



PROGRAM ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20301

11FRD

POM 79-83

Murray on USAF memo

August 23, 1977

13

~~FORMERLY RESTRICTED DATA~~
Unauthorized disclosure subject to administrative and criminal sanctions. Handle as Restricted Data on foreign dissemination. Section 114b, Atomic Energy Act 1954.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SUBJECT: Reclama to the Air Force Program Decision Memorandum (PDM) and the Air Force Program Objective Memorandum (POM) Amendment

The Air Force and JCS reclaims to your tentative decisions published in the 16 August 1977 PDM for the Department of the Air Force have been reviewed by OSD. The Amendment to the Air Force POM transmitted to you on 3 August 1977 also has been reviewed. The attached decision book provides material, including the results of these reviews, to assist you in your major issue meeting with the Secretary and Chief of Staff of the Air Force on 24 August 1977.

Brief summaries of the Air Force reclama, their amended POM and OSD Staff recommendations on specific items follow:

Reclama to the Air Force PDM

The PDM reduces the total Air Force program proposed in their POM by \$1.9B in FY 79 and a total of \$15.8B over the program period. In the Strategic Forces alone the proposed reductions are \$2.0B in FY 79 and \$17.5B over the program period. Most (93%) of Strategic Programs reductions reflect your B-1 and CONUS Air Defense Interceptor decisions. Offsetting the funding reductions in the Strategic area, the net result of your decisions for the remainder of the Air Force program has been a slight addition in FY 79 and an increase of \$1.6B over the program period.

The Air Force reclama would add up to \$175M in FY 79 and \$2B over the program years depending upon the alternatives you select. The Air Force reclama states that time constraints precluded the identification of offsets for the reclama items at this time. However, in his forwarding memo to you, the Secretary of the Air Force states that offsets will be identified prior to the Air Force budget estimate submission in October.

Department of Energy Declassification Review	
1 st Review Date: 8/23/77	Determination: (Circle Number(s))
Author: SB [Signature]	1. Classification Retained
Authority: DC DO	2. Classification Changed To: FRD
Derived From:	3. Contains No DOE Classified Info
Declassify On:	4. Coordinate With:
2 nd Review Date: 1/20/78	5. Declassified
Author: [Signature]	6. Classified Info Enclosed
Authority: DO	Other (Specify):

Does this include POM amendment
What is prospect of funding
the latter from OS part of
B-1/FB111H realignment,
if that is what I appear

DECLASSIFIED IN FULL
Authority: EO 13526
Chief, Records & Declass Div, WHS
Date: JUL 05 2016

330-80-0017, box 12, 100.54 (1-23 Aug) 1977

SECRET

15-m-1586

the specific issues addressed in the reclama are:

KC-135 Force Structure Reduction. Both the Air Force and the JCS reclaims oppose reduction of the KC-135 force by 70 UE aircraft in FY 82. This reduction was directed in the PDM as consistent with restructuring of the B-52 force and cruise missile deployment. The reclama states that the proposed reduction will impact adversely on the Air Force's capability to support air refueling commitments and maintain peacetime training requirements. The Air Force and the JCS state that both NATO and SIOP requirements for air refueling continue to grow in supporting its recommendation that the KC-135 force be restored. I recommend that you reaffirm the PDM. *I include reaffirm*

KC-135 Re-Engining. The Air Force reclama recommends that the KC-135 re-engining prototype program continue as planned in the POM in order to provide a broader basis for future decisions regarding modernization. The Air force states that re-engining the KC-135 is consistent with its extended service life potential of well past the year 2000, made possible by wing re-skin modifications that increase airframe life by 27000 hours. PA&E considers the capability of the existing KC-135 force to be adequate for our present strategic and general purpose force needs. I recommend that you reaffirm your PDM decision. If new requirements are identified later, then re-engining could provide an option for satisfying increased requirements. *new compared other opt*

B-77 Bombs.

[REDACTED] The Air Force reclama states that this decision precludes a capability to reconstitute a recovered bomber force with gravity weapons. Both the Air Force and the JCS urge you to delay the retirement of older bombs until the OSD/DDR&E directed weapons mix study is completed and the results reviewed. PA&E agrees that some number of weapons should be maintained in the strategic stockpile for reconstitution of the bomber force. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] This alternative, in effect, leaves unchanged the number of bombs in reserve for bombers recovered after a strike. I recommend you accept this alternative retirement plan. *✓*

CONUS Air Defense Interceptors. The Air Force reclama provides an alternative to the PDM which provides an almost comparable savings over the program period (\$2.87B in PDM vs. \$2.69B in AF reclama). The Air Force accepts your decision not to procure an FOI, at least for now. However, the reclama strongly urges you to retain the F-106s in the Active Force and, rather than dedicating a TAC wing to CONUS Air Defense, to plan for some TAC F-15s from various wings to be on Air Defense alert, as is done today with F-4s. The JCS reclama urges you to restore the FOI program proposed in the Air Force POM with an IOC of FY 80. PA&E proposes a slight variation to the Air Force reclama position that adheres to your desire to have an F-15 wing earmarked as crisis augmentation to the Active and ANG air defense forces for CONUS Air Defense. If you insist on one TAC F-15 wing so earmarked, I recommend you choose the Staff alternative. *Otherwise, I support the Air Force position with the understanding that the issue of F-106s in the active force will be addressed in the FY 80-84*

