

## Comparing Defense Savings Plans across the Political Spectrum

	SDTF	Back in Black	CAP	CATO	Simpson-Bowles	CNAS
<b>Nuclear Arsenal Reductions (pg 3):</b>						
Reduce the US nuclear arsenal	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Retire or reduce bomber leg of “nuclear triad”	✓					
Reduce ballistic submarine fleet	✓	✓		✓		
<b>Reform of Military Health Care Benefits and Compensation (pg 4):</b>						
Reform compensation (as recommended by Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation)	✓		✓	✓		
Reform TRICARE (eliminate retiree double-coverage)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<b>Limit Procurement and R&amp;D (pg 5-6):</b>						
Revise Air Force procurement plan for F-35s	✓	✓			✓	✓
Reduce or cancel Navy and Marine Corps plans for F-35s	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Reduce or cancel V-22 Osprey Program	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reduce or cancel Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle Program	✓			✓	✓	
Reduce R&D spending	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reduce Navy battle fleet	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reduce procurement for other programs		✓			✓	
Reduce “Other Procurement”		✓			✓	✓
<b>Personnel Reductions (pg 7-8):</b>						
Reduce Army personnel	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Reduce Marine Corps personnel	✓		✓	✓		✓
Reduce troop levels in Europe and Asia	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Reduce civilian DoD workforce		✓	✓	✓		✓
Reduce contractor staff augmentees		✓			✓	✓
Replace military pers. performing commercial-type activities with civilians		✓			✓	
<b>Other Savings (pg 9-10):</b>						
Curtail missile defense and space spending	✓	✓		✓		✓
Adopt Sec. Gates’s efficiency recommendations		✓	✓		✓	
Improve efficiency of military depots, commissaries and exchanges	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Reduce expenditures on command, support and infrastructure	✓			✓		
Reduce or hold constant intelligence spending		✓				✓
Salary freezes for DoD employees		✓			✓	
Audit the Pentagon/improve financial management	✓	✓			✓	

In response to rising defense costs and pressures to reduce the federal deficit, many Members of Congress, think tanks, and other entities have designed defense saving plans. We prepared the matrix below to compare six such studies that span the political spectrum and provide detailed information on how particular elements of the defense budget could be reformed. While this document should be seen as a good starting point for discussions on cost savings, inclusion of a recommendation does not necessarily imply the support of Congressman Garamendi or his office. We have also provided links to resources that describe other less comprehensive defense savings plans in order to provide access to as much information as possible. To compare other sources of information on the federal budget and defense spending, see the Committee for a Responsible Budget, *Federal Fiscal Plan Comparison Tool*, September 2011 at <http://crfb.org/compare/index.php?id=01>.

**Notes:**

- The National Security Network also has noteworthy recommendations for DOD spending in a new report, available at: <http://bit.ly/pAbjtO>
- The Cato Plan included in the matrix was listed as an alternative in the "Debt, Deficits and Defense-A Way Forward" plan provided by the Sustainable Defense Task Force. An updated plan is provided by CATO here: [http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=12151](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=12151)
- Readers should note that the Simpson-Bowles and CNAS reports exclude some possible cost savings from reforming military pay and benefits. Both reports argue that personnel programs are fundamentally different from other types of defense costs, and that reforming them can affect the choices that service members make about their careers in unpredictable ways.
- The 10th Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation (2008) can be accessed here: <http://www.whs.mil/library/doc/Tenth.pdf>. On the 13th of May, 2010, the Department of Defense announced the initiation of the 11th Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation.

Note: Congressman Garamendi does not necessarily endorse any specific proposal in this chart. This content is for information purposes only.

**Nuclear Arsenal Reductions:**

Sustainable Defense Task Force (\$960 billion over 10 yrs)	Savings in billions	Back in Black – Sen. Tom Coburn’s Plan (\$1.006 trillion over 10 yrs)		Center for American Progress (\$400 billion over 5 yrs)		A Strategy of Restraint - CATO Institute (\$1.111 trillion over 10 yrs)		Simpson-Bowles Commission (\$100.1 billion in 2015)		Selective Leverage – Center for A New American Security (\$664.8 billion over 10 yrs)	
Reduce the nuclear arsenal to 1,000 deployed warheads and 50 stored ones with 328 official launchers	113.5	Reduce the size of the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) force from 500 to 300; Maintain a 1,100 nuclear weapon reserve	79	Cut the US nuclear arsenal to 311 operationally deployed strategic nuclear weapons	34	Reduce the nuclear arsenal to 500 deployed warheads	100				
Retire the bomber leg of the “nuclear triad” and cancel Trident II missile		Maintain 40 strategic bombers and delay the purchase of new bombers until the mid-2020’s				Ultimately retire either the bomber or ICBM leg of the triad					
Cut the ballistic nuclear submarine (SSBN) fleet from 14 to 7		Reduce the size of the ballistic nuclear submarine fleet from 14 to 11			Reduce the size of the ballistic nuclear submarine fleet from 14 to 6	4					
Reduce nuclear weapon infrastructure and research, such as forgoing the construction of three new bomb-making facilities, and reducing warhead R&D	26										
	<b>139.5</b>		<b>79</b>		<b>34</b>		<b>104</b>				

Note: Congressman Garamendi does not necessarily endorse any specific proposal in this chart. This content is for information purposes only.

**Reform Military Health Care Benefits and Compensation:**

Sustainable Defense Task Force (960B/ 10 yrs)	Savings in billions	Back in Black – Sen. Tom Coburn’s Plan (1.006 trillion/10 yrs)		Center for American Progress (400B/ 5 yrs)		A Strategy of Restraint - CATO Institute (1.111 trillion over 10 yrs)		Simpson-Bowles Commission (100.1B in 2015)		Selective Leverage: Center for A New American Security (664.8B/10 yrs)	
Phase in compensation reforms (ex. include tax advantages and housing /subsistence allowances in calculating pay raises) as recommended by the Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation (QRMC)	55			Reform the military pay system, as recommended by the QRMC	14	Reform the calculation of military compensation and restructure health care benefits (this proposal concurs with the Sustainable Defense Task Force options)	115				
Prevent military retirees who are earning full-time salaries on top of their full military pensions from opting for TRICARE when they can get health coverage through their employer, along the lines suggested by the QRMC	60	Have working-age military retirees enrolled in TRICARE pay higher monthly fees, comparable to private sector health plans; expenses for a single retiree would be approximately \$2,000 per year and \$3,500 for a family	115	Restore TRICARE costs to more sustainable levels by reinstating a fair cost-sharing balance between military retirees and taxpayers and implementing a number of provisions to reduce overutilization and double-coverage.	42			Slightly increase premiums and co-payments for TRICARE along the guidelines set by Sec. Gates	6		
		Increase cost sharing for pharmaceuticals under TRICARE	26								
		Introduce minimum out-of-pocket requirements under TRICARE for Life	43								
	<b>115</b>		<b>184</b>		<b>56</b>		<b>115</b>		<b>6</b>		

Note: Congressman Garamendi does not necessarily endorse any specific proposal in this chart. This content is for information purposes only.

**Limit Procurement and R&D:**

Sustainable Defense Task Force (960B/10 yrs)	Savings in billions	Back in Black – Sen. Tom Coburn’s Plan (1.006 trn/10 yrs)		Center for American Progress (400B/5 yrs)		A Strategy of Restraint - CATO Institute (1.111 trn/10 yrs)		Simpson-Bowles Commission (100.1B in 2015)		Selective Leverage: Center for A New American Security (664.8B/10 yrs)	
Replace planned [Air Force] procurement of F-35s with advanced versions of the F-16 and F-15E	47.9	Keep Air Force F-35s but negotiate multi-year procurement	7					Substitute F-16 and F/A-18Es for half of the Air Force and Navy’s planned buys of F-35 fighter aircraft	2.3	Reduce F-35A purchases to 850; No substitutes	25
Cancel the Navy and Marine Corps buy of F-35 Joint Strike Fighters	9.85	Cancel Navy and Marine Corps Joint Strike Fighter and replace with F/A-18E	18	Cut Navy and Marine F-35 Joint Strike Fighters procurement	16			Cancel the Marine Corps' F-35 procurement	3.9	Reduce F-35B purchases to 150 and F-35C to 330; No substitutes	
End procurement of MV-22 Osprey and field alternatives	10-12	End purchases of the V-22 at 288 aircraft instead of the planned 458	6	Cancel the V-22 Osprey program	9.2	Terminate the V-22 Osprey	15	End purchases of the V-22 at 288 aircraft, and fill gap with MH-60 helicopters	1.1	Stop procurement of V-22 at 363 aircraft	7.9
Refurbish AAV7A1s instead of keeping the USMC expeditionary fighting vehicle program	8.5					Cancel the Assault Amphibious Vehicle 7A	11	Cancel the expeditionary fighting vehicle	0.65		
Reducing base budget spending on R&D by \$5 billion annually	50	Cut 10% of Research and Development budget	79	Cut \$10 billion annually from the RDT&E	40	Reduce total RDT&E spending by an additional 10% annually	73	Cut 10% of its Research and Development budget	7	Hold R&D spending to 10% below FY11, plus inflation.	93.7

