

404187

HQDP010032931



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUBJECT: Organization for Future Testing (U)

27 APR 1959

TO: Rear Admiral Edward H. Parker, USN
Chief, Armed Forces Special Weapons ProjectBrigadier General Alfred D. Starbird, USA
Director, Division of Military Application
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission

1. The attached outline of a proposed approach to the problem of determining an acceptable organization for future atomic tests is forwarded for your consideration.

2. In accordance with our conversation on Friday I have made notes in the outline of actions which each of us can take now with a view of speeding up committee action once a formal directive is received.

3. May I have your thoughts on this approach.

1 Incl

CHARLES H. ANDERSON
Major General, USAF
Commander

From NMB-S

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This page only

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW	
1ST REVIEWER DATE: <u>11/17/94</u>	DETERMINATION (CITE NUMBER(S))
AUTHORITY: <u>105 E.O. 12958</u>	1. CLASSIFICATION RETAINED
NAME: <u>W. B. Smith</u>	2. CLASSIFICATION CHANGED TO:
2ND REVIEWER DATE: <u>6/14/95</u>	3. CONTAINS NO DOE DETERMINED INFO
AUTHORITY: ADD	4. COORDINATE WITH <u>DOE/ORA</u>
NAME: <u>W. B. Smith</u>	5. CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED
	6. CLASSIFIED INFO BRACKETED

NATIONAL SECURITY

INFORMATION

Unauthorized disclosure is subject to
Administrative and Criminal Sanctions.

CODED	<u>de</u>
CANDED	
INDEXED	<u>1</u>
FILED	

MILITARY RESEARCH & ANAL.

JTF-7/S-90083

94SA20B000091

Declassified by DNA, Chief, ISTS

DATE: 10/18/94

transfer in some
way to the
portion.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW	
1ST REVIEWER DATE: 6/14/94	DETERMINATION (CIRCLE NUMBER(S))
AUTHORITY: [signature]	1. CLASSIFICATION RETAINED
NAME: [signature]	2. CLASSIFICATION CHANGED TO
2ND REVIEWER DATE: 6/14/94	3. CONTAINS NO DOE CLASSIFIED INFO
AUTHORITY: ADD	4. COORDINATE WITH
NAME: [signature]	5. CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED
	6. CLASSIFIED INFO BRACKETED

1 OBJECTIVES

A. To determine, ^(economy of movement & funds) ^(with respect to economics in funds & manpower) the responsibilities, the most

effective organization, manning and lines of

control for the [joint] planning and conduct of

all ^{staple} test operations ^{with particular emphasis on}

B. To examine the special problems involved in the

maintenance of the ^{down to test} proving grounds, wherever

located, and determine the functions to be per-

formed by the AEC and the DOE, the military

manning levels required, and the command and

control lines which should be maintained.

C. To delineate the support responsibilities of DOE

for AEC sponsored tests. (EPG - NTS)

D. To delineate the support responsibilities of AEC

for DOE sponsored tests. (EPG - NTS)

E. To develop appropriate draft AEC-DOE agreements

delineating:

1. The responsibilities and authorities of each

agency for the planning [and conduct of] test

operations, and

2. The primary responsibilities of each agency

for budgeting and funding for costs of joint

AEC-DOE operations and for maintenance of the

proving grounds.

II ASSUMPTIONS

There is no firm announced policy regarding future U. S. atomic tests. There are several letters which set forth in general the state of readiness which should be maintained to resume testing; however, these letters appear to be outdated. Therefore, the committee will have to make assumptions re:

- A. Policy regarding testing.
- B. Type of tests and probability of implementation.

DMA
to
prepare

III FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM

- A. AEC. It has been suggested that AEC prepare a paper for inclusion in the proposed study which will show:

DMA
to
prepare

- 1. AEC Responsibility for testing.
- 2. Organization.
- 3. Procedures for testing to include establishment of test objectives, programing, funding, testing and analysis of data.

- B. DOD. AFSWP to prepare a paper for DOD showing same info outlined in A. above.

- C. List of tests desired by AEC and DOD in the near future and the estimated lead times for preparation. (It is suggested that AEC and AFSWP prepare their respective lists for consideration by the Committee).

- 1. Starts from low.
- 2. Differs as between
 - a. Ops Review, etc.
 - b. NTS or Overseas
- 3. Test cycle follows budget.
 - a. 18 mo ahead with scale, location & test timing.
 - b. 12 mo ahead just by budget. Large scale prep start.
 - c. 6 mo ahead.
- 4. 3-1 mo ahead.
- 5. Test Org becomes Ops.
- 6. New chain of response.
- 7. Means of test.
- 8. Conduct.
- 9. Anal. of data.

- (1) diff. of PTF - 74
- (2) Note in 1974

D. Establish mission and responsibilities of

a test organization.

*Exclusive
N 18*

The committee should agree on the broad mission of a test organization as well as the specific responsibilities.

In order to assist the committee JTF-7 will prepare a paper showing the mission and detailed responsibilities of the Task Force for Operation HARDY, and AFSTP should list same for tests conducted at RTH.] *DoD part only.*

E. AEC and DOD test programs are likely to be less interdependent technically in the future than they have been in the past. *Not sure in NTS,*

May be.

F. The closing of the Pacific Proving Ground at this time, even if found desirable, could have serious political and psychological consequences.

Domestically, it could be taken as an indication of the lack of need for future tests of the type normally conducted in the Pacific. Internationally, it would demonstrate to the world the USSR is succeeding in its attempt to curtail U. S. testing without an international agreement.

G. Heavy investments in the Pacific Proving Ground facilities and equipment dictate a carefully organized program of maintenance until such time as

SECRET

a phased reduction in such equipment is agreed upon.

H. Facilities at the Pacific Proving Ground could well be highly useful for other purposes, for example, PHR, MATS, Army development.

I. EPG is the only land mass outside CONUS suitable for conducting tests.

J. The high cost in men, money, and materials to maintain the EPG in a near-operational status.

K. Other facts - - -

NOTE: At this point two sub-committees should be established to:

1. Develop detailed recommendations with regard to immediate actions to be taken on JTF-7 manning to include JTF-7 hqs.; 7.1; EPG.

2. Examine into the requirement for and feasibility of establishing a year around testing capability overseas.

IV CRITERIA

Set forth criteria which can be used to evaluate possible solutions.

Organization. Are we talking only overseas?

A. Be responsive to both AEC and DOD.

B. Be economical in personnel and funds.

C. Provide for coordination and correlation of AEC test requirements with DOD support capabilities.

SECRET

Someone should make a real survey of possibilities.

Not necessarily true.

Not at all sure with while.

**D. Provide for coordination and correlation of
DOD effects test requirements with AEC
support capabilities.**

**E. Be capable of rapid expansion, ^{or establishment} to meet testing
needs.**

F. - - etc.

V PROPOSED ORGANIZATIONS

List proposed solutions or recommendations.

VI EVALUATION OF PROPOSED ORGANIZATIONS AND SELECTION OF BEST

VII DRAFT RECOMMENDED AEC-DOD AGREEMENTS

**Based upon findings and recommendations above, a
sub-committee should now review present AEC-DOD agreements
on cost and responsibilities for atomic testing and prepare
new draft agreements.**

0 1124