes or large patrol craft that will be either lightly manned, optionally manned, or unmanned, as well as large UUVs.

---

5 In December 2019, it was reported that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) had directed the Navy to include in its FY2021 budget submission a legislative proposal to formally change the definition of which ships count toward the quoted size of the Navy (known as the number of battle force ships) to include not only manned ships, but also large UVs that operate essentially as unmanned ships. (See Justin Katz, “OMB: Pentagon Must Submit Proposal to ‘Redefine’ Battleforce Ships to Include Unmanned Vehicles,” *Inside Defense*, December 20, 2019; Joseph Trevithick, “White House Asks Navy To Include New Unmanned Vessels In Its Ambitious 355 Ship Fleet Plan,” *The Drive*, December 20, 2019; Paul McCleary, “Navy To Slash 24 Ships in 2021 Plan, Bolster Unmanned Effort,” *Breaking Defense*, December 20, 2019, David B. Larter, “Pentagon Proposes Big Cuts to US Navy Destroyer Construction, Retiring 13 Cruisers,” *Defense News*, December 24, 2019.)


In September 2020, then-Secretary of Defense Mark Esper signaled that the stated ship-force level goal will include large UVs. (See, for example, Megan Eckstein, “Esper: Unmanned Vessels Will Allow the Navy to Reach 355-Ship Fleet,” *USNI News*, September 18, 2020.)
Navy and DOD leaders believe that shifting to a more distributed fleet architecture is

- **operationally necessary**, to respond effectively to the improving maritime anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) capabilities of other countries, particularly China;⁶
- **technically feasible** as a result of advances in technologies for UVs and for networking widely distributed maritime forces that include significant numbers of UVs; and
- **affordable**—no more expensive, and possibly less expensive, than the current fleet architecture for a given level of overall fleet capability, so as to fit within expected future Navy budgets.

Regarding the first point above, shifting to a more distributed force architecture, Navy and Marine Corps officials have indicated, will support implementation of the Navy and Marine Corps’ new overarching operational concept, called Distributed Maritime Operations (DMO), and a supporting Marine Corps operational concept called Expeditionary Advanced Base Operations (EABO).⁷ A key aim of DMO and EABO is to improve the ability of the Navy and Marine Corps to counter China’s improving maritime military capabilities.

Some elements of the Navy’s new, more distributed fleet architecture were reflected in the Navy’s proposed FY2021 budget. In particular, the Navy’s proposed FY2021 budget included funding for the following:

- procurement of FFG-62-class frigates;⁸
- development of a smaller amphibious warship called the Light Amphibious Warship (LAW);⁹
- development of a smaller resupply ship called the Next-Generation Medium Logistics Ship;¹⁰

---

⁶ See, for example, David B. Larter, “With China Gunning for Aircraft Carriers, US Navy Says It Must Change How It Fights,” Defense News, December 6, 2019; Arthur H. Barber, “Redesign the Fleet,” U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, January 2019. Some observers have long urged the Navy to shift to a more distributed fleet architecture, on the grounds that the Navy’s current architecture—which concentrates much of the fleet’s capability into a relatively limited number of individually larger and more expensive surface ships—is increasingly vulnerable to attack by the improving A2/AD capabilities (particularly anti-ship missiles and the ir supporting detection and targeting systems) of potential adversaries, particularly China. Shifting to a more distributed architecture, these observers have argued, would

- complicate an adversary’s targeting challenge by presenting the adversary with a larger number of Navy units to detect, identify, and track;
- reduce the loss in aggregate Navy capability that would result from the destruction of an individual Navy platform;
- give U.S. leaders the option of deploying USVs and UUVs in wartime to sea locations that would be tactically advantageous but too risky for manned ships; and
- increase the modularity and reconfigurability of the fleet for adapting to changing mission needs.

For more on China’s maritime A2/AD capabilities, see CRS Report RL33153, *China Naval Modernization: Implications for U.S. Navy Capabilities—Background and Issues for Congress*, by Ronald O'Rourke.

⁷ For more on DMO, see, for example, Edward Lundquist, “DMO is Navy’s Operational Approach to Winning the High-End Fight at Sea,” Seapower, February 2, 2021. For more on EABO, see CRS Report R46374, *Navy Light Amphibious Warship (LAW) Program: Background and Issues for Congress*, by Ronald O'Rourke.

⁸ For more on the FFG-62 program, see CRS Report R44972, *Navy Constellation (FFG-62) Class Frigate (Previously FFG[X]) Program: Background and Issues for Congress*, by Ronald O'Rourke.

⁹ For more on the LAW program, see CRS Report R46374, *Navy Light Amphibious Warship (LAW) Program: Background and Issues for Congress*, by Ronald O'Rourke.

¹⁰ For more on the next-generation Medium Logistics Ship, see, for example, Megan Eckstein, “Navy Researching New
development of two types of larger USVs—Large USVs (LUSVs) and Medium USVs (MUSVs);\textsuperscript{11} and
procurement of large UUVs called Extra Large UUVs (XLUUVs).\textsuperscript{12}

For additional background information on the effort in 2019 and 2020 to develop a new Navy force-level goal, see Appendix H.

December 9, 2020, Document Outlining a Possible New Navy Force-Level Goal

On December 9, 2020, the outgoing Trump Administration released a document presenting an envisioned Navy force-level goal for achieving by 2045 a Navy with a more distributed fleet architecture, including 382 to 446 manned ships and 143 to 242 large UVs.\textsuperscript{13} Table 2 compares the force-level goal in this document with the 355-ship force-level goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ship type</th>
<th>355-ship goal</th>
<th>Force-level goal in document released on December 9, 2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack submarines (SSNs)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72 to 78</td>
<td>+6 to +12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large aircraft carriers (CVNs)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8 to 11\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>-4 to -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light aircraft carriers (CVLs)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 to 6\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>0 to +6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large surface combatants (cruisers and destroyers)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>73 to 88</td>
<td>-31 to -16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small surface combatants (frigates and littoral Combat Ships [LCSs])</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60 to 67</td>
<td>+8 to +15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibious ships</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61 to 67</td>
<td>+23 to +29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-deck (LHA/LHD)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9 to 10</td>
<td>-3 to -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD-type</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Amphibious Warships (LAWs)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>— \textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>— \textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD-type and LAWs combined</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52 to 57\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>+26 to +31 \textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Logistics Force (CLF) ships</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69 to 87\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>+37 to +55 \textsuperscript{d}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command and support ships</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27 to 30</td>
<td>-12 to -9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{11} For more on the LUSV and XLUUV programs, see CRS Report R45757, \textit{Navy Large Unmanned Surface and Undersea Vehicles: Background and Issues for Congress}, by Ronald O'Rourke.

\textsuperscript{12} For more on the XLUUV program, see CRS Report R45757, \textit{Navy Large Unmanned Surface and Undersea Vehicles: Background and Issues for Congress}, by Ronald O'Rourke.
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Ship type | 355-ship goal | Force-level goal in document released on December 9, 2020 | Difference
---|---|---|---
Subtotal manned ships | 355 | 382 to 446 | +27 to +91

Unmanned and optionally manned ships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ship type</th>
<th>355</th>
<th>Subtotal manned ships</th>
<th>Force-level goal in document released on December 9, 2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large and medium unmanned surface vessels (LUSVs and MUSVs)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>119 to 166</td>
<td>+119 to +166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-large unmanned underwater vehicles (XLUUVs)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 to 76</td>
<td>+24 to +76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal unmanned and optionally manned ships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143 to 242</td>
<td>+143 to +242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL manned and unmanned ships</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>525 to 688</td>
<td>+170 to +333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a. The document released on December 9, 2020, states: “Lower [end of the] range may be enabled by acquisition of cost-effective CVL.”

b. The document released on December 9, 2020, states: “Further study of cost-effective CVL capabilities and capacity required.”


d. The document released on December 9, 2020, states: "Includes Next Generation Logistic Ships (NGLS). Logistics force size/mix subject to on-going analysis.”

Some Observations on the December 9, 2020, Document

Observations on the December 9, 2020, document include the following:

- The December 9, 2020, document is not the FY2021 30-year shipbuilding plan, because the five-year and 30-year shipbuilding tables in the document begin with FY2022, not FY2021 (as they would for an FY2021 30-year shipbuilding plan), and because the data in the document’s five-year shipbuilding table includes changes from the Navy’s FY2021 five-year (FY2021-FY2025) shipbuilding plan for the years FY2022-FY2025. An FY2021 30-year shipbuilding plan would have five-year and 30-year tables beginning with FY2021, and the details for the period FY2022-FY2025 would match those of the Navy’s FY2021 five-year (FY2021-FY2025) shipbuilding plan. The FY2021 30-year shipbuilding plan was not submitted.

- The December 9, 2020, document is not a final version of the FY2022 shipbuilding plan. The final version of the FY2022 30-year shipbuilding plan is to be submitted in conjunction with DOD’s proposed FY2022 budget, which is to be submitted to Congress later this year.

- The December 9, 2020, document can be viewed as the outgoing Trump Administration’s own vision for future Navy force structure⁴ and/or a draft version of the FY2022 30-year Navy shipbuilding plan. It is not unprecedented for an outgoing Administration to present, in its final weeks in office, a document presenting information on what it says it would have submitted as its proposed DOD budget for the coming fiscal year.¹⁵

---


¹⁵ For example, in January 1993, then-Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney submitted an annual Secretary of Defense
In developing a new force-level goal for the Navy and preparing the FY2022 30-year shipbuilding plan that is to be submitted in conjunction with DOD’s proposed FY2022 budget, the Biden Administration may choose to adopt, revise, or set aside the December 9, 2020, document. Biden Administration officials have stated Navy shipbuilding will be a top area of focus for the Administration’s review of the Trump Administration’s defense plans and programs. The force-level goal and FY2022 30-year shipbuilding plan developed by the Biden Administration could differ from those in the December 9, 2020, document.

The December 9, 2020, document is available as a potential comparative reference for assessing and discussing future Navy force-level goals, budgets, and 30-year shipbuilding plans.

Although the Biden Administration’s force-level goal and FY2022 30-year shipbuilding plan may differ from those shown in the December 9, 2020, document, the general idea of shifting the Navy toward a more distributed force architecture that includes a smaller proportion of larger ships, a larger proportion of smaller ships, and a new third tier of large UVs may remain, because support for this change has been developing within Navy planning for years as a consequence of changes in technologies and the capabilities of potential adversaries. As noted earlier, some elements of the more distributed architecture were reflected in the Navy’s proposed FY2021 budget.

The force-level goal presented in the December 9, 2020, document is not fully described. As shown in Table 2, the numerical goals for every ship category other than SSBNs are expressed as a ranges, and some of the ranges are relatively wide. Fleets of markedly varying compositions could fit within the incompletely described force-level goal in the December 9, 2020, document.

---


The costs of achieving the December 9, 2020, document’s force-level goal would be greater than the costs of achieving the 355-ship force-level goal. An April 2021 Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report on the cost to implement the shipbuilding plan in the December 9, 2020, document states that, using Navy estimates, average annual new-ship construction costs would be 28% higher under the December 9, 2020, document than under the Navy’s FY2020 30-year-shipbuilding plan.\textsuperscript{18} The April 2021 CBO report also states:

The December 2020 plan would require average annual shipbuilding appropriations almost 50 percent larger than the average over the past five years. CBO estimates that total shipbuilding costs, including costs for nuclear refueling and unmanned systems, would average about $34 billion per year (in 2021 dollars), 10 percent more than the Navy estimates. Annual operation and support costs for the fleet would grow from $74 billion today to $113 billion by 2051. The Navy’s total budget would increase from about $200 billion today to $279 billion (in 2021 dollars) by 2051.\textsuperscript{19}

Some observers have questioned the prospective affordability of the December 9, 2020, document’s force-level goal, particularly in a scenario where the overall DOD budget in coming years does not grow in real (i.e., inflation-adjusted) terms.\textsuperscript{20} If DOD’s total budget were not increased to accommodate the additional costs of the document’s force-level goal, achieving the document’s force-level goal would require reducing funding for other DOD priorities. Some observers have speculated that funding the document’s force-level goal would involve reducing funding for the Army, on the grounds that countering China’s military is DOD’s stated top planning priority, and that the Western Pacific—the region at the center of the evolving U.S.-China military balance—is, for the United States, primarily a maritime and aerospace theater rather than a ground-forces-centric theater.\textsuperscript{21}

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{March 2021 Press Report About Potential Reduction in Aircraft Carrier Force}
\end{flushleft}

A March 10, 2021, press report stated


\textsuperscript{19} Congressional Budget Office, \textit{An Analysis of the Navy’s December 2020 Shipbuilding Plan}, April 2021, unnumbered page with the header “At a Glance” that immediately follows the report’s cover.


It might also be argued that while a shift in the U.S. role in the world to a more-restrained U.S. role—something that some observers have advocated (and which other observers oppose)—might imply a reduction in overall U.S. defense spending and the total required size and capabilities of the U.S. military, it might not necessarily imply a reduction in the Navy’s budget and the required size and capabilities of the Navy, because the United States under a more-restrained role might need to rely as much or more than it does now on its ability to use the world’s oceans as a buffer for protection from potential security challenges that might arise in Eurasia. For additional discussion, see page 8 of CRS Testimony TE10057, \textit{Future Force Structure Requirements for the United States Navy}, by Ronald O'Rourke.
The Pentagon is again considering a reduction in aircraft carrier force structure as part of the upcoming Fiscal Year 2022 budget submission to Congress, according to two sources familiar with the discussions.

In order to meet a proposed $704 billion to $708 billion topline for the first Biden Defense Department budget—the Trump administration’s FY 2022 budget proposed $722 billion—the Office of the Secretary of Defense is weighing how it could build in savings by reducing the carrier force, the two sources familiar with the ongoing internal discussion told USNI News on Wednesday [March 10]….

The search for cost savings could include revisiting a 2019 Trump administration proposal to take aircraft carrier USS Harry S. Truman (CVN-75) out of the inventory rather than conduct a mid-life refit and refueling, a legislative source told USNI News.

