

1490

721360

Joseph A. Lenhard

DIARY

April 13, 1971

1. Radiation Exposure Records: Harold Kneeland of Charlie Eason's staff in the HQ AGMO office called to discuss our radiation exposure information transmittal. Specifically, he was discussing the AEC and contractor annual reports of exposure by name. For AEC-direct employees, all exposures are reported and for contractors only those exposures over 1.25 rem per year are reported. Kneeland inquired whether it would be possible to make the computer tapes or records available directly to the HQ people. This he indicated would save the transcribing to written records by the contractor and the subsequent recoding at Headquarters. I indicated I saw no reason why this should not be possible. It would eliminate our local review of the information prior to recording. However, this has become rather routine now that the format has been established anyhow. Conceivably, we could have the taped information transmitted even though we and the contractors may wish to have the information written for review. Since this is effectively a change in our policy on this matter, I asked that he send us a memo. We later received the memo from Charlie Eason, and H&NS was requested to relay the matter to contractors and to see to what extent we could cooperate.

April 14, 1971

1. ORNL Internal Plutonium Exposure: Dr. Landgrebe of the HQ Division of Research inquired whose program was involved in the ORNL internal exposure. Jim Nehls and I discussed the matter with Landgrebe indicating, while it is not a directly research funded program, that we consider it generally administered under research.
2. Briefing on NBL Siting: Bill Thornton, Newt Culver, and I gave the NBL siting committee approximately a 30 minute briefing regarding NBL containment and siting problems. We indicated, in general, that while New Brunswick was not an ideal location for a plutonium laboratory that we felt that the facility when upgraded as planned is adequate to give assurance of safety. There were really no penetrating questions which tended to question our judgment. One member questioned the use of PVC in connecting glove boxes to main ducts in that a fire might destroy our containment. Is this a problem? -- Reactor Safety please advise.

*Oak Ridge Operations*  
 REPOSITORY Records Holding Center  
 COLLECTION Ship # 74-09 Loc. A-30-7  
 BOX No. HRE: 280 Box 3 of 4  
 FOLDER Special Cases 3-9 1155747

*Handwritten initials and scribbles*

1. EPA Visit: Jerry Wing advised that Francis Jung of the Tennessee Rad Health Group would not be accompanying the EPA people for their inspection here next week. I called Francis and strongly encouraged him to attend. He indicated he had serious problems with several occupational mercury poisonings in the Memphis area, and that he would not be able to be here. He indicated, however, that Bill Graham would be here for the ORNL portion of the visit. I suggested that Graham come for the entire visit rather than just parts of it so that continuity would be maintained. Francis agreed to take that suggestion.
2. UT-AEC Large Animal Irradiation Facility: Wiley Johnson advised that during their inspection of UT-AEC for VDRIF compliance that they found a sorry mess at the large animal irradiation facility. The safety light on the gate was burned out, the gate was unlocked, and the facility was operating unattended. Wiley and I agreed that this was a sad state of affairs after they just had an accident which resulted from the same lack of respect for rules and maintenance. I advised Dr. Roth and Ray Armstrong, both of whom agreed the facility should be shut down. Dr. Roth took that action.

April 16, 1971

1. Reactor Safety Appraisal: Mayhue Bell called to indicate that the local site of the RDT office would be a part of the HQ appraisal of OR reactor safety. He indicated that Shaw had made the policy decision that site offices would represent him for such things. I indicated our satisfaction of that decision. Fred Dearing will probably be the representative.
2. Large Animal Facility Shutdown: Received copies of a UT-AEC letter protesting shutdown of the large animal facility. Discussed the matter with Dr. Roth and Messrs. Armstrong and Sapirie. It was agreed that a strong contractual letter should be prepared to UT-AEC indicating the seriousness of this matter and requesting their immediate correction of safety deficiencies. This letter was later prepared with the assistance of Charlie Hill.
3. VDRIF Review: Bill Thornton and Jerry Combs advised of the initial results of their review of the VDRIF. The operating procedures are still not in good shape. Some additional instrumentation considerations have been discussed with UT-AEC. It is generally agreed that the radiation instrumentation should be used to prevent the maze door from opening. It still appears they have a way to go before they are ready to indicate compliance with the investigation report.

