

# Los Alamos

Los Alamos National Laboratory  
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

## memorandum

TO Eugene Sandoval, OS-6, MS F674 DATE October 16, 1984

FROM William R. Kennedy, Jr. *W.R. Kennedy* MAIL STOP/TELEPHONE: F670/7-4236

SYMBOL WDP/TO 410425

SUBJECT DECLASSIFICATION OF ENCLOSED EXCERPT - CASTLE - RADIOLOGICAL SAFETY REPORT.

As you suggested this morning, I am enclosing the following items. The purpose is to gain declassification of the part contributed by Dr. Thomas N. White of LASL, July 1954, Item 4.

Items:

1. Cover of basic document - SRD
2. P.iii - of table of contents
3. Listing of Tab "D", given on p.iii
4. D-18 through D-24; the document in question, CONFIDENTIAL, and
5. P.1 of the report referred to in Para 2, p. D-18. Unclassified by you February 28, 1984.

Thanks very much for your help.

WRK:fnr

Att: a/s

cc: W. Kennedy, WDP/TO, w/a  
WDP/TO Files, w/o

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

10/22/84

*This extract is unclassified. The entire document is in process of being made available for public release per DNF Documents Declassification Status List, dated Aug 31, 1984, Transmitted letter signed by Paul Boren of DNF.*

*E.M. Sandoval OS-6.*

Do not  
Destroy this  
Report.  
Retain

~~SECRET~~

44/10,417  
Z-17,85-80

6A  
TECHNICAL LIBRARY  
of the  
ARMED FORCES  
SPECIAL WEAPONS PROJECT  
8 Nov 54

TEMPO  
TEMPO  
B7951-01  
Copy 002

11-75 Vol 1

SECRET RESTRICTED DATA

TEMPO  
KTL 0550  
Copy No. 1

DTL019,314

VOLUME I

FINAL REPORT  
RADIOLOGICAL SAFETY  
OPERATION CASTLE  
SPRING 1954

H790

This title page  
is unclassified  
10-22-84  
R. M. Landrum

RESTRICTED DATA  
This material contains RESTRICTED DATA as defined in  
the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and its amendments and disclosure  
is subject to administrative and criminal sanctions.  
Classified by \_\_\_\_\_

S&I/Mo D.C. 83:1131

COPY 1

~~SECRET RESTRICTED DATA~~

Prepared By  
Technical Branch, J-3 Division  
Headquarters, Joint Task Force SEVEN  
Washington 25, D. C.

~~SECRET RESTRICTED DATA~~

RESTRICTED DATA

~~SECRET~~

DTL-19,314

- INDEX -

PART	PAGE
I - GENERAL .....	1
II - RADIOLOGICAL SAFETY PROBLEMS .....	17
III - FALL-OUT FORECASTING .....	52
IV - RADSAFE ORGANIZATION .....	73
V - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	87

TABS

A - ANNEX N TO CJTF SEVEN OPERATION ORDER NO. 3-53 .....	A-1
B - HEADQUARTERS, JTF SEVEN SPECIAL OPERATING PROCEDURE 30-2, WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE EXPOSURE (MPE) .....	B-1
C - CORRESPONDENCE AND WIRES RELATIVE TO OFF-SITE RESPONSIBILITIES AND PLANS .....	C-1
D - FALL-OUT FORECASTING TECHNIQUES .....	D-1
E - CLOUD TRACKING PLAN .....	E-1
F - CORRESPONDENCE RELATIVE TO STUDIES OF EXPECTED LAGOON CONTAMINATION ON OPERATION CASTLE .....	F-1
G - RADSAFE OFFICE .....	G-1
H - CORRESPONDENCE RELATIVE TO EVACUATION AND REHABILITATION OF MARSHALL ISLAND NATIVES .....	H-1
I - PROBABILITY OF OCCURENCE OF UPPER WINDS WITH SOUTHERLY COMPONENTS IN THE ENIWETOK-BIKINI AREA .....	I-1
J - RADIOLOGICAL SAFETY (EXTRACT FROM TG 7.3 FINAL REPORT) .....	J-1
K - BRAVO SHOT .....	K-1
L - ROMEO SHOT .....	L-1
M - KOON SHOT .....	M-1
N - UNION SHOT .....	N-1
O - YANKEE SHOT .....	O-1
P - NECTAR SHOT .....	P-1

T.B "D"

FALL-OUT FORECASTING TECHNIQUES

3 Incls:

1. Basic Techniques and Future Studies.
2. Long-range Forecasting by Modified Technique Developed after BR.VO. (Forecasting of the 10r Isodose Line)
3. Close-in Forecasting by New Techniques Developed after BR.VO.

