

336

HISTORY OF THE JOINT STRATEGIC TARGET PLANNING STAFF

REVISIONS 1-8 TO SIOP 64 (U)

Reproduction of this document in whole or in part is prohibited except with the permission of the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff.

THIS TITLE PAGE DOES NOT
CONTAIN CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

WARNING

THIS MATERIAL CONTAIN INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE ESPIONAGE LAWS TITLE 18. U. S. C. SECTIONS 793 AND 794 THE TRANSMISSION OR REVELATION OF WHICH IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW.

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC
REGRADING: DOD DIR 5200.10
DOES NOT APPLY

SPECIAL HANDLING REQUIRED
NOT RELEASABLE TO FOREIGN NATIONALS
OR THEIR REPRESENTATIVES

PREPARED EXPRESSLY FOR JSTPS BY
HISTORY & RESEARCH DIVISION
HEADQUARTERS STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND
JANUARY 1967

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
OFFICIAL FILE COPY
JCS AIR BRANCH 26980


CY 4A OF 9
[REDACTED]

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
JOINT STRATEGIC TARGET PLANNING STAFF
OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE
NEBRASKA
68113

31 JAN 1967

FOREWORD

1. (U) This fourth history of the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff (JSTPS), since its establishment in August 1960, is provided to satisfy the requirement in JCS SM-1825-64, Paragraph XIc(7), "Guidance for the Preparation of the Single Integrated Operational Plan (SIOP)," 5 December 1964.
2. (U) This history, as prescribed in JSTPS JAI 210-1, 21 March 1966, is concerned primarily with the eight revisions to SIOP-64. It covers a 27 month period, 1 January 1964 - 30 June 1966. As part of the basic SIOP, several separate annexes were published and should be reviewed for additional information concerning their specialized data. This history highlights the expanding threat and emphasizes planning factor changes and the growing role of missile systems in the SIOP. A discussion of significant organizational and personnel actions concludes the historical coverage.
3. (U) This is a TOP SECRET/NOFORN document and will be handled according to the provisions of DOD Directive 5200.1 and JCS Staff Memo 280-64 as amended. The classification of TOP SECRET/NOFORN is assigned to this document to conform with the classification of the information taken from the source documents.
4. (U) For downgrading of classification this document is placed in GROUP 1, and is excluded from automatic downgrading and declassification. The historian's analysis and consolidation of information from many sources, which individually may have lower downgrade provisions, result in a synthesis which may have wider implications than the material on which it is based. Therefore, individual downgrade instructions for each paragraph are not indicated, and all portions of this volume will be handled under the overall downgrading group.
5. (U) The history was prepared for JSTPS by Mr. E. R. Caywood of the Strategic Air Command historical staff.


ROBERT J. STROH
Vice Admiral, USN
Deputy Director

DISTRIBUTION:
JCS 5
SAC (DXIH) 1
JSTPS 3
JS (1)
JP (1)
JL (1)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. 1

Strategic Targeting Procedures. 2

Operational Concepts. 8

 Planning Factors 10

 Operational Considerations 12

 SIOP Preparation Procedures. 14

Revisions to SIOP-64 18

Missile and Other Targeting 22

Penetration Probabilities 48

The JSTPS Organization. 53

Summary 68

Footnotes 70

Appendix (TS Data)

Introduction

(U) This is the fourth history of the JSTPS since its establishment on 16 August 1960. The previous monographs, located in JSTPS files, were: SIOP-62 (16 August-1 December 1960, HA-0756); SIOP-63 (15 January-1 August 1962, 64-B-51); and SIOP-64 (1 September 1962-28 October 1963, 64-B-3847).

(S) The SIOP-64, approved 28 October 1963 with an effective date of 1 January 1964, remained in effect through 30 June 1966 and underwent eight revisions during the 30-month period.¹ As part of the basic plan several separate annexes were published and should be reviewed for detailed information concerning their special subjects.* A new plan, SIOP-4, became effective 1 July 1966, ending the longest interval between SIOPs since the completion of the initial plan on 1 December 1960.

(S) Although the Joint Chiefs of Staff made no basic policy changes affecting SIOP-64, its operational concepts and preparation procedures were reviewed for continuity purposes. This coverage was based mainly on the briefings and attached documents presented to the Secretary of Defense and JCS in October 1963 and to the President of the United States

* For details see the JSTPS SIOP-64 Planning Manual 64-B-2390 and the several annexes to the basic plan which were published separately.

and Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in September 1964.* These sources were selected because they contained information required for the highest level of decision making by the Government of the United States and its NATO Allies in the execution of SIOP-64.

(U) A discussion of the eight revisions to SIOP-64, changes in planning factors, and the application of missiles constitute the major operational portion of this history. The study concludes with a review of organizational and personnel changes and coverage of the NATO officers' assignment to the JSTPS and their participation in the development of the SIOP.

Strategic Targeting Procedures

(TS) The SIOP-64 was prepared within the parameters of the National Strategic Target and Attack Policy (NSTAP) which included the following objectives:²

(U)


* Although published in a NATO edition, in accordance with JCS SM-412-66, as summarized on page 66 of this history, the Presidential Briefing is considered a major historical reference because of the attendance of the President and the NATO Secretary General at a common briefing to review the overall policies and capabilities of SIOP-64.

~~TOP SECRET~~



~~TOP SECRET~~

(~~TOP SECRET~~)



~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~(TS)~~ The JSTPS made extensive use of computers in targeting the SIOP forces. For example, all targets [

Operational Concepts

(U) The concepts used in developing SIOP-64 remained valid during its eight revisions and are briefly reviewed for continuity purposes.

~~TOP SECRET~~



~~TOP SECRET~~

(TS) Cross-targeting provided additional assurance that programmed weapons would reach their targets and further compounded the enemy's targeting and timing problem.

Planning Factors

(TS) In planning the SIOP, the JSTPS applied specific mathematical factors to measure and contrast single sortie effectiveness or the overall plan effectiveness under a variety of conditions. The mathematical formulae comprised four major factors: (1) Pre-launch Survivability, (2) Weapon System Reliability, (3) Weather Darkness Factor, and (4) Penetration Probability.²⁶

~~(TS)~~ The Weapon System Reliability factor considered launch, in-flight, and warhead reliabilities. The latter included manual control and arming of the warhead in addition to the weapon dud factor. The commanders committing and coordinating forces in the SIOP furnished data for aircraft and cruise missiles, while the JCS supplied ballistic missile reliability data.²⁸



~~(TS)~~ The Weather Darkness Factor, including visibility and daylight-darkness conditions, was used for integrating the contribution of all non-weather sorties in the SIOP. Based on a comprehensive climatological study of the target system, factors were developed for all areas scheduled for attack.²⁹

(TS) The combined factors discussed above provided the tools for evaluating vehicle probability of arrival at the bomb release line. The analyses involving all these factors were made for each weapon in the SIOF [] and represented thousands of computations. []

(TS) In addition to the Probability of Arrival, the target's hardness, programmed weapon's yield, height of burst, and circular error probable (CEP) were considered. The CEP was based on the probable accuracy with which the weapon would be delivered. The combination of these factors provided the JSTPS with probability of damage and this data compounded with Probability of Arrival calculations resulted in Damage Expectancy (DE).³² [] In SIOF-64 the DE to any single DGZ would not exceed []

Operational Considerations

~~TOP SECRET~~




~~TOP SECRET~~

SIOP Preparation Procedures

~~(TS)~~ Each revision (like a new plan) to SIOP-64 was prepared within the guidelines of the NSTAP and comprised the four basic steps of (1) preplanning, (2) force application, (3) command and JSTPS data processing, and (4) collation, distribution and unit preparation. Following these procedures the revision became effective. A detailed breakout of the various procedures within the basic steps are illustrated in the charts on the following pages.

