

~~SECRET~~



27 February 1971

G. L. Bell, GSN 7.1

Robert H. Campbell, J-6

COMMENTS ON VNL SHARD INVESTIGATION REPORT

J-6-3534

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS 3 PAGES

General Staffed has requested comments from Jim Harvey by 1 March on Gerry Johnson's letter captioned above dated 19 February to Staffed. Proposed development of Shard to a Western Gun Site. The Staffed called us on 15 February asking for any comments to be left here from a construction standpoint.

We agreed, in discussing the matter with Sanders, to look at Gerry's proposal - no more. It is our feeling that Staffed might well invite the comment of SS 7.1 (not necessarily unanimous with SAC in those matters) and, feeling that, Harvey might better request SS 7.1's comments rather than those of J-6 alone. Hence we direct the following comments to you for any disposition you may care to make:

1. Any comment to agencies outside SS 7.1 should be prefaced by a caution that Gerry's paper is the view of VNL and not necessarily shared by SS 7.1. We feel that VNL sometimes takes advantage of our name.
2. Page 3, Item 1: Albins states that large devices can be fired on the northern side of Miral Atoll at the same time that firing of smaller devices is being conducted in the same complex. This statement might cause the uninitiated to believe that there would be no interaction between shots of any yield or method of firing than tested in this geographical relationship - we don't believe this is the case but don't think that given enough time and money the natural interactions can be reduced.
3. Page 3, Item 2: We hate to see VNL publishing a "concept" for SS 7.1, particularly for identification at the Washington level.
4. Page 4, Schedule I: Gun days between tower shots seems a little odd to erect the towers, particularly when there are a few dry runs and fires; particularly when one of these run days is used as a shot day for a 0.5 - 2.0 megaton target shot in the northern lagoon. We assume that they do not hope to have all towers up prior to the first shot; they have placed events 1 and 7 in the same location, events 1 and 5 being of the order of 1500' apart would hardly permit firing event 1 without severe damage to the event 2 zero area, and event 11 would take a moderate beating from events 9 and 10.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW	
1ST REVIEWER-DATE: 6/6/71	DETERMINATION (CIRCLE NUMBER(S))
AUTHORITY: DAOC DAAC DAAD	1. CLASSIFICATION RETAINED
NAME: L. M. [unclear]	2. CLASSIFICATION CHANGED TO:
2ND REVIEWER-DATE: [unclear]	3. CONTAINS NO DOE CLASSIFIED INFO
AUTHORITY: [unclear]	4. COORDINATE WITH:
NAME: [unclear]	5. CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED
	6. CLASSIFIED INFO BRACKETED

3413

5005810

~~CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED~~
~~REF DOG INTEREST JUNE 1970~~

~~SECRET~~

27 February 1957

5. Page 5, Schedule II: This schedule contains the same difficulties mentioned above in comment 4.
6. Page 6, Item (a): This paragraph mentions almost every consideration except the minor one of providing time for construction. A 300' tower requires approximately 18 working days for erection once the foundations have been prepared.
7. Page 7, Item (f): Would we agree that said probability is "high"?
8. Page 8, Item 2: Firing in the northern lagoon and working towards the ocean seems to conflict with Schedule II which indicates a reverse process. Barge access to the inside edge of the northern lagoon reef might be quite a problem for the first shot considering the navigational difficulties at this atoll.
9. The only comment we can make on the discussions of Weather and Geography and Fallout is that we are not too sure that the opinions they report out of context accurately reflect the opinions of the original authors.
10. Page 14, Item (a). From the costs per yard quoted here it would appear the H&N can move coral more cheaply (\$6.20/cu. yd. including overhead) than can the Navy (\$6.50/cu. yd. not including overhead.) Further, any Navy effort would not be free by virtue of not paying their salaries - H&N would still have to support them.
11. Page 15, Item (d): This, as does Item 2 on Page 8, conflicts with Schedule II.
12. Page 15, Item (e): An APL might be used for housing, but it isn't worth much for storage of construction materials or for maintenance of construction equipment.
13. Page 15, Item (f): H&N were fairly explicit regarding their communication requirement during the construction phase, and we doubt that they would accept the pre-CASTLE military type service again - it didn't work the first time.
14. Page 16, Item 2: Assembly and loading facilities of the type provided at a cost of \$870,000 at Farry would hardly suffice without additional water and blast protection - this facility might be rather expensive and relatively shortlived; we wonder if an LSD wouldn't be more economical?

3414

15. Page 17, Item (b): We doubt the practicality of HAN operating a capital ship a major portion of each year on the west coast. (A saving of 1-1/2 man years for USNL isn't much compared with the number of man years required from another agency to operate such a ship.)

16. Page 17, Item (c): We believe use of such a ship for EG 7.5 housing is a weak justification in that their major effort occurs prior to the arrival of this diagnostic ship.

17. Page 18, Item (e): It should be made clear that this paragraph is limited to a communications center for EG 7.1 in the Tongal Area. Here again the ship arrives too late to solve HAN's communications problem during the construction phase.

In general we feel that Garry's proposal tends to present a rather palliative version by omitting difficulties obvious to a more experienced group. We feel that both the pro's and con's should be presented in any proposal which requests a policy decision.

Robert H. Campbell, J-6

RHC:jjr

Distribution:

- 1A - G. L. Felt, CTG 7.1
- 2A - G. L. Felt, CTG 7.1
- 3A - J-6
- 4A - J-6 *me & files*
- 5A - J-6

Revised 15-5-67

3415

5005812

(3)

~~SECRET~~

~~CLASSIFICATION CONTROLLED~~
~~PER DOC CONTROL SYSTEM 10/3~~