

Department of Energy Washington, D.C. 20545

ł	M	77	
•	_	,,	

405209

JV 2 1978		l n	SEE	INIT
DIRECTOR NS		U	-	- 11111
anin. Assistant				
				// ·
PROJECT ENGINEER		7		//
ADMINISTRATIVE OFF.		4		<i></i>
PROGRAM LIAISON OFF.		\dashv	$-\mathcal{H}$	pm
		!	(N	
SEND COPY TO:			•	
H&N	T	\neg		
JA/SITE MGT. REP.	-	+		
EA/SITE MGT. REP.	-	-+-	-	
OTHER	+	+	-+-	
OTHER	_	+	+	

VADE R. R. Monroe, UES Director, Defense Euclear Agency Washington, D.C. 20305

Dear Admiral Monroe:

During the orientation visit to Enswetck Atoll by the Department of Energy Enswetck Advisory Group, a listing of issues and problem areas was presented during the Joint Task Force briefing. Prior to their departure from the Atoll, the group provided a preliminary draft of their initial views on these questions to Col. Beuchspies.

Upon their return from Enswetck Atoll, comments on the draft and suggestions representing the views of most of the members of the idvisory Group have been obtained. A revised copy of the group's comments and recommendations is enclosed. We endorse this advice and recommend it for your consideration.

The Task Group met again on October 3-4, 1978. Iny results relevant to knewstak cleanup from that meeting will be provided to you when the group's report has been received and reviewed.

Regarding a response to the DMA request for a review of the draft report, "Dose Estimate for Post-Cleanup Use of Enewetak Atoll," by E. T. Bramlitt, comments by several members of the Enewetak Advisory Group have been forwarded to us. We are avaiting comments from staff of the Levrence Livermore Laboratory, the laboratory performing such dose estimates for DOE.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REPOSITORY DOE/PASO

COLLECTION DOE/NV

BOX No. 1236

ENEWETAK FOLDER # 10

FOLDER GEN. CORR. FY 1979

Please accept our thanks for the courtesies extended to the Advisory Group in their visit to Enewetak, which by all reports was highly successful.

In I Holliston, Acting Director Divinion of Operational and

INCL:

a 5

CF:

W. BAIR, NLV WACHHOLD, DOE R. RAY, NV

1

The Marshall Islands Advisory Group provide the following comments and recommendations to issues and questions raised by DEA and DOE during the Advisory Group's visit to Enswetak in August 1978.

- 1. Acom Crypt The 40-80-160 pCi/g guidence was not intended to apply to special or unique situation such as the Acom Crypt. Information about the contents of the crypt is inadequate for the Advisory Group to offer any useful guidance. It might have been better to have left the crypt undisturbed. Nowever, since the decision has been made to remove the buried operanisated material. It is probably better for Col. Bauchspies to deal with the problem than to seek advice from other less-informed sources.
- 2. Preciseness of 40-80-160 The 40-80-160 guidance can and should be met by DNA. However, DOE should be "reasonable" in its evaluation of the cleanup relative to cartification since both soil removal and measurement-methods are subject to errors of at least a few percent.
- Serface Hot Spots Minimum Area Levels The opinion of the Advisory Group is that the minimum area requiring cleanup is that caused by an IMP reading (90% of a 25 meter square area) that exceeds the 40-80-160 guidance. However, if romoval of a "hot spot" brings-the. IMP reading down to the appropriate limit, then it should not be necessary to remove soil from the whole 25 meter square area.
- Ploring Advisability The Advisory Group is awaiting the results of the ploring experiment before considering any guidance regarding ploring.
- 5. Island Average vs Maximum Yalues Remedial action-is based upon maximum contamination levels. Radiological dose assessment and decisions regarding repopulation should be based on average values for larger environmental units such as an entire island or group of islands.
- 6. Contaminated Bunker Guidance Precise adherence to the AMSI standard is not appropriate to the bunker situation. Since streamous efforts have been made to remove loose contamination and because of its location and quantity the fixed contamination does not appear to represent a health hazard. The preservation of a bunker as a storm refuge for island residents is a worthdrile alternative to disposition of these structures. Although of no appearnt benefit to subsequent residents, the off-shore Kickapoo tower anchor blocks do not appear to be a redistion hazard and need not be removed.
- 7. Subsurface Contamination Subsurface contamination is defined as radioactivity more than about 2 cm under the ground surface, or at a depth not detectable by the DP. The Advisory Group is not yet prepared to offer guidance. In fact some members of the Advisory Group do not believe we should recommend criteria for subsurface contamination because of the uncertainty of the extent of subsurface contamination on the atoll. Subsurface contamination in small "bot spots" is apt to

"everaging." Examples are mixing of the "hot spot" with soil containing lower concentrations (as would occur in forwing operations), dilution as the "hot spot" becomes distributed throughout an ecosystem, and redistribution of the "hot spot" by wind erosion or solubility in water. Therefore it is entirely appropriate to incorporate averaging in the criteria. The Advisory Group believes this can be accomplished by averaging subsurface radioactivity throughout the total soil column above the "hot spot." The Advisory Group is opposed to recommending criteria that would require a complex sampling scheme, an inordinate compliance effort, or that would lead to removal of far more soil than is necessary to accomplish the desired reduction of the potential radiation dose to inhabitants. The Advisory Group will give further consideration to this question at its next meeting.

TELECOPIER TH	PAHSHITT	AL REQUEST		DATE:
	FROM	MN-PICKLER	office.	7513
		Unit/Company .	to Harry	ce .Tel. Ro. x S-969-4515