A separate source familiar with the carrier review said that, additionally, the entire scope of the shipbuilding budget was under scrutiny.

The idea of retiring an active carrier has circulated on Capitol Hill to the point where House Armed Services seapower and projection forces ranking member Rep. Rob Wittman (R-Va.) asked a senior admiral on Wednesday if retiring an aircraft carrier ahead of the overhaul was a good idea.

“In your best professional military judgment, do you believe—considering the current stress on the aircraft carrier force—that taking out an aircraft carrier from service just before its mid-life refueling would be a smart thing to do?” Wittman asked U.S. Indo-Pacific Command commander Adm. Phil Davidson on Wednesday.

Davidson responded, “there is no capability that we have that can substitute for an aircraft carrier in my view. You can see by the strain of the deployments over the course of the last year that they are in high demand by all the combatant commanders, and sustaining that capability going forward in my view is critically important. I’m in support of the law which calls for the number of carriers in the United States.”

When asked about the exchange between Wittman and Davidson and if cutting carriers was a consideration, Pentagon spokesman John Kirby told USNI News on Wednesday that DoD would not comment on the budget ahead of its rollout.22

The future aircraft carrier force level has been a frequent matter of discussion over the years, and (correctly or not) is often the starting point or the center of broader discussions over the future size and composition of the Navy. Decisions on the future aircraft carrier force level could have implications for required numbers of aircraft carrier air wings, surface combatants, and underway replenishment ships (such as oilers) for resupplying aircraft carriers and surface combatants that are operating at sea. A reduction in aircraft carrier force levels could, on the one hand, lead to a reduction in the number of surface combatants required for operating with aircraft carriers as part of carrier strike groups. It could also, however, lead to an increase in required numbers of surface combatants if the missile-firing capacity of surface combatants is used to compensate for a reduction in the fleet’s strike capability resulting from a reduction in the number of aircraft carriers.

Factors involved in discussions about the future aircraft carrier force level include but are not limited to

- the capabilities and costs (including procurement costs and life-cycle operation and support [O&S] costs) of aircraft carriers and their embarked air wings, and how those capabilities and costs compare to those of other U.S. military forces;

---

the prospective survivability of aircraft carriers in conflicts against adversaries (such as China) with highly capable anti-ship missiles;

- the numbers of carriers needed to support policymaker-desired levels of day-to-day aircraft carrier forward presence in various regions around the world; and

- the utility of carriers for purposes other than high-end combat, including deterrence of potential regional adversaries, reassurance of allies and partners, signaling U.S. commitment and resolve, and non-combat operations such as humanitarian assistance/disaster response (HA/DR) operations.

A reduction in the planned number of nuclear-powered aircraft carriers (CVNs) could lead to Navy proposals for one or more of the following:

- accelerated retirements for one or more Nimitz-class CVNs that have already received their mid-life nuclear refueling overhauls (which are called Refueling Complex Overhauls, or RCOHs);

- the cancellation of one or more planned RCOHs for Nimitz-class CVNs that have not yet received RCOHs, and the consequent early retirement of one or more of these ships;

- a deferral or cancellation of the procurement of the aircraft carrier CVN-82, which under the Navy’s FY2020 30-year shipbuilding plan was scheduled for FY2028; and/or

- the deferral or cancellation of the construction of the aircraft carrier CVN-81, which could require modifying the current two-ship construction contract for the aircraft carriers CVN-80 and CVN-81.

Navy’s FY2022, Five-Year, and 30-Year Shipbuilding Plans

FY2022 Five-Year (FY2021-FY2025) Shipbuilding Plan (Not Yet Submitted)

The Navy’s FY2022 five-year (FY2022-FY2026) shipbuilding plan is to be submitted to Congress later this year. As a placeholder pending the submission of the FY2022 five-year shipbuilding plan, Table 3 shows the Navy’s FY2021 five-year (FY2021-FY2025) shipbuilding plan, which includes for reference purposes, the ships funded for procurement in FY2020.
Table 3. FY2021 Five-Year (FY2021-FY2025) Shipbuilding Plan Under Original FY2021 Budget Submission
(FY2020 shown for reference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY20 (enacted)</th>
<th>FY21 (req.)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY21-FY25 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia (SSBN-826) class ballistic missile submarine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald R. Ford (CVN-78) class aircraft carrier</td>
<td>[a]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia (SSN-774) class attack submarine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arleigh Burke (DDG-51) class destroyer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFG-62 frigate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHA amphibious assault ship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>[b]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD-17 Flight II amphibious ship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>[b]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expeditionary Fast Transport (EPF) ship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submarine tender (AS[X])</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lewis (TAO-205) class oiler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATS towing, salvage, and rescue ship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAGOS(X) ocean surveillance ship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Table prepared by CRS based on FY2021 Navy budget submission, with adjustments as noted below.

**Notes:** [a] The Navy’s FY2021 budget submission presents the aircraft carrier CVN-81 as a ship that Congress procured in FY2020. Consistent with congressional action on the Navy’s FY2019 budget regarding the procurement of CVN-81, this CRS report treats CVN-81 as a ship that Congress procured (i.e., authorized and provided procurement funding for) in FY2019. [b] The Navy’s FY2021 budget submission presents LPD-31, an LPD-17 Flight II amphibious ship, as a ship requested for procurement in FY2021, and the amphibious assault ship LHA-9 as a ship projected for procurement in FY2023. Consistent with congressional action on the Navy’s FY2020 budget regarding the procurement of LPD-31 and LHA-9, this CRS report treats LPD-31 and LHA-9 as ships that Congress procured (i.e., authorized and provided procurement funding for) in FY2020.

FY2022 30-Year (FY2020-FY2049) Shipbuilding Plan (Not Yet Submitted)

The Trump Administration did not submit an FY2021 30-year (FY2021-FY2050) shipbuilding plan, and the Navy’s FY2022 30-year (FY2022-FY2051) shipbuilding plan is to be submitted to Congress later this year, in conjunction with the FY2022 defense budget submission. As a placeholder pending the submission of the FY2022 30-year shipbuilding plan, Table 4 shows the Navy’s FY2020 30-year (FY2020-FY2049) shipbuilding plan, which was designed to support the Navy’s 355-ship force-level objective and reflects the Navy’s existing fleet architecture rather than a more distributed fleet architecture.
Table 4. FY2020 30-Year (FY2020-FY2049) Shipbuilding Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>CVNs</th>
<th>LSCs</th>
<th>SSCs</th>
<th>SSNs</th>
<th>LPSs</th>
<th>SSBNs</th>
<th>AWSs</th>
<th>CLFs</th>
<th>Supt</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Key: FY = Fiscal Year; CVNs = aircraft carriers; LSCs = surface combatants (i.e., cruisers and destroyers); SSCs = small surface combatants (i.e., Littoral Combat Ships [LCSs] and frigates [FFG-62s]); SSNs = attack submarines; LPSs = large payload submarines; SSBNs = ballistic missile submarines; AWSs = amphibious warfare ships; CLFs = combat logistics force (i.e., resupply) ships; Supt = support ships.

Although the executive branch is required by law to submit a 30-year shipbuilding plan each year in conjunction with its annual budget submission, past Administrations have sometimes chosen not to submit a 30-year shipbuilding plan during their first year in office, on the grounds that they were spending that year reviewing and revising the previous Administration’s defense strategy, plans, and programs, so as to create a basis for subsequently devising a 30-year shipbuilding plan.

In devising a 30-year shipbuilding plan to move the Navy toward its ship force-structure goal, key assumptions and planning factors include but are not limited to ship construction times and service lives, estimated ship procurement costs, projected shipbuilding funding levels, and industrial-base considerations.
Projected Force Levels Under 30-Year Shipbuilding Plan

Table 5 shows the Navy’s projection of ship force levels for FY2020-FY2049 that would result from implementing the FY2020 30-year (FY2020-FY2049) shipbuilding plan shown in Table 4.

Table 5. Projected Force Levels Resulting from FY2020 30-Year Shipbuilding Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CVNs</th>
<th>LSCs</th>
<th>SSCs</th>
<th>SSNs</th>
<th>SSGN/LPS</th>
<th>SSBNs</th>
<th>AWSs</th>
<th>CLFs</th>
<th>Supt</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>355-ship goal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Figures for support ships include five JHSV transferred from the Army to the Navy and operated by the Navy primarily for the performance of Army missions.

Key: FY = Fiscal Year; CVNs = aircraft carriers; LSCs = surface combatants (i.e., cruisers and destroyers); SSCs = small surface combatants (i.e., frigates, Littoral Combat Ships [LCSs], and mine warfare ships); SSNs = attack submarines; SSGNs/LPSs = cruise missile submarines/large payload submarines; SSBNs = ballistic missile submarines; AWSs = amphibious warfare ships; CLFs = combat logistics force (i.e., resupply) ships; Supt = support ships.
Issues for Congress

Key Questions

The issue for Congress is whether to approve, reject, or modify the Navy’s proposed FY2022 shipbuilding program and the Navy’s longer-term shipbuilding plans. Decisions that Congress makes on this issue can substantially affect Navy capabilities and funding requirements, and the U.S. shipbuilding industrial base. Key questions for Congress include the following:

- Does the Biden Administration plan to present a new force-level goal to replace the 355-ship goal, and if so, when?
- Is the Navy’s force-level goal (either the existing 355-ship goal or a possible successor goal) appropriate for supporting U.S. national security strategy and U.S. defense strategy? Is the more distributed fleet architecture envisioned by the Navy the most cost effective fleet architecture for meeting future mission needs?
- Will the Navy’s proposed FY2022 shipbuilding funding request, five-year shipbuilding plan, and 30-year shipbuilding plan (if submitted) be consistent with the Navy’s force-level goal?
- Given finite defense resources and competing demands for defense funds, what is the prospective affordability of the Navy’s shipbuilding plans?
- Does the U.S. shipbuilding industry, including both shipyards and supplier firms, have adequate capacity for executing the Navy’s shipbuilding plans?
- How might a more distributed fleet architecture affect the distribution of shipbuilding work among the nation’s shipyards?
- What impact is the COVID-19 pandemic having on the execution of Navy shipbuilding programs?

Affordability of the Shipbuilding Plan

Overview

The prospective affordability of the Navy’s 30-year shipbuilding plans has been a matter of oversight focus for several years, and particularly since the enactment in 2011 of the Budget Control Act, or BCA (S. 365/P.L. 112-25 of August 2, 2011). Observers have been especially concerned about the prospective affordability of navy shipbuilding plans during the decade or so from the mid-2020s through the mid-2030s, when the Navy wants to procure Columbia-class ballistic missile submarines as well as replacements for large numbers of retiring attack submarines, cruisers, and destroyers.24

---


24 The Navy’s 30-year plans in recent years have spotlighted for policymakers the substantial increase in Navy shipbuilding funding that would be required to implement the 30-year plan during the decade or so from the mid-2020s through the mid-2030s. As discussed in CRS testimony in 2011, a key function of the 30-year shipbuilding plan is to alert policymakers well ahead of time to periods of potentially higher funding requirements for Navy shipbuilding. (See Statement of Ronald O’Rourke, Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, before the House Armed
Navy officials stated at hearings on the Navy’s FY2021 budget submission that achieving and supporting a 355-ship fleet over the next 10 years would require increasing the Navy’s budget by a cumulative total of $120 billion to $130 billion over the next ten years, or an average of $12 billion to $13 billion per year. This figure, Navy officials stated, included not only the cost of procuring new ships, but costs associated with crewing, arming, operating, and maintaining a 355-ship fleet. Prior to that—in September and October 2019—Navy officials stated that if Navy budgets in coming years remain at current levels in real (i.e., inflation-adjusted terms), the Navy would not be able to properly maintain a fleet of more than 302 to 310 ships. In January 2020, Admiral Michael Gilday, the Chief of Naval Operations, stated that fully funding the Navy’s program goals, including the attainment of a 355-ship fleet, would require allocating a larger share of DOD’s budget to the Navy.

**Potential Impact of Cost Growth**

If one or more Navy ship designs turn out to be more expensive to build than the Navy estimates, then the Navy’s shipbuilding plan as a whole would become more expensive to execute. As detailed by CBO and GAO, lead ships in Navy shipbuilding programs in many cases have turned out to be more expensive to build than the Navy had estimated. Ship designs that can be viewed as posing a risk of being more expensive to build than the Navy estimates include but are not necessarily limited to Columbia-class ballistic missile submarines and FFG-62 frigates, as well as other new classes of ships that the Navy wants to begin procuring years from now.

**CBO Estimate Compared to Navy Estimate**

The statute that requires the Navy to submit a 30-year shipbuilding plan each year (10 U.S.C. 231) also requires CBO to submit its own independent analysis of the potential cost of the 30-year plan (10 U.S.C. 231[d]). CBO analyses of past Navy 30-year shipbuilding plans have generally estimated the cost of implementing those plans to be higher than what the Navy estimated. As mentioned earlier, an April 2021 Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report on the cost to implement the shipbuilding plan in the December 9, 2020, shipbuilding document estimates that the plan would require 10% more funding to implement than the Navy estimates.
estimates that the cost of the first 10 years of the plan would be about 1% higher than the Navy estimates, that the cost of the middle 10 years of the plan would be about 8% higher than the Navy estimates, and that the cost of the final 10 years of the plan would be about 17% higher than the Navy estimates.\textsuperscript{31}

The growing divergence between CBO’s estimate and the Navy’s estimate as one moves from the first 10 years of the 30-year plan to the final 10 years of the plan is due in part to a technical difference between CBO and the Navy regarding the treatment of inflation. This difference compounds over time, making it increasingly important as a factor in the difference between CBO’s estimates and the Navy’s estimates the further one goes into the 30-year period. In other words, other things held equal, this factor tends to push the CBO and Navy estimates further apart as one proceeds from the earlier years of the plan to the later years of the plan.\textsuperscript{32}

The growing divergence between CBO’s estimate and the Navy’s estimate as one moves from the first 10 years of the 30-year plan to the final 10 years of the plan is also due to differences between CBO and the Navy about the costs of certain ship classes, particularly classes that are projected to be procured starting years from now. The designs of these future ship classes are not yet determined, creating more potential for CBO and the Navy to come to differing conclusions regarding their potential cost.