NOV '62 DEC JAN '63 FEB MAR APR MAY

SECRET



APPLICATI

~~SECRET~~

SEP

OCT

NOV

DEC

JAN '64

FEB

MAR

APR

MAY

~~SECRET~~

VISION 3

CMD STRIK
PROC TIMIN

SIOP-63 REVISION 4

PC	SAC NON UP ALERT	LANT ← EUR N.A.	COMMAND PROCESSING	STRIKE TIMING T.O.T.	DISTR OF DOC'MTS	COMMAND PLANNING	UNIT PREPARATION
SAC NON ALERT	PAC N.A.	ALERT < NON ALERT					

SIOP-64

FORCE APPLICATION	COMMAND PROCESSING	STRIKE TIMING
----------------------	-----------------------	------------------

- NSTDB
- NSDL
- ATOMIC ANNEX "C"
- SUMMARY TABLES
- DICTIONARY
- AIR DEF HANDBOOK
- SIOP JN CHARTS
- CONSEQUENCES OF EXEC
- UNIT & SORTIE & WPNS
- PENETRATION ANALYSIS
- DGZ GEODETICS
- TGT MATERIAL AVAILABILITY
- BASIC SIOP
- PLANNING MANUAL
- STRIKE TIMING SOURCE DATA BOOK
- ANNEX "F" APP I - MASTER ASGMT & FORCE TIMING
- ANNEX "F" APP I - TAB "A" FREE LAUNCH - FREE IMPACT SCHEDULE
- ANNEX "F" APP II - MASTER ASGMT IN ALD SEQUENCE
- ANNEX "F" APP III - SAFE SEPARATION CRITERIA - TGT CONFLICT LIST - MASTER TIMING IN THE SEQUENCE
- TANKER ASGMT & TIMING
- ANNEX "E" - COORDINATING INSTRUCTIONS / COUNTERMEASURES APPLICATION
- SIOP LAUNCH & IMPACT SUMMARY
- SIOP STATISTICAL ALMANAC
- SAC LAUNCH & IMPACT SUMMARY (BOMBERS & TANKERS)
- ROUTING CONFLICT ANALYSIS

INT

PRODUCT~~SECRET~~

DOPLP-64-1708

(S) The charts illustrate the considerable lead time required for preparing a new SIOP. Approximately five months pre-planning was required before the force application phase could begin for SIOP-64. The force application involved five months and command and JSTPS data processing required two months. The JSTPS sought to give the tactical units 60 to 90 days to complete their work, but the amount of actual time was closer to 45 days. Accordingly, considerable overtime was spent in order to meet the suspense date. Concurrent with SIOP-64 development, maintenance of SIOP-63 continued and four revisions to SIOP-63 were produced during this period.⁴⁰

(S) Three detailed war games were conducted evaluating SIOP-64 with the JCS providing Red Integrated Strategic Offensive Plans (RISOP): Basic SIOP-64, Revision 4, and Revision 6. It should be understood that continuous changes were made during the intervals between revisions in order to keep the SIOP target system up-to-date.

Revisions to SIOP-64

(S) The target system steadily increased during SIOP-64's effective period with a concurrent growth in SIOP forces. The peak in SIOP forces was reached with Revision 4 and declined slightly thereafter. This resulted mainly from the phaseout of SAC's medium bomber force and its early model ICBMs. The loss of these systems was partially offset by the addition of more sophisticated ICBMs and refinements in weapon system reliability factors.

(U) For specific breakouts of delivery vehicles, weapons, DGZs by Task, DE, and other appropriate data, the reader is referred to this history's Appendix and Annex C, NSTL to the SIOP and the SIOP Analysis Summary Tables in the permanent JSTPS files.

(TS) The growth in primary DGZs from the basic SIOP-64 to the last revision showed an increase of 327 -- 1716 versus 1389. The breakout by Revision, including total vehicles and weapons follow:⁴²

			<u>DGZs</u>	<u>Vehicles</u>	<u>Weapons</u>
SIOP-64	1 Jan-31	Mar 64	1389	2798	4718
Revision 1	1 Apr-30	Jun 64	1435	2914	4932
Revision 2	1 Jul-30	Sep 64	1451	2977	4999
Revision 3	1 Oct-31	Dec 64	1482	3105	5176
Revision 4	1 Jan-31	Mar 65	1517	3164	5299
Revision 5	1 Apr-30	Jun 65	1584	3045	5106
Revision 6	1 Jul- 9	Nov 65	1666	3083	5065
Revision 7*	10Nov-31	Mar 66	1697	2906	4899
Revision 8	1 Apr-30	Jun 66	1716	2836	4826

* The 10 November 1965 Revision was required by accelerated aircraft phaseouts.

(PS) With the exception of SAC, the strength of alert forces in all commands increased in delivery vehicles and weapons during the 30-month period of SIOP-64. However, the total number decreased by 78 vehicles and 106 weapons. This resulted from the phaseout of SAC's B-47 fleet, its B-52B bombers, the Atlas and Titan I ICBMs. These losses were partly compensated for by the acquisition of more modern Minuteman, improvements in weapon reliability and reduced CEPs for bomber aircraft systems. A comparison of vehicles and weapons capability for the first and last revision to SIOP-64 follows:⁴³

<u>Delivery Vehicles, SIOP-64</u>					
<u>Alert</u>		<u>Non-Alert</u>		<u>Total</u>	
<u>Rev 1</u>	<u>Rev 8</u>	<u>Rev 1</u>	<u>Rev 8</u>	<u>Rev 1</u>	<u>Rev 8</u>
1252	1223	602	313	1854	1546
64	112	121	141	185	253
93	138	183	212	276	350
<u>223</u>	<u>239</u>	<u>376</u>	<u>448</u>	<u>599</u>	<u>687</u>
1632	1722	1282	1114	2914	2836
<u>Weapons, SIOP-64</u>					
2497	2424	1280	1090	3777	3514
64	112	137	147	201	259
131	147	193	219	324	366
<u>227</u>	<u>239</u>	<u>403</u>	<u>448</u>	<u>630</u>	<u>687</u>
2919	2922	2013	1904	4932	4826

*

** (U) Polaris is included in both Lant and Eur totals.

-
- * (U) This probability took into consideration all appropriate operational factors of the SIOP weapon systems including enemy damage prior to launch, reliability, penetration losses, weather and darkness factors, and enemy target factors such as its type and vulnerability to attack. (Annex C, Policy Guidance for General War Planning, to JCS 2450/104/4, (U) "Agenda for First Meeting of Nuclear Planning Working Group of NATO's Special Committee of Defense Ministers," 1 Mar 66, 66-J-0331).

 - ** (U) These data are cumulative -- the first column is alert missiles, alert bombers are added in the second column and the third column applies non-alert forces for the total end position.

~~TOP SECRET~~



~~TOP SECRET~~



Missile and Other Targeting

~~(S)~~ The JSTPS targeted the missile force using projected weapon system reliability (WSR) factors and CEPs provided by JCS with the objective of reducing the magnitude and impact of changing factors

-
- * (U) W/O Shld - Without shielding factors as per WSEG Study 46, Supplement 3 Methodology.
 - ** (U) W/Shld - With shielding factors applied from DASA Study 617.
European monitor shielding = 80%.
Middle East, Far East and Nome monitor shielding = 45%

during the early phases of SIOP revisions.⁵¹ On 17 December 1964 (Decision 1620/443-3) the JCS established an annual schedule for reviewing the SIOP missile planning factors. The CINCs concerned evaluated the capability of their weapon systems during the July-September quarter and made appropriate recommendations to the JCS prior to the yearly review.⁵²

~~(TS)~~ The JCS used a variety of data to determine and validate the missile WSR and accuracy factors for the SIOP. In addition to the CINCs' estimates, they considered Service technical data, the Weapon Systems Evaluation Group's* evaluations, and the results of Operational Tests and Follow-on Operational Tests of the missile systems.⁵³

~~(TS)~~ The comparison of factors used for ballistic missile planning for the first and last revisions to SIOP-64 is shown below:⁵⁴

~~(TS)~~

TABLE II

Missile	Rev 1 Jan-Mar 64		Missile	Rev 8 Apr-Jun 66	
	Reliability	Accuracy		Reliability	Accuracy
Polaris A-1	.50	1.0 NM**	All deleted from SIOP by 1 Oct 65***		
Polaris A-2	.70	1.5 NM**	Polaris A-2	.75	1.0 NM
Polaris A-3	.20	1.5 NM	Polaris A-3	.60	1.0 NM

(con't on next page)

- * (U) After Minuteman II and Polaris A-3 Operational Testing, WSEG would no longer perform this function.
- ** (U) For simplicity in computations, 6000' and 9000' were used for 1.0 and 1.5 NM respectively.
- *** (U) The first five Polaris submarines were A-1 types. Their phase-out started in June 1963 and was completed 1 Oct 65 and deleted from SIOP-64.

