R - 409894

ENEWETAK file

ENERGY RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Division of
Operational and
Environmental Safety

August 22, 1977

This will tidy up the paper work on the meeting last week in Las Vegas. Thanks again for your participation.

T. McCraw

Tommy F. McCraw

REPOSITORY PNNL
COLLECTION Marshall Islands
BOX No. 5684
FOLDER Bikini - 1977

DOCUMENT DOES NOT CONTAIN ECI
Reviewed by P K Schuette Date 4/30/97

August 17, 1977

Dr. James L. Liverman
Assistant Administrator
for Environment and Safety
U. S. Energy Research and
Development Administration
Washington, D. C. 20545

Dear Dr. Liverman:

In response to your request of August 11, 1977, plans for the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll were reviewed at a meeting at the Nevada Operations Office, August 15-17, 1977. A list of participants in the review is attached.

Prior to the meeting, the reviewers were provided copies of documents relative to the development of cleanup criteria and preparation of the EIS. Supplementing these were briefings by Joe Deal, Tommy McCraw, Roger Ray, and members of the Staff of the Defense Nuclear Agency. Mr. Stevens reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement and Major General Shedd and Colonel Hemler described operational plans for soil cleanup and crater disposal. In addition, Mr. M. Gates, Manager of the Nevada Operations Office, met with the reviewers and discussed points he raised in his letter to you.

The reviewers addressed two primary issues:

The criteria for cleanup of the islands contaminated with plutonium.

The plan for disposal of plutonium contaminated soil and other radioactivity contaminated debris in the Cactus Crater.

Several other related issues were addressed during the discussion.

I. Summary of the Reviewers' conclusions

There was unanimous agreement that the criteria for cleanup of the islands contaminated with plutonium are reasonable in the light of present knowledge and their application does not pose an unacceptable health risk.

[redacted] reviewers considered the criteria for the [redacted] of approximately 10 Ci of plutonium from dispersed locations in the terrestrial environment to a central location in the Cactus Crater on Runit Island.

The reviewers concurred with the 40 pCi Pu/g soil value adopted in the Environmental Impact Statement as a minimal action level and with 400 pCi/g as the mandatory cleanup level. Using the assumptions in the EIS the reviewers estimated that the lung dose resulting from lifetime inhalation of air containing an equivalent concentration (100 µg soil/m^3 air or 4 fCi Pu/m^3) would be approximately 0.01 rem/year, or 1 mrad/year, assuming a quality factor of 10. This compares with the proposed EPA federal guidance value of 1 mrad/year to the lung from transuranic elements in the environment. The reviewers believe that lung doses from inhaled plutonium will be considerably less than this for persons living and working on the Atoll because of the small land area which minimizes buildup of plutonium concentrations in the air and because of the conservative assumptions used in estimating dose; e.g., all contaminated soil was considered respirable, the concentration of soil in air was maintained constantly at the 100 µg/m^3 level, etc.

The reviewers recommend that more specific guidance for application of the criteria at plutonium levels between 40 and 400 pCi/g be developed for the Task Group Commander.

[redacted]

human health effects, future maintenance and monitoring requirements, retrievability, potential restrictions on access to Runit Island, implications and risk of reopening the Environmental Impact Statement, costs, quantities of debris, and engineering problems. Weighed against these considerations the reviewers agreed that the planned emplacement of concrete-encased plutonium-contaminated soil and debris in the Cactus Crater would not in itself impose unacceptable human health risks. The method could result in the gradual release of this plutonium to the marine environment; this would be in addition to the 1500 Ci already in the lagoon sediment. However, for the worst case in which 10 Ci Pu is added to the Crater below the water level, the local lagoon water plutonium concentration would not increase more than by a factor of two. This could lead to an increased dose of a few mrem per year to a person who obtained all of his food from the local marine environment.

Several alternate disposal schemes, while not significantly influencing the health risk prospects, might be preferable. While it may be inadvisable to change disposal plans at this late date, the reviewers believe you should be aware of the possible advantages of other methods.

[redacted]

solution phase during disposal to the lagoon. The majority of material would settle to the floor of the lagoon. Concentrations of plutonium in aquatic organisms might increase, but since the residence time for sea water in the lagoon is about 150 days, the concentrations would shortly be reduced to ambient levels. Again, the EIS would have to be reopened and permits obtained from the EPA, other Federal agencies and the Trust Territory.

Terrestrial disposal on Runit Island with a concrete cover would have the least immediate impact on the local marine environment in that remobilization of the radionuclides from the soil to the groundwater and eventually to the lagoon is minimized. This method would maximize potential occupational exposures during the cleanup operation.

Terrestrial disposal by covering the existing contaminated areas on Runit with contaminated soil removed from other islands, but without concrete cover, was also considered. This would reduce the average surface levels of plutonium on Runit, but might require quarantine. Both terrestrial disposal methods would allow retrieval of the plutonium. Both would require reopening of the EIS.

