HOLMES & NARVER, Inc.
ENGINEERS-CONSTRUCTORS

405763

R

TO: C. L. A. Bochemohle JOB: 884

FROM: David L. Narver, Jr. RE: STATION 1200 RETAINING WALL

DATE: 12 April 1954

Thank you for your memorandum dated April 8th. So far the only criticism of the retaining wall has been mine, not the Users or A,E,C.

The reason I believe the horizontal steel should be run from the tunnel to the wall is to give an additional assurance that the wall immediately adjacent to both entrances would not be blocked. (During Ivy the failure of the top portion of the wall for Station 520 nearly blocked the entrance.) Blocking of either entrance could well mean loss of basic data or expending H&N personnel from radiological contamination when they removed the obstacle.

The small personnel entrance is used to recover film the first or second day after a test. The large door is used to recover the electronic racks approximately 10 days after a test. Of the two doors, the small door is the most important. If the wall was to fail 10 feet away from the entrance, it would probably be possible for personnel to climb over earth and debris and get into the tunnel outside of small door.

The above is just a personal observation, and I do not know of any design values to use except to be plenty safe. Maybe giving the entrance tunnel to the small door another 90 degree bend would be an easier solution. We do know this entrance tunnel was well worth the cost because as soon as one was far enough inside the small tunnel that they could no longer see the outside, the radiation fell off by a factor of 50. This eliminated having to open the small door in a highly contaminated area.

David L. Narver, Jr.

DAVID L. NARVER, JR.
CHIEF PROJECT ENGINEER

DLN:fjb

cc: M. R. Born
H/O Eng. Files