(TS) Cont'd.

Missile	Rev 1 Jan-Mar 64		Missile	Rev 8 Apr-Jun 66	
	Reliability	Accuracy		Reliability	Accuracy
Atlas D	.20	1.0 NM	Removed from SIOP Alert	1 Oct 64*	
Atlas E	.40	1.5 NM	Removed from SIOP Alert	31 Mar 65*	
Atlas F	.20	1.5 NM	Removed from SIOP Alert	12 Apr 65*	
Titan I	.20	1.0 NM	Removed from SIOP Alert	26 Mar 65*	
Titan II	.20	1.0 NM	Titan II	.65	1.0 NM
MM Wing I	.40	1.5 NM	MM A	.60	1.0 NM
			MM B	.65	1.0 NM
MM Wing II	.40	1.5 NM	MM II	.60	1.0 NM
			Pershing (QRA)	.40	.25 NM**
			Pershing (QRA)	.60	.25 NM***

(TS) From the approval of SIOP-64 to its last revision the weighted average reliability for ballistic missiles improved from 35 to 64 percent. Within the same period the CEP decreased from 1.37 to 1.00 NM and the number of missiles increased by 589. The major change in the target system was the hard ICBM category where the DGZs increased from 25 (basic SIOP-64) to 229 for Revision 8. The following chart depicts the target system with programmed missiles for both periods against each target category. The data were based on the alert force from a day-to-day posture and the resultant damage expectancy (DE) figures were for pre-emptory type of launch:⁵⁵

- * (U) SAC inactivated all Atlas and Titan I units by 25 Jun 65.
- ** (U) Interim Planning Factor effective 1 Jan 66.
- *** (U) Interim Planning Factor effective 1 Jul 66.

~~TOP SECRET~~




~~TOP SECRET~~



(S) Most changes in WSR and accuracy factors involved the SIOP's missile systems, but some aircraft weapon systems were also affected.

* (U) Not Applicable.

* The term, "Penetration Probabilities" is defined on page 50, Tab B, Attachment I, Appendix II, Chapter 8 in the JSTPS SIOP-64 Planning, Manual 64-B-2390.



the first Polaris SSBN with 16 missiles to commence alert coverage in December 1964.⁶⁵ The Polaris SSBNs were programmed to replace the five obsolescent Regulus SSBs: Grayback, Growler, Barbero, Tunny, and Halibut assigned to PACOM as Strategic Retaliatory Forces. In April 1964 the JCS recommended the replacement and phaseout of the first three Regulus SSBs. Meanwhile the PACOM scheduled intermittent alert coverage of two DGZs in the Western Pacific by Halibut and Tunny until their replacement by Polaris SSBNs in FY-1965.⁶⁶

(TS) However, their service terminated earlier than anticipated as a result of SAC's ICBM and bomber increased weight of effort. [

(~~TOP SECRET~~)


~~NOFORN~~
~~TOP SECRET~~

* (U) SAC B-47 aircraft in support of USCINCEUR targets prior to termination of Reflex operations.


(~~TOP SECRET~~)

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~



~~TOP SECRET~~



-
- * (U) Ministry of Defense and National Army Headquarters
 - ** (U) National Government Control, National Air Force Headquarters,
National Air Defense Headquarters, and Tactical Air Force
Headquarters

(~~TOP SECRET~~)

~~NOFORN
TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

(TS/NF) In accordance with JCS guidance the JSTPS determined that attack options, objectives and execution procedures contained in the NSTAP and SIOP-64 provided sufficient flexibility for a []

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~NOFORN
TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~



~~TOP SECRET~~

* (U) "Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan." The JSCPs governing SIOP-64 and its eight Revisions were: SM 1-63, JSCP-64, 1 July 1963-30 June 1964; SM 264-64, JSCP-65, 1 July 1964-30 June 1965; SM 1862-64, JSCP-66, 1 July 1965-30 June 1966.

~~TOP SECRET~~

42

~~NOFORN~~
~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~NOFORN
TOP SECRET~~

(~~TOP SECRET~~)

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

45

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~


~~TOP SECRET~~

(TS) In addition to the phaseout of SAC's weapon systems noted above, the Navy's first five Polaris SSBNs, A-1 type, phased out of the fleet. The process started in June 1963 and was completed by 1 October 1965.¹²²

* (U) Commander U. S. Military Assistance Command Vietnam

* (U) These aircraft were assigned to the 7th, 320th, and 454th Bombardment Wings and replaced 12 B-52Bs SIOP alert bombers (six each) from the 22nd and 95th Bombardment Wings.

~~TOP SECRET~~



~~TOP SECRET~~

The JSTPS Organization

(U) The JSTPS had its beginning on 16 August 1960 by authorization of Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr. and subsequent action by the JCS. It was co-located with Headquarters SAC and the Commander in Chief, SAC, also served as Director of Strategic Target Planning (DSTP). The first DSTP was General Thomas S. Power who served until his retirement on 1 December 1964. He was succeeded

* (U) Highest priority for destruction by the penetrating attack sorties.

at that time by General John D. Ryan, CINCSAC. The DSTP was responsive to the Secretary of Defense through the JCS for developing and maintaining the NSTL and SIOP for general and nuclear war.

(U) The Office of the Director, the CINC Representatives (CINCRep) and the Planning Staff consisting of the NSTL and SIOP Divisions, comprised the major elements of the JSTPS organization. The Director's Office consisted of a Deputy, four Senior Members from the Services (Director's Staff Group), and the Secretariat which handled administrative and personnel matters. The Unified and Specified Commands and SACEUR were kept informed of SIOP developments through their permanent representations to the JSTPS.¹³² Serving as General Ryan's Deputy was Vice Admiral Robert J. Stroh, assigned since 25 July 1963. As required by DOD, this position was filled by a Naval officer of flag rank.

(U) The Deputy Director, acting as Chairman without a vote, the four Senior Service Members, and the CINCREPs constituted the Policy Committee -- a total of nine voting members.* The Chiefs of the NSTL and SIOP Divisions attended the meetings as non-voting observers. The Committee served as advisor to the Director on major target planning issues and related SIOP matters. The DSTP resolved issues where agreement could not be reached. He, in turn, advised the JCS of his decisions



* (U) The Senior Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines; and the CINCREPs of CINCAL, CINCLANT, CINCPAC, CINCSAC, and SACEUR's Senior U. S. Member.

and forwarded any dissenting opinions. To date the JCS had not overruled any DSTP decisions and during SIOP-64's effective period only one had to be resolved by the Director.

(U) The NSTL Division analyzed target information and prepared the document of the same title. This data was vital to the development of the SIOP containing target and weapon system assignments for the Unified and Specified Commands. The Chiefs of the SIOP and NSTL Divisions were Brigadier General Paul K. Carlton (USAF) and Colonel Sam A. Roberts (USAF). They were assigned to their positions on 1 July 1965 and 1 June 1964 respectively. The chart on the following page reflects the JSTPS organization as of 30 June 1966.

