

file # 2 NSTL/SIOP messages
DECLASSIFIED Other than exclusions

TOP SECRET
PRIORITY

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
STAFF MESSAGE DIVISION

AF IN : 36553 (29 Apr 61) PR/pr

ACTION: JCS (4-38) ADDED DIST: ARMY (39-53), CNO (54-73), CMC (74-81),
XPD (82-85), XDC (86), ODC (87),
OOP (88), OOP-CP (89), CIN(90-91)

FROM : JCSLG OFFUTT AFB NEBRASKA

TO : JCS WASHINGTON, D.C.

NR : 61-27

JCS MONITOR

282318Z Apr 61

For Director Joint Staff and info J-3. This the 34th Weekly Activity Report. This msg in 1 part.

PART I. JSTPS Activity:

(A) The 30th Policy Committee meeting was held on 25 April. Minutes of this meeting will be forwarded when available. The NSTL Division gave a presentation on assurance of delivery in regard to amendment number 1. It was pointed out that contributing reasons for the amendment were force changes (SAC and SACEUR), intelligence changes (updating and January conference), and concept of employment (SAC 50 per cent alert). Guidelines for determining assurance of delivery of the LHE SIOP-62 original plan were reviewed and examined for possible changes in preparing amendment number 1. In amendment number 1 it was shown that there will be less than one percent change in the total number of DGZ's. The SIOP-62 original plan was based on about 3200 weapons. This figure in amendment number 1 will be approximately 3240 weapons. Consequently, the NSTL sees no appreciable change in the ratio of weapons to DGZ's. There is essentially no change caused by recategorization or shift in relative worth. In the ALPHA list, while the points are different, the point spread is comparable. In handling the changes caused by the increased ground alert force, the NSTL proposes to follow the same procedure as in the original plan. They will cover the whole spectrum, with emphasis on the top DGZ's, and optimize for weight versus worth. It is estimated that amendment number 1 for the alert force application will have an average overall assurance of 80 percent for 684 objective DGZ's plus 41 defenses for 725 total alert force DGZ's. The recommendation of the NSTL was:

- (1) Approve proposed assurance for the alert force.
- (2) Recognize the proposal as being within current guidelines.

The policy committee agreed with the recommendation with the exception

Reproduction of this message in whole or in part is prohibited without approval of THE OFFICE OF PRIMARY INTEREST.

59

OP
MAY 1961

AFHQ FORM 0-309
22 JUN 56

PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM MAY BE USED.

DECLASSIFIED

COPY NO.

DECLASSIFIED

page 2 of

TOP SECRET

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

AF IN : 36553 (29 Apr 61) STAFF MESSAGE DIVISION

NR : 61-27 fr JCSIG OFFUTT AFB NEBRASKA

(CONT'D)

that the CINCLANT representative maintained for the record the position he had taken in the original laydown of the plan, that 97 percent assurance is too high and that 90 percent should be the maximum figure. This is not registered as a formal dissent. The CINCPAC representative did not object. But stated that he could not indicate complete concurrence until he could check with CINCPAC, who had evidenced considerable interest in assurance figures. For the purpose of proceedings with the work on the amendment, the recommendation can be considered approved. A second presentation concerned the optimum-mix DGZ list and how it is served. It was pointed out that it consists of an ALPHA list, a separate BRAVO list, the identification of co-located installations as either ALPHA or BRAVO, and the manual merging of the two lists to form the single DGZ list. After the list was manually merged, the CINC representatives coordination was sought, and the list shapes up as follows:

- (1) For the alert force 684 ALPHA and BRAVO merged, 20 ALPHA defenses, 21 pure defenses, for a total of 725 DGZ's using 1706 weapons.
- (2) For the total force 953 ALPHA and BRAVO mixed, 82 other BRAVO DGZ's, and 25 pure defenses, for a total of 1060 DGZ's. (1035 without defenses).

(B) A volume of minor changes has made it more efficient to revise certain documents at the present time than to make extensive pen and ink changes. A decision has been reached to revise appendix I to Annex C by the week of 8 May, but to make no changes to or revise appendix II to that annex at this time. Appendix II is useful only in planning and analysis, ACD amendment number 1 will result in a completely new set of documents not later than 1 July.

(C) On 27 April the DSTP signed and sent to the JCS his proposed JTD, which is his 9 January submission revised to incorporate guidance received from the JCS on 22 March.

BT

*This JTD now being worked on by Joint Staff services. Probably up for consideration about 10 June. V. Kelly
Black*

NOTE : Advance copy delivered to JCS
Reproduction of this message in whole or in part is prohibited without approval of THE OFFICE OF PRIMARY INTEREST.

COPY NO.

AFHQ FORM 0-309
22 JUN 56

PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF THIS FORM MAY BE USED.

DECLASSIFIED