Reduce US Navy battle fleet from 286 ships to 230 (made up of 9 aircraft carriers, 7 SSBNs, 4 guided missile subs, 37 attack subs, 85 surface combat ships, 25 littoral combat ships, 27 amphibious combat ships, 36 logistics/support ships)	126.6	Reduce Aircraft Carriers From 11 to 10 and Navy Air Wings from 10 to 9	7	Cancel procurement of CVN-80 aircraft carrier; Retire 2 carrier battle groups and associated air wings; Limit procurement of Virginia-class subs and DDG-51 destroyer to 1/yr; Limit procurement of littoral combat ship to 2/ yr	28	Reduce the Navy's fleet to 40 tactical subs and 6 SSBNs by 2020; Retain 62 destroyers, but refurbish littoral ships instead of building new ones; Reduce Navy to 8 carriers and 7 naval air wings; Cancel maritime prepositioning force	130	Cancel the maritime prepositioning force	2.7	Reduce CVN fleet from 11 to 10; Cut active duty air wings to 9 and retire 5,600 sailors; Cancel procurement of 5 ships and 9 attack subs; Reduce littoral combat ship purchases to 27; Retire 6 cruisers; Procure 2 additional Flight IIA ships	51.9
		Terminate other weapon, information or technology systems that have cost overruns, duplications, or are "not a priority at this time"	35.5					Reduce procurement by 15% and set up a BRAC like system to eliminate inefficient weapons systems	20		
		Reduce Spending for "Other Procurement"	52					Reduce Spending for "Other Procurement"	8.5	Hold "Other Procurement" spending to 12.5% below FY11, plus inflation.	39.4
	<b>253.85</b>		<b>173.5</b>		<b>93.2</b>		<b>229</b>		<b>46.15</b>		<b>217.9</b>

Note: Other groups, such as the National Security Network, concurred with the Simpson-Bowles Commission's recommendation to reduce procurement of these costly programs and to develop a system to better identify inefficient weapons systems.

Note: Congressman Garamendi does not necessarily endorse any specific proposal in this chart. This content is for information purposes only.

**Personnel Reductions:**

Sustainable Defense Task Force (\$960 billion over 10 yrs)	Savings in billions	Back in Black – Sen. Tom Coburn’s Plan (\$1.006 trillion over 10 yrs)		Center for American Progress (\$400 billion over 5 yrs)		A Strategy of Restraint - CATO Institute (\$1.111 trillion over 10 yrs)		Simpson-Bowles Commission (\$100.1 billion in 2015)		Selective Leverage: Center for A New American Security (\$664.8 billion over 10 yrs)	
Roll back the active component Army from 45 to 42 maneuver brigades and reduce its end strength from 547,400 to 482,400; Reduce military recruiting expenditures	152	Return the Army to 482,400 soldiers on active duty and slightly reduce the number of reservists	92	Roll back 74,200 Army positions	39	Cut active-duty Army to approx. 360,000 personnel	220			Starting in FY15 reduce Army end strength to 460,000 with 12,000 reservists.	63.8
Roll back USMC end-strength to 175,000				Roll back 27,000 USMC positions		Cut the size of the USMC by nearly 30%, from 202,000 to approx. 145,000 (approx. 3.5% per year)	67		Starting in FY15 roll back USMC end-strength to 162,500		
		Reduce civilian workforce by 5% beginning in 2014	22.5	Reduce corresponding number of civilian positions		Reduce civilian payroll by roughly 30 % over a 10 year period	105		Reduce civilian workforce by 125,000 over 10 years	61.1	
Reduce troops in Europe and Asia, cutting end strength by one third (50,000)	80	Reduce military personnel in Europe and Asia by one-third	69.5	Reduce active-duty troops in Europe and Asia by one-third	43			Reduce active-duty troops in Europe and Asia by one-third	8.5		