OSD
Section 6.2 (a)

OSD
Section 6.2 (a)

DECLASSIFIED IN P/P
Authority: EO 13526
Chief, Records & Document
Date: JUL 05 2006

Expanded Deployment of A-10s. The Air Force prefers increasing the size of its first deployed A-10 wing to 90 aircraft rather than stationing a second wing in Europe as directed by the PDM. The Air Force proposes a new employment concept for the A-10, whereby A-10 aircraft would deploy from a Main Operating Base (MOB) in both peace and war to Forward Operating Locations (FOL) and would work closely with ground forces fulfilling daily interservice and combined training requirements. The Air Force considers that this larger A-10 wing along with FOL operations should provide more sorties than the POM program with fewer political and operational disadvantages. The Air Force concerns with the two wing deployment include the possibility of having to close a CONUS base while needing to open a new MOB in Europe. I view the concept of deploying from an MOB to FOLs during peacetime and wartime as innovative and having potential for increased readiness and combat capability. This concept should be pursued by the Air Force. However, I still recommend the Air Force plan on deployment of the second wing by FY 83 in order to provide increased critical anti-armor capability in the opening days of short-warning conflict. Time is available to address the potential political, including MBFR, and operational considerations to permit review of this decision at a later date, if warranted.

OK with 4

and a plus 2

Tactical Reconnaissance Force Size/Mix. The Air Force reclama requests a return to their POM program. The Air Force states that deactivation of two RF-4C squadrons and a reduction in the active force to six squadrons will require a decrease in our DPQ commitment. While agreeing with the need for reevaluation of our tactical reconnaissance capability, the Air Force strongly objects to the proposed conversion of the F-111D ("our only all-weather tactical fighter") to an RF-111 at a cost it claims to be over one billion dollars. The Air Force recommends you reverse this decision and states it will submit the results of an ongoing tactical reconnaissance analysis within the next few weeks or prior to final formulation of the FY 79 budget. I recommend that you reaffirm the PDM. I firmly believe the proposed increases in our Near Real Time (NRT) capability in the NATO theater area surveillance, when combined with the tactical use of national intelligence assets and our planned enhancement of fighter attack forces, much more than offset the decreased active force levels. These proposed capability improvements, if implemented successfully, preclude the requirement in the near future for the RF-X program with its potential multi-billion dollar price tag. The DDR&E also supports the F-111D conversion, pending receipt of the Air Force analysis, as an interim solution to the RF-X requirement.

need more disc

what is ally is

yes

This is a distinct and. why not just do a couple of RF-4C squadrons?

what connection has this?

Defense Suppression Force Mix - EF-111A Program. The PDM accelerated the EF-111A program to an IOC in May 1981 and directed the increased near term costs be offset from other defense suppression-related development and/or procurement programs including drones and RPVs. The Air Force agrees to accelerate the EF-111A program and to identify offsetting costs. However, the reclama proposes an alternative to your decision which would emphasize the near term importance of the EF-111A but would maintain some RPV/drone capability today and allow introduction of a

DECLASSIFIED IN FULL
 Authority: EO 13526
 Chief, Records & Declass Div, WHS
 Date: JUL 05 2016

second generation RPV in the mid-1980's. The Air Force proposal results in only a month's slip in the EF-111A IOC compared to the "most efficient" schedule. It applies FY 77/78 funds from cancelled RPV related programs to the FY 79 EF-111A program and thus requires OSD approval of action to initiate Congressional reprogramming. Both the DDR&E and I support the Air Force proposed funding alternative. Our staffs will work with the USAF prior to budget submission to further develop the funding profiles. ✓

F-16 Procurement Rate. The reclama strongly recommends restoral of 10 aircraft in the F-16 procurement request for FY 79. In the Air Force POM the FY 79 F-16 procurement was reduced from 145 to 135 aircraft. These ten aircraft were to be procured as FMS training assets, the costs of which (\$72M) would be paid back by various FMS customers. The Air Force emphasizes the importance of maintaining the originally planned production rates in order to avoid increased costs for both the US and European programs. The reclama states that increased prices for the European aircraft will have serious political and economic impacts because of the very tight budgets within which the Europeans are operating. The DDR&E supports the Air Force position and recommends that you restore the 10 aircraft. I recommend against the restoral unless the Air Force identifies sufficient offsets that are acceptable to OSD. After all, it was the tight budget considerations that led to this Air Force decision in their POM. The situation is tighter at this point in time than it was then. ✓ y. what FM: is in prospect might be