(S) An evaluation of the JSTPS's capability to discharge its responsibilities was provided the DSTP and JCS by a team from the Defense Department following an inspection in January 1966.¹³³ The Inspection Report concluded that the JSTPS was carrying out its mission in support of the NSTAP in a highly efficient manner and that this accomplishment also reflected the adequacy of guidance contained in the NSTAP.¹³⁴ "Of particular significance," the inspectors noted, "have been the objective, personal example of the Director, Strategic Planning, the careful consideration of the views and concept of the Services and CINCs by the Policy Committee, and the individual roles played therein by the Senior Service Members." They also noted the benefits derived by the assigned NATO officers from the SIOP publications available for their use and the responsive liaison between JSTPS personnel and the multi-national group.¹³⁵

JOINT STRATEGIC TARGET PLANNING STAFF



(J) Several key personnel changes occurred during the period including the Director of Strategic Target Planning on 1 December 1964 when General John D. Ryan assumed command of Strategic Air Command replacing General Thomas S. Power, retired.¹³⁶ Additional changes follow: Chief, SIOP Division -- Brigadier General Paul K. Carlton (USAF) vice Major General William J. Crumm, 6 July 1965;¹³⁷ Colonel Sam A. Roberts (USAF) vice Colonel Jammie M. Philpot (USAF) (promoted to Brigadier General on 15 July 1964) 1 June 1964;¹³⁸ CINCSAC Representative: Brigadier General Howard A. Davis (USAF) vice Brigadier General Winton R. Close (USAF) (promoted to Major General on 1 March 1964) 24 February 1964; Major General Winton R. Close vice Brigadier General Howard A. Davis, 12 July 1965; Brigadier General Roland A. Campbell (USAF) vice Major General Winton R. Close, 2 August 1965;¹³⁹ Major General John S. Samuel (USAF) vice Brigadier General Roland A. Campbell, 9 October 1965; CINCPAC Representative: Rear Admiral Joseph A. Jaap vice Rear Admiral Francis E. Nuessle, 4 May 64; Captain Howard S. Moore (USN) vice Rear Admiral Jaap, 8 May 1966; CINCLANT Representative: Captain John L. From (USN) vice Captain Floyd L. Harris (USN), 6 June 1965; CINCAL Representative: Colonel William W. Jones (USAF) vice Colonel William E. Ross (USAF) 27 March 1966; SACEUR Representative: Brigadier General Richard T. Kight (USAF) vice Major General Henry R. Sullivan (USAF) 30 August 1965; Senior Air Force Member: Colonel Martin C. McWilliams (USAF) vice Colonel William B. Taylor (USAF), 22 June 1965; Senior Army Member: Colonel Urey W. Alexander (USA) vice Colonel Robert E. Arn (USA), 13 August 1964; Senior Navy Member: Captain William J. Ruefle (USN) vice Captain Richard H. Mills (USN), 24 July 1964; Senior Marine

Corps Member: Colonel John E. Hays (USMC) vice Colonel Donald H. Stapp (USMC), 13 July 1964; and Secretary: Lieutenant Colonel Joe J. Reichel (USAF) vice Lieutenant Colonel Eugene M. Crook (USAF), 7 July 1965.¹⁴⁰

(U) The manning of JSTPS increased slightly from 180 to 182 during the period of 1 January 1964 through 30 June 1966. The Joint Table of Distribution showed a gain of two enlisted spaces, E-5 and E-4 (Air Force). These spaces were assigned to the Secretariat to accomplish the additional document distribution workload created by the disestablishment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Liaison Group.¹⁴¹ The personnel chart on the following page provides a breakout by service within JSTPS.

(U) The current 182 authorized personnel was considerably less than the original JCS authorization of 301 in 1960. The hurried preparation of the first SIOP resulted in assigning numerous officers to complete the plan as quickly as possible. With its completion the DSTP reduced the staff to 186 which he and the JCS considered adequate for keeping the plan up-to-date.¹ With each succeeding SIOP, however, the process of preparation became more complex. For example, the initial SIOP was a relatively simple document with limited flexibility. A year later 8000 documents were required in producing the SIOP. By 1963 the number of documents increased to nearly 15,000 with the preparation of SIOP-64.¹⁴³

(U) Besides its primary responsibilities, other JCS requirements were levied on JSTPS to prepare special studies and analyses. These additional tasks included a special version of the SIOP for use by NATO military staff agencies and a preliminary Post-SIOP Reconnaissance Plan. The increased workload did not affect the quality of the NSTL and SIOP, but caused longer working hours for assigned and support personnel.¹⁴⁴

(U)

Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff
 Personnel Authorizations, 1 Jan 64-30 Jun 66*

Service	<u>Director</u>			<u>NSTL Div</u>				<u>SIOP Div</u>				<u>Totals</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>Off</u>	<u>EM</u>	<u>Civ</u>	<u>NS</u>	<u>Off</u>	<u>EM</u>	<u>Civ</u>	<u>Off</u>	<u>EM</u>	<u>Civ</u>	<u>NS</u>	<u>Off</u>	<u>EM</u>	<u>Civ</u>	
Not Specified				12							12				12
Army	1			** 3	7			1			**3	9			9
Navy	4	3		** 1	13	6		11	3		**1	28	12		40
Air Force	3	4	2	** 8	2			3	5	3	**8	8	9	5	22
Marine Corps	1				1			1				3			3
Total JSTPS	9	7	2	12	23	6		16	8	3	12	48	21	5	86
SAC Dual Status	1				21	14	3	37	15	5		59	29	8	96
Grand Total	10	7	2	12	44	20	3	53	23	8	12	107	50	13	182

* Joint Table of Distribution, JSTPS, 1 Jan 64, 1 Jan 65, 1 Jan 66 -- effective 30 Jun 64, 30 Jun 65 and 30 Jun 66.

** Included in the total of 12.

(U) The major organizational change in the JSTPS was the addition of NATO personnel to its structure. As discussed in the History of SIOP-64, the United States and its NATO Allies agreed during the Ministerial Conference in Ottawa 22-24 May 1963 to increase the participation of their military staffs in nuclear planning for mutual defense purposes. As a result, arrangements were completed within the year to assign four NATO officers to the JSTPS as SACEUR Representatives to assist in planning, targeting, and coordinating the SACEUR's Scheduled Program (SSP) with the SIOP.¹⁴⁵

(U) The first to report was Colonel Enrico Bassi of the Italian Air Force. He was assigned on 22 October 1963. By mid-1964 the other officers were in place: Colonel Heinrich W. Schumacher (Air Force) Federal German Republic, 14 January 1964; Wing Commander (RAF) Ulf L. Burberry, United Kingdom, 16 April 1964; and Lieutenant Colonel Jacques G. Hourlier (Air Force) France, 30 July 1964. There were also German and French NCOs assigned as administrative and operational assistants (Master Sergeant Dieter O. E. Reinhardt, German Air Force, assigned 14 January 1964; and Technical Sergeant Georges E. Lambert, French Air Force, assigned 21 January 1965).¹⁴⁶

(U) The SACEUR's Representatives of the JSTPS totaled seven: a Senior Member (USAF) with voting power on the Policy Committee, plus six additional officers -- two from the United States Military Services, one Air Force and one Navy; and the four NATO officers. The SACEUR's first Senior Representative was Colonel Paul J. Long, USAF, who served from

15 December 1960 to 1 March 1963. He was replaced by Major General Henry R. Sullivan, USAF, on 14 March 1963. General Sullivan filled the position until 12 August 1965 and was succeeded by Brigadier General Richard T. Kight, USAF, on 30 August 1965.¹⁴⁷

(U) With the agreement concluded to assign NATO officers to JSTPS, the next steps were to insure their proper clearances and provide them with releasable atomic information for their use as non-US SACEUR Representatives.

(U) The CINCSAC approved the NATO Representatives with permanent duty assignments within the SAC Control Center to have unescorted access to Area 1 (above ground) and when certified by SHAPE that they had a final Top Secret (TS) clearance, to Area 10 (below ground). The SACEUR Representation was advised of this requirement. When access to Area 11 (Command Post), Area 6 (Air Intelligence Room), and Area 13 (Operations Planning Room) was required, escort was provided by JSTPS on an individual case basis.¹⁴⁸

(U) The security clearance documents for the NATO personnel by SHAPE to Headquarters SAC and DSTP contained the following statement:¹⁴⁹

"Security reliability positively established and was established by National regulations and standards for persons to be entrusted with Top Secret COSMIC information. The individual is suitable for access to Top Secret information." The SHAPE Adjutant General certified that this statement was an authentic basis for clearance for COSMIC or NATO information.