		Reduce contractor staff augmentees by 20 % (instead of 10 % as Sec. Gates proposed)	37.8					Reduce contractor staff augmentees by 20 % (instead of 10% as Sec. Gates proposed)	5.4	Reduce HQ contractors by 20% ,in addition to previously announced 30% reduction in HQ spending on augmentees	20.4
		Replace approx. 88,000 military personnel who perform commercial-type activities with civilian personnel in FY13	53					Replace approx. 88,000 military personnel who perform commercial-type activities with civilian personnel in FY13	5.4		
						Reduce the number of expeditionary strike groups to 6	9				
	<b>232</b>		<b>274.8</b>		<b>82</b>		<b>401</b>		<b>19.3</b>		<b>145.3</b>

Notes:

- Since the start of the Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in Afghanistan the Army has added 89,400 personnel (pre-war level was 480,000); the Marine Corps has added 29,100 personnel (pre-war level was 173,000); the Marine Corps has added 29,100 personnel (pre-war level was 173,000)
- The U.S. currently maintains 150,000 military personnel in Europe and Asia
- The civilian workforce is currently 784,000



Note: Congressman Garamendi does not necessarily endorse any specific proposal in this chart. This content is for information purposes only.

**Other Savings:**

Sustainable Defense Task Force (\$960 billion over 10 yrs)	Savings in billions	Back in Black – Sen. Tom Coburn’s Plan (\$1.006 trillion over 10 yrs)		Center for American Progress (\$400 billion over 5 yrs)		A Strategy of Restraint - CATO Institute (\$1.111 trillion over 10 yrs)		Simpson-Bowles Commission (\$100.1 billion in 2015)		Selective Leverage – Center for A New American Security (\$664.8 billion over 10 yrs)	
Selectively curtail missile defense & space spending	55	Terminate Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) program	13			Refocus investment in missile defense programs away from procurement and toward R&D; Cancel components with excessive cost overruns (ex. airborne-laser program)	60			Cancel Precision Tracking Space System (PTSS); Reduce spending on experimental national missile defense programs	37.5
		Adopt Sec. Gates's efficiency recommendations and redirect to deficit reduction	100	Redirect DOD's planned efficiency savings to reduce baseline defense budget	133			Adopt Sec. Gates's efficiency recommendations and redirect to deficit reduction	28		
Improve efficiency of military depots, commissaries and exchanges	13	Consolidate commissaries and exchanges	9.1			Reform maintenance and supply systems	13	Reform maintenance and retail systems	2.2	Hold base support and maintenance facilities budgets at 12.5% below FY11 (plus inflation) and consolidate commissaries and exchanges	41.6

Reduce expenditures on command, support and infra structure	100					Reduce expenditures on command, support and infrastructure	100				
		Keep intelligence spending constant	26							Hold intelligence spending to 10% below FY11 (plus inflation)	88.5
		Freeze federal salaries for DoD employees	15.5					Freeze all compensation for DoD civilian employees, and non-combat military pay for 3 years	14.5		
Audit the Pentagon, to improve accountability	No estimate	Audit the Pentagon (claims savings will come from better financial mgmt)	25					Improve DoD financial management and audit readiness	No estimate		
	<b>168</b>		<b>188.6</b>		<b>133</b>		<b>173</b>		<b>44.7</b>		<b>167.6</b>

Notes:

- Three year freeze of compensation for all DoD civilian employees has already been enacted by the Obama administration—expected savings are \$15.5 billion over a ten year period