STANDARD FORM NO. 64

400746

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Brig. General Alfred D. Starbird, USA
Director of Military Application, AEC, Washington

DATE: APR 15 1960

FROM : James E. Reeves, Assistant Manager for
Test Operations, AEC, Albuquerque

V W Luckett, for

Capt. Houston
Cdr. Bankhardt
Lt. Col. Josephson
Lt. Col. O'Brien
Capt. Rosen

SUBJECT: MANPOWER AND COST ANALYSIS - ENIWETOK PROVING GROUND

SYMBOL: ALT:JER-1496

Transmitted are two copies of Holmes & Narver's latest manpower and cost analysis study for Eniwetok Proving Ground. The study was made in compliance with your request to determine what the possibility would be of getting down to an organization of 200 men by the beginning of FY 1962 or $3,000,000 total budget.

As you will note from the report, Holmes & Narver feels that they can reduce to 200 men at a total budget of $3,425,000; but, to get to $3,000,000 they would have to reduce manpower to 173 bodies. They have indicated that they feel an undesirable sacrifice would be made in both personnel and service to accomplish this $3,000,000 cost ceiling. (1)

We are not entirely happy with the manner in which they would propose to make either the reduction to 200 people or to 173. We feel that there may be areas in which reductions could better be made than in certain of the areas in which they have proposed drastic reductions. For instance, we do not believe it is necessary to release the two chaplains. We plan to discuss the accomplishing of such reductions with H&N in considerable detail. (2)

We feel that something less than the 200 could be accomplished, possibly not to the level of 173. We would suggest that, for planning purposes, a minimum figure of three and a quarter million be used. We feel, for example, that some reduction could be made in the 28-man-year effort of the Los Angeles office. It would appear to us that if this reduction is contemplated, the surplusing of the equipment and inventory not necessary for the day-to-day operations of the site would be desirable. On the basis of a very rough estimate, four to five million dollars of excess equipment and three

Yes indeed.

(continued)

WITHOUT ENCLOSURE
CONFIRMED TO BE UNCLASSIFIED
AUTHORITY: DOE/SA-20
BY R.S. DEWEY, DATE:
RSD 6/10/94

5005341

2082

APR 1 5 1960

(3) to four million of excess inventory could be disposed of assuming that we process this equipment and surplus inventory to reduce the level by approximately 50%. It is estimated it would require six to eight months to reduce the manpower level by 50 or more men if the job of transferring equipment and surplus inventory was a job site requirement.

Good — as soon as DoD signs off

If this major reduction to 200 men is contemplated within the next two years, it would seem to us that it might be just as well to initiate action towards this reduction now and accomplish the reduction as soon as possible, with due consideration to the manpower requirements that might be required for crating and shipping of surplus equipment.

(4) We would recommend that equipment installed in scientific stations be left there, as most of this equipment is of special design for the particular structure for which it is used. We feel that the cost for recovery of this equipment would exceed that for which we would obtain from it.

Holmes & Narver has informed us that they feel with even the closing down of the Tank Farm on Elmer (topping tanks used with diesel fuel) that there would be adequate capability to meet the Air Force requirements. We would have on Fred two 10,000 bbl. jet fuel tanks and two 10,000 bbl. tanks for aviation gas. Our diesel fuel and mogas fuel would be contained in two 5,000 bbl. tanks. Our present schedule for delivery of oil is on a 60-day cycle, and our supply should be adequate for 70-80 days.

(5) One thing that should be considered in the reduction to 200 men or below is that very little capability would remain in this organization for any additional construction or construction support to potential users of the site. Also, it is very doubtful that with this reduction we would be able to house, feed, and transport large numbers of temporary residents. We might handle the 200 Air Force personnel for a period of a few days, but we doubt that we could satisfactorily do this for a period of two weeks unless the Air Force personnel were willing to pitch in and help. We doubt if they would bring mess-hall and housing-type personnel with them.

(6) Finally, we feel that this reduction probably could not be efficiently accomplished before December 31, 1960, even if we were directed to start immediately.

8 1/2 months to reduce!

Enclosure:
H&N Analysis dtd 4/12/60

5005342

2083