(G) By international agreement, forces of NATO countries earmarked for the Alliance were committed to SACEUR's nuclear strike plans. The SACEUR's area of interest included the Soviet European Satellites and that part of the USSR West of 55 degrees East Longitude while the SIOP was concerned with the entire Sino-Soviet Bloc. Coordination of SACEUR's Scheduled Program (SSP) with the SIOP was therefore essential to provide mutual support and insure compatibility of forces. This was effected before the fact by SACEUR's Representatives and JSTPS on a continuing basis.¹⁵⁰

(E) The objective in assigning NATO officers to the JSTPS was to increase non-United States participation in nuclear forces planning. To make this objective workable the SACEUR Representatives required continuous access to a wide variety of essential SIOP data including background information, policy discussions, briefings, and documentary materials as defined in JCS SM-412-66.

(S) In addition to the principals -- JSTPS and SACEUR -- other Government agencies were affected in working out legal arrangements for the release of atomic information by JSTPS to SACEUR Representatives. The development of these procedures was accomplished by the Joint Atomic Information Exchange Group (JAIEG) an agency serving both the Defense Department and Atomic Energy Commission. By October 1963 the JAIEG's proposal was circulated to the JCS, Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), DSTP, and SACEUR. Following their changes and subsequent concurrence,¹⁵¹ the JAIEG approved and placed the "Channel and Procedures" Paper into effect on 24 January 1964.¹⁵²

SECRET

SECRET

(S) The 24 January 1964 "Channel and Procedures" Paper remained in effect until 29 July 1965 when a new directive was published. The basic difference in the two documents was the addition of SACLANT to receive atomic information from JSTPS where the Allied Command Atlantic was affected. The direct liaison and channels between DSTP and SACLANT was documentary only whereas the DSTP-SACEUR Representatives and DSTP-SACEUR transmission channel consisted of documentary, oral, and visual.¹⁵⁷

(S) In accordance with the 1965 "Channel and Procedures" Paper, the JAIEG reviewed and approved the release of atomic information to SACEUR and SACLANT. Following receipt of this authority, DSTP transmitted the information directly to the commands concerned. Reproduction of documents by SACEUR and SACLANT required JAIEG approval, a procedure previously exercised by JSTPS.¹⁵⁸

(U) The JSTPS administered the transmission of atomic information to SACEUR and SACLANT through detailed internal instructions published by the Secretariat which controlled and transmitted approved information provided by the NSTL and SIOP Divisions.¹⁵⁹

(C) The exchange of atomic information among the NATO members was based on a formal Agreement of 18 June 1964 and the supporting administrative arrangements published on 12 March 1965.¹⁶⁰

(S) Concurrent with the preparation and publication of the "Channel and Procedures" Paper by JAIEG, the JCS delegated authority to DSTP in December 1963 to provide other DOD releasable classified information to SACEUR Representatives.¹⁶¹ Updated in May 1966, this guidance empowered DSTP, in coordination with the SACEUR Representatives, to disclose classified

information relative to current and subsequent SIOPs to SACEUR and SACLANT. The earlier directive had not included SACLANT as a recipient. ¹⁶²

~~(S)~~ The disclosure of this appropriately modified information was contingent upon specific restrictions: (1) Adherence to the provisions of US National Disclosure Policy (State-Defense Military Information Control Committee - MIC - 206/29, 1 August 1964), (2) Disclosure of Restricted Data/Formerly Restricted Data atomic information required JAIEG's approval, (3) Modification of all SIOP information as prescribed in JCS Memorandum SM-412-66 (17 May 1966), and (4) Prior JCS approval of information concerning changes in the NSTDB and SIOP Annexes C and F. ¹⁶³

(U) Within the confines of these directives the following SIOP documents and their changes were releasable to SACEUR/SACLANT in NATO version format: ¹⁶⁴ (1) Basic SIOP, including Annexes A, B, D and E; (2) Annex C with Appendix I; (3) Annex F, Appendices I, II, and III, Volumes I and II; (4) National Strategic Target Data Base, Volumes I and II; (6) JSTPS Planning Manual; (7) Strike Timing Source Data Instructions; (8) SIOP Target Islands; (9) ALN Printout for SACEUR; (10) Weapons Dictionary-Isle DGZ Sortie and Unit Sortie; (11) SACEUR/US Nuclear Plans Coordination Manual; (12) SACEUR Source Data; (13) EUR/SOV Bloc TDI; and (14) National Strategic Reconnaissance List.

(~~SECRET~~)

~~NOFORN~~
~~SECRET~~

(U) The disapproval of France's action by the other NATO members was reflected in their unanimous declaration on 18 March that the Alliance was essential to common security. At that time the American Under Secretary of State, George Ball, stated that France's withdrawal from NATO military structures diminished the Alliance's deterrent effort and that if

France's defense was dependent on loose liaison between the separate military commands, its security would also be weakened. He commented that the sharing of nuclear responsibilities had not been resolved and that the proposed establishment of a multilateral force was not the only possible solution. A collective plan enabling NATO countries without nuclear weapons to participate in decisions on nuclear power continued under study.¹⁷¹

(U) As a preliminary step toward resolving nuclear weapons control within the Alliance, Mr. Ball emphasized that with the exception of specific air-defense units capable of instant retaliation, French forces -- or those of any other NATO nation -- there was no peacetime integration of operational command. And should war occur, national troops would be placed under SHAPE's operational command only if France "deemed it necessary" under Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty. Accordingly, the NATO could dispose of French forces only on France's authority. Mr. Ball concluded by saying that the United States considered France obligated to assist in defending the Alliance should any of its members be attacked if France desired to remain within NATO as its Government had stated.¹⁷² Subsequent events regarding the withdrawal of French forces from NATO are outside the confines of this historical period.

Summary

(TS) During the 30-month period from SIOP-64's effective date to the beginning of SIOP-4, 1 January 1964 - 1 July 1966, significant changes occurred in the force size and composition. In the interval

between plans the B-47, B-52B, Atlas, Titan I, and Polaris A-1 weapon systems were deleted from the SIOP. As these systems phased out, the number of more modern Minuteman and Polaris missiles increased to partially offset the loss of obsolescent aircraft and earlier model missiles. Concurrent improvements were realized in weapon system planning factors. These included reduction of CEPs and increased reliability for both bomber and missile weapon systems.

(S) The most significant development in targeting was response to the growing

(S) The overall effectiveness of SIOP-64 and its Revisions reflected the JSTPS's capability to carry out its functions and tasks which was evaluated as highly efficient following a DOD inspection in early 1966.

FOOTNOTES

1. JCS SIOP-64, "(U) Strategic Integrated Operational Plan, 1964," 1 Jan 64, JCS-400.
2. The basic guidance for the SIOP is SM-1232-62, (U) "Guidance for preparation of Single Integrated Operational Plan, 1964 (SIOP-64)," 14 Nov 62, 66-J-0139. This guidance is reflected in the following references: Briefing for the President of the United States and the Secretary-General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, presented by General Thomas S. Power, CINCSAC and DSTP, Offutt AFB, Nebr., 29 Sep 64, Vol I, pp 1-2, 64-B-4713. Hereafter cited as Presidential Briefing by DSTP, Vol No. and date. The overall Volume I was classified TS, SIOP-ESI, Formerly Restricted Data (In Foreign Dissemination, Handle as Restricted Data According to Section 144B, Atomic Energy Act of 1954). Individual paragraphs were not marked, but each page was stamped TS, with no other markings. Group 1 was stamped on the cover. This also applies to Vol II of the Presidential and NATO Secretary-General Briefing.
3. Ibid., Vol I, pp 1-2.
4. Ibid., Vol I, p 2.
5. Ibid., Vol I, p 3.
6. Ibid., Vol I, p 34.
7. Ibid., Vol I, p 4.
8. Ibid., Vol II, pp 2-3; Comprehensive Presentation of SIOP-64 by the DSTP to JCS and Sec Def, Vol I, 22 Oct 63, p 6 (B-93440). This Vol I included the following markings: Special Handling Required, Not Releasable to Foreign Nationals or their Representatives. Group Marking was: Downgraded at 12 Year Intervals, Not Automatically Declassified; Atch 1, Briefing - "Concept of Application for New SIOP" to Minutes of the 70th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, 5 Feb 65 (65-B-1038).
9. Comprehensive Presentation of SIOP-64 by the DSTP to JCS and Sec Def, Vol I, 22 Oct 63, p 6 (B-93440).
10. Presidential Briefing by DSTP, Vol II, pp 2-3, (64-B-4713)
11. Comprehensive Presentation of SIOP-64 by the DSTP to JCS and Sec Def, Vol I, 22 Oct 63, p 7 (B-93440).
12. Ibid., p 8.
13. Presidential Briefing by DSTP, 29 Sep 64, Vol I, p 5 (64-B-4713).

