

Note: This is the extent of the prepared testimony being provided by Bill Scheuren, former DP-2 Program Manager at the Defense Advance Research Projects Agency

From: William Scheuren [mailto:Scheuren@hughes.net]

Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2007 7:27 AM

To: Pasternak, Doug

Subject: Re: DP-2 Hearing Invite

Doug,

Here is my synopsis of the answers to the questions you forwarded in the invitation.

1. I was first exposed to the DP-2 in the 1990 timeframe when I was invited by DARPA to participate in a technical assessment of the DP-2 concept for a special operations forces VSTOL transport aircraft. The assessment team consisted of approximately 6 technologists with backgrounds in military aircraft design, flying qualities, performance, reliability, and safety. The team agreed that the DP-2 concept was fatally flawed in all of the above evaluation areas with the possible exception of performance where we did not have enough details to make a confident assessment. Of particular concern were probable flying qualities and the jet exhaust downwash velocities and attendant erosion/debris production when attempting to operate from unprepared surfaces.
2. The DP-2 never offered a capability that US military forces said they wanted. duPont took examples of needs like transport range, mid-mission hover, and survivability, and combined them in a concept that he thought was a solution. The military services representatives and we in the R&D community never agreed with him.
3. Among other deficiencies, the DP-2 original control system consisted of conventional mechanical controls assisted by rate dampers. In many ways it was similar to the original Harrier system. The simplicity was to be applauded for inherent reliability, but as we ultimately proved with the original batch of Harriers, we judged it was just inadequate to product a safely controllable aircraft.
4. With enough time, money, and application of state-of-the-art aerospace technology we can make almost anything fly. The real issues are whether or not the ultimate product is worth the investment and whether or not the Nation is willing to devote the resources to achieve the capability. In my opinion the DP-2 has failed both tests. duPont promises a product at an R&D price at least an order of magnitude below the multi-billions necessary to mature the concept, and the services say they don't need or want it even if can be built.

Bill

William Scheuren
scheuren@hughes.net