Other methods for disposal of plutonium were proposed. One interesting possibility is the application of mining and milling techniques to separate plutonium from the soil of Enewetak Atoll. The reviewers were not aware of this having been explored. While such a technique could not be available for application to Enewetak Atoll, it might be useful at other sites in the future.

C. Future ERDA Commitments at Enewetak Atoll

According to the Environmental Impact Statement, ERDA is committed to long-term monitoring the the Enewetak Atoll.

Planning for this responsibility appears to be incomplete. The reviewers offer the following suggestions:

1. The environmental monitoring program should be as inconspicuous as possible and should be aimed at estimating radiation doses to the inhabitants of the Atoll.

2. Any activities carried out by individuals other than the Enewetakese should be conducted only if it is ascertained that the activity has minimal impact on the inhabitants.

3. During the next three years a study of resuspension of plutonium from soils in circumstances typical of those that will occur when the islands are reinhabited should be conducted. It is emphasized that this should not be a study of resuspension associated with cleanup activity per se. Information applicable to the Enewetak people will be invaluable in improving estimates of radiation dose to human beings returning to the islands and will assist in reaching decisions about future use of specific islands.

4. The EPA regards the crater disposal method as temporary storage. Under this view, maintenance of the concrete structure may be required. The Defense Nuclear Agency regards this method as permanent disposal which would imply no maintenance. This could lead to uncertainties of responsibility for future activities at the crater site.

5. A programmatic effort must be initiated to communicate to the Enewetak people the nature of the risks to which they will be exposed. The potential risks associated with living and visiting the various islands must be made comprehensible to the people from their perspective to insure their understanding the need for restricted access to Runit, etc.

D. Concern for incomplete cleanup

The reviewers were concerned that the cleanup program, as defined in the EIS, could be terminated before completion if the funds and other resources appropriated for the effort proved to be insufficient due to underestimates of the magnitude of the amount of soil that has to be removed.

In conclusion it should be emphasized that only the adequacy of the criteria and disposal methods were reviewed and that the operational plans for assuring implementations of the criteria were not examined in detail.

Sincerely,

William J. Bair, Chairman

PARTICIPANTS IN REVIEW OF ENEWETAK CLEAN-UP [redacted]

NEVADA OPERATIONS OFFICE, LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

August 15-18, 1977

William J. Bair, Ph.D., Chairman
Manager, Biomedical and Environmental Programs
Battelle - Pacific Northwest Laboratory

Chester W. Francis, Ph.D.
Soil Scientist, Environmental Sciences Division
Oak Ridge National Laboratory

John H. Harley, Ph.D.
Director, Health and Safety Laboratory
U. S. Energy Research and Development Administration

John W. Healy
Assistant Leader, H-Division
Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory

Roger O. McClellan, D.V.M.
Director, Inhalation Toxicology Research Institute
Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research

Victor E. Noshkin, Ph.D.
Section Leader for Marine Sciences, Environmental Sciences Division
Lawrence Livermore Laboratory

William Ogle, Ph.D.
3801 W. 44th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99503

William L. Templeton
Associate Manager, Ecosystems Department
Battelle - Pacific Northwest Laboratory

Roy C. Thompson, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Scientist, Biology Department
Battelle - Pacific Northwest Laboratory

Joseph Trimble, Ph.D.
Research Scientist
Battelle Human Affairs Research Center, Seattle

Observers

L. Joe Deal
Assistant Director for Field Operations
Division of Operational and Environmental Safety
U. S. Energy Research and Development Administration

Tommy F. McCraw
Division of Operational and Environmental Safety
U. S. Energy Research and Development Administration

Roger Ray
Assistant Manager for Environment and Safety
Nevada Operations Office
U. S. Energy Research and Development Administration

Paul B. Dunaway
Director, Bioenvironmental Sciences Division
Nevada Operations Office
U. S. Energy Research and Development Administration

Lt. Col. Edwin T. Still, D.V.M., USAF
Research Program Coordinator
Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute
Defense Nuclear Agency

Bruce W. Wachholz, Ph.D.
Office of the Assistant Administrator for Environment and Safety
U. S. Energy Research and Development Administration

REVIEW OF ENEWETAK CLEAN-UP CRITERIA AND DISPOSAL

NEVADA OPERATIONS OFFICE

August 15-19, 1977

PARTICIPANTS

William J. Bair, Ph.D., Chairman
Manager, Biomedical and Environmental Programs
Battelle - Pacific Northwest Laboratory

Chester W. Francis, Ph.D.
Soil Scientist, Environmental Sciences Division
Oak Ridge National Laboratory

John H. Harley, Ph.D.
Director, Health and Safety Laboratory
U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration

John W. Healy
Assistant Leader, H-Division
Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory

Roger O. McClellan, D.V.M.
Director, Inhalation Toxicology Research Institute
Lovelace Foundation for Medical Education and Research

Victor E. Noshkin, Ph.D.
Section Leader for Marine Sciences, Environmental Sciences Division
Lawrence Livermore Laboratory

