

Reviewed by R. Schmitt Date 4/27/97

3801B West 44th Ave.
Anchorage, Alaska 99503
October 14, 1973

Joe Deal
USAEC
Washington, D. C. 20545

409800

R

Dear Joe:

You asked me to put down some of my thoughts as a result of our recent meeting on paper, even though I hate to write. So..

1. I question the political need of having to go to $\frac{1}{2}$ the gamma MPC for individuals (and applaud the thought of using the international individual level of approx. .5R/year). The natives of Enewetak should not have appreciable doses from other man-made sources, so I suspect we could sell approx. .9 of the MPC. But,
2. The MPC's are set the way they are by assuming linearity of effects (which I don't believe). So I feel it is appropriate to obtain the numbers on those effects for the small population expected on the upper end of the atoll. If the effects are small (i.e. 1 cancer/30 years) then I cannot see selling to Congress reducing the numbers linearly by factors like two at the expenditure of several millions of dollars.

I propose we try to sell the concept that the gamma dose over the next generation can be made acceptable by minor plowing of the upper islands, and appropriate village construction. People in large numbers will not be on the northern end of the atoll for 5-7 years. The dose rate will drop to approx. $\frac{1}{2}$ in ten years.

The plutonium problem on Runit is a sticker. Suggest more information is essential. What are airborne plutonium dose rates? What plutonium levels are in edible plants? What does this mean in body burden from expected ingestion? I suspect these answers will show that plutonium problem on Runit does not require clean-up if present MPC's for airborne plutonium are accepted. However, I suspect these MPC's will change in the next few years. Particle size should become important. If you wish to get problem to status that no future worry is necessary, then do that by removing soil in proper regions of Runit and replacing with clean soils. Problems of soil disposal and replacement source should be solved before settling on this path.

REPOSITORY P.N.V.L.
 COLLECTION Marshall Islands
 BOX No. 5685
 FOLDER 214505101 10/14/73

I am pleased with your decision to discuss the plutonium problem with LASL people before arriving at decision. To me, none of the radiation hazards so far presented are sufficient to keep the people from coming back. Thus I believe we should adopt that path that maximizes the probability of their return.

Sincerely,

Wm. E. Ogle