

J/AN 40/17/2  
J/FE 313  
(Agenda Item No. 353)

28 July 1955

NOTE BY THE SECRETARIES<sup>1</sup>

to the

JOINT AODS TO NAVIGATION PANEL  
JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PLANS PANEL  
JOINT STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS PLANS PANEL  
JOINT FREQUENCY ALLOCATION PANEL

on

REVISION OF THE LORAN INSTALAAATION PLAN

Reference: J/AN 40/17/D

1. The enclosed report, approved by the Joint Aids to Navigation Panel, is forwarded to the:
  - a. Joint Tactical Communications Plans Panel, Joint Strategic Communications Plans Panel, and Joint Frequency Allocation Panel for coordination; and
  - b. Joint Aids to Navigation Panel for information and file.
2. Copies of Enclosure "B" may be seen by contacting the respective Service members of the Joint Aids to Navigation Panel.
3. Early telephonic concurrence is requested.

L.C.WALL  
Captain, USAF

ARLEY C. RICHTER  
Major, USA

A.S.HANSTROM  
LCDR, USN

Secretary, J/TP  
Panel

Secretary, J/SC and  
J/FA Panels

Secretary,  
J/AN Panel

WORKING GROUP

LCDR R. T. Norris, USCG, Steering Member  
LT COL D. J. Freund, USAF  
CDR S. H. MacGregor, USN

J/AN 40/17/2

J/TP 113

J/SC 252

J/FA 213

CONFIDENTIAL

---

<sup>1</sup> Transcribed from original records located at NARA Washington, DC

CONFIDENTIAL

REPORT BY THE JOINT COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONICS COMMITTEE

to the

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

on

REVISED LORAN INSTALLATION PLAN

References: a: J.C.S. 141/59

b: J.C.S. 141/68

c: J.C.S. 141/69

CONFIDENTIAL

REVISED LORAN INSTALLATION PLAN

THE PROBLEM

1. To revise the Loran Installation Plan\*, as amended, so as to satisfy all U. S. requirements and the requirements of CAN-UK-US and NATO for Loran coverage in the North Atlantic, North Sea, Norwegian Sea and Mediterranean areas upon the outbreak of war in Europe.

FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM

2. See Enclosure "A".

DISCUSSION

3. See Enclosure "A"

CONCLUSIONS

4. The Loran Installation Plan, Enclosure "B", meets all U. S. requirements as well as the CAN-UK-US and NATO requirements for Loran coverage in the North Atlantic, North Sea, Norwegian Sea and Mediterranean area upon outbreak of war in Europe. It should be adopted and should supersede the present Loran Installation Plan\*.

5. The installations involved in this plan should be completed as soon as possible, but not later than Fiscal Year 1960.

6. The U.S. Navy has a requirement for priorities 1 through 16, and the U.S. Air Force has a requirement for priorities 10 and 14, as outlined in Appendix to Enclosure "B".

7. The U.S. Coast Guard is the proper agency to implement the revised plan and the Treasury Department should be requested to direct that the U.S. Coast Guard do so. This responsibility should include funding, installation, and the operation and maintenance of the equipment.

\* J.C.S. 141/59 (On file in Joint Secretariat)

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

8. The plan should be reviewed annually by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Communications-Electronics Committee, at the instigation of the U.S. Coast Guard to evaluate: Installation progress, including NATO progress; validity of requirements; new development; and to bring the plan up-to-date.

9. The United States Member of the Standing Group, NATO, should obtain information concerning NATO progress. This information should be transmitted the Joint Chiefs of Staff for consideration in the annual review. If NATO progress is not satisfactory, the United States should assume the responsibility to install these stations.

10. The Secretary of Defense should press to completion, a Loran Budgeting Agreement with the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the policies established by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.\*

RECOMMENDATIONS

11. It is recommended that the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

- a. Approve the plan in Enclosure "B" , which supersedes the current plan.\*\*
- b. Forward Enclosure "C" to the Secretary of Defense.
- c. Forward Enclosure "D" to the United States Representative, Standing Group, NATO.

12. It is recommended that a copy of this Staff Study be forwarded to the Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard.

13. No recommendation is made as to the distribution of this paper to commanders of unified or specified commands.

\* J.C.S. 141/69 (On file in Joint secretariat)

\*\* J.C.S. 141/59 (On file in Joint secretariat)

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

ENCLOSURE "A"

FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM

1. The basic Loran Plan\* indicated world-wide U.S. Loran requirements and divided the areas into priorities A and B. The A priorities applied during peacetime or in the event of war not involving Europe. The B priorities were to supersede the A priorities upon outbreak of war in Europe, and were then to be effected as urgent wartime requirements. The amendment to the basic plan pointed out that there was no way of funding for, or stockpiling equipment for the B priorities since they were not valid requirements until after the outbreak of war. To correct this, the Joint Chiefs of Staff established the policy\*\* that Loran coverage would be immediately required in the North Atlantic, North Sea, Norwegian Sea, and the Mediterranean areas upon the outbreak of war in Europe. The Joint Chiefs of Staff\*\* also stipulated that the revised Loran Plan should satisfy NATO and CAN-UK-US requirements in these areas rather than U.S. requirements alone.