Space Shuttle Mission Control. The Air Force proposes to modify NASA's Johnson Mission Control Center (MCC) for DoD payloads by the early 1980s, rather than by 1980 as directed in the PDM, and to retain the option for a separate DoD Mission Control Facility. DDR&E accepts the need to retain an option for a separate DoD facility, but does not accept the IOC slip of the Johnson MCC modification or the revised funding profile. DDR&E recommends that you change the wording of your decision in the APDM to permit the Air Force to preserve the option for a separate DoD MCC as a follow-on to Johnson MCC. ✓

General Purpose Satellite Communications System. The Air Force reclama requests that the funds designated in the PDM for the GPSCS be transferred beginning in FY 81 to permit full scale development of the SSS program. The ASD(C3I) recommends that you stay with the PDM TOA position for full scale development of the GPSCS and permit vigorous R&D effort on the SSS program, i.e., alternative 3. However, you should note that the GPSCS funding profile has been revised to reflect updated figures provided by the Air Force. ✓

Foreign Weapons Evaluation. The Air Force believes that their current program is satisfactory and should not be transferred to OSD control because they were successful in defending their FY 78 program before Congress. DDR&E believes that increased NATO standardization requires improved budgetary support of Foreign Weapons Evaluation. Service support of Foreign Weapons Evaluation has not been uniform, and this program could be better managed centrally under DDR&E. DDR&E recommends you reaffirm the PDM.

could allow A F up (as best person plus OSD, etc

DECLASSIFIED IN FULL
Authority: EO 13526
Chief, Records & Declass Div, WHS
Date: JUL 05 2016

Civilian Substitution. The PDM directed the Air Force to convert 13,000 positions from military to civilians during FY 1979 and an additional 13,000 in FY 1980. The Air Force objects to the civilian substitution, arguing that it would adversely affect their combat readiness, wartime capability, mobilization potential, and rotation base. The Air Force proposal would restore the deleted military positions and delete the civilian positions added in the PDM for civilian substitution. It also would add 5,900 civilian positions as a hedge in case FY 1978 Congressional restrictions on contracting are carried into the program years. A third alternative would reverse the substitution, but not allow the 5,900 addition. The ASD(MRA&L) recommends reaffirming the PDM decision.

11/80
anon
scm

Air Force Civil Engineering. The PDM directed the Air Force to maintain the FYDP force level for Air Force Civil Engineers, both Active and Reserve, and to rely on the Army to perform initial engineering work in the first 30 days of war in Europe, consistent with the guidance in DoD Directive 1315.6. The Air Force did not appeal the denial of their programmed increase in the Civil Engineering Force, but requested that the decision to transfer initial engineering work to the Army during the early stages of a war in Europe be deferred pending the results of an OSD directed study to validate the need for a revision to DoDD 1315.6. The ASD(MRA&L) recommends deferring the decision pending completion of the OSD directed study.

OK, b
Kandic
alternatives
European's
priority

Air Force POM Amendment

The Air Force submitted an amendment to their POM on 3 August 1977. The Air Force had submitted its FY 79-83 POM prior to the announcement of the President's B-1 decision and your subsequent guidance. The Amended POM included a series of strategic initiatives, many of which are involved with the B-1 decision and subsequent guidance, some high priority NATO initiatives designed to improve conventional combat capability and sustainability, as well as other recommended program changes. The Amended POM items accounted for an additional \$2B in FY 79 and \$9B over the program period above the Air Force POM TOA.

W. L. ... + ...

The OSD Staff has reviewed the POM Amendment with emphasis on the strategic initiatives and NATO combat capability and sustainability items. While many of these items are quite attractive, the fiscal realities we face at this time probably preclude our funding them without some appropriate offsets.

In this context we present a number of items which I recommend for your favorable consideration. The strategic initiatives from the Amended POM are treated in a staff paper which accounts for those items which were considered by you in issuing your PDM and recommends alternatives to the Air Force request on three other specific items.

B-
F

DECLASSIFIED IN FULL
Authority: EO 13526
Chief, Records & Declass Div, WHS
Date: JUL 05 2016

~~SECRET~~

In addition, the OSD review identified a total of 15 items in the area of NATO readiness and combat sustainability. We recommend your favorable consideration of these items provided that funding and/or appropriate offsets are made available. These items range in cost from Improved Launch and Recovery Testing (\$3M in FY 79) to Alternate Runway Construction in NATO (\$60M in FY 79) and Survival Enhancement Facilities in NATO (\$66M in FY 79, \$410M in FY 79-83). Brief staff assessments of these items are provided for your review.

*Hsu
Sun*



Russell Murray, 2nd
Assistant Secretary of Defense
Program Analysis & Evaluation

Office of the Secretary of Defense
Chief, RDD, ESD, WHS
Date: 05 Jul 2016 Authority: EO 13526
Declassify: _____ Deny in Full: _____
Declassify in Part: X
Reason: 6.2(a)
MDR: 15 -M- 1586

5 U.S.C. 552

+

DECLASSIFIED IN FULL
Authority: EO 13526
Chief, Records & Declass Div, WHS
Date: JUL 05 2016

~~SECRET~~