

2000

MEMO ROUTE SLIP Form AEC-98 (Rev. May 14, 1947)		See me about this. Note and return.	For concurrence. For signature.	For action. For information.
TO (Name and unit) Dr. Claus <i>see my note attached</i>	INITIALS <i>WJL</i> DATE <i>8/27</i>	REMARKS Attached is an Information Services attempt to coordinate accident reporting. It seems to me that this is merely a part of the overall package of improving the coordination of the handling and reporting of these incidents from occurrence to litigation. I would suggest that you look at this from that point of view.		
TO (Name and unit) Dr. Dunham	INITIALS <i>WJL</i> DATE <i>8/27</i>	REMARKS Secondly, this memorandum deals with the reporting of information to the press by operations managers, but makes no provision for touching base with responsible program divisions or line operating divisions. May I have your comments, please.		
TO (Name and unit) <i>[Handwritten mark]</i>	INITIALS <i>[Handwritten mark]</i> DATE <i>[Handwritten mark]</i>	REMARKS <i>Chair's comment on very well taken - [Handwritten mark]</i>		
FROM (Name and unit) Mr. Brown	REMARKS <i>taken - [Handwritten mark]</i>			
PHONE NO.	DATE <i>8/23/56</i>	<p style="text-align: right;"> CONFIRMED TO BE UNCLASSIFIED AUTHORITY: [Handwritten] BY E. B. [Handwritten], DATE: [Handwritten] </p>		

USE OTHER SIDE FOR ADDITIONAL REMARKS

16-50607-1

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

199

Shelby Thompson, Deputy Director
Division of Information Services

September 17, 1956

G. L. Dunham, M.D., Director
Division of Biology and Medicine

CLARIFICATION OF POLICY REGARDING REPORTING OF ACCIDENTS

SYMBOL: BMBP:WDC

It has been called to my attention that it may be possible to misinterpret my memo of September 11 to you on the above subject.

It was my intention to suggest that item 4 (of your July 26 draft) should read as follows:

- "4. Accidents involving any single radiation incident which results in (or, pending confirmation, is suspected to have resulted in) the exposure of AEC or AEC-contractor personnel, or other persons, whether on or off-site, to a dose of ionizing radiation in excess of:
 - (a) a whole-body (or major organ) dose of 3 rem of gamma, neutron or corpuscular radiation;
 - (b) the total dose (to the critical tissue, organ or region of interest, as a result of inhalation, ingestion, cuts or abrasions or other means) equivalent to that which would be received should the person be exposed for a continuous 10-week period to official permissible concentrations in air or water."

I wish to emphasize that we do not believe that an announcement should be mandatory simply because such an exposure has occurred. The exposure is newsworthy only in its relationship to a reportable accident, or to an incident which is potentially a source of groundless rumor or public concern.

Actual experience has shown that the number of such occasions has been small, and there is no reason to believe that the frequency should increase greatly. When correct, the news release might very appropriately be accompanied by an explanation that the exposures simply exceeded guide lines that have been set to help avoid over-exposure, and that these exposures do not in themselves represent over-exposure of the individuals.

CONFIRMED TO BE UNCLASSIFIED
AUTHORITY: DOE-DPC
BY E. B. BARNES, DATE: 4/18/82

5000-1
84

OFFICE ▶	cc Mr. D. F. Hayes, O&P			
SURNAME ▶	BMBP CLAUDE W. BLACK 9/18/56	BMA O'NEILL 9/18/56	BMA BROWN 9/18/56	BMBP DUNHAM 9/18/56
DATE ▶				

MEDICINE, HEALTH & SAFETY