

May 11, 1973

*From
Box 3108
JUB#
7238*

T. F. McCraw
Division of Operational Safety

POSSIBLE DEGREES OF RNIWETOK CLEANUP

Drs. Barr, Grahn, Goldman and Harley have read R. B. Leachman's draft entitled as above. The following is a consolidation of their comments.

1. NEIR report is available and offers credible risk estimates which are conservative. Use NEIR in lieu of G&T.
2. In paragraph 3, page 1, the meaning of the statement "radiological levels that happen to be presented as isodoses . . ." is not clear. Also, how do "customary standards" enter in balance between the financing and insult to islands mentioned in paragraph 1, page 1. One cannot particularise island situations and use generally applicable standards.
3. The "worst case" approach is invalid. The fallacy of basing plans and actions on a "worst case" analysis is that one is correcting a non-existent situation; therefore, he finds a high price on any real reduction in population exposures which should be the objective of and basis for deciding between the alternatives for cleanup.
4. In III, page 3, values containing more than one significant figure will be questioned. For example, how will you measure 131 micro R/hr?
5. All reviewers were uneasy about the paragraph on page 6. Comments on this paragraph are as follows: We need to know what means are available to reduce population exposures. How much do they reduce populations exposure? How does the reduction match with dollar and environmental costs? While the "worst case" analysis avoids difficulties in the above approach, it does not solve the problem. The Pu doses, external beta-gamma exposures, and internal emitter doses should be clarified. Bring out relationship between reduction of external exposure rate and the internal emitter risk. ⁹⁰ Sr cannot control when the major gamma is from activation; be more concerned with Pu than is indicated.

2735

OFFICE ▶	<i>D/C - navy - Re - medical survey - Hawaii</i>			
SURNAME ▶				
DATE ▶				

T. F. McGraw

- 2 -

Staff concerned with Eniwetok believe that this method of "forecasting" the report of the radiological survey can lead to difficulties which may be hard to correct in the future if a document such as this is circulated. Being unclassified, it has a potentially wide readership. We would be reluctant to see anything distributed which might prejudice the expensive, time consuming and painstaking work of the radiological survey, the report, and the judgements and recommendations based on them.

B1
W. W. Schroebel
Analysis and Evaluation Branch
Division of Biomedical and
Environmental Research

cc: L. J. Deal, DOS
M.F. BARR

2736

Original signed

OFFICE ▶	A&E				
SURNAME ▶	WSchroebel:ls				
DATE ▶	5/11/73				