

~~SECRET~~

Handle via BYEMAN
Control System

2

RT DATA ENTERED
DATE 6/25/87
 MICROFICHER
DATE 6/26/87

DEC 16 1966

Brigadier General Russell A. Berg
Deputy Director, MOL Program
Space Systems Division
Los Angeles, California

Dear Russ:

On December 1, 1966 I forwarded to you an information
copy of my memo on follow-on program options. At that time
it was not appropriate to officially ask you to undertake
the task since our contractor structure was still somewhat
uncertain. In view of our recent progress in contract
negotiations, I now ask that you immediately proceed with the
follow-on options study, with the same target date for
completion. I appreciate the time problem this deadline
presents us, but we nevertheless must have the results as
near mid-January as possible.

Sincerely,

SIGNED

HARRY L. EVANS
Major General, USAF
Vice Director, MOL Program

1 Atch
Memo for Gen Berg
from Gen Evans
(BYE 21261-66)

Cys: SAFSLM Official File
Green Read
SCG Read

DORIAN

Page 1 of 1 page
Copy 2 of 2 copies
SAFSL BYE 21284-66

Handle via BYEMAN
Control System

~~SECRET~~

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING;
DOB DIR 5200.10 DOES NOT APPLY

BYE-21284/66



Handwritten vertical notes and markings on the right edge of the document.

~~SECRET~~

HANDLE VIA **BYEMAN**
CONTROL SYSTEM

RT DATA ENTERED
DATE 6/25/87
 MICROFILMED
DATE 6/26/87

DEC 16 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR DEPUTY DIRECTOR, MOL PROGRAM

SUBJECT: MOL Follow-On Program Options

I believe it is now timely, at this stage in the MOL Program, to consider options for a follow-on operational MOL Program. As I see it, we will require funding in Fiscal Year 1969 to provide for an orderly follow-on to our current R&D program.

The number of possible options which can be structured for a follow-on program is large, and it is difficult, at this time and on an analytical basis, to select one option in favor of others. In the larger context, it would seem to be better not to impose arbitrary bounds by selecting a few candidate program options now, but rather to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of all reasonable options and select the several preferred. However, at this point in time, such a course appears to be too time consuming, and results could hardly be expected in sufficient time to support Fiscal Year 1969 budget actions.

Under these circumstances, I consider it most desirable to select a few program options which seem most realistically achievable in the time frame following our current program. Assuredly, these options must be considered only typical of those which could be pursued, with the understanding that any program actually adopted would depend upon extensive discussions during the structuring of the Fiscal Year 1969 budget. On this basis it is possible to establish some bounds which will facilitate the selection of options. Perhaps the most important is to assume that the general technical intelligence requirement to be satisfied by the initial MOL Program will remain substantially unchanged for a follow-on program. Hence, the questions of number and types of targets, priorities, frequency of coverage and similar factors which might exist in the 1971-1976 time frame will not limit our selection of program options. Other bounds of importance are:

- a. All options should be based on a five-year follow-on program.

DORIAN

Page 1 of 3 pages
Copy 3 of 4 copies
SAFSL BYE 21261-66

HANDLE VIA **BYEMAN**
CONTROL SYSTEM

1586-0396-53

~~SECRET~~

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC DOWNGRADING;
DOD REG. 3800.10 DOES NOT APPLY

~~SECRET~~

HANDLE VIA **BYEMAN**
CONTROL SYSTEM

b. Costs should be identified on the basis of a five-year plan, but should be structured for consecutive two-year, two-year and one-year incremental buy packages. Resulting lead time considerations should be specifically identified.

c. Costs should be structured on a fiscal year basis, identifying first costs, if any, in Fiscal Year 1969. Experience factors and cost-of-living considerations should be carefully evaluated to insure the best possible cost estimates are derived.

d. Costs should include sustaining engineering and services, such as Aerospace MES, reliability assurance, flight analysis, follow-on product improvement, and similar factors normally a part of current operational programs.

e. All options should be phased in with the completion of the current R&D Program (last R&D launch January 1971).

f. Negotiated baseline MOL capabilities, configurations and costs should be used as points of departure in constructing follow-on options.

g. SIGINT, Ocean Surveillance, and other independent missions should not be considered. The EPS should be included, but separately identified and costed.

h. Product or performance improvements not now included in the baseline program should not be considered.

i. New industrial, checkout, launch base, or other facilities, other than those included in the baseline program, should not be included, unless impossible to avoid.

Based on the foregoing, it is requested that you evaluate in detail, and cost each of the following specific options:

Option A - Three flights per year (except only two new flights in CY 1971), all unmanned, commencing May 1971 and continuing on four-month centers, with no conversion of any vehicles to the manned mode. A total of 15 flights.

Option B - Three flights per year (except only two new flights in CY 1971), all manned, commencing May 1971 and continuing on four-month centers, with no conversion of any vehicles to the unmanned mode. A total of 15 flights.

DORLAN

Page 2 of 3 pages
Copy 3 of 4 copies
SAFE L BYE 21261-66

HANDLE VIA **BYEMAN**
CONTROL SYSTEM

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

HANDLE VIA **BYEMAN**
CONTROL SYSTEM

Option C - Three flights per year (except only two new flights in CY 1971), commencing May 1971 and continuing on four-month centers, the first three flights manned with two-thirds of the remainder being configured for the manned mode. Also include hardware and labor costs to convert and fly all manned vehicles in the unmanned mode. A total of 15 flights.

Option D - Six flights per year (except only five new flights in CY 1971), commencing March 1971 and continuing on two-month centers, one-half to be configured in the manned mode and one-half in the unmanned mode. Also include hardware and labor costs for conversion from a manned configuration to an unmanned mode, with the assumption that only one of each year's manned flights will be actually converted to the unmanned mode. A total of 30 flights.

Option E - Six flights per year (except only five new flights in CY 1971), commencing March 1971 and continuing on two-month centers, each vehicle to be carried in an uncommitted configuration through the production cycle as far as possible before a manned/unmanned decision is made. One-half of the flights each year actually fly in the unmanned mode. A total of 30 flights.

Option F - Five new flights in CY 1971, commencing March 1971, flown on two-month centers; nine flights in CY 1972, flown on 40 day centers; twelve flights per year thereafter flown on one-month centers, for a total of 51 flights. One half of the vehicles to be configured for unmanned flight, and the other half for manned operation. One-third of the manned vehicles ultimately to be converted and flown as unmanned vehicles.

I would value any critique or improvement of the above options you may have. I would also welcome any additional options which you believe would be suitable, as well as your considerations as to the most attractive options from your standpoint. I will furnish any additional information you may need upon your request. Colonel Randall and Major Campbell of my office will be my cognizant officers for this task. I would appreciate receiving the results of your efforts on this task by January 16, 1967 in order to provide sufficient time to complete any necessary Fiscal Year 1969 budget activities.

SIGNED

Cys: SAF-SLM File
Green Read
SCG Read

HARRY L. EVANS
Major General, USAF
Vice Director, MOL Program

DORLAN
HANDLE VIA **BYEMAN**
CONTROL SYSTEM

~~SECRET~~

Page 3 of 3 pages
Copy 3 of 4 copies
SAFSL BYE 21261-66