Classified by Paul Brown  
Date DNA Doc. Decl. List, Aug 31, 1984, Doc ID PDL-019 514  
By G.M. Jan 1961 05-6  
OCT 22 1964

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CLOSE-IN FORECASTING BY NEW TECHNIQUES DEVELOPED AFTER BRAVO

EXTRACT FROM :

Vol I  
Final Report Radiological Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory  
Safety Operation Castle  
Spring 1954  
Thomas N. White  
July 1954

1. The method of calculating local fall-out, as described here, is the hasty outgrowth of a more complex method that had been unexpectedly successful in accounting for the BRAVO fall-out pattern in the Rongelap-Rongerik area. As the time of the last shot (on Eniwetok Atoll) approached, the problem of forecasting local fall-out became more acute. Since the method attempted to take account of the initial size and shape of the cloud, it seemed that it should be suitable for local forecasting. With the aid of Dr. Gaelen Felt, the method was simplified to the extent that an atoll pattern could be estimated within about an hour. The simplified method was tested against the Bikini patterns produced by ROMEO, UNION and YANKEE and found satisfactory, and the method was used in forecasting for NECTAR.

2. The following description covers the simplified method only. The more complex method warrants further study which will be reported elsewhere.

3. Assumptions:

(a) The initial cloud (after rise is practically completed) is divided into horizontal slices, each of 10,000 ft depth, with centers at 10,000, 20,000, - - - 70,000 ft altitude, with the central concentration (radio-activity per unit volume) independent of altitude.

(b) In each layer all of the activity lies in a horizontal plane thru the center.

(c) In each layer, the concentration falls off laterally according to the law of normal distribution of errors

$$c(r) = C_0 e^{-\frac{r^2}{a_0^2}}$$

where  $C_0$  is the initial central concentration,  $r$  is distance from center, and  $a_0$  is the initial spread parameter (analogous to standard deviation). For altitudes 10,000 thru 40,000 ft,  $a_0 = 1.9$  miles; 50,000 thru 70,000 ft,  $a_0 = 5.8$  miles.

INCLOSURE #3

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

(d) Thruout the whole cloud, all radioactive particles are of the same size, and fall at 50,000 ft per hour.

(e) In each layer, the central particle falls, without diffusion, as directed by the winds, while other particles diffuse horizontally away from the center equally in all directions so that, when the layer arrives on the surface, the distribution about the center is given by

$$c(r) = \frac{C_0}{p^2} e^{-\frac{(q)^2}{(p)^2}}$$

where  $p = \frac{S_0}{S}$ ,  $q = r/a_0$ ,  $S$  = total horizontal distance travelled by the central particle,  $S_0 = 5.2 a_0$ . (The last quantity may be pictured as the horizontal distance back to a fictitious point source of the cloud layer).

(f) The dose rate at any point is proportional to the sum of the concentrations from all of the layers as estimated from the preceding formula.

4. Apart from the assumption of a single particle size this formulatio has a number of other obvious defects, e.g.

a. The sum of the quantities  $C_0 a_0^2$  should be made proportional to the total radioactive yield of the "bomb." In practice, the final estimates were adjusted somewhat on account of expected yield. This, in effect, allowed for the influence on  $C_0$ , but not on  $a_0$ .

b. The estimation of  $S$  as total horizontal distance is rather unsatisfactory in local forecasting where the atoll dimensions are not much greater than the height of the cloud.

Also, there was no time to find out whether better results could be obtained by choice of some other values for parameters such as rate of fall for the particles. From the test of the method against the Bikini patterns, it was clear that it was good enough for the purpose at hand. It appeared that differences between forecast and actual winds would be likely to produce much larger errors than those inherent in the assumptions.

5. In application, the method is not as tedious as might appear. The standard hodograph plot, giving the location of central particles falling at 5,000 ft per hour, is prepared for the Command Briefing as a matter of course. It can be superimposed on a ten times magnified atoll map, allowing for the 50,000 ft per hour fall rate assumed in the method. With a ruler of corresponding scale, the distances  $S$ , along the zig-zag path to each of the height points on the hodograph can be quickly measured or

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

this can be done by summation of hodograph winds if these are more readily accessible. Likewise, the distances from the altitude points on the hodograph to points of fall-out interest can be quickly measured with the ruler, giving the values of  $r$ . Knowing  $S$  and  $r$ , one can easily compute  $p$  and  $q$ . With the aid of a family of curves of  $\frac{1}{p^2} e^{-\frac{(q)^2}{(p)^2}}$  vs  $q$

(see Fig. 1) for several values of  $p$ , one can rapidly interpolate the values that must be added up at any location. The exponential factor drops off very rapidly with  $q$ , and after working out a few cases, one can tell, from an inspection of the hodograph-on-atoll plot, some of the altitude points that can be neglected in the computation.