William Ogle, Ph.D.
3801 W. 44th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99503

William L. Templeton
Associate Manager, Ecosystems Department
Battelle - Pacific Northwest Laboratory

Roy C. Thompson, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Scientist, Biology Department
Battelle - Pacific Northwest Laboratory

Joseph Trimble, Ph.D.
Research Scientist
Battelle Human Affairs Research Center, Seattle

Observers

William W. Burr, M.D.
Deputy Director, Division of Biomedical and Environmental Research
U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration

L. Joe Deal
Assistant Director for Field Operations
Division of Operational and Environmental Safety
U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration

Tommy F. McCraw
Division of Operational and Environmental Safety
U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration

Roger Ray
Assistant Manager for Environment and Safety
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration

Lt. Col. Edwin T. Still, D.V.M., USAF
Research Program Coordinator
Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute
Defense Nuclear Agency

Bruce W. Wachholz, Ph.D.
Office of the Assistant Administrator for Environment and Safety
U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration

[redacted]

Mr. Milton E. Stevens
Logistics Directorate, Headquarters

AGENDA

Monday, August 15, 1977

8:30
Introduction - Bruce W. Wachholz

8:45
Background - Joe Deal

9:45
Development and Application of Clean-up Criteria - Tommy McCraw

10:45
Break

11:00
Operational Viewpoint - Roger Ray

12:15
Lunch - Cafeteria

1:30
Defense Nuclear Agency
Introduction - Maj. Gen. Shedd
Review of Crater Containment Operations and Disposal Plans - Col. Hemler
Review of EIS - Mr. Stevens
Closing Remarks - Maj. Gen. Shedd

Tuesday - Friday, August 16-19

Activities of the Review Committee - William J. Bair

UNITED STATES
ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

AUG 11 1977

Dr. W. J. Bair
Manager, Biomedical and
Environmental Research Program
Pacific Northwest Laboratory
P. O. Box 999
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Dr. Bair:

This will confirm recent telephone conversations seeking your assistance in the review of the cleanup criteria for Enewetak that AEC/ERDA was responsible for preparing. The key element in plans for the ongoing Enewetak Atoll project is recommendations for cleanup and rehabilitation criteria developed by an AEC Task Group in June 1974, and decisions by Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) on crater disposal of contaminated debris and soil on Runit Island. Several factors opt for a final review of these recommendations and decisions; namely, EPA has in draft for final review, "Guidance on Dose Limits for the Transuranium Elements in the General Environment"; Mahlon E. Gates, Manager, NV, has indicated his professional staff have voiced objections to the disposal plan and believe that "soil cleanup" of the northern islands according to AEC guidance is unsupportable, unsound, and counterproductive; concern has been expressed for the cleanup guidelines in a letter to Dr. Liverman which was prepared by a number of scientists at the time of the Livermore review of all AES Pacific activities on June 27-29, 1972; DOD has a heavy commitment to the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll and to a technique of disposal that has changed with time and will shortly begin to expend considerable effort in soil removal and disposal activities; and ERDA has commitments to provide certification of Enewetak cleanup and long term radiological followup of the Atoll when it is resettled.

You are invited to participate in a review of:

1. AEC recommendations for cleanup and rehabilitation of Enewetak Atoll and specifically the criteria for plutonium-239 in soil, and

2. Environmental and health implications and long term monitoring requirements for crater disposal of contaminated debris and soil on Runit Island.

A copy of the AEC Task Group report is enclosed along with additional background material. You will be informed of arrangements for a review session, which is expected to be held next week at a location as yet undetermined. If there are any questions, please contact Bruce Wachholz on 353-4365 or FTS 233-4365.

Sincerely,

for James L. Liverman
Assistant Administrator
for Environment and Safety

Enclosure:
As stated

Identical Letters Sent To:

Dr. W. J. Bair
Manager, Biomedical and
Environmental Research Program
Pacific Northwest Laboratory
P. O. Box 999
Richland, Washington 99352

Dr. Roy Thompson
Biology Department
Pacific Northwest Laboratory
P. O. Box 999
Richland, Washington 99352

Dr. Roger McClellan
Director, Inhalation Toxicology
Research Institute
Lovelace Foundation for Medical
Education and Research
P. O. Box 5890
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87115

Dr. Jack Healy
Health Division
Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory
P. O. Box 1663
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

Dr. John Harley
Director, Health and Safety Laboratory
U.S. ERDA
376 Hudson Street
New York, New York 10014

Dr. William Templeton
Pacific Northwest Laboratory
P.O. Box 999
Richland, Washington 99352

Dr. Chester Francis
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
P. O. Box X
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

Identical Letters Sent To: 2

Dr. Victor E. Noshkin
Aquatic Sciences
University of California
Lawrence Livermore Laboratory
P. O. Box 808
Livermore, California 94550

Dr. Roy E. Albert
Department of Environmental Medicine
New York University
College of Medicine
New York, New York 10016

Dr. William E. Ogle
3801 B West 44th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99503