14. Comprehensive Presentation by the DSTP to JCS and SecDef, Vol I, 22 Oct 63, p 8 (B-93440).
15. Presidential Briefing by DSTP, 29 Sep 64, Vol I, p 5 (64-B-4713).
16. Ibid., Vol I, p 5.
17. Ibid., Vol I, p 5.
18. Ibid., Vol I, pp 13-14, 9.
19. Ibid., Vol II, p 2.
20. Ibid., Vol II, pp 2-3.
21. Ibid., Vol II, PP 2-3; Annex D, Briefing: SIOP Forces, to JCS 2450/104-4, "(U) Agenda for First Meeting of Nuclear Planning Working Group of NATO's Special Committee of Defense Ministers," 1 Mar 66, p 7, 66-J-0331.
22. Presidential Briefing by DSTP, 29 Sep 64, Vol II, pp 3-4.
23. Ibid., Vol II, p 4.
24. Ibid., Vol II, pp 4-5.
25. Ibid., Vol II, p 6.
26. Ibid., Vol II, pp 7-8.
27. Ibid., Vol II, p 7.
28. Ibid., Vol II, p 7.
29. Ibid., Vol II, p 8.
30. Ibid., Vol II, p 8.
31. Ibid., Vol II, p 8.
32. Ibid., Vol II, p 9.
33. Atch 1, "Concept of Application for New Siop," to Minutes of the 70th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, 5 Feb 65, 65-B-1038; Atch 1 to Atch to Memorandum for JDD, "(U) Comments on the Recommendations on the JCS Manpower Survey Team," by Brig Gen P. K. Carlton, Ch, SIOP-JSTPS Div, JCS Manpower Survey Team," by Brig Gen P. K. Carlton, Ch, SIOP-JSTPS Div, 7 Jul 66, 66-J-1183.

34. Presidential Briefing by DSTP, 29 Sep 64, Vol II, pp 10-11.
35. Ibid., Vol II, p 11.
36. Ibid., Vol II, p 12.
37. Ibid., Vol II, p 12.
38. Ibid., Vol II, p 13.
39. Ibid., Vol II, p 13.
40. SACM 55-7, Vol II, 22 Nov 66, Interview, E. R. Caywood, Historian, w/Maj J. J. Skierski, Jr., DOPLCF, 23 Nov 66.
41. Ibid.
42. Appendix to this history, "DGZ Growth SIOP-64, Rev 1-8"; "Delivery Vehicles"; "Weapons"; History of JSTPS: Preparation of SIOP-64, p 22, 64-B-3847.
43. Ibid., "Delivery Vehicles"; and "Weapons."
44. Annex C, Policy Guidance for General War Planning, to JCS, 2450/104-4, (U) "Agenda for First Meeting of Nuclear Planning Working Group of NATO's Special Committee of Defense Ministers," 1 Mar 66, 66-J-0331.
45. Annex D, SIOP Planning, to JCS 2450/104-4, (U) "Agenda for First Meeting of Nuclear Working Group of NATO's Special Committee of Defense Ministers, 1 Mar 66, 66-J-0331.
46. Ibid.
47. Appendix to this history, "Damage Expectancy - Revision 8."
48. History of JSTPS, Preparation of SIOP-64, pp 23-24, 64-B-3847.
49. Appendix to this history, "Constraints - Revisions 1-8."
50. Ibid., JSTPS Inspection Report by Directorate of Inspection Services, Office of Asst Secretary of Defense (Administration) 17-28 Jan 66, n.d., Part Two, p 10, Tab M, p 33, 66-J-0928.
51. JSTPS Inspection Report of Directorate of Inspection Services, Office of the Assistant Sec Def (Administration) 17-28 Jan 66, Part Two, p 10, n.d., 66-J-0928.
52. JSTPS Activity Report, Week Ending 22 Jan 65, 29 Jan 65.

53. JCS 1620/443-3, (U) "Procedures for period Review of Strategic Missile Weapon System Reliability and Accuracy Factors," 17 Dec 64, 65-B-0812; Appendix, p 3, to JCS 1620/472-8, (U) "Ballistic Missile Uniform Prediction System," 28 Dec 65, 66-J-0267.
54. Memorandum for JD, (U) "Revised Strategic Reliability Factors for SIOP-64, Revision 1," by Vice Admiral R. J. Stroh, DDSTP, 31 Jan 64, 64-B-398; JCS 1620/481-8, (U) "Status of Ballistic Missile Test Programs," 25 Jun 66, p 10, 66-J-1193, and Appendix F thereto, p 6.
55. Ltr, Gen J. D. Ryan, DSTP, to Director, Joint Staff, no subject, 5 Apr 66, 66-J-0603.
56. Minutes of the 66th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, 29 Feb 64.
57. Ibid.
58. Minutes of the 74th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, 1 Apr 65.
59. Minutes of the 68th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, 8 Oct 64, 64-B-4958.
60. Minutes of the 69th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, 30 Nov 64.
61. Annex D, Briefing: SIOP Forces, to JCS 2450/104-4 (U) "Agenda for First Meeting of Nuclear Planning Working Group of NATO's Special Committee of Defense Ministers," 1 Mar 66, p 7, 66-J-0331.
62. Atch 1, (U) "Concept of Application for New SIOP," to Minutes of the 70th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, 5 Feb 65, 65-B-1038.
63. JSTPS Peg Point III Back-up Briefings to JCS: Talking Papers and Questions and Answers, 21-23 Mar 66, prep 18 Mar 66, 66-J-0541.
64. Annex D, Briefing: SIOP Forces, to JCS 2450/104-4, (U) "Agenda for First Meeting of Nuclear Planning Working Group of NATO's Special Committee of Defense Ministers," 1 Mar 66, p 7, 66-J-0331.
65. JSTPS Activity Report, Week Ending 1 May 64, 7 May 64; Ibid., 17 Jul 64, 23 Jul 64; Msg, CINCPAC, EDA984V, to JSTPS, (U) "SIOP Force Commitment," 27/2330Z Jun 64, 64-B-3295.
66. JCSM-68-64, Memorandum for the SecDef, (U) "Regulus Submarines - Change in FY 1964 - FY 1969 Strategic Retaliatory Forces," 30 Jan 64, 64-B-711.

67. Msg, TS, CINCPAC to JCS, (U) "PACOM Regulus Commitment," 23236Z Jul 64, 64-B-3638; Msg, TS/SpecCat/SIOP JDD 64-B-3709, JSTPS to JCS, "PACOM Regulus Commitment," 291900Z Jul 64.
68. Msg, CINCPAC to CINCPAC Rep JSTPS, (UO "SSBN Priority of Launch," 220220Z Dec 65, 65-B-8329.
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid.
71. Msg, CINCLANT to DSTP, 06234Z Oct 65, 65-B-7045.
72. Msg, JCS TS/NF 5832, JCS to USMR SHAPE (U), "Targeting of SSBNs Earmarked for Assignment to SACEUR," 140008Z Apr 64, 64-B-1441.
73. Msg, TS/NF/SpecCat/SIOP DSTP 64-B-874, (U) "Targeting of SSBNs," DSTP to JCS, 5 Mar 64.
74. Msg, JCS TS/NF 5832, JCS to USMR SHAPE (U) "Targeting of SSBNs Earmarked for Assignment to SACEUR," 140008Z Apr 64, 64-B-1441.
75. Memorandum of Agreement Regarding Targeting Coordination Between the JSTPS and the SACEUR Representative, by Vice Admiral R. J. Stroh, DDSTP, and Major General H. R. Sullivan, SACEUR Senior Representative, JSTPS, 23 Apr 64; Interview, E. R. Caywood, Historian, with Brig Gen R. T. Kight, SACEUR Senior Representative, JSTPS, 23 Sep 66; JCS SM-412-66, (S) "Delegation of Authority and Guidance for the Disclosure of US Classified Military Information by the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff to SACEUR and SACEUR's Representative (Non-US) and to SACLANT, in Connection with Multi-national Participation in Nuclear Forces Planning," 17 May 66.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid.
78. Minutes of the 78th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, 10 Dec 65, 65-B-8320.
79. Atch 1, p 17, to Minutes of the 78th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, 10 Dec 65, 65-B-8320.
80. Atch 3, p 2, to Minutes of the 78th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, 10 Dec 65, 65-B-8320.
81. Ibid.
82. Minutes of the 78th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, pp 13-14, 10 Dec 65, 65-B-8320.
83. Memorandum for: See Distribution, By DDSTP, (U) "Addendum to 78th Policy Committee Meeting," 5 Jan 66, 66-J-0189.

