Option 3: Start Electro-Optical Imaging system procurement in December 1971 with level funding by fiscal year and with IOC about June 1976; terminate Film-Readout-system-activities; (Dr. McLucas' note: "Why include this? We haven't started system work yet. Furthermore we ought to continue R&D on TSC as a hedge.)

This option pursues Electro-Optical Imaging system procurement alone on a recommended level of funding of [ ] per year until system IOC. Without considering the inefficiencies of such a funding discipline it appears that an IOC could be expected no earlier than mid-1976. The development cost of the Electro-Optical Imaging system, Relay satellites and ground station in this option is [ ] and annual operating cost [ ] per year.

This option has utility if there is not an urgent need for the readout and crisis capability or if present satellite and aircraft resources can meet this need. It has utility also in that it applies fiscal restraints to the NRP budget, keeping budget levels at or below [ ] in FY 73 and FY 74. In addition, the option responds to Congressional advice concerning the choice of one of the two systems offered.
Option 4: Start Electro-Optical Imaging System procurement in December 1971 in an accelerated program with possible December 1974 IOC; terminate-Film-Readout-system-activities.

(Dr. McLucas' note: Why include this, etc.)

This option corresponds to an urgent effort to attain the Electro-Optical Imaging system capability at the earliest practical date and has significant risk of schedule slippage and cost overrun. The estimated development cost of the Electro-Optical imaging system, its relay satellites and ground station is [ ] and the annual operating cost [ ] per year.

This option has utility in that it concentrates on one system and offers a chance of having the potentially greater responsiveness and productivity of the Electro-Optical Imaging system available at the earliest practicable date. The option has difficulties in that it has significant possibility of cost overruns and schedule slippages and in that it could be vulnerable to subsequent Congressional action and require strong defense in that it allocates well over [ ] in each of FY 73 and FY 74.

The Executive Committee agrees that the US should move toward developing the EOI system at some level of funding. That is
why we do not show an Option 5 to go for FROG only. Such an option would have had the dual advantages of being the lowest cost and allowing the community to begin to digest the resultant imagery at the earliest time, with consequent learning of how best to design an eventual EOI system. Some configuration of EOI is in fact the intelligence imaging system of the future: it has almost open ended possibility for growth both in image quality and in image processing. The Committee disagrees on attaches different importance to the urgency and its associated risk, and on the price worth paying in attaining this capability. Furthermore we do not know your own evaluation of the urgency and how exactly to interpret the OMB letter of April. We are therefore presenting this issue to you for your decision.
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