The ship class that is the largest contributor to the difference between CBO and Navy regarding the cost of the shipbuilding plan in the December 9, 2020, document is the DDG(X) next-generation destroyer, which the Navy wants to begin procuring years from now as the successor to the DDG-51 destroyer design. The DDG(X), CBO says, accounts for 28% of the difference between the CBO and Navy estimates. The second-largest source of difference by ship class is the SSN(X) next-generation attack submarine, which the Navy wants to begin procuring years from now as the successor to the Virginia-class SSN design. The SSN(X), CBO says, accounts for 20% of the difference between the CBO and Navy estimates. Together, the DDG(X) and SSN(X) account for 48%, or almost half, of the difference between the CBO and Navy estimates.

The third- and fourth-largest sources of difference by ship class are the Constellation (FFG-62) class frigates that the Navy began procuring in FY2020 and a new class of large-payload submarines that the Navy envisions procuring after procurement of Columbia-class SSBNs is complete. CBO says that these two classes of ships each account for 12% of the difference between the CBO and Navy estimates. Several other ship classes each account for between 1% and 6% of the difference between the CBO and Navy estimates. The Columbia-class SSBN accounts for 1% of the difference, and CBO estimates that DDG-51s will cost 1% less than the Navy estimates.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{31}Congressional Budget Office, \textit{An Analysis of the Navy’s December 2020 Shipbuilding Plan}, April 2021, p. 4 (figure entitled “Average Annual Costs of All Shipbuilding Activities Under the December 2020 Plan, as Estimated by CBO and the Navy”).

\textsuperscript{32}For additional discussion of how CBO estimates the costs of new Navy ships, see Congressional Budget Office, \textit{How CBO Estimates the Cost of New Ships}, April 2018, 6 pp.

\textsuperscript{33}Congressional Budget Office, \textit{An Analysis of the Navy’s December 2020 Shipbuilding Plan}, April 2021, p. 23 (Table B-2).
Sustainment Cost

In addition to the issue of the cost to build new ships, the Navy in its FY2020 30-year shipbuilding plan highlighted a concern over the potential costs to sustain a larger fleet. On this issue, the FY2020 30-year shipbuilding plan stated in part:

Coincident with the relatively new dynamic of purchasing more ships to grow the force instead of simply replacing ships or shrinking the force, is the responsibility to “own” the additional inventory when it arrives.

Consistent annual funding in the shipbuilding account is foundational for an efficient industrial base in support of steady growth and long-term maintenance planning, but equally important is the properly phased, additional funding needed for operations and sustainment accounts as each new ship is delivered—the much larger fiscal burden over the life of a ship and the essence of the challenge to remain balanced across the three integral elements of readiness–capability–capacity. Because the Navy [until recently] has been shrinking not growing, and because of the disconnected timespan from purchase to delivery, often five years or more and often beyond the FYDP, there is risk of underestimating the aggregate sustainment costs looming over the horizon that must now be carefully considered in fiscal forecasting.

For a ship, the rough rule of thumb for cost is 30 percent for procurement and 70 percent for operating and sustainment; for example, a ship that costs $1B to buy costs $3.3B to own, amortized over its lifespan. Accordingly, multi-ship deliveries can add hundreds of millions of dollars to a budget year, and then require the same funding per year thereafter, compounded by additional deliveries in subsequent years and only offset by ship retirements, which lag deliveries when growing the force. A similar dynamic occurs when the life of a ship is extended. Sustainment resources programmed to shift from a retiring ship to a new ship must now stay in place—for the duration of the extension. The burden continues to grow until equilibrium is reached at the desired higher inventory, when deliveries match retirements and all resourcing accounts reach steady-state at a higher, enduring sustainment cost.

For perspective, the current budget, among the largest ever, supports a modern fleet of approximately 300 ships, nearly 20 percent fewer than the goal of 355. The battle force inventory… rises from 301 ships in FY2020 to [a projected figure of] 314 ships in FY2024, and then 355 in FY2034. The programmed sustainment cost… is $24B [billion] in FY2020 and rises to $30B [billion in FY2024 in TYS [then-year dollars]. When the battle force inventory reaches 355 in FY2034, [the] estimated cost to sustain that fleet will approach $40B (TYS), 32% higher than in FY2024. For now, included in this sustainment estimate are only personnel, planned maintenance, and some operations; representing those costs tied directly to owning and operating a ship, easily modeled today, and already line-item accounted for in the budget. Equally important additional costs, but not yet included in the future estimate, are those not easily associated with individual ships and require complex modeling for long-term forecasting (beyond 3 to 5 years), such as the balance of the operations accounts (market and schedule driven), modernization and ordnance (threat and technology driven), infrastructure and training (services spread across many ships), aviation detachments, networks and cyber support, plus others….

Less of a challenge when shrinking the force, the Navy is now working towards developing the complex model needed to capture indirect costs for growing the force. Until then, macro ratios are helpful in estimating rough orders of magnitude beyond the FYDP and for identifying future areas of concern. Similar to procurement, estimates will be less precise deeper into the plan. Recovering from the long-term investment imbalance has proven to be costly, particularly in the readiness accounts. As readiness becomes more accurately defined, the modeling will improve and so will the ability to more accurately forecast. However, no matter the method, the anticipated cost of sustaining the proper mix of 355...
ships is anticipated to be substantial, and reform efforts and balanced scalability will continue to be the drivers going forward.\textsuperscript{34}

As mentioned earlier, an April 2021 CBO report on the cost of the shipbuilding plan in the December 9, 2020, shipbuilding document estimates that if the plan were implemented, the fleet’s annual operation and support (O&O) costs in constant 2021 dollars would grow from $74 billion today to $113 billion by 2051, and that the Navy’s total budget would increase in constant 2021 dollars from about $200 billion today to $279 billion by 2051.\textsuperscript{35}

**Capacity of Shipbuilding Industry**

Areas of particular focus in recent years regarding the capacity of the U.S. shipbuilding industry to execute the Navy’s shipbuilding plans include shipyard capacity for building submarines at desired rates, and the capacity of supplier firms to support increased rates of production for both submarines and surface ships. Shipyard capacity for conducting maintenance and overhaul work on an expanded fleet is another concern, particularly given the delays and other difficulties the Navy has experienced in recent years in executing overhaul and repair work on today’s fleet.\textsuperscript{36}

**COVID-19 Impact on Execution of Shipbuilding Programs**

**DOD Point Paper on Impacts from March 15 Through June 15, 2020**

A DOD point paper on COVID-19 impacts to DOD acquisition programs from March 15, 2020, through June 20, 2020, stated in part

The Acquisition Program Impact Penalty cost is an estimate of the program costs increases realized because of inefficiencies caused by COVID-19. This document covers expected cost incurred between March 15, 2020 and June 15, 2020. Specific reasons for these inefficiencies across the defense programs includes the following:

- Confirmed cases or quarantines.
- Government facility closure/stand down-test delays and Research and Development Center inefficiencies.
- Telework across the Defense Industrial Base

---


\textsuperscript{35} Congressional Budget Office, *An Analysis of the Navy’s December 2020 Shipbuilding Plan*, April 2021, unnumbered page with the header “At a Glance” that immediately follows the report’s cover.

• Closures due to travel restrictions
• Logistic implications caused by travel restrictions requiring commercial freight
• Availability of parts and supplies
• High absentee rates
• Local and state lockdowns
• Foreign Government Lockdowns
• Company/Supplier shutdowns
• Financial distress
• Social distancing across the industrial base (production line implications)
• Added costs for cleaning/Disinfecting and temperature sensors
• Added costs for PPE
• CARES Act Section 3610 costs to pay for contractor/subcontractor employees unable to work due to COVID-19 impacts

The Department closely monitors and tracks approximately 22,000 critical contractors who are most important to modernization and readiness. As of July 8, 2020, 977 of DoD’s suppliers have closed since March 15, 2020. The average closure is over two weeks. 943 have reopened with 34 still closed. The biggest sectors affected have been Aviation, Space, Combat Vehicles, Clothing and Textiles and Missiles. Some sectors like Aviation also have significant impacts related to commercial aviation challenges.

The estimate currently does not include potential overhead rate increases due to layoffs, especially if the contractor performs both government and commercial work. The Department is also concerned with a potential loss of critical labor skills (e.g. welders) and continue to work these issues by contract and location as we analyze the impact across the Defense Industrial Base (DIB).

DoD’s Requirements

The Department currently estimates a potential cost to complete (or Request for Equitable Adjustments) totaling about $10.8 billion and touching more than 106,000 jobs. This estimate is calculated by considering the projected spend over this period for the portfolio, assessment of the percentage of that spend attributed to direct labor, and application of reported inefficiencies in that sector. The data from industry is showing approximately a 30-40% inefficiency across the DIB but in certain sectors like shipbuilding we are seeing about a 50-60% inefficiency.

Projected cost overrun/inefficiency risk examples are as follows….

• Navy [impact:] $4,664.0M (43,214 Jobs)
  – Shipbuilding: Significant touch labor; greater facility impact from social distancing; and strong union representation at some yards pushing for paid leave with facility shutdown. Worker attendance rates range from 50% to 70% for blue collar workforce, and much of the white collar workforce is teleworking. At least one of the big seven private shipyards may shutdown. Recovery from a full shutdown would extend inefficiencies well into next year after restart.
  – Aircraft Procurement: Moderate touch labor but tends to enable better distancing. No prime production impacts yet, but there are some sub-tier Component impacts. A couple of short term plant shutdowns occurred in early April with possibly more in the near future.
− Other Procurement: Moderate touch labor; greater facility impacts from social distancing, sub tiers reporting issues (e.g., BAE York shut down for two days; returned with 50% workforce). Weapons manufacturer’s not seeing significant impacts yet as many not located in high COVID impact areas.

− Fragility concerns: The DoN shares the Army’s long term fragility concern regarding FLIR, combat vehicle transmissions, and aircraft engines (GE specifically). The DoN also shares Army concerns about short term risk to textile manufacturers; body armor suppliers, and small business electronics suppliers who feed guidance systems (PGK, GMLRS, Excalibur) and wiring harnesses (vehicles, aircraft).

…

• **Missile Defense Agency** [impact:] $593.5M (3,956 Jobs)

…

− Aegis Program delays: SM-3 Block IIA production deliveries; Aegis Ashore Poland construction (further delays); and Aegis Testing delays for Flight Test Missile (FTM)-44 (Aegis), FTM-31, and FTM-33.37

The Navy later clarified that the statement in the above passage that “[a]t least one of the big seven private shipyards may shutdown” refers to the possibility of a shipyard closing temporarily due to COVID-19, rather than to the possibility of a shipyard closing permanently.38

**March 2021 Press Reports**

A March 15, 2021, press report states:

A year into the pandemic, a Defense News review tried to measure its toll on the defense industry. The full scope of damage is complex and still coming into focus, but a broad outline is becoming clear. Among the findings:

■ Early in the pandemic, Pentagon leaders worried about the health of the industrial base and program timelines. However, the largest firms have rebounded, and the biggest projects are mostly on track. In the past year, at least half of the Pentagon’s major defense acquisition programs experienced some kind of delay as a result of COVID-19. Programs were able to recover, often in a matter of months following nearly $5 billion in federal aid and efforts to push money more quickly to suppliers. Pentagon leaders have not listed all of the specific programs which have faced delays.

■ Smaller companies—already imperiled before the pandemic—are still struggling, with as many as 1 in 7 believing they will never return to pre-pandemic levels.

■ Industry invested roughly $10 billion to reconfigure production lines and build infrastructure for remote working, costs that if not addressed by Congress could become amortized over time and potentially lead to overall per unit price increases.

---


Finally, quantifying the human toll on the workforce is nearly impossible. The Pentagon has not tracked deaths in the defense industry, and only two companies—Defense News contacted—acknowledged employee deaths from the pandemic.  

A March 31, 2021, press report states:

Absenteeism rates at public and private shipyards skyrocketed. Supply chains slowed. Top officials and executives worried the pandemic would result in significant new delays for already troubled Navy shipbuilding and maintenance programs. But as the one-year anniversary of pandemic-related shutdowns passes, outside analysts, the ranking Republican on the House shipbuilding subcommittee and the Navy itself say the service successfully managed the crisis.

Past Examples of Assistance to Shipyards and Supplier Firms

Potential options for Congress for providing assistance to shipyards and supplier firms whose operations are impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic could take various forms. Some past instances of assistance relating to shipbuilding include the following:

- Following Hurricane Katrina in August 2005, Congress provided $1.7 billion in reallocated emergency supplemental appropriations to pay estimated higher shipbuilding costs for 11 Navy ships under construction at the Ingalls shipyard in Pascagoula, MS, and the Avondale shipyard upriver from New Orleans, LA.


Citing the need for “special oversight” of these shipbuilding funds dedicated to cover property damage, cleanup, idle payroll, and business disruption (that may also be covered by shipbuilders’ insurance), the appropriators added report language requiring that the Navy or Army, as applicable, submit a report to the Appropriations Committees “certifying” that the costs were related to the hurricanes and would not be paid for by FEMA or the shipbuilders’ insurers.


See also CRS Report RL33298, FY2006 Supplemental Appropriations: Iraq and Other International Activities; Additional Hurricane Katrina Relief, Paul M. Irwin, Coordinator, Larry Nowels, Coordinator, June 15, 2006, pp. 59-66; and CRS Report RL33197, Reallocation of Hurricane Katrina Emergency Appropriations: Defense and Other Issues, Coordinated by Amy Belasco, December 15, 2005, pp. 9-14. (These CRS reports are out of print and available for congressional clients from the author of this report.)