6. Fig. 2 and Table 1 illustrates the application of the method to NECTAR shot, using the winds observed at shot time. The points on Fig. 2 marked 10, 20, 30, are the 10,000 ft, 20,000 ft, - - - altitude points on the hodograph for particles falling 50,000 ft per hour. A particle starting, for example, at 30,000 ft above ground zero, and falling under the influence of winds but not diffusion, would land at the point marked 30. The value of  $S$ , the horizontal distance travelled, is estimated by summing the distance between the successive points from ground zero to point 30. In calculating  $q$  in Table 1, some values are omitted as beyond the range of Fig. 1. More values are dropped, as too small to bother with, in entering the quantities  $\frac{1}{p^2} e^{-\frac{(q)^2}{(p)^2}}$ . The final totals are the surface

concentrations that would be produced if the initial central concentrations ( $C_0$ ) were all unity. When the method was tried out on Y. NKEE, it was found that if the resultant surface concentrations were multiplied by 100, they agree reasonably well with the dose rate, in roentgens per hour, measured one day after the shot. This factor was used in making up Table 2, and it appears to give fairly good results for ECUVO, ROMEO, and UNION also, although there is some tendency to over-estimate the lower dose rates at the larger distances. In Table 1, however, it is clear that the agreement is about as good as in Table 2 without multiplying by a factor of 100. The yield of NECTAR was less than that of the shots in Table 2, but not by a factor of 100. At the present time the only explanation that can be offered for this discrepancy is the heavy rain that occurred on NECTAR day.

7. There is good reason to anticipate that the current detailed study of the more complex method will yield a better simplified technique than the above. For this reason, there is little justification for a more elaborate report on the method at this time.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

TABLE 1

$$q = r/a_0$$

HEIGHT (1000 FT)	$a_0$ (MI)	$S_0$ ( $5.2 a_0$ )	S (MI)	P ( $S_0/S$ ) ( $S_0$ )	ALICE	JANET	SALLY	ELMER
70	5.8	30	29	2.0	1.6	1.4	2.3	4.4
60	5.8	30	23	1.8	2.2	1.5	1.7	4.1
50	5.8	30	19	1.6	2.1	1.3	2.1	4.5
40	1.9	10	12	2.2	4.5	4.7	—	—
30	1.9	10	9	1.9	3.1	4.2	6.8	—
20	1.9	10	6	1.6	2.4	4.4	—	—
10	1.9	10	3	1.3	1.2	3.0	5.6	—

$$\frac{1}{p^2} = \frac{-(q)^2}{(p)^2}$$

HEIGHT	$p$	ALICE	JANET	SALLY	ELMER
70	2.0	.14	.16	.07	.0020
60	1.8	.07	.15	.12	.0020
50	1.6	.07	.20	.07	—
40	2.2	—	—	—	—
30	1.9	.02	—	—	—
20	1.6	.04	—	—	—
10	1.3	.23	—	—	—
	TOTAL	.57	.51	.26	.002
	OBSERVED R/HR at N-1 D.Y	.70	.18	.027	.000



UNCLASSIFIED

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

TABLE 2

BIKINI

R/HR AT D / 1 DAY

ISLAND	ERLVO		ROMEIO		UNION		YANKEE	
	OBS	CALC	OBS	CALC	OBS	CALC	OBS	CALC
HOW	24	22	0	0.6	8.5	9	25	30
NAN	9	5	0	0.6	0.09	2	2	7
OBOE			0	0.6	0	0.7	0.04	3
UNCLE	1.0	0.9					0	5
ERLVO	1.0	0.6					0.5	0.3
ABLE			50	70			2	5
FOX	55	47			12	45		


UNCLASSIFIED

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

FIG. 1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

TK



$p^{-2} \exp(-q^2/p^2)$


Source: See also...  
New Legend...  
MADE IN U.S.A.

This material contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws, Title 18, U. S. C., Secs. 793 and 794, transmission or revelation of which in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED



UNCLASSIFIED

Elmer

This material contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws Title 18, U. S. C., Secs. 793 and 794, the transmission or revelation of which in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.