THE FOLLOWING PRELIMINARY ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS CONTAINED IN REFERENCE PROVIDED:

1. THE 1 MAY DATA SUGGESTED BY G.E. TO NASA SEEM TO BE RELATED TO THE FACT THAT WE HAVE ASKED FOR (BUT NOT YET RECEIVED) A COMPLETED PROPERTY INVENTORY AND REPORT OF THOSE INVENTORY FROM G.E. THE PURPOSE OF THE INVENTORY IS TO PERMIT ALL OF YOUR PEOPLE (OTHER PROGRAMS TO SCREEN THE INVENTORY TO SEE IF SOME OF THE EQUIPMENTS GOVERNMENT OWNED CAN BE DIVERTED FOR USE ON OTHER PROJECTS. ASIDE FROM ALL THE OBVIOUS BENEFITS TO G.E. TO HAVE A COMMITMENT OUT OF NASA AT THE EARLIEST, ONE CAN POSTULATE THE G.E. MAY SEE SOME HELP FROM NASA TO ASSIST IN RETAINING SOME OF THE PROPERTY INVENTORY. THE MORE PROPERTY RETAINED BY G.E. PERMITS G.E. TO MAKE A LOWER COST PROPOSAL TO NASA. THE ABOVE IS A G.E. IDEA AND WE INTEND TO SCREEN THE PROPERTY FOR OUR USE INDEPENDENT OF G.E. DESIRES. SPECIFICALLY, OCD HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE G.E. SELECTION OF 1 MAY FOR A NASA RESPONSE.

2. WITH REGARD TO SECURITY COMPLICATIONS OF NASA'S USE OF THIS SPACECRAFT, TWO PROBLEM AREAS ARE EVIDENT. THE FIRST IS THE SECURITY CONDITION OF THE REMAINING INVENTORY OF VEHICLES. THERE ARE FOUR COMPLETE UNITS AT THE FACTORY WHICH WILL BE EXPENDED THIS MONTH. THERE ARE TWO INCOMPLETE VEHICLES AT THE FACTORY WHICH ARE TO BE USED FOR SPARE PARTS IF AND AS REQUIRED. WE HAVE A G.E. NON FOR APPROXIMATELY $260K TO SANITIZE THESE 6 VEHICLES TO A CONDITION WHICH WILL PERMIT THE VEHICLES TO BE MOVED TO A NON-GAMBIT AREA FOR COMPLETE DESTRUCTION IN A HYDRAULIC PRESS. WE HAVE NOT RECEIVED AN ESTIMATE FROM G.E. FOR THE COST TO SANITIZE THE VEHICLES SO THAT THEY CAN BE OF FURTHER USE. YOU CAN ASSUME THAT THE LATTER COST WOULD EXCEED THE FORMER BY A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT. I AM SURE THAT WE WOULD NOT PAY TO HAVE THE VEHICLES SANITIZED FOR NASA'S USE SO THAT LEAVES NASA AND G.E. WITH A PROBLEM. THE SECOND AREA OF SECURITY CONCERN IS THE LONG TERM COMPLICATION OF NASA SANITING FLIGHT PERFORMANCE DATA, FLIGHT QUALIFICATION DATA AND OTHER HISTORICAL INFORMATION. THIS IS MORE OF AN IRRITATION THAN A REAL RISK IN MY OPINION, BUT IT CAN BE VERY DIFFICULT.

3. AS FAR AS PROBLEMS INVOLVED WITH GETTING THE SPACECRAFT LAUNCHED OR ITS FILM RECOVERED FOR NASA, THERE ARE MANY UNKNOWNS AND UNCERTAINTIES, ALL OF WHICH ARE TIME AND MANPOWER DEPENDENT. IF YOU ASSUME AN AF SUPPORT TO NASA RELATIONSHIP SUCH AS GEMINI, WITH AN SSD PROGRAM OFFICE,
Control System

Then AFSC and NASA have a manpower resources problem of some difficulty at SS0, at VAFB, and probably at the STC. The size of the problem depends upon timing and the scheduling of the work in relation to other work. You really need specifics to work this question. Some general observations follow.

At least standard space launch vehicles (SLV's) will continue to be available. Lead times vary from a few months by trading resources to the full re-order time of approximately 14 months. Launch pads and Atlantic launch crews are a little more difficult. As you know, the Atlantic/Acena pads at VAFB have the following status. SLC-4E is scheduled for conversion to T-1110 beginning 0/A 1 July. SLC-3E, now supporting prime, will be placed in a standby status 0/A 1 Jan 68. It is estimated that 2 to 3 months would be required to re-activate pad and crew for use any time after 1 Jan 68. The dollars associated with any set of options are time sensitive.

4. I have also found out that LMSC has been asked by NASA to brief NASA on a concept for an Earth photographic Orbiter. The conditions, format and status of the briefing are facts which I will determine. I understand that the work is on a short fuse with a briefing scheduled at NASA on 16 May. A multi-camera configuration with a Stellar Index System, double recovery capability, VAFB launch, STC control, and AF recovery is under consideration. NASA has specified main camera resolution consistent with the one mil-rad rule.