32 US ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA Location

LOS ALAMOS SCIENTIFIC LABORATORY (CONTRACT W-7405-ENG-36) P.O. Box 1663 LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO

Collection 1

CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED

H-5

Luke

Vortmans Files

RG

407607

Sandia Corporation Post Office Fox 5800 Sindia Pase Albuquerque, Lew Hexilo

This Document copied for DOE/Hdgtrs DOE contract DE-AC08-83NV10312 August 1983 Sandia Laboratory Location ORTH More Luke Vortmanis Jules

Dear I'r. Church:

I'r. T. S. Church

Employed is the description of a method of computing fall-out that we discussed 20 July. I have deliped sending it in order to satisfy apself that it can easily be modified in such a way as to include the same approximation to aerodynamic fall theory as is planned for the deather Bureau - Eurosu of Standards computer.

I applogize for sending you a part : anuscript copy, but I do not wint to make may further delay. The confusion on Fig. 4 srised in part from some irregularities that con out of our machine calculation on account of too course in integration system, and on account of the discontimuity in the cloud model used in the modeline calculation. Ideard the end of TEAFOR we came to feel that our hond calculation, which presents the distribution on any arc as a single gaussian, was more reliable than the machine results. We are currently trying to improve the rethine code.

If one could count on the single gaussian always to do as well as in this particular case, there would be no need to build an analog machine for operational forecasting of distant fallout. The single gaussial method will give a pattern in 20 to 30 minutes of hand calculation. However, I am afraid that it may fell down rather badly for some Nevada and many Facific patterns.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It seems to me that one should be able to obtain a satisfactory operational system with a minimum of design and construction effort by a combination of hand with analog computation. The computation of the functions WEy/r and Eg for any given point on an arc can be done quite quickly and easily by graphical methods. The real bottle-neck is in the integration of the products of the functions. I think that either function can be represented adequately by linear interpolation between not more than ten points. The first function remains unchanged so long as one is working on the same arc, and, with sufficient experience, one should be able to choose on each arc


ment transmitted herewith contains H

LANDIA RC

ENCLOSURES, HANDLE

TRANSMITTAL WHEN SEPARATED FROM THIS DOCUMENT AS

(insert proper chasification)



three points, on each side of the main fall-out axis, so that the results at these points would define the limits of the pattern adequately at this distance. This still means a lot of hand work; perhaps 5 arcs with 70 settings of interpolation values per arc, but I think that it could be done fast enough for operational purposes if the interpolation values can be entered as easily as by setting potentiometers.

It would speed up the computation considerably if one could make the machine compute E_2 . As I see it, the main difficulty arises because, although E is fundamentally a very simple function, the quantity that has to be put into it is the difference between the arbitrary ingle of and another angle that is specified by the height by way of the composite wind diagram, as in Fig. 2. As a result, the $\rm E_2$ that must be used in the calculation is a different function for each value of (), as in Fig. 3A.

It would be very nice to have a machine that would plot the dose, or dose-rate, as a function of (), but I would not favor risking such an effort if it would interfere with getting a workable machine in time. If you think that there is time to include this feature, the merits of another co-ordinate system should be considered. Hevada experience, and a little Pacific experience, indicate that the actual width of a distant fall-out pattern is more constant than the angular width. From the viewpoint of resolving power it would thus seem preferable to handle E, as a function of $r(\Theta-\psi)$ rather than as a function of $(\Theta-\psi)$. The disadvantage is that one then has to feed in ro vs h for each arc distance r, instead of the single curve of Fig. 2. However, since this is a simple multiplicative correction perhaps the machine could do this too.

I hope that you will not hesitate to call me if there is atything obscure in this description of the problem.

To the best of my knowledge, the only classified information in this material is that which reveals the cloud model which we are using.

Very sincerely yours,

Fon While - BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Thomas N. White, Leader Radiological Physics Group HEALTH DIVISION

TNW: bg

Enc: Copies 1A of H-6-86 & H-6-87

cc: Gaelen Felt w/o enc. Vay Shelton w/o enc.

> COPIED/DOE SANDIA RC

INCOMPLETE DOCUMENT REFERENCE SHEET

The archive copy of this document is incomplete.

Pages missing		_	
Enclosures missing			
Attachments missing			
Other			
Signature Dick Koogle			
Signature 8-25-88 date			
	RG	326 US ATOMIC EN	ERGY

COMMISSION

Collection IRT NONE-1 WE VORTMAN'S Files

Folder GAUSSIAN FALL OUT
CALCULATION (DISTANT PAINTS)

Location SNL