2. The United States, the CAN-UK-US, and the NATO requirements for Loran are as follows:

a. The current United States requirements for Loran are satisfied in the basic Loran Plan.\* Part of this plan has been implemented and coverage has been provided for three of the areas required; i.e. Japan-China Sea, priority A-1; Philippines-Marianas, priority A-2, and Davis Strait, priority A-4.

b. The CAN-UK-US Loran requirements\*\*\* were approved on 18 March 1954.

c. The NATO Loran requirements are also satisfied by CAN-UK-US requirements which were presented to NATO\*\*\*\* and approved on 2 MAY 1955#.

\* J.C.S. 141/59 (On file in Joint secretariat)

\*\* J.C.S. 141/68 (On file in Joint secretariat)

\*\*\* CCB 428 (On file in Joint secretariat) (in JCEC files)

\*\*\*\* CCBM 309 (On file in Joint secretariat) (in JCEC files)

# SGM 261/55 (On file in Joint secretariat) (in JCEC files)

CONFIDENTIAL

Enclosure "A"

CONFIDENTIAL

3. CAN-UK-US\* and NATO\*\* have agreed that Loran should be the military standard interim long range aid to navigation in the North Atlantic in preference to Consol; Non-Directional Beacons, or other interim aids. Furthermore, the reasons for an agreed standard aid are still valid since none of the aids under development (Navarho, doppler systems, inertial systems, astro systems, etc.) is sufficiently advanced to be considered for operational use at this time nor will they be for a number of years to come.

DISCUSSION

4. The Loran system is vital to the defense of the United States. Although the United States has the means to detect and locate enemy forces on, over, and under the high seas, Loran is the only precise all-weather navigational aid which has extensive existing coverage and which can be used by aircraft and vessels to navigate to the point of contact. Thus, it is an important defensive and offensive weapon. It is also essential to logistics operations such as Military Air Transport Service, Military Sea Transportation Service, and convoy operations.

5. Enclosure "B" is the Loran Installation Plan revised to meet the fixing requirements of the United States, CAN-UK-US, and NATO. Areas have been indicated on the chart by letters and the numbers related to priority listing in Appendix to Enclosure "B".

6. In the determination of priorities, early provision was made to complete coverage in areas contiguous to the U.S. coast, then to complete installations in other areas in the order in which they affected the defense of the United States. NATO

\* CCB 367/1 (On file in Joint secretariat) (in JCEC files)

\*\* SGM 227/53 (On file in Joint secretariat) (in JCEC files)

CONFIDENTIAL

priorities are designed to provide coverage for entrances into NATO controlled waters first. Priority listings are based on the consideration that the United States requires all installations. Since NATO installations are to be financed by INFRASTRUCTURE, it is intended that priorities 3 through 9 will not be included in the United States financial planning if NATO implementation progress is satisfactory.

7. Certain Loran stations in the European area cannot be placed into operation after installation is completed because of the frequency problems expressed in Atlantic City Conference of 1947. They would be placed in caretaker status (on stand-by) and operated only in the event of war. These stations have been indicated in Appendix to Enclosure "B".

8. In order for the Loran plan to be realistic, installation must commence immediately, with the planned completion date not later than Fiscal Year 1960. Present estimates indicate that installations cannot be achieved earlier although more rapid implementation is desirable. The Loran plan should be reviewed annually to reflect changing conditions. The annual review should:

- a. Bring the plan up-to-date to show any changes such as new installations completed.
- b. Reaffirm the Service requirements.
- c. Evaluate progress of installation and recommend necessary actions.
- d. Evaluate progress in development and implementation of new long range navigational systems, and evaluate the effect of those systems on the Loran plan.

9. The Bureau of Budget disapproved the Coast Guard Loran installation budget for Fiscal Year 1956 on the basis that the principle using agency, Department of Defense, should budget for such funds. This deviates from past agreements and

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

statutory authority which place funding responsibility in the hands of the U.S. Coast Guard. Furthermore, the Department of Defense has been unable to provide the funds necessary. Since no funds have been provided for 1956, the installation program will be delayed through 1956. Unless budgetary agreement between the Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Defense, and Director, Bureau of Budget is reached in the near future, the completion of the Loran system, which is vital to the security of the United States, will be serious jeopardy.

