

404187

HQDP010032931



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**SUBJECT:** Organization for Future Testing (U) **27 APR 1959**

**TO:** Rear Admiral Edward N. Parker, USN  
 Chief, Armed Forces Special Weapons Project

Brigadier 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

*Chas*  
**CHARLES H. ANDERSON**  
 Major General, USAF  
 Commander

*From NMB-S*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*This page only*

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW	
1ST REVIEWER DATE: <i>4/1/59</i>	DETERMINATION (ORCIE NUMBER(S))
AUTHORITY: <i>105 FPMR 101.11</i>	1. CLASSIFICATION RETAINED
NAME: <i>W. B. ...</i>	2. CLASSIFICATION CHANGED TO:
2ND REVIEWER DATE: <i>4/1/59</i>	3. CONTAINS NO DOE CLASSIFIED INFO
AUTHORITY: ADD	4. COORDINATE WITH <i>DOE (DRA)</i>
NAME: <i>...</i>	5. CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED
	6. CLASSIFIED INFO BRACKETED

*a 3124*

CODED	<i>de</i>
INDEXED	<i>/</i>
FILED	

NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION

Unauthorized disclosure is subject to administrative and/or criminal sanctions.

JTF-7/S-90083

MILITARY RESEARCH & APPL

*7 2 4 9 5*

*att 12*

*94SA20B000091*

Declassified by DNA, Chief, ISTS WITH INCLOSURE

DATE: *10/18/94*

Declassified by DNA, Chief, ISTS

DATE: 12/18/94  
*Richard C. [Signature]*

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW	
1ST REVIEWER DATE: 6/11/94	DETERMINATION (CIRCLE NUMBER(S))
AUTHORITY: [Signature]	1. CLASSIFICATION RETAINED
NAME: [Signature]	2. CLASSIFICATION CHANGED TO
2ND REVIEWER DATE: 6/16/94	3. CONTAINS NO DOE CLASSIFIED INFO
AUTHORITY: ADD	4. COORDINATE WITH: [Signature]
NAME: [Signature]	5. CLASSIFICATION CANCELED
	6. CLASSIFIED INFO BRACKETED

transfer in some portion to the FACTS

**OBJECTIVES**

A. To determine, *(Economy of Personnel & Funds)* *with best regard to economics in funds & manpower* the most effective organization, manning and lines of control for the [Joint] planning and conduct of all *single test operations with particular emphasis on* <sup>development test</sup> operations.

B. To examine the special problems involved in the maintenance of the <sup>development test</sup> proving grounds, wherever located, and determine the functions to be performed by the AEG and the DOD, the military manning levels required, and the command and control lines which should be maintained.

C. To delineate the support responsibilities of DOD for AEG sponsored tests. (EPG - NTS)

D. To delineate the support responsibilities of AEG for DOD sponsored tests. (EPG - NTS)

E. To develop appropriate draft AEG-DOD 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 AEG-DOD 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:

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

DMA  
to  
prepare

B. DOD. AFSVP 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 AFSVP prepare their respective lists for consideration by the Committee).

1. State from law.  
2. Differs as between  
a. Spies Review, etc. vs  
b. NTS or Overseas  
3. Test cycle follows budget,  
a. 18 months ahead schedule  
scale location & test  
timing.  
b. 12 months ahead just by  
budget. Large  
scale prep start.  
c. 6 months ahead  
Pres approval (not  
reqd by law).  
d. 3-1 months ahead,  
Test Org becomes Opns.  
New Chem. of weapons.  
hears officer  
e. Conduct.  
g. Analy. of data:  
(1) JEP BTF-7th  
(2) NTS

**D. Establish mission and responsibilities of**

**a test organization.**

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

Exclusive  
N 19.

In order to assist the committee JTF-7 will prepare a paper showing the mission and detailed responsibilities of the Task Force for Operation HARDWARE, and APTWP should list same for tests conducted at RTB. ] DSD part only.

**E. AWC 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**

a phased reduction in such equipment is agreed upon.

Someone should make a real survey of possibilities.

Not necessarily true.

H. Facilities at the Pacific Proving Ground could well be highly useful for other purposes, for example, FMR, 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.

Not at all sure with white.

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.

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

**E. Be capable of rapid expansion, <sup>or established</sup> 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