42 Section 3508 of P.L. 110-417 amended the U.S. Code to add Section 54101 to Title 46, which establishes a program
Following Hurricane Michael in October 2018, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), of which the Coast Guard is a part, announced on October 11, 2019, that DHS had granted extraordinary contractual relief to Eastern Shipbuilding Group (ESG) of Panama City, FL, the builder of the first of the Coast Guard’s new Offshore Patrol Cutters (OPCs), under P.L. 85-804 as amended (50 U.S.C. 1431-1435). P.L. 85-804, originally enacted in 1958, authorizes certain federal agencies to provide certain types of extraordinary relief to contractors who are encountering difficulties in the performance of federal contracts or subcontracts relating to national defense. ESG reportedly submitted a request for extraordinary relief on June 30, 2019, after ESG’s shipbuilding facilities were damaged by Hurricane Michael.

The past instances listed above do not necessarily represent the full range of options available to Congress for assisting shipyards and supplier firms—additional options might be available through the Defense Production Act (DPA) or other federal authorities.

---

43 50 U.S.C. 1431 states in part

The President may authorize any department or agency of the Government which exercises functions in connection with the national defense, acting in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the Government, to enter into contracts or into amendments or modifications of contracts heretofore or hereafter made and to make advance payments thereon, without regard to other provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, whenever he deems that such action would facilitate the national defense. The authority conferred by this section shall not be utilized to obligate the United States in an amount in excess of $50,000 without approval by an official at or above the level of an Assistant Secretary or his Deputy, or an assistant head or his deputy, of such department or agency, or by a Contract Adjustment Board established therein.


44 For more on the extraordinary contractual relief provided to ESG under P.L. 85-804, see CRS Report R42567, *Coast Guard Cutter Procurement: Background and Issues for Congress*, by Ronald O’Rourke.

Legislative Activity for FY2022

CRS Reports Tracking Legislation on Specific Navy Shipbuilding Programs

Detailed coverage of legislative activity on certain Navy shipbuilding programs (including funding levels, legislative provisions, and report language) can be found in the following CRS reports:

- CRS Report R41129, Navy Columbia (SSBN-826) Class Ballistic Missile Submarine Program: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
- CRS In Focus IF11679, Navy DDG(X) Future Large Surface Combatant Program: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
- CRS Report RL32109, Navy DDG-51 and DDG-1000 Destroyer Programs: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
- CRS Report R44972, Navy Constellation (FFG-62) Class Frigate (Previously FFG[X]) Program: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
- CRS Report R43543, Navy LPD-17 Flight II and LHA Amphibious Ship Programs: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
- CRS In Focus IF11674, Navy Next-Generation Logistics Ship (NGLS) Program: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
- CRS Report R45757, Navy Large Unmanned Surface and Undersea Vehicles: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.

Legislative activity on individual Navy shipbuilding programs that are not covered in detail in the above reports is covered below.

FY2022 Funding Request to Be Submitted Later This Year

The Navy’s proposed FY2022 budget, including its funding request for shipbuilding, is to be submitted to Congress later this year.

Summary of Congressional Action on FY2021 Funding Request

Table 6 summarizes congressional action on the Navy’s FY2021 funding request for Navy shipbuilding. The table shows the amounts requested and congressional changes to those requested amounts. A blank cell in a filled-in column showing congressional changes to requested amounts indicates no change from the requested amount.
### Table 6. Summary of Congressional Action on FY2021 Funding Request

Millions of dollars, rounded to nearest tenth; totals may not add due to rounding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line number</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Original Navy FY2021 Budget Submission</th>
<th>Congressional changes to requested amounts</th>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HASC</td>
<td>SASC</td>
<td>Conf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Columbia-class SSBN</td>
<td>2,891.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Columbia-class SSBN (AP)</td>
<td>1,123.2</td>
<td>+175.0</td>
<td>+130.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>CVN 78-80 aircraft carriers</td>
<td>997.5</td>
<td>-90.0</td>
<td>-90.0</td>
<td>-92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>CVN-81 aircraft carrier</td>
<td>1,645.6</td>
<td>-180.0</td>
<td>-39.2</td>
<td>-39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Virginia-class SSN</td>
<td>2,334.7</td>
<td>+2,296.0</td>
<td>-74.4</td>
<td>+2,285.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Virginia-class SSN (AP)</td>
<td>1,901.2</td>
<td>+272.0</td>
<td>+472.0</td>
<td>+272.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>CVN RCOH</td>
<td>1,878.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>CVN RCOH (AP)</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>DDG-1000</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>DDG-51</td>
<td>3,040.3</td>
<td>-30.0</td>
<td>-30.0</td>
<td>-109.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>DDG-51 (AP)</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>+435.0</td>
<td>+305.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>LCS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>FFG-62</td>
<td>1,053.1</td>
<td>-98.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>LPD-17 Flight II</td>
<td>1,155.8</td>
<td>-37.7</td>
<td>-250.0</td>
<td>-30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>LPD-17 Flight II (AP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+500.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015A</td>
<td>LPD-17 Flight II (LPD-33)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+500.0</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Expeditionary Sea Base (ESB)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016A</td>
<td>Expeditionary Sea Base (ESB) (AP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+73.0</td>
<td>+73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>LHA amphibious assault ship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+250.0</td>
<td>+500.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>LHA amphibious assault ship (AP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>Expeditionary Fast Transport (EPF)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+260.0</td>
<td>+260.0</td>
<td>+260.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>TAO-205 oiler</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>TAO-205 oiler (AP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>TATS</td>
<td>168.2</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>LCU 1700 landing craft</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>Outfitting and post delivery</td>
<td>825.6</td>
<td>-78.3</td>
<td>-59.3</td>
<td>-19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>Ship-to-shore connector (SSC)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>Service craft</td>
<td>249.8</td>
<td>+25.5</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>LCAC landing craft SLEP</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>-56.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>Completion of PY ships</td>
<td>369.1</td>
<td>+38.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>+38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>COVID recov. 2nd, 3rd, 4th tier suppliers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YY</td>
<td>Auxiliary vessels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>19,902.8</strong></td>
<td>+2,421.7</td>
<td>+1,351.3</td>
<td>+3,506.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Table prepared by CRS based on original Navy FY2021 budget submission, committee reports, and explanatory statements on the FY2021 National Defense Authorization Act and FY2020 DOD Appropriations Act.

**Notes:** Millions of dollars, rounded to nearest tenth. A blank cell indicates no change to requested amount. Totals may not add due to rounding. **AP** is advance procurement funding; **HASC** is House Armed Services Committee; **SASC** is Senate Armed Services Committee; **HAC** is House Appropriations Committee; **SAC** is Senate Appropriations Committee; **Conf.** is conference report.
Appendix A. Earlier Navy Force-Structure Goals
Dating Back to 2001

The table below shows earlier Navy force-structure goals dating back to 2001. The 308-ship force-level goal of March 2015, shown in the first column of the table, is the goal that was replaced by the 355-ship force-level goal released in December 2016.

Table A-1. Earlier Navy Force-Structure Goals Dating Back to 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs)</td>
<td>12b</td>
<td>12b</td>
<td>12-14b</td>
<td>12b</td>
<td>12b</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruise missile submarines (SSGNs)</td>
<td>0c</td>
<td>0c</td>
<td>0-4c</td>
<td>4c</td>
<td>0c</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 or 4c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack submarines (SSNs)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>~48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft carriers</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruisers and destroyers</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>~90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94a</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frigates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littoral Combat Ships (LCSs)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>~55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibious ships</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>~32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33h</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPF(F) ships</td>
<td>0i</td>
<td>0i</td>
<td>0i</td>
<td>0i</td>
<td>0i</td>
<td>12i</td>
<td>10i</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat logistics (resupply) ships</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>~29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated mine warfare ships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint High Speed Vessels (JHSV)</td>
<td>10i</td>
<td>10i</td>
<td>10i</td>
<td>21i</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>~23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24i</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total battle force ships</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>~310-316</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table prepared by CRS based on U.S. Navy data.

Notes: QDR is Quadrennial Defense Review. The “~” symbol means approximately.

a. Initial composition. Composition was subsequently modified.
b. The Navy plans to replace the 14 current Ohio-class SSBNs with a new class of 12 next-generation SSBNs. For further discussion, see CRS Report R41129, Navy Columbia (SSBN-826) Class Ballistic Missile Submarine Program: Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O’Rourke.
c. Although the Navy plans to continue operating its four SSGNs until they reach retirement age in the late 2020s, the Navy does not plan to replace these ships when they retire. This situation can be expressed in a table like this one with either a 4 or a 0.
d. The report on the 2001 QDR did not mention a specific figure for SSGNs. The Administration’s proposed FY2001 DOD budget requested funding to support the conversion of two available Trident SSBNs into.
SSGNs, and the retirement of two other Trident SSBNs. Congress, in marking up this request, supported a plan to convert all four available SSBNs into SSGNs.

e. With congressional approval, the goal has been temporarily reduced to 10 carriers for the period between the retirement of the carrier Enterprise (CVN-65) in December 2012 and the entry into service of the carrier Gerald R. Ford (CVN-78), currently scheduled for September 2015.

f. For a time, the Navy characterized the goal as 11 carriers in the nearer term, and eventually 12 carriers.

g. The 94-ship goal was announced by the Navy in an April 2011 report to Congress on naval force structure and missile defense.

h. The Navy acknowledged that meeting a requirement for being able to lift the assault echelons of 2.0 Marine Expeditionary Brigades (MEBs) would require a minimum of 33 amphibious ships rather than the 31 ships shown in the February 2006 plan. For further discussion, see CRS Report RL34476, Navy LPD-17 Amphibious Ship Procurement: Background, Issues, and Options for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.

i. Today's Maritime Prepositioning Force (MPF) ships are intended primarily to support Marine Corps operations ashore, rather than Navy combat operations, and thus are not counted as Navy battle force ships. The planned MPF (Future) ships, however, would have contributed to Navy combat capabilities (for example, by supporting Navy aircraft operations). For this reason, the ships in the planned MPF(F) squadron were counted by the Navy as battle force ships. The planned MPF(F) squadron was subsequently restructured into a different set of initiatives for enhancing the existing MPF squadrons; the Navy no longer plans to acquire an MPF(F) squadron.

j. The Navy no longer plans to acquire an MPF(F) squadron. The Navy, however, has procured or plans to procure some of the ships that were previously planned for the squadron—specifically, TAKE-1 class cargo ships, and Mobile Landing Platform (MLP)/Afloat Forward Staging Base (AFSB) ships. These ships are included in the total shown for “Other” ships. AFSBs are now called Expeditionary Sea Base ships (ESBs).

k. The figure of 26 dedicated mine warfare ships included 10 ships maintained in a reduced mobilization status called Mobilization Category B. Ships in this status are not readily deployable and thus do not count as battle force ships. The 375-ship proposal thus implied transferring these 10 ships to a higher readiness status.

l. Totals shown include 5 ships transferred from the Army to the Navy and operated by the Navy primarily for the performance of Army missions.

m. This category includes, among other things, command ships and support ships.

n. The increase in this category from 17 ships under the February 2006 313-ship goal to 24 ships under the apparent 328-ship goal included the addition of one TAGOS ocean surveillance ship and the transfer into this category of six ships—three modified TAKE-1 class cargo ships, and three Mobile Landing Platform (MLP) ships—that were previously intended for the planned (but now canceled) MPF(F) squadron.
Appendix B. Comparing Past Ship Force Levels to Current or Potential Future Levels

In assessing the appropriateness of the current or potential future number of ships in the Navy, observers sometimes compare that number to historical figures for total Navy fleet size. Historical figures for total fleet size, however, can be a problematic yardstick for assessing the appropriateness of the current or potential future number of ships in the Navy, particularly if the historical figures are more than a few years old, because

- the missions to be performed by the Navy, the mix of ships that make up the Navy, and the technologies that are available to Navy ships for performing missions all change over time; and

- the number of ships in the fleet in an earlier year might itself have been inappropriate (i.e., not enough or more than enough) for meeting the Navy’s mission requirements in that year.

Regarding the first bullet point above, the Navy, for example, reached a late-Cold War peak of 568 battle force ships at the end of FY1987, and as of April 22, 2021, included a total of 296 battle force ships. The FY1987 fleet, however, was intended to meet a set of mission requirements that focused on countering Soviet naval forces at sea during a potential multitheater NATO-Warsaw Pact conflict, while the April 2021 fleet is intended to meet a considerably different set of mission requirements centered on countering China’s improving naval capabilities. In addition, the Navy of FY1987 differed substantially from the April 2021 fleet in areas such as profusion of precision-guided air-delivered weapons, numbers of Tomahawk-capable ships, and the sophistication of C4ISR systems and networking capabilities.

In coming years, Navy missions may shift again, and the capabilities of Navy ships will likely have changed further by that time due to developments such as more comprehensive implementation of networking technology, increased use of ship-based unmanned vehicles, and the potential fielding of new types of weapons such as lasers or electromagnetic rail guns.

The 568-ship fleet of FY1987 may or may not have been capable of performing its stated missions; the 296-ship fleet of April 2021 may or may not be capable of performing its stated missions; and a fleet years from now with a certain number of ships may or may not be capable of performing its stated missions. Given changes over time in mission requirements, ship mixes, and technologies, however, these three issues are to a substantial degree independent of one another.

For similar reasons, trends over time in the total number of ships in the Navy are not necessarily a reliable indicator of the direction of change in the fleet’s ability to perform its stated missions. An increasing number of ships in the fleet might not necessarily mean that the fleet’s ability to

---

46 Some publications have stated that the Navy reached a peak of 594 ships at the end of FY1987. This figure, however, is the total number of active ships in the fleet, which is not the same as the total number of battle force ships. The battle force ships figure is the number used in government discussions of the size of the Navy. In recent years, the total number of active ships has been larger than the total number of battle force ships. For example, the Naval History and Heritage Command (formerly the Naval Historical Center) states that as of November 16, 2001, the Navy included a total of 337 active ships, while the Navy states that as of November 19, 2001, the Navy included a total of 317 battle force ships. Comparing the total number of active ships in one year to the total number of battle force ships in another year is thus an apples-to-oranges comparison that in this case overstates the decline since FY1987 in the number of ships in the Navy. As a general rule to avoid potential statistical distortions, comparisons of the number of ships in the Navy over time should use, whenever possible, a single counting method.