85. Minutes of the 67th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, with Atch 1, 24 Jul 64, 64-B-3657.

86. Ibid.

88. Ibid.

94. Ibid.

96. Ibid.

97. JSTPS Activity Report, Week Ending 27 Nov 65, 1 Dec 65.

102. Msg, TS/NF/SpecCat/SIOP/ESI JD J-0311, JSTPS to JCS, (U) "Weapon/Constraint Data," 272210Z Jan 66, 66-J-0311.

104. JSTPS Peg Point III Briefing to JCS Background Material, 21-23 Mar 66, prep 18 Mar 66, 66-J-0542, p 45; Appendix to this history, "Constraints - Revisions 1-8," provides data for the other Revisions to SIOP-64.

105. Revision 7, Consequences of Execution, SIOP-64, 4 Feb 66, pp 3, 80, 66-J-0153.

106. Ibid.

107. Ibid.

108. Ibid.

109. Msg, TS/SpecCat/SIOP-ESI JD 64-B-3220, JSTPS to JCS, "(U) Penetration Factors," 232035Z Jun 64.

110. Ibid.

111. Minutes of the 65th Meeting of the JSTPS Policy Committee, 18 Nov 63.

112. Ibid.

117. Inclosure B, p 23, and Inclosure C, pp 24-25, to JCS 2147/355-4, 15 Mar 65, 65-B-2697.
118. History of SAC, Jan-Jun 65, Vol I, Chap III, pp 125-130, 65-B-7287.
119. 1-SAC VI Report, 00001Z Jan 66.
120. Atch 3, to ltr, Col I. M. Johnson, Ex Off, DM, Hq SAC, to DXIH, (U) "History of SAC, Jan-Jun 66," 26 Jul 66.
121. 1-SAC VI Report, 00001Z Jan 66; Rept, SAC Assigned Aerospace Vehicles, 6 Jul 66.
122. Interview, E. R. Caywood, Historian, with Captain (Navy) J. L. From, CINCLANT Rep, JSTPS, 19 Oct 66.
123. Atch 1 to Atch to Memorandum for JDD, (U) "Comments on the Recommendations of the JCS Manpower Survey Team by Brig Gen P. K. Carlton, Ch, SIOP/JSTPS Div, 7 Jul 66, 66-J-1183; Msg, TS JD 01464, JSTPS to JCS, "Withdrawal of B-47s from Forward Area," 161925 Feb 65, 65-B-1464.
124. Msg, TS/LIMDIS JCS 8826 J-3, JCS to DSTP (Info SAC) (S) "Increase Arc Light Sorties," 171738Z Dec 65, 65-B-8238.
125. JSTPS Activity Report, Week Ending 7 May 64; 14 May 64; msg, TS/LIMDIS JD J-0161, JSTPS to JCS, (S) "Increase Arc Light Sorties, 032120Z Jan 66, 66-J-0161.
126. Msg, TS JCS 003064, JCS to CINCSAC, (U) "B-52F Guam Reflex," 282106Z May 65, 65-B-4298.
127. Msg, TS/LIMDIS JCS 8826 J-3, JCS to DSTP (Info SAC) (S) "Increase Arc Light Sorties," 171738Z Dec 65, 65-B-8238.
128. Msg, TS/LIMDIS JD J-0161, JSTPS to JCS, (S) "Increase in Arc Light Sorties," 032120Z Jan 66, 66-J-0161.
129. Ibid.
130. Ibid.
131. Ibid.
132. SM 1174-65, (U) "Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan, 1 July 1966-30 June 1967 (JSCP-67), Part V, 27 Dec 65, 66-J-0168.
133. JSTPS Inspection Report by Directorate of Inspection Services (DINS) Office of the Assistant SecDef (Administration) 17-28 Jan 66, Part One, Sect I, p 1, n.s., 66-J-0928.

134. Ibid.; Part One, Sect IV, p 5; Inclosure B, Memorandum for the Director of Strategic Target Planning, SM 609-66, (U) "Inspection of the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff by the Directorate for Inspection Services, 17-28 January 1966," 26 Jul 66, p 21, TO JCS 2453/4-10, (U) "Inspection of the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff," 26 Jul 66.
135. JSTPS Inspection Report by Directorate of Inspection Services (DINS) Office of the Assistant SecDef (Administration) 17-28 Jan 66, Part One, Sect III, p 4, n.d., 66-J-0928.
136. DAF AA 2375, 24 Nov 64; JSTPS Form 2, Personnel Data, JS, JSTPS.
137. SO P 425, 3902ABW, 13 Jul 65.
138. Hq SAC SO A 427, 5 Jun 64; Memorandum of Assignment No. 6, JS, JSTPS, 1 Jun 64.
139. USAF SO AA 1055, 28 May 65.
140. JSTPS Form 2, Personnel Data, JS, JSTPS.
141. JSTPS Joint Table of Distribution (JTD) 1 Jan 65, effective 1 Jul 65.
142. History of JSTPS, Preparation of S IOP-63, Appendix I, 64-B-51.
143. JSTPS Inspection Report by Directorate of Inspection Services, Office of Assistant SecDef (Administration) 17-28 Jan 66, Part Two, Tab F, pp 21-22, n.d., 66-J-0928.
144. Ibid.
145. History of JSTPS, Preparation of SIOP-64, pp 42-57, 64-B-3847.
146. JSTPS Form 2, Personnel Data, JS, JSTPS.
147. Ibid.
148. Ltr, Col R. T. Holland, Dep IG for Inspections, Hq SAC, to DO, et al., (U) "Granting NATO Representatives Unescorted Access to the SAC Control Center," 23 Jul 63; Ltr, Col W. J. Schweiger, Jr., Asst Dep IG for Security, Hq SAC, to CS, (U) "Granting NATO Representatives Unescorted Access to the SAC Control Center," 11 Jul 63.
149. Ltr, Col W. J. Schweiger, Jr., Asst Dep IG for Security, Hq SAC, to CS, (U) "Granting NATO Representatives Unescorted Access to the SAC Control Center," 11 Jul 63.

150. (U) SACEUR/US Nuclear Plans Coordination Manual, JSTPS, 15 Apr 66, 66-J-0632.
151. Msg, JDD 0556, JSTPS to JCS, 151817 Nov 63; Ltr, SACEUR, to Chief, JAIEG; (U) "Establishment of a Retransmission Channel," 20 Jan 64; Memorandum for Director, Defense Intelligence Agency, (U) "Establishment of Special Retransmission Channel," by JAIEG, 24 Jan 64.
152. "Channel and Procedures for the Exchange of Atomic Information Between the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff (JSTPS) and Representatives of the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe (SACEUR Rep)," by Joint Atomic Information Exchange Group, DOD and AEC, 24 Jan 64; Memorandum for Director, Defense Intelligence Agency, (U) "Establishment of Special Retransmission Channel," by JAIEG, 24 Jan 64; Memorandum for Director, Strategic Target Planning, (U) "Establishment of Special Retransmission Channel," by Brig Gen L. D. Clay, Jr., Dep Dir for Command/Area, Ops Directorate, JCS, 31 Jan 64.
153. "Channel and Procedures for the Exchange of Atomic Information Between the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff (JSTPS) and Representatives of the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe (SACEUR Rep)," p 1, by Joint Atomic Information Exchange Group, DOD and AEC, 24 Jan 64, JAIEG Case N-150/63.
154. Ibid., p 3.
155. Ibid., p 4.
156. Msg, JS 0520, JSTPS to JCS for J-3 (U) "Release of Documents for Multi-National Participation in Nuclear Forces Planning," 012313 Oct 63.
157. "Channel and Procedures for the Exchange of Atomic Information Between the DSTP and SACEUR, and SACLANT," by JAIEG, 29 Jul 65, p 1, JAIEG Case N-150/65.
158. Ibid., p 2.
159. JAI No. 11-14, 27 Feb 64; JAI No. 11-14, 16 Aug 65.
160. "Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information," 18 Jun 64; "Administrative Arrangements to Support the Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Co-Operation Regarding Atomic Information," 12 Mar 65.
161. JCS SM-1556-63, (U) "Delegation of Authority to Release Classified Military Information to Non-US SACEUR Representatives in Connection with Multinational Participation in Nuclear Forces Coordination in Omaha," 24 Dec 63.

