

████████████████████
Copy ██████████

12 April 1963

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT : Dirty Pool

**REFERENCE : Memorandum for the Record, dated 8 April 1963,
Subject: M-2 ██████████ Committee ██████████**

1. On Tuesday afternoon, 9 April, an informal review was held for ██████████ on proceedings up to then of the group described in the reference memorandum. The group recommendations at that time were agreed to by all, but perhaps with differing surety or emphasis as follows:

a. Restart ██████████ on an eight flight schedule leading to an eventual C-375 camera configuration.

b. Start M-2 and continue to a sensible decision point.

c. Start MK-8 recovery vehicle development for use in either case or with M if appropriate.

d. Continue TAT improvements, but plan for Atlas boosters for either ██████████ or M-2 on basis of present knowledge.

2. On Wednesday, 10 April, at 1830 hours, a report was rendered by the committee chairman to Secretary McMillan with ██████████ and others attending. The session was introduced by ██████████, who stated to the Secretary that these views were unanimous among the committee. The same main points were made as listed above. The Secretary observed that he would expect some more formal presentation or documentation in the future as basis for decision.

3. I record the following observations as a matter of information only.

a. It was not emphasized in the briefing to the Secretary that reinstatement of ██████████ using the four cameras, will produce quality better than the previously

[REDACTED]

advertised 10' only by flying at lower altitudes; and that one or two committee members believe that MURAL at the same altitude will produce competitive quality. The "restart" costs of [REDACTED] were said to be inconsequential, which I doubt, but cannot challenge for lack of data; on the other hand the NPIC representative stated that the improved scale of [REDACTED] over M will be of significant benefit.

b. The development cost of the total recommended package ([REDACTED], M-2, MK-8, etc.) was given as [REDACTED]. This includes an arbitrary reduction of from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] in cost of simonizing [REDACTED] to the improved C-375 configuration. This was explained as due to a change in management procedures.

c. The relative timing of the two systems was clouded by the 5-6 month availability for flight of existing [REDACTED] hardware and lack of a forecast of time needed to grow to C-375 configuration quality vs a slightly more conservative forecast of availability of M-2 than as given by the vehicle or camera contractors.

4. At this juncture a dissent is not in order since a formal committee report is in preparation.

SIGNED

EUGENE P. KIEFER
Technical Analysis and Evaluation Staff
(Special Activities)

E.P.Kiefer:TAES/OSA:haj (12 April 1963)
Distribution:

[REDACTED]

ALIEN [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: Briefing of #D/NEO on M-2 - [REDACTED] 10 Apr '63

1. D/NEO was briefed on the results of the Ad Hoc committee on 10 Apr 63. In general, the briefing represented the combined efforts of the total committee.
2. A take exception to certain aspects of the presentation. The general tone, more by implication than explicit statement, was more favorable to the interim usage of E/B than is warranted by the data available to the committee.
3. Particular items:
 - 3.1 One chart, not presented at the dry run, stated that M (current) was far from meeting the needs of the community, and that [REDACTED] could give a ~~very~~ much improved interim capability.
 - 3.2. M-2 was presented in a grossly unfair schedule situation. The time necessary

for E/C to "grow" into the [redacted] system was neglected; in addition, the 15-18 month span quoted by the contractors for M/2 grew to 18-20 months on the chart (probably valid) then to 24-27 months in discussions.

3.3. Pad problems associated with the heavy ATLAS launchers ~~and~~ schedule ~~proposed~~ proposed were neglected; as was the cost of additional pads or launch complexes.

3.4.