1. EPA Visit: Along with representatives of Waste Management and Pollution Control Branch and Carbide plants, I spent four days with EPA and State of Tennessee representatives reviewing OR liquid effluents. There were four EPA and four State representatives involved in the review. This review was significantly different from the reviews at our other sites. It was clearly indicative of things to come in waste effluent control. Despite our wealth of data, the committee seemed to want more. Also they were unwilling to discuss only quality of final effluents, but were interested in getting data from our in-plant release points. All of their discussions were aimed at pipeline criteria rather than after mixing. A number of policy matters were raised. Some of these were:
  - a. State of Tennessee still appears determined to classify White Oak Creek as a fishing stream right up into our plant.
  - b. EPA inquired why we had not submitted waste effluent performance specifications for all of our facilities. We indicated this was because AEC interprets the Executive Order to require this only for new facilities.
  - c. They asked whether we were planning to develop elaborate environmental impact statements for our existing operations-- indicating that a number of other Federal agencies were doing so. We indicated no AEC policy determination had been made to do this.
  - d. Finally, they asked what our plans were for compliance with recent implementation of the 1899 Refuse Act. We indicated again that no AEC policy had been established on this point.

The group developed numerous questions regarding each of the local facilities mostly requesting additional data of one type or another. Our greatest problems appeared in answering their questions about other than radioactive effluents. A number of questions were left to be answered after the committee's departure.

The committee gave a preliminary critique at the time of their departure. They noted a general satisfaction with the degree of self-analysis that we had already done. Some specific comments were:

- a. They noted that ORGDP and ORNL had only primary sewage treatment and that they might have to recommend secondary sewage treatment despite our quality of effluents which is good. They noted in any case that action should be taken to reduce the excess water inleakage to these plants and to find the sources of minor radioactivity inputs and eliminate these.

- b. They generally felt that contaminated laundries, however, should be routed to sanitary sewers.
- c. They noted that chromates were above permissible in our effluents and suggested continuation of our reduction programs. They noted both AEC water treatment plants deserve better handling of sludges and backwash. They agreed to supply guidelines for these.
- d. They noted there were numerous storage tanks not diked and suggested that all should be. They noted sampling techniques for uranium at production plants are too insensitive to accordingly determine very small concentrations of uranium and suggested that these be changed.

At Y-12 they did not like the S-3 ponds at all. They were termed an insult to the environment. They suggested that most wastes of significance going to these ponds be considered for recovery or recycle. They did not like the oil disposal in the burial ground even though they did not learn that there had been surface seepage. They suggested recycle of the oils. They indicated that pH fluctuations on a daily basis were still too wide coming out of New Hope Pond and suggested that discharges to East Fork be reanalyzed and better controlled. At ORNL, most all members of the committee recommended meeting MPC at the White Oak Dam. EPA suggested that projects be developed along with costs for doing this and be submitted for budgetary approval.

More detailed information on their visit will be made available later to interested groups.

1. Dempster Dumpsters. I called Gibbons' office (3-6931) and left word with Gibbons' secretary that we could not authorize the use of the Dumpsters. (Gibbons and Fulkerson were out of town.) Ken Bahler told me that he could not reach Fulkerson or Gibbons. Hence, he talked to a Ron Rahn and told him we had no authorization to do this. Bahler said he emphasized the idea that Weinberg would have to sign the letter on "programmatic interest." I sent an MRS to Gibbons, with cc's to Wende and Bahler.
2. Univ. of Florida, Contract 4155. Prof. Cerrute will not be able to get in his proposal until June 15 instead of May 15. He just moved down there from Princeton!