

*MPG*  
*Jan*

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO : T. L. Shipman, M.D.  
FROM : T. N. White, H-6  
SUBJECT: RAD-SAFE ORGANIZATION FOR TESTS  
SYMBOL : H-6

DATE: 30 January 1953  
PROJECT: B26 US ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION 407625  
Location: LANL  
Distribution: Send Center-E9, B39  
MPG - General

- (1) I am afraid that this will defeat the purpose of the plan. If a program director is going to lose operational control of his rad-safe men, what incentive does he have to pick and train good men? He is then being asked to go and work for a job that was previously done for him, with no assurance of any benefit to his program, and he will be more than before inclined to criticize the rad-safe organization. I believe that if the plan is going to be successful, each program director must have full operational control of all of his people, and must carry full responsibility for all of the rad-safe requirements that are peculiar to his program, while the rad-safe unit is responsible only for general policy and those services that are of common interest to all programs.
- (2) I think that some of the foregoing objections apply also to this scheme, though not with the same force. Can't this difficulty be overcome by putting the plan on an optional basis? Some program directors may have excellent reasons for preferring to depend entirely on the test rad-safe unit. They may have no qualified people, and no way of training people. If this scheme is forced down their throats, they will demand that the test organization provide their needs, and the rad-safe unit will be back in the training business under even more difficult circumstances.
- (3) I would put the test rad-safe unit in an advisory position with respect to program requirements. If the program director is to be able to carry his command responsibility for safety, he must be free to accept or reject such advice on his own responsibility. If he is subject to outside restrictions on the size of his safety organization, he cannot be held responsible for the consequences.
- (4) For the foregoing reasons, I feel that the main emphasis in the instructions to the program director should be on the fact that he is responsible for the safety of his people. He should then be given the option of adopting either of the two plans, and should be asked to state who in his program should be contacted with regard to the services that he will require from the test rad-safe unit.

R  
OK

(5) Another advantage is the reduction in friction by giving the dissatisfied customer a way out. *places responsibility where it belongs*

COPIES/DOE  
LANL RG