MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

SUBJECT: NRO START/INF Collection Initiatives

Since our meeting with President Reagan, I have reviewed several reconnaissance satellite alternatives for responding to the recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) for additional intelligence capabilities required in the 1990s (particularly in the context of a potential START agreement). As you recall, our discussions with the President focused on

My principal concern in this review has been to keep the total development of both these initiatives at a reasonable level, while still addressing the needs pointed out by the SSCI.

The two options summarized below provide a range of capabilities with corresponding costs.

OPTION 1 - Preferred

(b)(1)
(b)(3)
BUDGET (dollars): 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY89</th>
<th>FY90</th>
<th>FY91</th>
<th>FY92</th>
<th>FY93</th>
<th>TOTAL FY89-93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION: Option 1 provides the earliest possible collection system improvements in support of the INF/START treaties. The (1993) will guarantee of all key treaty sites, including treaty-related-item production facilities, Portal Perimeter Monitoring sites, Field Training Areas (activity monitoring), and sites selected for on-site inspection. The constellation will provide the additional treaty coverage without penalizing coverage of current intelligence requirements, and will also provide of other areas like the Soviet

OPTION 2 - Alternate
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend Option 1. It improves our collection capabilities as early as possible, and gives us the most time to prepare for the long-term compliance and monitoring phase of a START agreement. It addresses Senators Boren and Cohen's desire for improved coverage as early as possible, is considerably less costly in FY 1989 than the approach recommended by the SSCI provides the schedule desired by the SSCI, and capability by

If Option 1 is too costly, a reasonable fallback would be Option 2. Option 2 meets the spirit of the SSCI call for improved collection capabilities, but does so at a lower cost by delaying operations to 1997. Option 2 would still provide the collection capabilities required for the long-term compliance and monitoring phase of a START agreement.

A recent Intelligence Community study concluded that
The NRO also recognizes and supports the need for setting funding aside for improved exploitation of the additional collection that would be provided by these systems. Exploitation funding, however, is not included in the NRO options provided above.

Finally, there are still specific benefits to be gained from a system. We are continuing to study such an initiative and intend to provide a program option in our formal budget submission to you later this spring.

E. C. Aldridge, Jr.
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MEMO TO THE STAFF

SUBJECT: SSCI QFR Review, 15 Apr 88

April 18, 1988

1. Mr. Keith Hall of the SSCI met with Mr. Hill and several of the NRO staff in the afternoon of 15 April to review a subset of the SSCI FY 89 Questions for the Record (QFRs). Answers to roughly half of the 81 SSCI QFRs were reviewed. Answers to the remaining QFRs will be reviewed on Wednesday or Thursday of this week. This is a change of previous plans which were to review the remaining QFRs on Tuesday, 19 Apr.

2. There are several actions required of the staff based upon the QFR review. A summary of the actions is provided below. Responses are due by 10 Apr tomorrow, 20 Apr 88.

Q1: Provide an update of the color cartoon showing distribution of the Titan IV booster buys according to DoD and NRO programs.

Q7: Breakdown the SRP budget shortfall by year.

Q18: Is the all launch incentives for just two boosters?

Q21: Confirm that Col Paulson briefed to the SSCI staff last year that he had given up costs as part of the FY 88 action. Also, can we get credit if either launches slip?

Q24: Provide balance costs for the kinds of payloads described in the answer i.e.,

(b)(1) (b)(3)

Q26: Is the which we carry for technology in the FY 89 budget?

Q26: What are the costs by year starting in FY 89 for a system? Run out costs through FOC.

Q26: What are the costs by year starting in FY 89 for a run out costs through FOC. Consider aggregating funds beyond the FYDP.
Q27: Why not compute the

Q46C: Does the ground segment line include funds for both another control channel and another terminal? If so, can the costs be broken out?

3. Other potential issues include the following:

- System support. Vulnerable again this year in absence of sufficient justification (QFR yet to be provided).

- RMS. Vulnerable due to lack of definition.

- Processing upgrade. Vulnerable in light of deletion from availability. Same issue as last year.

NRL MILCON. Pending justification (QFR yet to be provided).

Greg Gilles

Approved for Release: 2019/10/07 C05101485
Q7. The NRP budget shortfall by year is as follows (dollars in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 90</th>
<th>FY 91</th>
<th>FY 92</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q21. The SPO has confirmed that the basis of estimate for

charges has not changed in the last year. Both the FY 1988

and the FY 1989 CBJs estimated requirements of

in FY 1988, based on a launch in the timeframe.

The production in FY 1988 was accommodated by

O&M Manning. Yes, if or

(b)(1)

(b)(3)

Q24. Ballpark FYDP costs for the options provided in the answer
to Question 24 are:

Q27. Competition of the is still subject to cost and

schedule trades. Our information is to stick with

to help reduce development risk, both because of their experience

with the current payload and their
ANSWERS TO SSCE QUESTIONS RESULTING FROM ANSWERS TO

FIRST SET OF QUESTIONS

These answers went to SSCE informally

Q7. The NRP budget shortfall by year is as follows (dollars in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 90</th>
<th>FY 91</th>
<th>FY 92</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q21. The SPO has confirmed that the basis of estimate for
charges has not changed in the last year. Both the FY 1988
and the FY 1989 CBUBS estimated requirements of
in FY 1988, based on a launch in the timeframe.
The reduction in FY 1988 was accommodated by
O&M manning. Yes, if

Q24. Ballpark FYDP costs for the options provided in the answer
to Question 24 are:

Q27. Competition of the is still subject to cost and
schedule trades. Our inclination is to stick with
to help reduce development risk, both because of their experience
with the current payload and their

familiarity with the new technology.
MEMO FOR THE STAFF

SUBJECT: HPSCI and SSCI FY 1989 NRP Mark-up

Attached for your information are copies of the NRP portion of the HPSCI and SSCI mark sheets for the FY 1989 NFIP budget submission. The Classified Annex to the HPSCI report, which provides the accompanying language to the mark, is still in preparation and should be available next week. The SSCI Classified Annex should follow within a week of the HPSCI. A corresponding memo is being sent to Programs A, B and C.

GREGORY L. GILLES, Lt Col, USAF
Deputy for Congressional Affairs

2 Attachments
1. FY 1989 HPSCI Mark
2. FY 1989 SSCI Mark
### National Reconnaissance Program

**Program Issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 1989 Request</th>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>FY 1989 Authorization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Authorization Summary:**
- Other Procurement, Air Force
- Missile Procurement, Air Force
- RDT&E, Air Force
- Military Construction

**Total NRP**

**Special Navy Program**

**Program Issues:** None

**Authorization Summary:**
- Military Personnel, Navy
- RDT&E, Navy

**Total Special Navy**

**DoD Foreign Counterintelligence**

**Program Issues:** None

**Authorization Summary:**
- Military Personnel
- Operations and Maintenance
- Other Procurement

**Total DoD/FCI**

* MILCON separately authorized by MILCON.
Page Denied