47 C4ISR stands for command and control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.
perform its stated missions is increasing, because the fleet’s mission requirements might be increasing more rapidly than ship numbers and average ship capability. Similarly, a decreasing number of ships in the fleet might not necessarily mean that the fleet’s ability to perform stated missions is decreasing, because the fleet’s mission requirements might be declining more rapidly than numbers of ships, or because average ship capability and the percentage of time that ships are in deployed locations might be increasing quickly enough to more than offset reductions in total ship numbers.

Regarding the second of the two bullet points above, it can be noted that comparisons of the size of the fleet today with the size of the fleet in earlier years rarely appear to consider whether the fleet was appropriately sized in those earlier years (and therefore potentially suitable as a yardstick of comparison), even though it is quite possible that the fleet in those earlier years might not have been appropriately sized, and even though there might have been differences of opinion among observers at that time regarding that question. Just as it might not be prudent for observers years from now to tacitly assume that the 296-ship Navy of September 2020 was appropriately sized for meeting the mission requirements of 2020, even though there were differences of opinion among observers on that question, simply because a figure of 296 ships appears in the historical records for 2020, so, too, might it not be prudent for observers today to tacitly assume that the number of ships of the Navy in an earlier year was appropriate for meeting the Navy’s mission requirements that year, even though there might have been differences of opinion among observers at that time regarding that question, simply because the size of the Navy in that year appears in a table like Table G-1.

Previous Navy force structure plans, such as those shown in Table A-1, might provide some insight into the potential adequacy of a proposed new force-structure plan, but changes over time in mission requirements, technologies available to ships for performing missions, and other force-planning factors, as well as the possibility that earlier force-structure plans might not have been appropriate for meeting the mission demands of their times, suggest that some caution should be applied in using past force structure plans for this purpose, particularly if those past force structure plans are more than a few years old. The Reagan-era goal for a 600-ship Navy, for example, was designed for a Cold War set of missions focusing on countering Soviet naval forces at sea, which is not an appropriate basis for planning the Navy today, and there was considerable debate during those years as to the appropriateness of the 600-ship goal.48

---

48 Navy force structure plans that predate those shown in Table A-1 include the Reagan-era 600-ship goal of the 1980s, the Base Force fleet of more than 400 ships planned during the final two years of the George H. W. Bush Administration, the 346-ship fleet from the Clinton Administration’s 1993 Bottom-Up Review (or BUR, sometimes also called Base Force II), and the 310-ship fleet of the Clinton Administration’s 1997 QDR. The table below summarizes some key features of these plans.

### Features of Recent Navy Force Structure Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>600-ship</th>
<th>Base Force</th>
<th>1993 BUR</th>
<th>1997 QDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total ships</td>
<td>~600</td>
<td>~450/416²</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>~305/310¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack submarines</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80/55</td>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>50/55²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft carriers</td>
<td>15⁶</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11+1¹</td>
<td>11+1¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface combatants</td>
<td>242/228⁶</td>
<td>~150</td>
<td>~124</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibious ships</td>
<td>~75⁶</td>
<td>51¹</td>
<td>41¹</td>
<td>36¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Prepared by CRS based on DOD and U.S. Navy data.

a. Commonly referred to as 450-ship goal, but called for decreasing to 416 ships by end of FY1999.
b. Original total of about 305 ships was increased to about 310 due to increase in number of attack submarines to 55.
from 50.
c. Plan originally included 80 attack submarines, but this was later reduced to about 55.
d. Plan originally included 50 attack submarines but this was later increased to 55.
e. Plus one additional aircraft carrier in the service life extension program (SLEP).
f. Eleven active carriers plus one operational reserve carrier.
g. Plan originally included 242 surface combatants but this was later reduced to 228.
h. Number needed to lift assault echelons of one Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) plus one Marine Expeditionary Brigade (MEB).
i. Number needed to lift assault echelons of 2.5 MEBs. Changing numbers needed to meet this goal reflect in part changes in the design and capabilities of amphibious ships.
Appendix C. Industrial Base and Employment Aspects of Additional Shipbuilding Work

This appendix presents background information on the ability of the industrial base to take on the additional shipbuilding work associated with achieving and maintaining the Navy’s 355-ship force-level goal and on the employment impact of additional shipbuilding work.

Industrial Base Ability

The U.S. shipbuilding industrial base has some unused capacity to take on increased Navy shipbuilding work, particularly for certain kinds of surface ships, and its capacity could be increased further over time to support higher Navy shipbuilding rates. Navy shipbuilding rates could not be increased steeply across the board overnight—time (and investment) would be needed to hire and train additional workers and increase production facilities at shipyards and supplier firms, particularly for supporting higher rates of submarine production. Depending on their specialties, newly hired workers could be initially less productive per unit of time worked than more experienced workers.

Some parts of the shipbuilding industrial base, such as the submarine construction industrial base, could face more challenges than others in ramping up to the higher production rates required to build the various parts of the 355-ship fleet. Over a period of a few to several years, with investment and management attention, Navy shipbuilding could ramp up to higher rates for achieving a 355-ship fleet over a period of 20-30 years.

An April 2017 CBO report stated that

all seven shipyards [currently involved in building the Navy’s major ships] would need to increase their workforces and several would need to make improvements to their infrastructure in order to build ships at a faster rate. However, certain sectors face greater obstacles in constructing ships at faster rates than others: Building more submarines to meet the goals of the 2016 force structure assessment would pose the greatest challenge to the shipbuilding industry. Increasing the number of aircraft carriers and surface combatants would pose a small to moderate challenge to builders of those vessels. Finally, building more amphibious ships and combat logistics and support ships would be the least problematic for the shipyards. The workforces across those yards would need to increase by about 40 percent over the next 5 to 10 years. Managing the growth and training of those new workforces while maintaining the current standard of quality and efficiency would represent the most significant industrywide challenge. In addition, industry and Navy sources indicate that as much as $4 billion would need to be invested in the physical infrastructure of the shipyards to achieve the higher production rates required under the [notional] 15-year and 20-year [buildup scenarios examined by CBO]. Less investment would be needed for the [notional] 25-year or 30-year [buildup scenarios examined by CBO].

A January 13, 2017, press report states the following:

The Navy’s production lines are hot and the work to prepare them for the possibility of building out a much larger fleet would be manageable, the service’s head of acquisition said Thursday.

From a logistics perspective, building the fleet from its current 274 ships to 355, as recommended in the Navy’s newest force structure assessment in December, would be

---

straightforward, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition Sean Stackley told reporters at the Surface Navy Association’s annual symposium.

“By virtue of maintaining these hot production lines, frankly, over the last eight years, our facilities are in pretty good shape,” Stackley said. “In fact, if you talked to industry, they would say we’re underutilizing the facilities that we have.”

The areas where the Navy would likely have to adjust “tooling” to answer demand for a larger fleet would likely be in Virginia-class attack submarines and large surface combatants, the DDG-51 guided missile destroyers—two ship classes likely to surge if the Navy gets funding to build to 355 ships, he said.

“Industry’s going to have to go out and procure special tooling associated with going from current production rates to a higher rate, but I would say that’s easily done,” he said.

Another key, Stackley said, is maintaining skilled workers—both the builders in the yards and the critical supply-chain vendors who provide major equipment needed for ship construction. And, he suggested, it would help to avoid budget cuts and other events that would force workforce layoffs.

“We’re already prepared to ramp up,” he said. “In certain cases, that means not laying off the skilled workforce we want to retain.”

A January 17, 2017, press report states the following:

Building stable designs with active production lines is central to the Navy’s plan to grow to 355 ships. “if you look at the 355-ship number, and you study the ship classes (desired), the big surge is in attack submarines and large surface combatants, which today are DDG-51 (destroyers),” the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Sean Stackley, told reporters at last week’s Surface Navy Association conference. Those programs have proven themselves reliable performers both at sea and in the shipyards.

From today’s fleet of 274 ships, “we’re on an irreversible path to 308 by 2021. Those ships are already in construction,” said Stackley. “To go from there to 355, virtually all those ships are currently in production, with some exceptions: Ohio Replacement, (we) just got done the Milestone B there (to move from R&D into detailed design); and then upgrades to existing platforms. So we have hot production lines that will take us to that 355-ship Navy.”

A January 24, 2017, press report states the following:

Navy officials say a recently determined plan to increase its fleet size by adding more new submarines, carriers and destroyers is “executable” and that early conceptual work toward this end is already underway....

Although various benchmarks will need to be reached in order for this new plan to come to fruition, such as Congressional budget allocations, Navy officials do tell Scout Warrior that the service is already working—at least in concept—on plans to vastly enlarge the fleet. Findings from this study are expected to inform an upcoming 2018 Navy Shipbuilding Plan, service officials said.

A January 12, 2017, press report states the following:


Brian Cuccias, president of Ingalls Shipbuilding [a shipyard owned by Huntington Ingalls Industries (HII) that builds Navy destroyers and amphibious ships as well as Coast Guard cutters], said Ingalls, which is currently building 10 ships for four Navy and Coast Guard programs at its 800-acre facility in Pascagoula, Miss., could build more because it is using only 70 to 75 percent of its capacity.

A March 2017 press report states the following:

As the Navy calls for a larger fleet, shipbuilders are looking toward new contracts and ramping up their yards to full capacity....

The Navy is confident that U.S. shipbuilders will be able to meet an increased demand, said Ray Mabus, then-secretary of the Navy, during a speech at the Surface Navy Association’s annual conference in Arlington, Virginia.

They have the capacity to “get there because of the ships we are building today,” Mabus said. “I don’t think we could have seven years ago.”

Shipbuilders around the United States have “hot” production lines and are manufacturing vessels on multi-year or block buy contracts, he added. The yards have made investments in infrastructure and in the training of their workers.

“We now have the basis ... [to] get to that much larger fleet,” he said....

Shipbuilders have said they are prepared for more work.

At Ingalls Shipbuilding—a subsidiary of Huntington Ingalls Industries—10 ships are under construction at its Pascagoula, Mississippi, yard, but it is under capacity, said Brian Cuccias, the company’s president.

The shipbuilder is currently constructing five guided-missile destroyers, the latest San Antonio-class amphibious transport dock ship, and two national security cutters for the Coast Guard.

“Ingalls is a very successful production line right now, but it has the ability to actually produce a lot more in the future,” he said during a briefing with reporters in January.

The company’s facility is currently operating at 75 percent capacity, he noted....

Austal USA—the builder of the Independence-variant of the littoral combat ship and the expeditionary fast transport vessel—is also ready to increase its capacity should the Navy require it, said Craig Perciavalle, the company’s president.

The latest discussions are “certainly something that a shipbuilder wants to hear,” he said. “We do have the capability of increasing throughput if the need and demand were to arise, and then we also have the ability with the present workforce and facility to meet a different mix that could arise as well.”

Austal could build fewer expeditionary fast transport vessels and more littoral combat ships, or vice versa, he added.

“The key thing for us is to keep the manufacturing lines hot and really leverage the momentum that we’ve gained on both of the programs,” he said.

The company—which has a 164-acre yard in Mobile, Alabama—is focused on the extension of the LCS and expeditionary fast transport ship program, but Perciavalle noted that it could look into manufacturing other types of vessels.

“We do have excess capacity to even build smaller vessels … if that opportunity were to arise and we’re pursuing that,” he said.

Bryan Clark, a naval analyst at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, a Washington, D.C.-based think tank, said shipbuilders are on average running between 70 and 80 percent capacity. While they may be ready to meet an increased demand for ships, it would take time to ramp up their workforces.

However, the bigger challenge is the supplier industrial base, he said.

“Shipyards may be able to build ships but the supplier base that builds the pumps … and the radars and the radios and all those other things, they don’t necessarily have that ability to ramp up,” he said. “You would need to put some money into building up their capacity.”

That has to happen now, he added.

Rear Adm. William Gallinis, program manager for program executive office ships, said what the Navy must be “mindful of is probably our vendor base that support the shipyards.”

Smaller companies that supply power electronics and switchboards could be challenged, he said.

“Do we need to re-sequence some of the funding to provide some of the facility improvements for some of the vendors that may be challenged? My sense is that the industrial base will size to the demand signal. We just need to be mindful of how we transition to that increased demand signal,” he said.

The acquisition workforce may also see an increased amount of stress, Gallinis noted. “It takes a fair amount of experience and training to get a good contracting officer to the point to be [able to] manage contracts or procure contracts.”

“But I don’t see anything that is insurmountable,” he added.54

At a May 24, 2017, hearing before the Seapower subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee on the industrial-base aspects of the Navy’s 355-ship goal, John P. Casey, executive vice president–marine systems, General Dynamics Corporation (one of the country’s two principal builders of Navy ships) stated the following:

It is our belief that the Nation’s shipbuilding industrial base can scale-up hot production lines for existing ships and mobilize additional resources to accomplish the significant challenge of achieving the 355-ship Navy as quickly as possible....

Supporting a plan to achieve a 355-ship Navy will be the most challenging for the nuclear submarine enterprise. Much of the shipyard and industrial base capacity was eliminated following the steep drop-off in submarine production that occurred with the cancellation of the Seawolf Program in 1992. The entire submarine industrial base at all levels of the supply chain will likely need to recapitalize some portion of its facilities, workforce, and supply chain just to support the current plan to build the Columbia Class SSBN program, while concurrently building Virginia Class SSNs. Additional SSN procurement will require industry to expand its plans and associated investment beyond the level today....

Shipyard labor resources include the skilled trades needed to fabricate, build and outfit major modules, perform assembly, test and launch of submarines, and associated support organizations that include planning, material procurement, inspection, quality assurance, and ship certification. Since there is no commercial equivalency for Naval nuclear submarine shipbuilding, these trade resources cannot be easily acquired in large numbers from other industries. Rather, these shipyard resources must be acquired and developed over time to ensure the unique knowledge and know-how associated with nuclear

The mechanisms of knowledge transfer require sufficient lead time to create the proficient, skilled craftsmen in each key trade including welding, electrical, machining, shipfitting, pipe welding, painting, and carpentry, which are among the largest trades that would need to grow to support increased demand. These trades will need to be hired in the numbers required to support the increased workload. Both shipyards have scalable processes in place to acquire, train, and develop the skilled workforce they need to build nuclear ships. These processes and associated training facilities need to be expanded to support the increased demand. As with the shipyards, the same limiting factors associated with facilities, workforce, and supply chain also limit the submarine unique first tier suppliers and sub-tiers in the industrial base for which there is no commercial equivalency.

