

~~SECRET~~

22 October 1964

Bud,

In my opinion, this letter from Cy is a real beaut: it's a classic example of de facto negotiation. The specific points which the Vance letter has fuzzed over, or changed, are:

1) Vance's letter puts [redacted] clearly in the position of "complete" technical direction, whereas Mr. McCone's letter (and our enclosed reply to Vance) strongly make the case that the responsibility for technical direction of the "payload" is assigned to [redacted]. This is a crucial point.

2) Vance suggests that technical directives on approved changes shall be issued by the CORONA program director [redacted] and sent to the contractors. We insist that these directives, in the payload area, be prepared and issued by [redacted].

3) Finally, we would like to make it clear that the Advisory Committee (which replaces CCB) shall be a place where [redacted] can be effective. In our reply, you notice we suggest he chair this group. If that won't sell, some words should be added which indicate that [redacted] must agree to changes, i. e., a veto is possible.

I think this position is a minimum one from our point of view. I would hope that you, the General, and Mr. McCone can somehow see that we don't move significantly from this position.

[redacted]

~~SECRET~~

[redacted]

~~SECRET~~
~~SECRET~~

22 October 1964

Notes on McCone letter to Vance

Para #2.

The reference to Lockheed technical direction may be ambiguous. LMSC 1) builds Agenas & 2) modifies them for the C mission (i.e., adds programmer, Lifeboat system, modifies altitude control system, etc.) and runs AP facility. [REDACTED] should have AP facility and Agena modifications but not Agena production.

Para #5.

The Technical Director should have authority to issue TD's. This is not clearly stated.

~~SECRET~~
~~SECRET~~