160. JCS SM-412-66, (8) "Delegation of Authority and Guidance for the Disclosure of US Classified Military Information by the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff to SACEUR and SACEUR's Representative (Non-US) and to SACLANT, in Connection with Multinational Participation in Nuclear Forces Planning," 17 May 66.
163. Ibid.
164. Ibid.
165. Ibid.
166. Interview, E. R. Caywood, Historian, with Brig Gen R. T. Kight, SACEUR Senior Representative, JSTPS, 23 Sep 66.
167. JSTPS Inspection Report by Office of the Assistant SecDef (Administration) Directorate for Inspection Services (DINS) 17-28 Jan 66, Part I, Sect IV, p 6, n.d., 66-J-0928.
168. French Aide Memoire of 10 March 1966, in Dept of State Bul, 18 Apr 66, pp 617-18.
169. Interview, E. R. Caywood, Historian, with Brig Gen Richard T. Kight, SACEUR Senior Rep, JSTPS, 23 Sep 66.
170. Interview, E. R. Caywood, Historian, with Brig Gen Richard T. Kight, SACEUR Senior Rep, JSTPS, 23 Sep 66; Annex D, Briefing: SIOP Forces, to JCS 2450/104-4, "(U) Agenda for First Meeting of Nuclear Planning Working Group of NATO's Special Committee of Defense Ministers," 1 Mar 66, 66-J-0331.
171. Dept of State Bulletin, 18 Apr 66, pp 614, 616.
172. Ibid.

~~TOP SECRET~~

The following is historical data for SIOP-64 and the 8 Revisions for the various following categories. The data are based on the start date of each Revision.

Delivery Vehicles

<u>Alert</u> <u>SIOP-64 Rev 1</u>	<u>Non-Alert</u> <u>SIOP-64 Rev 1</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>SIOP-64 Rev 1</u>
1252	602	1854
64	121	185
93	183	276
<u>223</u>	<u>376</u>	<u>599</u>
1632	1282	2914
<u>Rev 2</u>	<u>Rev 2</u>	<u>Rev 2</u>
1281	540	1821
64	102	166
111	183	294
<u>241</u>	<u>455</u>	<u>696</u>
1697	1280	2977
<u>Rev 3</u>	<u>Rev 3</u>	<u>Rev 3</u>
1332	520	1852
80	124	204
109	183	292
<u>277</u>	<u>480</u>	<u>757</u>
1798	1307	3105
<u>Rev 4</u>	<u>Rev 4</u>	<u>Rev 4</u>
1314	541	1855
96	128	224
125	199	324
<u>295</u>	<u>466</u>	<u>761</u>
1830	1334	3164
<u>Rev 5</u>	<u>Rev 5</u>	<u>Rev 5</u>
1280	439	1719
112	130	242
141	199	340
<u>291</u>	<u>453</u>	<u>744</u>
1824	1221	3045

w/permission of Col Leichel, JSRS
Reproduced 15 Feb 67 by DKIH
Reproduced by 11 of 13 copies

66-B-3312

OPR JPTP
DATE 26 Aug 66

GROUP-1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and declassification.

COPY NUMBER 11 OF 13 COPIES

Reproduction of this document in whole or in part is prohibited except with the permission of the office of origin

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

Delivery Vehicles

<u>Alert</u>	<u>Non-Alert</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Rev 6</u>	<u>Rev 6</u>	<u>Rev 6</u>
1303	432	1735
128	138	266
141	234	375
282	425	707
<u>1854</u>	<u>1229</u>	<u>3083</u>
<u>Rev 7</u>	<u>Rev 7</u>	<u>Rev 7</u>
1236	376	1612
112	131	243
138	212	350
276	425	701
<u>1762</u>	<u>1144</u>	<u>2906</u>
<u>Rev 8</u>	<u>Rev 8</u>	<u>Rev 8</u>
1233	313	1546
112	141	253
138	212	350
239	448	687
<u>1722</u>	<u>1114</u>	<u>2836</u>

~~TOP SECRET~~

Weapons

<u>Alert</u> <u>SIOP-64</u>	<u>Rev 1</u>	<u>Non-Alert</u> <u>SIOP-64</u>	<u>Rev 1</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>SIOP-64</u>	<u>Rev 1</u>
2497		1280		3777	
64		137		201	
131		193		324	
<u>227</u>		<u>403</u>		<u>630</u>	
2919		2013		4932	
<u>Rev 2</u>		<u>Rev 2</u>		<u>Rev 2</u>	
2577		1201		3778	
64		108		172	
131		193		324	
<u>245</u>		<u>480</u>		<u>725</u>	
3017		1982		4999	
<u>Rev 3</u>		<u>Rev 3</u>		<u>Rev 3</u>	
2643		1214		3857	
80		124		204	
129		193		322	
<u>282</u>		<u>511</u>		<u>793</u>	
3134		2042		5176	
<u>Rev 4</u>		<u>Rev 4</u>		<u>Rev 4</u>	
2629		1290		3919	
96		134		230	
145		209			
<u>300</u>		<u>496</u>		<u>796</u>	
3170		2129		5299	
<u>Rev 5</u>		<u>Rev 5</u>		<u>Rev 5</u>	
2536		1210		3746	
112		142		254	
143		219		362	
<u>291</u>		<u>453</u>		<u>744</u>	
3082		2024		5106	

~~TOP SECRET~~

Weapons


<u>Alert</u>	<u>Non-Alert</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Rev 6</u>	<u>Rev 6</u>	<u>Rev 6</u>
2521	1168	3689
128	144	272
153	244	397
282	325	707
<u>3084</u>	<u>1881</u>	<u>5065</u>
<u>Rev 7</u>	<u>Rev 7</u>	<u>Rev 7</u>
2438	1142	3580
112	131	243
147	219	366
287	433	710
<u>2984</u>	<u>1925</u>	<u>4899</u>
<u>Rev 8</u>	<u>Rev 8</u>	<u>Rev 8</u>
2424	1090	3514
112	147	259
147	219	366
239	448	687
<u>2922</u>	<u>1904</u>	<u>4826</u>

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

18 JUL 1966

DAMAGE EXPECTANCY - REVISION 8 (U)



Reproduced 15 Feb 67 by DXIH
Reproduced Cy 11 of 13 copies

66-B-3313

Cy #1

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

200 /

~~TOP SECRET~~

18 JUL 1966

DGZ Growth SIOP-64 (Rev 1-8) (U)



Reproduced 15 Jul 67 by DXIH
Reproduced by 11 of 13 copies

66 - B - 33 13

cy #1

~~66 - B - 33 13~~


Attch 2

~~TOP SECRET~~

~~TOP SECRET~~

18 JUL 1966

DAMAGE EXPECTANCIES - SELECTED CATEGORIES (Rev 1-8) (U)



Reproduced 15 Feb 67 by DXIH
Reproduced Cy 11 of 13 copies

66-B-3313

~~TOP SECRET~~

cy #1
~~66-1200~~
Plk 3

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

18 JUL 1966

CONSTRAINTS - REVISION 1-8 (U)

[Redacted content]

[Redacted content]

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~