

#63

~~SECRET~~

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

Strategic Bomber Forces  
Issue Sponsor: USDRE

Issue: Should we retain more bombers than called for in our previous plan at the expense of their survivability and endurance or should we reduce numbers in order to fund improvements in military capability.

Military Department: U.S. Air Force

Rationale: The President's strategic program directed not only deployment of the B-1B and enduring C3I but included other bomber items for high confidence in force survivability/endurance. Implicit in the decision to deploy the B-1B and develop the ATB was B-52/FB-111A phase out as the new bombers were deployed. The planned bomber force structure at the time of the bomber decision included approximately 280 B-1B/B-52/FB-111A in 1990. The current POM includes 380 aircraft with B-52/FB-111A phaseout as the ATB enters the inventory in the 1990s. The FY83 PDM directed: a) enhanced bomber basing, b) B-52 EMP hardening, c) counter SUAWACS capability, and d) 3780 PAA ALCMs. The 84-88 Defense Guidance (Strategy, Force Planning & Resource Guidance Sections) confirmed the PDM and directed AF to identify a time-phased program for a survivable enduring bomber/tanker force capable of protracted nuclear war.

Additionally, the Defense Guidance directs increased use of bomber aircraft in support of maritime and conventional land attack missions. Studies have shown that strategic bombers equipped with modern standoff weapons can significantly blunt Soviet or Soviet proxy forces. The AF POM does not provide adequate means to develop this capability.

An essential ingredient of bomber survivability/endurance is air defense and survivable C3I. These are covered in other related issue papers.

Cost Summary:

	<u>TOA (FYDP \$ Millions)</u>	
	<u>FY 84</u>	<u>FY 84-88</u>
Estimated POM Resources (ALT #1)	14215	72665
<u>Proposed Changes to POM Resources</u>		
Alternative 2 (B-52 Phaseout)	0	-504
Alternative 3 (B-52 H EMP)	+111	+1798
Alternative 4 (Counter SUAWACS)	+20	+214
Alternative 5 (Enduring bomber basing)	+41	+400
Alternative 6 (Bomber Weapons)	+40	+850
Alternative 7 (B-52 Standoff Capability)	+50	+400
Alternative 8 (KC-135 Reengining)	+536	-226

Office of the Secretary of Defense  
Chief, RDD, ESD, WIIS  
Date: 05 FEB 2016 Authority: EO 13526 + 5 USC 552  
Declassify:  Deny in Full: \_\_\_\_\_  
Declassify in Part: \_\_\_\_\_  
Reason: \_\_\_\_\_  
MDR: 16-M-0933

~~SECRET~~

16-M-0933

~~SECRET~~B-52 CONVENTIONAL MODERNIZATIONISSUE SPONSOR: ISP

Issue: Should the Air Force modernize selected B-52Gs with a conventional stand-off weapon capability as directed by the Defense Guidance?

Military Department: U.S. Air Force

Rationale: The Defense Guidance directs the Air Force to develop a conventional stand-off weapon for the B-52s. The POM does not fund this program. Studies have indicated that even a few so equipped B-52s can be highly effective in conventional land attack and/or maritime strike roles. In view of the maritime potential of such a system, the development of a B-52 stand-of weapon appears to fit into the cross-service category. The alternatives offered below provide for the development of a stand-off weapon and interface with 67 non-ALCM B-52G platforms.

<u>Cost Summary:</u>	<u>TOA (FYDP \$ Millions)</u>	
	<u>FY84</u>	<u>FY84-88</u>
Estimated POM Resources (Alt. 1)	--	--
Proposed Changes to POM Resources		
Alternative 2 (Stand-off weapon)	65.9	982.5
Alternative 3 (B-52G interface)	29.8	206.2

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

Prepared by Dmitry Ponomareff, OASD/ISP (Strat Pol), x72792

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~B-52 STRATEGIC MODERNIZATIONISSUE SPONSOR: ISP

Issue: Should the Air Force continue the modernization of the B-52s designed to enhance their survivability and strategic offensive capability as directed by the President's program and as reflected in the FY83 budget decisions?

Military Department: U.S. Air Force

Rationale: The bomber portion of the President's strategic modernization program directed that selected B-52G/H aircraft be EMP hardened and be provided with additional ECM (counter-AWACS) capability. These programs were included in the FY83 budget. The FY84 Air Force POM deletes the EMP program and delays the introduction of counter AWACS capability until FY86. The alternatives listed below restore the original programs.

<u>Cost Summary:</u>	<u>TOA (FYDP \$ Millions)</u>	
	<u>FY84</u>	<u>FY84-88</u>
Estimated POM Resources (Alt. 1)	121.6	851.0
Proposed Changes to POM Resources		
Alternative 2 (EMP)	110.6	1866.0
Alternative 3 (Counter-AWACS)	36.0	33.0

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

Prepared by Dmitry Ponomareff, OASD/ISP (Strat Pol), x72792

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

R&O-12

Issue: Was the B-52 Modification Program POM 84 reduced for unneeded work included in POM 83?

Military Department: Air Force

Rationale: GAO Report MASAD-82-30 April 12, 1982 "Opportunities to Reduce the Costs of Some B-52 Modifications," showed that the FY 84 funding levels could be reduced \$31.4 million. The Air Force POM 84 did not disclose that this reduction was made.

Cost Summary:

	Costs (FYDP \$ Millions)	
	FY 84	FY 84-88 Total
Estimated POM Resources (Alt 1)	\$693.1	\$6,513.4
Proposed Changes to POM Resources (Alt 2)	-31.4	-31.4

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

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~KC-135 REENGINEINGISSUE SPONSOR: ISP

Issue: Should the Air Force continue KC-135 reengining consistent with the directive given in FY83 PDM and economical production rate?

Military Department: U.S. Air Force

Rationale: In view of the critical role of the tanker fleet in supporting our strategic and global mobility requirements, as well as in recognition of the existing shortfall of tanker assets, the FY83 PDM directed the reengining--at economical production rates--of KC-135s. This program will increase the efficiency of the KC-135 platforms, thus contributing to the alleviation of the tanker shortage, and will address some of the environmental concerns associated with the original engines. The U.S. Air Force POM submission reduces the FY84 funding level by \$500 million below the FYDP. This will result in uneconomical production rates and in a slowdown of the effort to improve the current tanker shortfall. Alternative 2 restores the original program.

<u>Cost Summary:</u>	<u>TOA (FYDP \$ Millions)</u>	
	<u>FY84</u>	<u>FY84-88</u>
Estimated POM Resources (Alt. 1)	855.0	7608.7
Proposed Changes to POM Resources Alternative 2	494.5	499.6

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

Prepared by Dmitry Ponomareff, OASD/ISP (Strat Pol), x72792

~~SECRET~~