

~~SECRET~~

CRM FILE BC 1



DD 83734

27 February 1997

400897

G. L. Holt, 505 7.1

Robert E. Campbell, J-6

COMMENTS ON WEST GAZON REVELATION PROPOSAL

J-6-1534

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS 3 PAGES

General Stewart has requested comments from Jim Barnes by 1 March on Gerry Johnson's letter Gagon-313 dated 19 February to Stewart, ~~requesting removal of Gagon 313 to a higher level file.~~ ~~Jim Barnes called to on 20 February asking for my comments to right here from a construction standpoint.~~

We agreed, in discussing the matter with Sanders, to look at Gerry's proposal - no more. It is our feeling that Stewart might well invite the comment of 505 7.1 (not necessarily anonymous with EAST in those matters) and, feeling that, Barnes might better request 505 7.1's comments rather than those of J-6 alone. Hence we direct the following comments to you for any disposition you may care to make:

1. Any comment to agencies outside 505 7.1 should be prefaced by a mention that Gerry's paper is the view of WEST and not necessarily shared by 505 7.1. We feel that WEST sometimes takes advantage of our name.
2. Page 3, Item 1: Althaus states that Large Arvies can be fired on the northern side of District Atoll at the same time that firing of smaller Arvies is being conducted in the same complex. This statement might cause the uninitiated to believe that there would be no interaction between shots of any yield or method of firing when tested in this geographical relationship - we don't believe this is the case but admit that given enough time and money the natural interactions can be produced.
3. Page 3, Item 2: We have to see WEST publishing a "concept" for 505 7.1, particularly for distribution at the Washington Level.
4. Page 4, Schedule I: Gun days between tower shots seems a little odd to erect the towers, launch them, have a few dry runs and fire; particularly when one of these ten days is used as a shot day for a 0.5 - 2.0 megaton range shot in the northern lagoon. We assume that they do not hope to have all towers up prior to the first shot; they have placed events 1 and 7 in the same location, events 1 and 5 being of the order of 1900' apart would hardly permit firing event 1 without severe damage to the event 2 zero area, and event 11 would take a moderate beating from events 9 and 10.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW	
1ST REVIEWER-DATE: 6-16-97	DETERMINATION (CIRCLE NUMBER(S)) 1. CLASSIFICATION RETAINED 2. CLASSIFICATION CHANGED TO: 3. CONTAINS NO DOE CLASSIFIED INFO 4. COORDINATE WITH: 5. CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED 6. CLASSIFIED INFO BRACKETED
AUTHORITY: DAOC DAAD WADD	
NAME: W. M. [Signature]	
2ND REVIEWER-DATE: [Signature]	
AUTHORITY: WADD	
NAME: [Signature]	

3413

5005810

DECLASSIFICATION CANCELLED
PEN 500 METRIC JAN. 97

~~SECRET~~



27 February 1957

5. Page 5, Schedule II: This schedule contains the same difficulties mentioned above in comment 4.
6. Page 6, Item (a): This paragraph mentions almost every consideration except the minor one of providing time for construction. A 300' tower requires approximately 18 working days for erection once the foundations have been prepared.
7. Page 7, Item (f): Would we agree that said probability is "high"?
8. Page 8, Item 2: Firing in the northern lagoon and working towards the ocean seems to conflict with Schedule II which indicates a reverse process. Barge access to the inside edge of the northern lagoon reef might be quite a problem for the first shot considering the navigational difficulties at this atoll.
9. The only comment we can make on the discussions of Weather and Geography and Fallout is that we are not too sure that the opinions they report out of context accurately reflect the opinions of the original authors.
10. Page 14, Item (a). From the costs per yard quoted here it would appear the H&N can move coral more cheaply (\$6.20/cu. yd. including overhead) than can the Navy (\$6.50/cu. yd. not including overhead.) Further, any Navy effort would not be free by virtue of not paying their salaries - H&N would still have to support them.
11. Page 15, Item (d): This, as does Item 2 on Page 8, conflicts with Schedule II.
12. Page 15, Item (e): An APL might be used for housing, but it isn't worth much for storage of construction materials or for maintenance of construction equipment.
13. Page 15, Item (f): H&N were fairly explicit regarding their communication requirement during the construction phase, and we doubt that they would accept the pre-CASTLE military type service again - it didn't work the first time.
14. Page 16, Item 2: Assembly and loading facilities of the type provided at a cost of \$870,000 at Farry would hardly suffice without additional water and blast protection - this facility might be rather expensive and relatively shortlived; we wonder if an LSD wouldn't be more economical?

3414

15. Page 17, Item (b): We doubt the practicality of EAM operating a capital ship a major portion of each year on the west coast. (A saving of 1-1/2 man years for USNL isn't much compared with the number of man years required from another agency to operate such a ship.)

16. Page 17, Item (c): We believe use of such a ship for EG 7.5 housing is a weak justification in that their major effort occurs prior to the arrival of this diagnostic ship.

17. Page 18, Item (e): It should be made clear that this paragraph is limited to a communications center for EG 7.1 in the Tongal Area. Here again the ship arrives too late to solve EAM's communications problem during the construction phase.

In general we feel that Garry's proposal tends to present a rather palliative version by omitting difficulties obvious to a more experienced group. We feel that both the pro's and con's should be presented in any proposal which requests a policy decision.

Robert H. Campbell, J-6

RHC:jjr

Distribution:

- 1A - G. L. Felt, CTG 7.1
- 2A - G. L. Felt, CTG 7.1
- 3A - J-6
- 4A - J-6 *ms R files*
- 5A - J-6

Revised 155617

3415

5005812

(3)

~~SECRET~~

~~CLASSIFICATION CONTROLLED~~
~~PER DOC NUMBER 31113~~