[redacted]

407614

L. D. Connolly, D-7 2 July 1953

T. N. White, H-6

REVIEW OF REPORT DATED 30 APRIL 1953 ON PROJECT 5.4a, OPERATION IVY

H-6

[redacted] RESTRICTED DATA

This document contains restricted data as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

Subject report has been reviewed in full by Major John Servis, Thomas N. White, and in part by Mr. William Kennedy.

We all agree that it is a very good report and have no criticisms to offer.

In reading various reports on the subject of fall-out, we have noticed that it is customary to make a distinction between air bursts and tower shots in a way that is probably quite satisfactory to all who are familiar with the phenomena involved. It has occurred to us that to the uninitiated the distinction between an air burst and a tower shot may be somewhat obscure. Indeed there is now some evidence that, from the point of view of fall-out, there has occurred at least one tower shot which behaved much like an air burst, so that the distinction, on the basis of whether or not a tower is present, does not seem entirely satisfactory. From the evidence available it appears that a more satisfactory criterion is contact between the fire ball and the surface. At least we know that fall-out has been quite intense when there has been extensive contact and that fall-out has always been relatively light when there was definitely no contact.

Since subject report will undoubtedly be widely read with considerable interest, it is suggested that it might be useful to present a somewhat more definite statement about what is meant by an air burst, perhaps as a footnote on this term in paragraph 1.1.

The report is returned to you herewith.

Thomas N. White, H-6

Enc. Rept. USNRDL CO9013

cc: 2 - L.D. Connolly
1 - N. H. Smith
1 - File

[redacted]

6