


REPOSITORY NAEA / College Park -
COLLECTION AEC Minutes (NAB-326-92-026)
BOX No. 3
FOLDER Vol 7 (2 of 2)
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION



408401

R

MEETING NO. 565

2:00 p.m., Monday, June 4, 1951

Present

Gordon Dean
Thomas E. Murray
Henry D. Smyth
T. Keith Glennan

M. W. Boyer
Walter J. Williams
Everett L. Hollis

Roy B. Snapp


Also Present

Brig. Gen. James McCormack, Jr.
Col. Robert G. Butler, Jr.
Donald H. Loughridge
Rafford L. Faulkner
Neil J. Carothers

1. Meeting with Reactor Subcommittee of JCC

The Commission reviewed topics likely to arise at the meeting with the JCC Subcommittee scheduled for Wednesday, June 6. Mr. Dean emphasized the importance of conveying to the Joint Committee the distinction between current production ratios of plutonium to U-235 and stockpile percentages of the two materials. Production ratios at any given time tended to be meaningless as they fluctuated with operating necessities, research developments, and plant completion schedules. The present and projected quantities of plutonium and U-235 in the stockpile were important, however, to a thorough understanding of the Commission's program.

CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED
AUTHORITY: OLC 1990
BY: [Signature] DATE: 5/23/90
[Signature] 4/2/90
BOB



General McCormack pointed out that after having subtracted the quantities of plutonium and U-235 needed for research, high yield weapons, gun type weapons, and other required weapons for fixed composition, the remaining fissionable material of whatever proportion could all be fabricated into weapons. Accordingly, within reasonable limits, the production ratio at this specific point in time should not be permitted to be a matter of concern. It is with regard to the construction of new plant for future production that it is important to examine the "ratio" question.

2. Fissionable Material Production Program

Mr. Dean referred to the letter of May 10, (AEC 387/1) from the Secretary of Defense stating that the fissionable material program should be examined from time to time to determine desirable changes. The results of RANGER and GREENHOUSE would be available for review in the near future. Accordingly another review of the Commission's program could be undertaken. The meeting at Princeton, June 16 and 17 might be considered a beginning of such a review.

The Commission discussed at length the various factors entering into the production program: prospects for ore supply; improved reactor designs to permit processing of feed material depleted to a larger extent or of more economical design in terms of cost or neutron utilization; weapon development prospects; and the prospects for mobile or other specialized power reactors. The Commission's production program for the future would depend upon an evaluation of all these factors, many with a high degree of unpredictability.

3. Project GABRIEL

Mr. Boyer reported that he had requested the Division of Biology and Medicine to review Project GABRIEL (AEC 278, December 12, 1949) and to submit a report with any necessary revisions to the Commission.

Roy B. Snapp
Secretary

Approved by the Commission: June 20, 1951