The supply base is the third resource that will need to be expanded to meet the increased demand over the next 20 years. During the OHIO, 688 and SEAWOLF construction programs, there were over 17,000 suppliers supporting submarine construction programs. That resource base was “rationalized” during submarine low rate production over the last 20 years. The current submarine industrial base reflects about 5,000 suppliers, of which about 3,000 are currently active (i.e., orders placed within the last 5 years), 80% of which are single or sole source (based on $). It will take roughly 20 years to build the 12 Columbia Class submarines that starts construction in FY21. The shipyards are expanding strategic sourcing of appropriate non-core products (e.g., decks, tanks, etc.) in order to focus on core work at each shipyard facility (e.g., module outfitting and assembly). Strategic sourcing will move demand into the supply base where capacity may exist or where it can be developed more easily. This approach could offer the potential for cost savings by competition or shifting work to lower cost work centers throughout the country. Each shipyard has a process to assess their current supply base capacity and capability and to determine where it would be most advantageous to perform work in the supply base.

Achieving the increased rate of production and reducing the cost of submarines will require the Shipbuilders to rely on the supply base for more non-core products such as structural fabrication, sheet metal, machining, electrical, and standard parts. The supply base must be made ready to execute work with submarine-specific requirements at a rate and volume that they are not currently prepared to perform. Preparing the supply base to execute increased demand requires early non-recurring funding to support cross-program construction readiness and EOQ funding to procure material in a manner that does not hold up existing ship construction schedules should problems arise in supplier qualification programs. This requires longer lead times (estimates of three years to create a new qualified, critical supplier) than the current funding profile supports.

We need to rely on market principles to allow suppliers, the shipyards and GFE material providers to sort through the complicated demand equation across the multiple ship programs. Supplier development funding previously mentioned would support non-recurring efforts which are needed to place increased orders for material in multiple market spaces. Examples would include valves, build-to-print fabrication work, commodities, specialty material, engineering components, etc. We are engaging our marine industry associations to help foster innovative approaches that could reduce costs and gain efficiency for this increased volume.

Supporting the 355-ship Navy will require Industry to add capability and capacity across the entire Navy Shipbuilding value chain. Industry will need to make investment decisions for additional capital spend starting now in order to meet a step change in demand that would begin in FY19 or FY20. For the submarine enterprise, the step change was already envisioned and investment plans that embraced a growth trajectory were already being formulated. Increasing demand by adding additional submarines will require scaling facility and workforce development plans to operate at a higher rate of production. The nuclear shipyards would also look to increase material procurement proportionally to the increased demand. In some cases, the shipyard facilities may be constrained with existing
capacity and may look to source additional work in the supply base where capacity exists or where there are competitive business advantages to be realized. Creating additional capacity in the supply base will require non-recurring investment in supplier qualification, facilities, capital equipment and workforce training and development.

Industry is more likely to increase investment in new capability and capacity if there is certainty that the Navy will proceed with a stable shipbuilding plan. Positive signals of commitment from the Government must go beyond a published 30-year Navy Shipbuilding Plan and line items in the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP) and should include:

- Multi-year contracting for Block procurement which provides stability in the industrial base and encourages investment in facilities and workforce development
- Funding for supplier development to support training, qualification, and facilitization efforts—Electric Boat and Newport News have recommended to the Navy funding of $400M over a three-year period starting in 2018 to support supplier development for the Submarine Industrial Base as part of an Integrated Enterprise Plan Extended Enterprise initiative
- Acceleration of Advance Procurement and/or Economic Order Quantities (EOQ) procurement from FY19 to FY18 for Virginia Block V
- Government incentives for construction readiness and facilities / special tooling for shipyard and supplier facilities, which help cash flow capital investment ahead of construction contract awards
- Procurement of additional production back-up (PBU) material to help ensure a ready supply of material to mitigate construction schedule risk....

So far, this testimony has focused on the Submarine Industrial Base, but the General Dynamics Marine Systems portfolio also includes surface ship construction. Unlike Electric Boat, Bath Iron Works and NASSCO are able to support increased demand without a significant increase in resources....

Bath Iron Works is well positioned to support the Administration’s announced goal of increasing the size of the Navy fleet to 355 ships. For BIW that would mean increasing the total current procurement rate of two DDG 51s per year to as many as four DDGs per year, allocated equally between BIW and HII. This is the same rate that the surface combatant industrial base sustained over the first decade of full rate production of the DDG 51 Class (1989-1999)....

No significant capital investment in new facilities is required to accommodate delivering two DDGs per year. However, additional funding will be required to train future shipbuilders and maintain equipment. Current hiring and training processes support the projected need, and have proven to be successful in the recent past. BIW has invested significantly in its training programs since 2014 with the restart of the DDG 51 program and given these investments and the current market in Maine, there is little concern of meeting the increase in resources required under the projected plans.

A predictable and sustainable Navy workload is essential to justify expanding hiring/training programs. BIW would need the Navy’s commitment that the Navy’s plan will not change before it would proceed with additional hiring and training to support increased production.

BIW’s supply chain is prepared to support a procurement rate increase of up to four DDG 51s per year for the DDG 51 Program. BIW has long-term purchasing agreements in place for all major equipment and material for the DDG 51 Program. These agreements provide for material lead time and pricing, and are not constrained by the number of ships ordered in a year. BIW confirmed with all of its critical suppliers that they can support this increased procurement rate....

The Navy’s Force Structure Assessment calls for three additional ESBs. Additionally, NASSCO has been asked by the Navy and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to evaluate its ability to increase the production rate of T-AOs to two ships per year. NASSCO has the capacity to build three more ESBs at a rate of one ship per year while building two
T-AOs per year. The most cost effective funding profile requires funding ESB 6 in FY18 and the following ships in subsequent fiscal years to avoid increased cost resulting from a break in the production line. The most cost effective funding profile to enable a production rate of two T-AO ships per year requires funding an additional long lead time equipment set beginning in FY19 and an additional ship each year beginning in FY20.

NASSCO must now reduce its employment levels due to completion of a series of commercial programs which resulted in the delivery of six ships in 2016. The proposed increase in Navy shipbuilding stabilizes NASSCO’s workload and workforce to levels that were readily demonstrated over the last several years.

Some moderate investment in the NASSCO shipyard will be needed to reach this level of production. The recent CBO report on the costs of building a 355-ship Navy accurately summarized NASSCO’s ability to reach the above production rate stating, "building more … combat logistics and support ships would be the least problematic for the shipyards."

At the same hearing, Brian Cuccias, president, Ingalls Shipbuilding, Huntington Ingalls Industries (the country’s other principal builder of Navy ships) stated the following:

Qualifying to be a supplier is a difficult process. Depending on the commodity, it may take up to 36 months. That is a big burden on some of these small businesses. This is why creating sufficient volume and exercising early contractual authorization and advance procurement funding is necessary to grow the supplier base, and not just for traditional long-lead time components; that effort needs to expand to critical components and commodities that today are controlling the build rate of submarines and carriers alike. Many of our suppliers are small businesses and can only make decisions to invest in people, plant and tooling when they are awarded a purchase order. We need to consider how we can make commitments to suppliers early enough to ensure material readiness and availability when construction schedules demand it.

With questions about the industry’s ability to support an increase in shipbuilding, both Newport News and Ingalls have undertaken an extensive inventory of our suppliers and assessed their ability to ramp up their capacity. We have engaged many of our key suppliers to assess their ability to respond to an increase in production.

The fortunes of related industries also impact our suppliers, and an increase in demand from the oil and gas industry may stretch our supply base. Although some low to moderate risk remains, I am convinced that our suppliers will be able to meet the forecasted Navy demand....

I strongly believe that the fastest results can come from leveraging successful platforms on current hot production lines. We commend the Navy’s decision in 2014 to use the existing LPD 17 hull form for the LX(R), which will replace the LSD-class amphibious dock landing ships scheduled to retire in the coming years. However, we also recommend that the concept of commonality be taken even further to best optimize efficiency, affordability and capability. Specifically, rather than continuing with a new design for LX(R) within the “walls” of the LPD hull, we can leverage our hot production line and supply chain and offer the Navy a variant of the existing LPD design that satisfies the aggressive cost targets of the LX(R) program while delivering more capability and survivability to the fleet at a significantly faster pace than the current program. As much as 10-15 percent material savings can be realized across the LX(R) program by purchasing respective blocks of at least five ships each under a multi-year procurement (MYP) approach. In the aggregate, continuing production with LPD 30 in FY18, coupled with successive MYP contracts for

---

the balance of ships, may yield savings greater than $1 billion across an 11-ship LX(R) program. Additionally, we can deliver five LX(R)s to the Navy and Marine Corps in the same timeframe that the current plan would deliver two, helping to reduce the shortfall in amphibious warships against the stated force requirement of 38 ships.

Multi-ship procurements, whether a formal MYP or a block-buy, are a proven way to reduce the price of ships. The Navy took advantage of these tools on both Virginia-class submarines and Arleigh Burke-class destroyers. In addition to the LX(R) program mentioned above, expanding multi-ship procurements to other ship classes makes sense....

The most efficient approach to lower the cost of the Ford class and meet the goal of an increased CVN fleet size is also to employ a multi-ship procurement strategy and construct these ships at three-year intervals. This approach would maximize the material procurement savings benefit through economic order quantities procurement and provide labor efficiencies to enable rapid acquisition of a 12-ship CVN fleet. This three-ship approach would save at least $1.5 billion, not including additional savings that could be achieved from government-furnished equipment. As part of its Integrated Enterprise Plan, we commend the Navy’s efforts to explore the prospect of material economic order quantity purchasing across carrier and submarine programs.56

At the same hearing, Matthew O. Paxton, president, Shipbuilders Council of America (SCA)—a trade association representing shipbuilders, suppliers, and associated firms—stated the following:

To increase the Navy’s Fleet to 355 ships, a substantial and sustained investment is required in both procurement and readiness. However, let me be clear: building and sustaining the larger required Fleet is achievable and our industry stands ready to help achieve that important national security objective.

To meet the demand for increased vessel construction while sustaining the vessels we currently have will require U.S. shipyards to expand their work forces and improve their infrastructure in varying degrees depending on ship type and ship mix—a requirement our Nation’s shipyards are eager to meet. But first, in order to build these ships in as timely and affordable manner as possible, stable and robust funding is necessary to sustain those industrial capabilities which support Navy shipbuilding and ship maintenance and modernization....

Beyond providing for the building of a 355-ship Navy, there must also be provision to fund the “tail,” the maintenance of the current and new ships entering the fleet. Target fleet size cannot be reached if existing ships are not maintained to their full service lives, while building those new ships. Maintenance has been deferred in the last few years because of across-the-board budget cuts....

The domestic shipyard industry certainly has the capability and know-how to build and maintain a 355-ship Navy. The Maritime Administration determined in a recent study on the Economic Benefits of the U.S. Shipyard Industry that there are nearly 110,000 skilled men and women in the Nation’s private shipyards building, repairing and maintaining America’s military and commercial fleets.1 The report found the U.S. shipbuilding industry supports nearly 400,000 jobs across the country and generates $25.1 billion in income and $37.3 billion worth of goods and services each year. In fact, the MARAD report found that the shipyard industry creates direct and induced employment in every State and Congressional District and each job in the private shipbuilding and repairing industry supports another 2.6 jobs nationally.

This data confirms the significant economic impact of this manufacturing sector, but also that the skilled workforce and industrial base exists domestically to build these ships. Long-

56 Statement of Brian Cuccias, President, Ingalls Shipbuilding, Huntington Ingalls Industries, Subcommittee on Seapower, Senate Armed Services Committee, May 24, 2017, pp. 4-11.
term, there needs to be a workforce expansion and some shipyards will need to reconfigure or expand production lines. This can and will be done as required to meet the need if adequate, stable budgets and procurement plans are established and sustained for the long-term. Funding predictability and sustainability will allow industry to invest in facilities and more effectively grow its skilled workforce. The development of that critical workforce will take time and a concerted effort in a partnership between industry and the federal government.

U.S. shipyards pride themselves on implementing state of the art training and apprenticeship programs to develop skilled men and women that can cut, weld, and bend steel and aluminum and who can design, build and maintain the best Navy in the world. However, the shipbuilding industry, like so many other manufacturing sectors, faces an aging workforce. Attracting and retaining the next generation shipyard worker for an industry career is critical. Working together with the Navy, and local and state resources, our association is committed to building a robust training and development pipeline for skilled shipyard workers. In addition to repealing sequestration and stabilizing funding the continued development of a skilled workforce also needs to be included in our national maritime strategy....

