

to say to this point, show we have been fairly level in the administrative cost—not administrative cost, but in personnel numbers. If I read correctly the charts you have shown, there has been a disproportionate increase in administrative cost as related to the number of personnel—both contractors and civilian—that you have had, and I think this is reflected on some of your earlier graphs. Now, you come along and propose in the area of support service contracting that you are consolidating on a competitive basis in some of the areas with an idea that, when you consolidate some of the support services, you should have to deal with no more than one man and just have one NASA man to interface with. How is this going to affect your administrative costs? Measurably? Or insignificantly?

The trend points to administrative costs even though you said you now have a ratio of 1 to 7, whereas you once had 2 to 3. I think your administrative cost figure is \$99 million here this year as compared 2 years ago to \$83 million. How do you account for that?

Mr. SIEPERT. I should have defined our terminology better. The "Administrative operations" appropriation is used to pay all the civil service people. That pays for the total technical competence of the Government, not its administrative competence alone. The AO funds pay for that too, but we need to keep in mind that over 40 percent of our total manpower consists of highly trained engineers. They are not doing administrative work. They are the heart of the technical operation that integrates the contractors' missions.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Classified as administrative personnel?

Mr. SIEPERT. They are classified as AST, that is, aerospace technologists—space engineers. Now, on the contractors side we described a large group called support operations. The great bulk of those people are not doing administrative work. They are performing direct technical or operational functions that are needed in order for us to carry out our launch activity here.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I know that the trend affects the operation cost, but what part is overtime playing for administrative personnel in those administrative costs?

Mr. SIEPERT. Overtime is a special problem. Once KSC gets the impact of a schedule change down here, the question is whether or not we can get the flight hardware assembled, checked out, and launched in the agreed time. Overtime money is tight in the present budget, but its availability can make the difference.

Mr. WAGGONNER. On the basis of what was said, it was planned to shorten from 6 weeks to about a month that time at the pad to be ready for launch. Now, have you been able to shorten that?

Mr. PETRONE. We expect to be learning. It would be our first launch off pad A. As you go into subsequent operations, you should—and we expect them to—proceed smoother and faster. That would not be reduced by overtime operations.

Mr. SIEPERT. In Launch Operations, for example, what is your overtime at the present time?

Mr. PETRONE. Of course, it varies. You might say it varies week by week. We average 10 or 11 percent.

Mr. SIEPERT. It has been higher than that, hasn't it?

Mr. PETRONE. We have been up to 20 percent.