



DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20305

400078

BEHR

MEMORANDUM FOR ~~GC~~ *16 Feb 83 cover in 92.3 on not qualified to address 91.*
DDST(TT)
ISCM (Mr. Niles)
IN TURN

*Don't see
understand this
which thing. rlf
170 16 Feb 83*

16 Feb 83

SUBJECT: Operation Redwing Final Draft

1. While it's clear that our astute and diligent investigator could at best infer certain information from the predicted patterns in the history, it is by no means clear to me that more than fission yields could be roughly estimated. The argument that one could then obtain total yields from the predicted cloud heights is true only if one iterated on the calculations with some insight, in my opinion, because predicted cloud heights are not given in the draft. I believe, but have not verified, that ground burst assumptions were made to complete the calculations in all cases. However, if one did not already know the assumed parameters of the event (yield, HOB, fission yield) I believe calculations would not yield meaningful results. Therefore, I believe we could hope to reclaim DoE's decision on predicted patterns. If you agree, I recommend we pursue this course of action.

2. The question of whether we (DoD) should attempt to convince DoE to declassify Pacific Test yields is not one which I believe we can profitably address. I see no hope of a successful conclusion to such a course of action, and also see no profit for us if it were successful.

D. L. Auton

DAVID L. AUTON, PhD
Chief, BEHR

5000948

407

BEHR

16 Feb 83

MEMORANDUM FOR GC
DDST(TT)
ISCM (Mr. Niles)
IN TURN

SUBJECT: Operation Redwing Final Draft

1. While it's clear that our astute and diligent investigator could at best infer certain information from the predicted patterns in the history, it is by no means clear to me that more than fission yields could be roughly estimated. The argument that one could then obtain total yields from the predicted cloud heights is true only if one iterated on the calculations with some insight, in my opinion, because predicted cloud heights are not given in the draft. I believe, but have not verified, that ground burst assumptions were made to complete the calculations in all cases. However, if one did not already know the assumed parameters of the event (yield, HOB, fission yield) I believe calculations would not yield meaningful results. Therefore, I believe we could hope to reclaim DoE's decision on predicted patterns. If you agree, I recommend we pursue this course of action.

2. The question of whether we (DoD) should attempt to convince DoE to declassify Pacific Test yields is not one which I believe we can profitably address. I see no hope of a successful conclusion to such a course of action, and also see no profit for us if it were successful.

DAVID L. AUTON, PhD
Chief, BEHR

5000949

412