In conclusion, the U.S. shipyard industry is certainly up to the task of building a 355-ship Navy and has the expertise, the capability, the critical capacity and the unmatched skilled workforce to build these national assets. Meeting the Navy’s goal of a 355-ship fleet and securing America’s naval dominance for the decades ahead will require sustained investment by Congress and Navy’s partnership with a defense industrial base that can further attract and retain a highly-skilled workforce with critical skill sets. Again, I would like to thank this Subcommittee for inviting me to testify alongside such distinguished witnesses. As a representative of our nation’s private shipyards, I can say, with confidence and certainty, that our domestic shipyards and skilled workers are ready, willing and able to build and maintain the Navy’s 355-ship Fleet.57

Employment Impact

Building the additional ships that would be needed to achieve and maintain the 355-ship fleet could create many additional manufacturing and other jobs at shipyards, associated supplier firms, and elsewhere in the U.S. economy. A 2015 Maritime Administration (MARAD) report states

Considering the indirect and induced impacts, each direct job in the shipbuilding and repairing industry is associated with another 2.6 jobs in other parts of the US economy; each dollar of direct labor income and GDP in the shipbuilding and repairing industry is associated with another $1.74 in labor income and $2.49 in GDP, respectively, in other parts of the US economy.58

A March 2017 press report states, “Based on a 2015 economic impact study, the Shipbuilders Council of America [a trade association for U.S. shipbuilders and associated supplier firms] believes that a 355-ship Navy could add more than 50,000 jobs nationwide.”59 The 2015

57 Testimony of Matthew O. Paxton, President, Shipbuilders Council of America, before the United States Senate Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Seapower, [on] Industry Perspectives on Options and Considerations for Achieving a 355-Ship Navy, May 24, 2017, pp. 3-8.
economic impact study referred to in that quote might be the 2015 MARAD study discussed in the previous paragraph. An estimate of more than 50,000 additional jobs nationwide might be viewed as a higher-end estimate; other estimates might be lower. A June 14, 2017, press report states the following: “The shipbuilding industry will need to add between 18,000 and 25,000 jobs to build to a 350-ship Navy, according to Matthew Paxton, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, a trade association representing the shipbuilding industrial base. Including indirect jobs like suppliers, the ramp-up may require a boost of 50,000 workers.”  

Similarly, another press report states the following: “The Navy envisioned by Trump could create more than 50,000 jobs, the Shipbuilders Council of America, a trade group representing U.S. shipbuilders, repairers and suppliers, told Reuters.” (Mike Stone, “Missing from Trump’s Grand Navy Plan: Skilled Workers to Build the Fleet,” Reuters, March 17, 2017.)

Appendix D. A Summary of Some Acquisition Lessons Learned for Navy Shipbuilding

This appendix presents a general summary of lessons learned in Navy shipbuilding, reflecting comments made repeatedly by various sources over the years. These lessons learned include the following:

- **At the outset, get the operational requirements for the program right.** Properly identify the program’s operational requirements at the outset. Manage risk by not trying to do too much in terms of the program’s operational requirements, and perhaps seek a so-called 70%-to-80% solution (i.e., a design that is intended to provide 70%-80% of desired or ideal capabilities). Achieve a realistic balance up front between operational requirements, risks, and estimated costs.

- **Use mature technologies.** Use land-based prototyping and testing to bring new technologies to a high state of maturity before incorporating them into ship designs, and limit the number of major new technologies to be incorporated into a new ship design.

- **Impose cost discipline up front.** Use realistic price estimates, and consider not only development and procurement costs, but life-cycle operation and support (O&S) costs.

- **Employ competition** where possible in the awarding of design and construction contracts.

- **Use a contract type that is appropriate for the amount of risk involved,** and structure its terms to align incentives with desired outcomes.

- **Minimize design/construction concurrency** by developing the design to a high level of completion before starting construction and by resisting changes in requirements (and consequent design changes) during construction.

- **Properly supervise construction work.** Maintain an adequate number of properly trained Supervisor of Shipbuilding (SUPSHIP) personnel.

- **Provide stability for industry,** in part by using, where possible, multiyear procurement (MYP) or block buy contracting.

- **Maintain a capable government acquisition workforce** that understands what it is buying, as well as the above points.

Identifying these lessons is arguably not the hard part—most if not all these points have been cited for years. The hard part, arguably, is living up to them without letting circumstances lead program-execution efforts away from these guidelines.
Appendix E. Some Considerations Relating to Warranties in Shipbuilding Contracts

This appendix presents some considerations relating to warranties in shipbuilding contracts and other defense acquisition.

In discussions of Navy (and also Coast Guard) shipbuilding, one question that sometimes arises is whether including a warranty in a shipbuilding contract is preferable to not including one. The question can arise, for example, in connection with a GAO finding that “the Navy structures shipbuilding contracts so that it pays shipbuilders to build ships as part of the construction process and then pays the same shipbuilders a second time to repair the ship when construction defects are discovered.”

Including a warranty in a shipbuilding contract (or a contract for building some other kind of defense end item), while potentially valuable, might not always be preferable to not including one—it depends on the circumstances of the acquisition, and it is not necessarily a valid criticism of an acquisition program to state that it is using a contract that does not include a warranty (or a weaker form of a warranty rather than a stronger one).

Including a warranty generally shifts to the contractor the risk of having to pay for fixing problems with earlier work. Although that in itself could be deemed desirable from the government’s standpoint, a contractor negotiating a contract that will have a warranty will incorporate that risk into its price, and depending on how much the contractor might charge for doing that, it is possible that the government could wind up paying more in total for acquiring the item (including fixing problems with earlier work on that item) than it would have under a contract without a warranty.

When a warranty is not included in the contract and the government pays later on to fix problems with earlier work, those payments can be very visible, which can invite critical comments from observers. But that does not mean that including a warranty in the contract somehow frees the government from paying to fix problems with earlier work. In a contract that includes a warranty, the government will indeed pay something to fix problems with earlier work—but it will make the payment in the less-visible (but still very real) form of the up-front charge for including the warranty, and that charge might be more than what it would have cost the government, under a contract without a warranty, to pay later on for fixing those problems.

From a cost standpoint, including a warranty in the contract might or might not be preferable, depending on the risk that there will be problems with earlier work that need fixing, the potential cost of fixing such problems, and the cost of including the warranty in the contract. The point is that the goal of avoiding highly visible payments for fixing problems with earlier work and the goal of minimizing the cost to the government of fixing problems with earlier work are separate and different goals, and that pursuing the first goal can sometimes work against achieving the second goal.

---

61 See Government Accountability Office, Navy Shipbuilding[:] Past Performance Provides Valuable Lessons for Future Investments, GAO-18-238SP, June 2018, p. 21. A graphic on page 21 shows a GAO finding that the government was financially responsible for shipbuilder deficiencies in 96% of the cases examined by GAO, and that the shipbuilder was financially responsible for shipbuilder deficiencies in 4% of the cases.

62 It can also be noted that the country’s two largest builders of Navy ships—General Dynamics (GD) and Huntington Ingalls Industries (HII)—derive about 60% and 96%, respectively, of their revenues from U.S. government work. (See General Dynamics, 2016 Annual Report, page 9 of Form 10-K [PDF page 15 of 88]) and Huntington Ingalls Industries,
The Department of Defense’s guide on the use of warranties states the following:

Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 46.7 states that “the use of warranties is not mandatory.” However, if the benefits to be derived from the warranty are commensurate with the cost of the warranty, the CO [contracting officer] should consider placing it in the contract. In determining whether a warranty is appropriate for a specific acquisition, FAR Subpart 46.703 requires the CO to consider the nature and use of the supplies and services, the cost, the administration and enforcement, trade practices, and reduced requirements. The rationale for using a warranty should be documented in the contract file.

In determining the value of a warranty, a CBA [cost-benefit analysis] is used to measure the life cycle costs of the system with and without the warranty. A CBA is required to determine if the warranty will be cost beneficial. CBA is an economic analysis, which basically compares the Life Cycle Costs (LCC) of the system with and without the warranty to determine if warranty coverage will improve the LCCs. In general, five key factors will drive the results of the CBA: cost of the warranty + cost of warranty administration + compatibility with total program efforts + cost of overlap with Contractor support + intangible savings. Effective warranties integrate reliability, maintainability, supportability, availability, and life-cycle costs. Decision factors that must be evaluated include the state of the weapon system technology, the size of the warranted population, the likelihood that field performance requirements can be achieved, and the warranty period of performance.63

Appendix F. Avoiding Procurement Cost Growth vs. Minimizing Procurement Costs

This appendix presents some considerations relating to avoiding procurement cost growth vs. minimizing procurement costs in shipbuilding and other defense acquisition.

The affordability challenge posed by the Navy’s shipbuilding plans can reinforce the strong oversight focus on preventing or minimizing procurement cost growth in Navy shipbuilding programs, which is one expression of a strong oversight focus on preventing or minimizing cost growth in DOD acquisition programs in general. This oversight focus may reflect in part an assumption that avoiding or minimizing procurement cost growth is always synonymous with minimizing procurement cost. It is important to note, however, that as paradoxical as it may seem, avoiding or minimizing procurement cost growth is not always synonymous with minimizing procurement cost, and that a sustained, singular focus on avoiding or minimizing procurement cost growth might sometimes lead to higher procurement costs for the government.

How could this be? Consider the example of a design for the lead ship of a new class of Navy ships. The construction cost of this new design is uncertain, but is estimated to be likely somewhere between Point A (a minimum possible figure) and Point D (a maximum possible figure). (Point D, in other words, would represent a cost estimate with a 100% confidence factor, meaning there is a 100% chance that the cost would come in at or below that level.) If the Navy wanted to avoid cost growth on this ship, it could simply set the ship’s procurement cost at Point D. Industry would likely be happy with this arrangement, and there likely would be no cost growth on the ship.

The alternative strategy open to the Navy is to set the ship’s target procurement cost at some figure between Points A and D—call it Point B—and then use that more challenging target cost to place pressure on industry to sharpen its pencils so as to find ways to produce the ship at that lower cost. (Navy officials sometimes refer to this as “pressurizing” industry.) In this example, it might turn out that industry efforts to reduce production costs are not successful enough to build the ship at the Point B cost. As a result, the ship experiences one or more rounds of procurement cost growth, and the ship’s procurement cost rises over time from Point B to some higher figure—call it Point C.

Here is the rub: Point C, in spite of incorporating one or more rounds of cost growth, might nevertheless turn out to be lower than Point D, because Point C reflected efforts by the shipbuilder to find ways to reduce production costs that the shipbuilder might have put less energy into pursuing if the Navy had simply set the ship’s procurement cost initially at Point D.

Setting the ship’s cost at Point D, in other words, may eliminate the risk of cost growth on the ship, but does so at the expense of creating a risk of the government paying more for the ship than was actually necessary. DOD could avoid cost growth on new procurement programs starting tomorrow by simply setting costs for those programs at each program’s equivalent of Point D. But as a result of this strategy, DOD could well wind up leaving money on the table in some instances—of not, in other words, minimizing procurement costs.

DOD does not have to set a cost precisely at Point D to create a potential risk in this regard. A risk of leaving money on the table, for example, is a possible downside of requiring DOD to budget for its acquisition programs at something like an 80% confidence factor—an approach that some observers have recommended—because a cost at the 80% confidence factor is a cost that is likely fairly close to Point D.
Procurement cost growth is often embarrassing for DOD and industry, and can damage their credibility in connection with future procurement efforts. Procurement cost growth can also disrupt congressional budgeting by requiring additional appropriations to pay for something Congress thought it had fully funded in a prior year. For this reason, there is a legitimate public policy value to pursuing a goal of having less rather than more procurement cost growth.

Procurement cost growth, however, can sometimes be in part the result of DOD efforts to use lower initial cost targets as a means of pressuring industry to reduce production costs—efforts that, notwithstanding the cost growth, might be partially successful. A sustained, singular focus on avoiding or minimizing cost growth, and of punishing DOD for all instances of cost growth, could discourage DOD from using lower initial cost targets as a means of pressurizing industry, which could deprive DOD of a tool for controlling procurement costs.

The point here is not to excuse away cost growth, because cost growth can occur in a program for reasons other than DOD’s attempt to pressurize industry. Nor is the point to abandon the goal of seeking lower rather than higher procurement cost growth, because, as noted above, there is a legitimate public policy value in pursuing this goal. The point, rather, is to recognize that this goal is not always synonymous with minimizing procurement cost, and that a possibility of some amount of cost growth might be expected as part of an optimal government strategy for minimizing procurement cost. Recognizing that the goals of seeking lower rather than higher cost growth and of minimizing procurement cost can sometimes be in tension with one another can lead to an approach that takes both goals into consideration. In contrast, an approach that is instead characterized by a sustained, singular focus on avoiding and minimizing cost growth may appear virtuous, but in the end may wind up costing the government more.
Appendix G. Size of the Navy and Navy Shipbuilding Rate

Size of the Navy

Table G-1 shows the size of the Navy in terms of total number of ships since FY1948; the numbers shown in the table reflect changes over time in the rules specifying which ships count toward the total. Differing counting rules result in differing totals, and for certain years, figures reflecting more than one set of counting rules are available. Figures in the table for FY1978 and subsequent years reflect the battle force ships counting method, which is the set of counting rules established in the early 1980s for public policy discussions of the size of the Navy.

As shown in the table, the total number of battle force ships in the Navy reached a late-Cold War peak of 568 at the end of FY1987 and began declining thereafter. The Navy fell below 300 battle force ships in August 2003 and remained below 300 ships for the next 16 years. The Navy briefly returned to a level of 300 ships in early July 2020, for the first time in almost 17 years, and has since fallen back below 300 ships. As of April 22, 2021, the Navy had 296 battle force ships.

As discussed in Appendix B, historical figures for total fleet size might not be a reliable yardstick for assessing the appropriateness of proposals for the future size and structure of the Navy, particularly if the historical figures are more than a few years old, because the missions to be performed by the Navy, the mix of ships that make up the Navy, and the technologies that are available to Navy ships for performing missions all change over time, and because the number of ships in the fleet in an earlier year might itself have been inappropriate (i.e., not enough or more than enough) for meeting the Navy’s mission requirements in that year.

For similar reasons, trends over time in the total number of ships in the Navy are not necessarily a reliable indicator of the direction of change in the fleet’s ability to perform its stated missions. An increasing number of ships in the fleet might not necessarily mean that the fleet’s ability to perform its stated missions is increasing, because the fleet’s mission requirements might be increasing more rapidly than ship numbers and average ship capability. Similarly, a decreasing number of ships in the fleet might not necessarily mean that the fleet’s ability to perform stated missions is decreasing, because the fleet’s mission requirements might be declining more rapidly than numbers of ships, or because average ship capability and the percentage of time that ships are in deployed locations might be increasing quickly enough to more than offset reductions in total ship numbers.

