UNCLASSIFIED

SAA200040400000

THIS DOCUMENT CONSISTS OF 5 PAGE(S)
NO. 7 OF 7 COPIES, SERIES A

AUG 16 1988

WPD:DER

WPD:pfs

Lt. Col. Patrick E. Neeley, DP-242.1, GTN, OMA, HQ, w/cy. 1/7A

Rosson
Rosson
8/16/88

Asset Availability and Schedule Options (U)

Reference:

b(1)
(a):X4

(2) Teletype from HQ SAC, XRH to those listed DTG 271815Z, Subject: "Interim Earth Penetrating Weapon (EPW) Option"

b(1)
(a):X4

Reference (2) satisfied a SAC action item from POM 88-1 to identify numerical requirements for the system.

b(3)

OD 1.5(
X4

b(3)

All schedules are predicated on those presented in Draft Stockpile Memorandum 88D dated August 1988.

INVENTORIED
MAY 31 1989

b(3)
1.5(a):
X4

Option I -

h

A

tentative schedule to accomplish this is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW
VIEW-DATE: 11/09/95
RITY: CLASSIFIED
VIEW-DATE: 4/19/96
RITY: RR Schmidt

DETERMINATION (CIRCLE NUMBER(S))
1. CLASSIFICATION RETAINED
2. CLASSIFICATION CHANGED TO:
3. CONTAINS NO DOE CLASSIFIED INFO
4. COORDINATE WITH:
5. CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED
6. CLASSIFIED INFO BRACKETED
7. OTHER (SPECIFY):

UNCLASSIFIED

FORMERLY RESTRICTED DATA
Unauthorized disclosure subject to Administrative and Criminal Sanctions. Handle as Restricted Data in Foreign Dissemination. Section 144.b, Atomic Energy Act, 1954.
Classified by D.E. Rosson Org. WPD
Title Program Manager Date 8/15/88

08 88-068 7/7A

DOE, b(3)

DOE, b(3)

, b(3)

To date, planned losses reflect a stockpile confidence test and an accelerated aging unit. Only one unplanned loss has been experienced in the past three years. Based on this record, we are confident that at least [redacted] can be scheduled to yield to the Stockpile IEPW Program; one unit is allocated for an unplanned loss in the Program. It was assumed that a six to seven month turnaround time for performing the [redacted] Warhead conversion is adequate. Thus [redacted] returned from SAC in December 1990 will be returned to the stockpile as IEP Warheads in June 1991. It should be understood that this assumption has no data to support it, since design and process flow data are not yet available.

DOE 1.5(a) X4

D 1.5(a) X4

E, b(3)

[redacted] addition, there will be transportation costs incurred for transporting these assets between SAC bases and Pantex.

D 1.5(a) X4

E, b(3)

SECRET UNCLASSIFIED

This option is advantageous, because it increase the number in the stockpile with modern detonation safety and insensitive high explosive; it produces Assets as scheduled in the timeframe for which they are planned and budgeted, and thus production capacity and other resources are allocated for the work

With regard to the Pantex costs alluded to above, it should be emphasized that this is a very small percentage of the total direct cost at the Pantex Plant, and if units are not assembled, some other activity will utilize the majority of these resources.

Option II - Complete the manufacturing on a schedule that would support the ultimate use (UU) schedule outlined in Draft Stockpile Memorandum 88D and presented in Option I above. Considering production lead times, the last component would be shipped to Pantex in June 1990.

the associated costs would be essentially the same, and excepting the Pantex Plant, the manufacturing effort in the Weapons Production Complex would be uninterrupted.

Option III

Approximately 12 to 15 months prior to the FPU of the IEP Warhead (March to June 1990 based on current plan) RE-TMS the entire production line along with the IEP Warhead unique components, manufacture support for and assemble the IEP Warheads.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECRET UNCLASSIFIED

b(3)

Further, RE-TMS of complex electronic hardware is possible but highly undesirable and should be avoided if at all possible.

b(3) Option IV -

Option IV is perhaps possible but not cost effective or very feasible.

b(3)

b(3)

1.5(a)

It should be understood that this plan may cause logistic or provisioning difficulties for the Navy that are insurmountable.

b(3)

If you wish to pursue the above scenario with the Navy and/or ATSD AE, please advise.

(b)(3)

1.5(a)

Both options accomplish the program goals in a timely, cost

UNCLASSIFIED SECRET

SECRET

effective manner; with Option II being slightly more efficient. Option I maximizes assets in the user's hand in the event that some difficulty is experienced in carrier availability. In any case, to implement either of these recommendations, it would be unnecessary to change the planning directive from that shown in Draft Stockpile Memorandum 88D until January 1989. At that time, if the IEP Warhead has received a Phase 3, the P & PD can be modified with no risk or penalty.

DD 1.5(a)

Given minimum resource support within the P and S Budget for IEP Warhead acquisition, we believe the major risk to accomplishing this goal is the availability of the chosen carrier in a timely manner. Accordingly, we believe that contingency plans should be established to support the IEP Warhead Program with one of the other carriers considered in the "four months" feasibility study.

As always, we will be happy to discuss this matter further with you or your staff. Please advise if we can provide additional information.

Original Signed By
DAVID E. ROSSON

David E. Rosson, Jr.
Program Manager for
Bomb Systems
Weapon Programs Division

cc:

b(1)
1.5(a)

Don McCoy, Interim EP Program Officer, Org. 5111, SNLA, w/cy. 4/7A

bcc:
AL WPD RF, w/cy. 5/7A
AL Mail & File Unit, w/cy. 6/7A
D. Rosson, WPD, AL, w/cy. 7/7A
(170723)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECRET