

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

David

7

REPORT NO. LAND-399

CLASSIFICATION ~~SECRET~~

COPY NO. ~~22A~~

SAA 20006986 0000

THIS IS A COVER SHEET FOR A CLASSIFIED DOCUMENT

TRANSMITTAL OF THE DOCUMENT MUST BE COVERED BY A SIGNED RECEIPT. IT MUST NOT BE LEFT UNATTENDED OR WHERE AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON MAY HAVE ACCESS TO IT. WHEN NOT IN USE, IT MUST BE STORED IN A LOCKED FILE OR SAFE. WHILE THIS DOCUMENT IS IN YOUR POSSESSION AND UNTIL YOU HAVE OBTAINED A SIGNED RECEIPT UPON ITS TRANSFER TO AN AUTHORIZED INDIVIDUAL, IT IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO KEEP IT AND ITS CONTENTS FROM ANY UNAUTHORIZED PERSON.

CAUTION

"THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES. ITS TRANSMISSION OR THE DISCLOSURE OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED AND MAY RESULT IN SEVERE CRIMINAL PENALTIES UNDER APPLICABLE FEDERAL LAWS."

Redacted Version

RESTRICTED DATA

This document contains Restricted data as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Unauthorized disclosure subject to Administrative and Criminal Sanctions.

RESTRICTED DATA

This document contains restricted data as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

CLASSIFICATION CORRECTION

~~CLASSIFIED~~ **SECRET** ~~RD~~
10-11-78

UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION CANCELLED

~~SECRET~~

Per *[Signature]*
By *[Signature]*
FEB 5 1973

Att. Cd

910502000001

ADWD-179

~~SECRET~~

This document consists of 5 pages.
No. 33 of 48 copies. Series A.

LAMD-399

FAMILY COMMITTEE
Minutes of Twenty-First Meeting
August 26, 1950

UNCLASSIFIED

A. Attendance.

The twenty-first meeting of the Family Committee was held Saturday, August 26, 1950 at 9:00 A.M. in Room B-117. Those present were:

- | | |
|----------------|---------------------|
| N. E. Bradbury | E. R. Jette |
| J. C. Clark | M. H. Johnson |
| F. de Hoffmann | D. P. MacDougall |
| E. Fermi | R. D. Richtmyer |
| D. K. Froman | R. W. Spence |
| R. W. Goranson | E. Teller, Chairman |
| D. B. Hall | F. Walters |
| E. Krause | J. A. Wheeler |
| M. G. Holloway | C. V. Strain |


B. Minutes of the Twentieth Meeting.

The Committee unanimously adopted the minutes of the Twentieth Meeting reported in ADWD-176 with the following correction:

DOE b(3)

C. DINEX vs. GANEX.

Dave Hall reported that a meeting on the subject had been held with the NRL group all of Friday, August 25th. These discussions led to the feeling that basically DINEX and GANEX had the same chance of yielding information on the time dependence.



There seemed to be weight given to two points in favor of GANEX. The first one of these concerned itself with the fact that the DINEX shield, as previously noted in these minutes, gives rise to interference with experiments such as ball of fire, TENEX, PHONEX and ANEX (up to recently no alternative to DINEX was available so that this interference had to be tolerated; now one is in a position of minimizing this interference in replacing DINEX by GANEX). The second point concerned itself with the feeling that the radio-chemistry would suffer appreciably due to the great amount of lead present in the DINEX shield (this point was cleared up during the course of the present meeting and is discussed further on in these minutes).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW

1ST REVIEW DATE: 8-19-97

2ND REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

3RD REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

4TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

5TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

6TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

7TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

8TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

9TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

10TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

11TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

12TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

13TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

14TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

15TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

16TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

17TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

18TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

19TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

20TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

21ST REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

22ND REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

23RD REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

24TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

25TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

26TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

27TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

28TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

29TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

30TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

31ST REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

32ND REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

33RD REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

34TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

35TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

36TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

37TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

38TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

39TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

40TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

41ST REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

42ND REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

43RD REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

44TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

45TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

46TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

47TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

48TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

49TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

50TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

51ST REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

52ND REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

53RD REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

54TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

55TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

56TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

57TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

58TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

59TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

60TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

61ST REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

62ND REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

63RD REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

64TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

65TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

66TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

67TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

68TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

69TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

70TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

71ST REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

72ND REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

73RD REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

74TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

75TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

76TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

77TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

78TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

79TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

80TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

81ST REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

82ND REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

83RD REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

84TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

85TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

86TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

87TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

88TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

89TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

90TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

91ST REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

92ND REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

93RD REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

94TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

95TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

96TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

97TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

98TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

99TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

100TH REVIEW DATE: 9-19-97

DOE b(3)

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

RESTRICTED DATA

This document contains Restricted Data as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Its release or disclosure is prohibited by Executive Order 12958 and Criminal Statutes.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

In view of the Friday meeting, Hall submitted a possible program for discussion:

1. DINEX effort continued but is cut back to the extent that parts dealing with insuring energy level measurement such as absorber-scatterer measurements are eliminated.
2. GANEX be engineered.
3. At the earliest possible time but not later than January 1, 1951, decide on either GANEX or DINEX but decide at once that no combination of the two should be used.

Considerable discussion ensued concerning this proposal. Krause raised the point that one of the difficulties in successfully planning any program was that connected with the uncertainty of what kind of gadget would be shot.

DOE
b13

Rod Spence was asked to join the group at this point to evaluate the difficulties the DINEX shield would present with respect to the radiochemical program. He was able to report that the difficulties would not be as great as anticipated. In particular, it has now been established that the filter papers would not be clogged--rather the difficulty would arise from the amount of tungsten and uranium contained as impurities in the approximately 500 tons of lead required for DINEX. Spence hopes that it will be possible without too much difficulty to analyze representative samples of the lead used for uranium and tungsten and make appropriate corrections. While this will lower slightly the accuracy of the radiochemical method, it is not believed that this would be a sufficiently strong argument against the use of DINEX.

Krause suggested that it may be advisable to carry on a program which would result in a shot with a cut back DINEX and GANEX (where GANEX also would be kept to its essentials, that is for instance, one would not indulge in the luxury of measuring fission neutrons by GANEX). In this case, the logistic effort would be planned such that DINEX and GANEX jointly would not exceed the logistic effort of the full scale DINEX alone. Clark reported that from the point of view of J Division, it would be acceptable to plan for either DINEX alone, GANEX alone or a combination in the manner just indicated.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED


~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

J Division could hold up on the decision to build a limonite column for DINEX as late as November 1, 1950. On the other hand, arrangements for the 200 ton tower should probably be made immediately.

Wheeler emphasized that the NRL group should be given as much freedom of decision as possible in view of the fact that they are the group that will actually have to take the experimental responsibility for the success of the experiment. The group strongly supported this view. Fermi expressed the view that possibly the instrumentation of both DINEX and GANEX might lead to too much effort being put into these experiments but agreed that this depended to a large extent on how much NRL itself felt it could carry. Holloway dissented strongly from the majority view and thought that it was too late to introduce a new experiment such as GANEX into the schedule and that one would have to have strong reasons forcing one to include GANEX. He would think it preferable if DINEX were to be instrumented to completion now and the schedule adhered to.



DOE
6(2)

Probably the ball of fire would be most strongly affected and TENEX least. In view of the possibility of replacing DINEX by GANEX, it was thus recommended that J Division re-examine the extent of interference of the DINEX shield, particularly because PHONEX and ANEX were currently thought of as rather valuable and simple experiments.

In view of this situation, the following summary was agreed upon:

1. The NRL group should have as much influence as possible in deciding questions of DINEX and GANEX.
2. Re-evaluation should be undertaken immediately concerning the interference of the DINEX shield with the ball of fire, ANEX, PHONEX and TENEX.
3. If this re-evaluation shows that the interference is very considerable, then it is believed NRL may want to concentrate on GANEX and carry along DINEX only as insurance if GANEX should show up flaws.
4. If this re-evaluation shows that the interference is either tolerable or can be circumvented by calibration methods and other experiments then the NRL group would try to reach a decision whether or not to carry on DINEX only, GANEX only, or a combination of the two requiring no more than the original logistic effort envisaged for DINEX.

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

12-2


~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~


~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

5. In view of the first four points, it is agreed that NRL will continue for the present on DINEX and give immediate consideration to GANEX. DINEX will not be dropped for the moment. The ultimate decision concerning DINEX will be made after the re-evaluation of the interference of the DINEX shield with other experiments by this laboratory. At that time, the decision will be influenced by NRL opinion as to the relative reliability of GANEX.



It is now believed that the first of these proposals would meet with more difficulty from the point of view of the implosion than is compatible with the present late date. Furthermore, it is believed unlikely that the second scheme can be calculated well enough by about the first of next year to give any assurance that it would be useful to carry out such a test.



MacDougall pointed out that such development would be concerned with an external initiator, possible addition in the amount of U235 in the implosion, and similar items.

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

DOE
b(3)

DOE
b(3)

DOE
b(3)

DOE
b(3)

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

DOE
b(3)

E. Booster.

MacDougall reminded the Family Committee that both W and GMX Divisions are anxious to have an early date on which the design of the booster shall be frozen. In this connection, Goranson reported that it is hoped that the IBM calculations can be completed within the next two weeks.

F. Next Meeting.

There will be no meeting on Thursday, August 31st, unless one of the members so desires (in which case, please inform the secretary).

Fredric de Hoffmann
Executive Secretary

DISTRIBUTION:

1A	N. E. Bradbury	25A	E. Teller
2A	W. C. Bright	26A	" "
3A	S. W. Burriss	27A	" "
4A	J. C. Clark	28A	" "
5A	D. K. Froman	29A	" "
6A	R. W. Goranson	30A	J. von Neumann
7A	A. C. Graves	31A	J. A. Wheeler
8A	G. K. Hess	32A	Document Room
9A	M. G. Holloway	33A	" "
10A	E. R. Jette	34A	" "
11A	" " "	35A	" "
12A	J. M. B. Kellogg	36A	" "
13A	E. Konopinski	37A	" "
14A	D. P. MacDougall	38A	" "
15A	" " "	39A	J. M. Keller
16A	D. P. MacMillan	40A	R. W. Spence
17A	J. H. Manley	41A	A. C. Graves
18A	J. C. Mark	42A	R. C. Smith
19A	H. C. Paxton	43A	W. E. Ogle
20A	F. Reines	44A	E. Teller
21A	" "	45A	" "
22A	" "	46A	" "
23A	A. R. Sayer	47A	" "
24A	R. F. Taschek	48A	" "

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~