---

Some publications have stated that the Navy reached a peak of 594 ships at the end of FY1987. This figure, however, is the total number of active ships in the fleet, which is not the same as the total number of battle force ships. The battle force ships figure is the number used in government discussions of the size of the Navy. In recent years, the total number of active ships has been larger than the total number of battle force ships. For example, the Naval History and Heritage Command (formerly the Naval Historical Center) states that as of November 16, 2001, the Navy included a total of 337 active ships, while the Navy states that as of November 19, 2001, the Navy included a total of 317 battle force ships. Comparing the total number of active ships in one year to the total number of battle force ships in another year is thus an apples-to-oranges comparison that in this case overstates the decline since FY1987 in the number of ships in the Navy. As a general rule to avoid potential statistical distortions, comparisons of the number of ships in the Navy over time should use, whenever possible, a single counting method.
Table G-1. Total Number of Ships in Navy Since FY1948

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>FY&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>FY&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>FY&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by CRS using U.S. Navy data. Numbers shown reflect changes over time in the rules specifying which ships count toward the total. Figures for FY1978 and subsequent years reflect the battle force ships counting method, which is the set of counting rules established in the early 1980s for public policy discussions of the size of the Navy.

a. Data for earlier years in the table may be for the end of the calendar year (or for some other point during the year), rather than for the end of the fiscal year.
Shipbuilding Rate

Table G-2 shows past (FY1982-FY2021) and programmed (FY2022-FY2025) rates of Navy ship procurement.

Table G-2. Battle Force Ships Procured or Requested, FY1982-FY2025
(Procured in FY1982-FY2021 and programmed for FY2022-FY2025)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>82</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>98</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CRS compilation based on Navy budget data and examination of defense authorization and appropriation committee and conference reports for each fiscal year. The table excludes nonbattle force ships that do not count toward the 355-ship goal, such as certain sealift and prepositioning ships operated by the Military Sealift Command and oceanographic ships operated by agencies such as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Notes: (1) The totals shown for FY2006, FY2007, and FY2008, reflect the cancellation two LCSs funded in FY2006, another two LCSs funded in FY2007, and an LCS funded in FY2008.

(2) The total shown for FY2012 includes two JHSVs—one that was included in the Navy’s FY2012 budget submission, and one that was included in the Army’s FY2012 budget submission. Until FY2012, JHSV were being procured by both the Navy and the Army. The Army was to procure its fifth and final JHSV in FY2012, and this ship was included in the Army’s FY2012 budget submission. In May 2011, the Navy and Army signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) transferring the Army’s JHSV to the Navy. In the FY2012 DOD Appropriations Act (Division A of H.R. 2055/P.L. 112-74 of December 23, 2011), the JHSV that was in the Army’s FY2012 budget submission was funded through the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) appropriation account, along with the JHSV that the Navy had included in its FY0212 budget submission. The four JHSV’s that were procured through the Army’s budget prior to FY2012, however, are not included in the annual totals shown in this table.

(3) The figures shown for FY2019 and FY2020 reflect a Navy decision to show the aircraft carrier CVN-81 as a ship to be procured in FY2020 rather than a ship that was procured in FY2019. Congress, as part of its action on the Navy’s proposed FY2019 budget, authorized the procurement of CVN-81 in FY2019.
Appendix H. Effort in 2019 and 2020 to Develop New Navy Force-Level Goal

This appendix presents additional background information on the effort in 2019 and 2020 to develop a new Navy force level goal.65

Navy’s Initial Effort Was Called the Integrated Naval FSA (INFSA)

The effort to develop a new Navy force-level goal began in the Navy with a new FSA that Navy and Marine Corps officials called the Integrated Naval FSA (INFSA), with the words *integrated naval* intended to signal that this FSA would integrate Marine Corps requirements into the analytical process more fully than previous FSAs did. Department of the Navy (DON) officials stated that the INFSA would take into account the Trump Administration’s December 2017 National Security Strategy document and its January 2018 National Defense Strategy document, both of which put an emphasis on renewed great power competition with China and Russia,66 as well as updated information on Chinese and Russian naval and other military capabilities and recent developments in new technologies, including those related to UVs.67

INFSA May Have Called for a 390/435-Ship Force-level Goal

Press reports and statements from Navy officials suggested that the INFSA was completed in late 2019 or early 2020, and that it may have resulted in a new Navy force-level goal for a fleet of about 390 manned ships plus about 45 unmanned or optionally manned ships, for a total of about 435 manned and unmanned/optionally manned ships. Navy officials provided few additional details about the composition of this 390/435-ship force-level goal.68

---


INFSA Results and Associated FY2021 30-Year Shipbuilding Plan Withheld from Congress

The release to Congress of the new Navy force-level goal resulting from the INFSA was postponed repeatedly in late 2019 and early 2020. Remarks from DOD officials and press reports indicated that then-Secretary of Defense Mark Esper and officials within the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) disagreed with some of the INFSA’s assumptions and resulting conclusions. Coincident with this, OSD reportedly also withheld the release to Congress of the Navy’s associated FY2021 30-year shipbuilding plan, because Esper and OSD officials reportedly believed that it did not present a “credible pathway” for achieving a fleet of at least 355 ships in a timely manner.

INFSA Superseded by DOD’s Future Naval Force Study (FNFS)

The INFSA was reportedly superseded in early 2020 by an OSD-led effort called the Future Naval Force Study (FNFS) that reportedly involves OSD and the Joint Staff and is being overseen by Deputy Defense Secretary David Norquist. As part of the FNFS, OSD reportedly has used war games to assess the merits of three candidate fleet plans prepared by the Navy, the Joint Staff, and the Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) office within OSD. The Hudson Institute, a private defense and foreign policy think tank, provided an additional study to help


A December 6, 2019, memorandum from then-Acting Secretary of the Navy Thomas Modly stated that he expected the final INFSA to be published no later than January 15, 2020. (Memorandum for distribution from Acting Secretary of the Navy Thomas B. Modly, subject “SecNav Vector 1,” dated December 6, 2019. See also David B. Larter, “Acting US Navy Secretary: Deliver Me a 355-SHIP Fleet by 2030,” Defense News, December 9, 2019.)

A January 23, 2020, press report quoted Modly as saying that the January 15 date was an internal Navy deadline, and that the Navy expected the INFSA to be released to outside audiences sometime during the spring of 2020. (Mallory Shelbourne, “Modly: Navy Expects to Release FSA by Spring,” Inside Defense, January 23, 2020.)


inform DOD’s work. With the INFSA having been superseded by the FNFS, the Navy reportedly “has lost much of its power on deciding what its future fleet will look like.” No release date for the result of the FNFS has been announced, but press reports suggest that much of the analytical work on the FNFS has now been completed, and that the results of the FNFS could be released in coming days or weeks.

April and June 2020 Press Reports About FNFS Results

April and June 2020 press reports stated that FNFS as of April 2020 was moving toward recommending a fleet with, among other things, 68 or 69 nuclear-powered attack submarines (SSNs), 9 aircraft carriers, 80 to 90 large surface combatants (i.e., cruisers and destroyers), 55 to 70 small surface combatants (i.e., frigates and Littoral Combat Ships [LCSs]), 65 unmanned or lightly manned surface vehicles, and 50 extra-large unmanned underwater vehicles (XLUUVs).

September 2020 Press Reports About FNFS Studies

A September 24, 2020, press report about studies done in April in support of the FNFS stated

The Pentagon’s upcoming recommendation for a future Navy is expected to call for a significant increase in the number of ships, with officials discussing a fleet as large as 530 hulls, according to documents obtained by Defense News.

Supporting documents to the forthcoming Future Navy Force Study reviewed by Defense News show the Navy moving towards a lighter force with many more ships but fewer aircraft carriers and large surface combatants. Instead, the fleet would include more small surface combatants, unmanned ships and submarines and an expanded logistics force.

Two groups commissioned by Secretary of Defense Mark Esper to design what a future Navy should look like suggested fleets of anywhere from 480 to 534 ships, when manned and unmanned platforms are accounted for—at least a 35 percent increase in fleet size from the current target of 355 manned ships by 2030.

The numbers all come from an April draft of inputs to the Future Navy Force Study conducted by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. While the number will likely have changed somewhat in final recommendations recently sent to Esper, the plans being discussed in April are notable as they reflect what will likely be major shift in the Navy’s future—and the expectation is that a larger-than-planned Navy based on the concepts laid out in the documents will remain intact in the final analysis….

The Future Naval Force Study, overseen by Deputy Secretary of Defense David Norquist, kicked off in January after Esper decided he wanted an outside take on the Navy’s self-review of its future force structure. The OSD-led review tasked three groups to provide their version of an ideal fleet construction for the year 2045, one each by the Pentagon’s

---

Cost Assessment & Program Evaluation office, the Joint Staff, the Navy and a group from the Hudson Institute.

Those fleets were war-gamed and the results were compiled into the Future Naval Force Study, which was briefed to Esper earlier this month.…

The April documents viewed by Defense News included notional fleets designed by CAPE and the Hudson Institute.…

The fleets designed by the CAPE and Hudson teams agreed on the need to increase the number and diversity of ships while boosting vertical launch system capacity—while also holding the operations and sustainment cost of the fleet as steady as possible and avoid adding to the number of sailors required to operate it.

As of the April drafts, both the CAPE and Hudson Institute teams were supportive of shrinking the number of supercarriers to nine from the current 11, which would effectively give the country eight active carriers, with one carrier always in midlife overhaul and refueling. The Hudson study also called for investing in four light carriers.

The CAPE fleet called for between 80 and 90 large surface combatants, about the same level as today’s 89 cruisers and destroyers. Hudson looked to reduce the number slightly and instead fund more lightly manned corvettes, something Hudson has called for in the past.

The reports called for between 65 and 87 large unmanned surface vessels or optionally unmanned corvettes, which the Navy hopes will boost vertical launch system capacity to offset the loss over time of the Arleigh Burke-class destroyers and the four guided missile submarines.

Both fleets called for increased small surface combatants, with the CAPE study putting the upper limit at 70 ships. Hudson recommended a maximum of 56. The Navy’s 2016 Force Structure Assessment called for 52 small surface combatants.

Both fleets also favored a slight increase in attack submarines over the current 66-ship requirement but reflected a big boost in large unmanned submarines, anywhere between 40 and 60 total. The idea would be to get the Extra Large Unmanned Underwater Vehicle to do monotonous surveillance missions or highly dangerous missions, freeing up the more complex manned platforms for other tasking.

On the amphibious side, both fleets reduced the overall number of traditional dock landing ships, such as the LPD-17, from the current 23 to between 15 and 19. As for the big-deck amphibious ships, CAPE favored holding at the current level of 10, while Hudson favored cutting to five, with the savings reinvested towards four light carriers.

The studies called for between 20 and 26 of the Marines’ light amphibious warships, which they need for ferrying Marines and gear around islands in the Pacific.

Both fleets significantly expanded the logistics force, with big increases coming from smaller ships similar to offshore or oil platform support-type vessels. The fleets called for anywhere from 19 to 30 “future small logistics” ships. The CAPE and Hudson fleets increased the number of fleet oilers anywhere from 21 to 31, up from today’s 17.…

The Hudson fleet called for a significant boost to the command and support ship infrastructure from today’s 33 ships to 52 ships. CAPE called for the fleet to remain about the same. Those ships include dry cargo ships, the expeditionary fast transports, expeditionary transfer docks and expeditionary sea bases.
All told, the fleets posited between 316 and 358 “traditional” ships, but when new classes and unmanned ships were lumped in, the fleet designs contained upwards of 500 ships or more.\footnote{76} A September 25, 2020, press report similarly stated that the Hudson Institute study called for a Navy with 434 manned ships and 139 large UVs, including, among other things, 60 nuclear-powered attack submarines (SSNs), 9 aircraft carriers, 80 corvettes, 26 Light Amphibious Warships (LAWs), 99 medium unmanned surface vessels (MUSVs), and 40 extra-large unmanned underwater vehicles (XLUUVs).\footnote{77}

**June 2020 Testimony from Hudson Institute**

At a June 4, 2020, hearing on future force structure requirements for the Navy before the Seapower and Projection Forces subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, one of the witnesses, Bryan Clark of the Hudson Institute, presented testimony that proposed a fleet of 473 manned ships and 152 large UVs, including 12 ballistic missile submarines; 61 SSNs; 10 large-deck, nuclear-powered aircraft carriers (CVNs); 77 large surface combatants (i.e., cruisers and destroyers); 52 small surface combatants (i.e., frigates and Littoral Combat Ships); 91 corvettes; 33 larger amphibious ships, including 9 large-deck (LHD/LHA-type) ships and 24 small-deck (LPD-type) ships; 27 smaller Light Amphibious Warships (LAWs); 39 larger resupply ships (including 20 oilers); 20 smaller oilers; 51 command and support ships; 112 MUSVs; and 40 XLUUVs.\footnote{78}

**October 2020 Report from Hudson Institute**

An October 2020 report by the Hudson Institute on future Navy force structure presented a revised set of force-level goals, recommending a fleet of 442 manned ships and 139 large UVs, including 12 ballistic missile submarines; 60 SSNs; 9 large-deck, nuclear-powered aircraft carriers (CVNs); 64 large surface combatants (i.e., cruisers and destroyers); 52 small surface combatants (i.e., frigates and Littoral Combat Ships); 80 corvettes; 30 larger amphibious ships, including 8 large-deck (LHD/LHA-type) ships and 22 small-deck (LPD-type) ships; 26 smaller Light Amphibious Warships (LAWs); 38 larger resupply ships; 18 smaller oilers; 53 command and support ships; 99 MUSVs; and 40 XLUUVs.\footnote{79}


\footnote{78} Prepared statement by Bryan Clark, Senior Fellow, Hudson Institute, to Seapower and Projection Forces subcommittee, House Armed Services Committee, hearing on future force structure requirements for the United States Navy, June 4, 2020, p. 4.

\footnote{79} Bryan Clark, Timothy A. Walton, and Seth Cropsey, *American Sea Power at a Crossroads: A Plan to Restore the US Navy’s Maritime Advantage*, Hudson Institute, September 2020, Table 1 on p. 9. The report was released on September 30, 2020.
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