

Los Alamos

Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

16-000353

58909

Received from Baytos & stored to 16-000269

memorandum

TO: L. Stretz, D. Loughran, M-1, J. Baytos M-1 DATE: 10 October 1984
FROM: M. J. Urizar MAIL STOP/TELEPHONE: C920/7-4325
SYMBOL: M-1
SUBJECT: IMPACT SENSITIVITY

S A M P L E	SENSITIVITY			STABILITY ml/g/48 h at 120°C
	50% Height log units	cm	σ log units	
<u>Type 12</u>				
Std. TNT	2.1634 ^m	146.0	0.034	
Dirt + 25% HE	2.1468	140.0	0.074	
LAS-I-141 95% DINGU 5% Exon 461	2.0218	105.0	0.068	
<u>Type 12B</u>				
Std. TNT	NO GO AT 320 CM.			
Dirt + 25% HE	2.2009	159.0	0.076	
LAS-I-141	1.9438	87.9	0.077	

M. L. Clancy
M. L. Clancy

HMX: 230-35 cm
RDX: 22



3527

M-1-F-43

D. P. MacDougall

COMMENTS ON MINUTES OF 4 APRIL 1951 MEETING OF LCPB

4/30/51

GMX

We have just received copy No. 6 of these minutes and would like to record a few comments:

First, our comments on the problem of the layout for the entrance to the new S Site Service Area have already been forwarded to you by R.W. Drake in a memorandum dated 13 April 1951. That memorandum gives the detailed reasoning and conclusions upon which our original layout was based. The idea that an alternative layout, to which we have vigorous objections, "will eliminate the need for guard station No. 389, and two guards" is an illusion. Some guard must inspect personnel entering the "5" badge area just as Station 389 now does, and there is no way that this function may be disposed with. To say that a guard may be saved (which we suspect means relocated from Station 370; the source of the second "saved" guard is a mystery to us) is simply confessing that there is already a superfluous Inspector at Station 370. This may actually be the case between 5:30 P.M. and 7:30 A.M. During the shift No. 2 period we continue to feel that the layout on which Kistner, Curtis and Wright were told to go ahead is completely unsatisfactory. To build the geographic arrangement so that Station 389 is not substantially separate from Station 370 perverts the best arrangement for the critical peak traffic period in the interest of the two shifts when a lesser traffic volume is involved. The same kind of reasoning suggests that since Station 304 (Shep gate) may be closed and is not used at night it should really be combined with Station 302 (A Building gate) and Station 304 eliminated and a guard "saved".

We are also confused that the minutes state that further LCPB discussion of this problem was to take place, whereas Kistner, Curtis and Wright were given a go-ahead on an unsatisfactory alternative plan immediately after this particular LCPB meeting.

An alternative arrangement for Security Station 385 has been proposed by us to Messrs. Metzger and Skipper who think it is an attractive plan. Drake's office will send you a layout and description of this plan in a few days, specifically in support of our requests for fencing to be added to the Phase A Service Area contract. This new plan will be most efficient in its use of Protective Force manpower and satisfies all our requirements for the traffic routing around Stations 370 and 389. Mr. Metzger seems to believe that Mr. Elmer Morgan is likely to concur with this new arrangement, and therein our worries about this situation may be solved.

COPY

20 April 1951

Shortly we will present to you a new proposal for the new S Site cafeteria. It is rather distressing to us that this facility had to be eliminated from the Service Area planning, and also somewhat frustrating that this was done apparently without any opportunity for defense of our proposal by you or by ourselves. We hope to construct a plan now which will command attention and a sympathetic review of that facility.

/s/ D. P. MacDougall
/s/ D. P. MacDougall

RWD:pbe

cc: J. Bolton
D. K. Freeman
GME-3
File

COPY