10. Budgeting for Loran stations located in the European area under cognizance of NATO is the responsibility of INFRASTRUCTURE now that NATO has an accepted Loran Plan.\* The 4th and 5th slice of INFRASTRUCTURE agreed to the construction of nineteen Loran stations providing coverage for the eastern North Atlantic, Denmark Strait, the Norwegian Sea, and the Greenland Sea.

11. The NATO requirements for Loran are also U.S. requirements, yet the United States alone does not have power to decide what actions NATO will take. It is possible that the NATO implementation of Loran will lag so as to jeopardize United States operational requirements. In this event, the United States must be prepared to assume the responsibility for installation of the NATO Loran stations.

\* SGM 261/55 (On file in Joint secretariat) (in JCEC files)

CONFIDENTIAL

ENCLOSURE "B"

(COPIES OF ENCLOSURE "B" MAY BE SEEN  
BY CONTACTING THE RESPECTIVE SERVICE  
MEMBERS OF THE JOINT AIDS TO NAVIGATION  
PANEL)

CONFIDENTIAL

LORAN INSTALLATION PLAN

(Date)

APPENDIX TO ENCLOSURE "B"

|                                    | <u>Priority</u> | <u>Area</u> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| West Indies                        | 1               | D           |
| Panama East                        | 2               | E           |
| Denmark Strait*                    | 3               | H           |
| Greenland Sea**                    | 4               | I           |
| Mediterranean Sea**                | 5               | L           |
| North Sea**                        | 6               | J           |
| SW Approaches to United Kingdom**  | 7               | K           |
| Azores**                           | 8               | P           |
| West Approaches to Mediterranean** | 9               | M           |
| Midway                             | 10              | C           |
| Panama West                        | 11              | F           |
| Lower California/Mexico            | 12              | G           |
| Carolinas                          | 13              | B           |
| Japan, N.E.                        | 14              | A           |
| Arabian Sea                        | 15              | N           |
| South America                      | 16              | O           |

\* To be constructed with NATO funds

\*\* To be placed in caretaker status after construction. To be constructed with NATO funds.

NOTE: This supersedes Joint Chiefs of Staff Loran Installation Plan 1951, and is to be completed by Fiscal Year 1960.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

ENCLOSURE "C"

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Subject: Revision of the Loran Installation Plan

1. Enclosed are copies of the recently approved "Revised Loran Installation Plan".
2. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that present difficulties in the funding for the Loran expansion program interfere with its immediate implementation and should not be allowed to continue. The plan is predicated on prompt budget action, and it is suggested that the negotiations with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director, Bureau of the Budget be pressed to an early completion in order that the plan which is important to the security of the United States can be completed by Fiscal Year 1960.
3. It is requested that a memorandum substantially as shown in Appendix "A" to Enclosure "C" be forwarded to the Secretary of the Treasury, and a memorandum substantially as shown in Appendix "B" to Enclosure "C" be forwarded to the Director, Bureau of Budget.

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX "A" TO ENCLOSURE "C"

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Subject: Revision of the Loran Installation Plan

1. Enclosed is a copy of the recently approved "Revised Loran Installation Plan". This plan supersedes the plan forwarded to you office on 4 June 1951.

2. The U.S. Coast Guard is the responsible agency to implement this plan. It is requested that the Treasury Department take action to procure funds and provide for installation, operation, and maintenance of these stations in accordance with the provisions of 14 USC 81 in order that a completion date of Fiscal Year 1960 will be met.

3. In addition to the implementation, it is requested that the Treasury Department, through the Coast Guard, initiate an annual review of this plan by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in order that it be kept current.

4. It should be noted that present difficulties in funding for Loran expansion are interfering with a program which is important to the security of the United States. My letter of 14 April 1955 outlined the Department of Defense position in regard of the situation. The plan is predicated on prompt budget action, and it is suggested that should there be further difficulties in funding for this program that a conference be arranged with representatives of the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Treasury, and Director, Bureau of Budget, to determine a mutually satisfactory course of action.

CONFIDENTIAL

APPENDIX "B" TO ENCLOSURE "C"

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF BUDGET

Subject: Revision of the Loran Installation Plan

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have approved a revised Loran Installation Plan. This plan reflects current requirements and recognizes the Coast Guard under 14 USC 81 as the implementing agency to establish, operate and maintain the stations. Early implementation is based on prompt budgetary action. My letter to you dated 14 April 1955 requested assistance in solving the problems of funding for this program which is very important to the security of the United States. Your assistance in promptly implementing this program is again solicited.

CONFIDENTIAL

ENCLOSURE "D"

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM FOR U.S. MEMBER, STANDING GROUP, NATO

Subject: SGM 261/55, 2 May 1955

1. SGM 261/55, 2 May 1955, established a NATO plan for Loran Installations in which the United States has considerable interest.
2. It is requested that an annual summary on the progress of this plan be forwarded to the Joint Chiefs of Staff each November. It is requested that the report include such subjects as funding, siting, frequency allocations, and construction started or completed.