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# TWELFTH ANNUAL REPORT RADIATION EXPOSURES FOR DOE AND DOE CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES 1979 

## PREFACE

This report is one of a series of annual reports provided by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) summarizing occupational radiation exposures received by DOE and DOE contractor employees. These reports provide an overview of radiation exposures received each year as well as identification of trends in exposures being experienced over the years.

In 1968, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) established a program for reporting certain occupational radiation exposure information to a central radiation records repository. At the same time, a contract was made with Union Carbide Corporation at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, to computerize the processing of the radiation exposure reporting system. Annual summary reports were published from 1969 through 1973 (WASH-1350-R1 through WASH-1350-R6), and included information on AEC contractor employees and visitors, as well as employees and visitors of companies in the private sector licensed by the AEC.

In January 1975, with the separation of the AEC into the Energy Research and Development Agency (ERDA) and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), each agency assumed responsibility for collecting and maintaining occupational exposure information reported by the facilities under its jurisdiction. Former AEC licensees reported to the NRC while contractors reported to ERDA. At the same time, a contract was made with Union Carbide Corporation at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, to computerize the reporting and processing of both the ERDA and NRC radiation exposure reporting systems. On October 1, 1977, DOE was formed and assumed the responsibilities of ERDA. Processing and programming of exposure information continued at Oak Ridge until October 1978, when the management and further development of the DOE radiation exposure reporting system was assigned to the System Safety Development Center, EG\&G Idaho, Inc.; the NRC system remained at Oak Ridge.

Radiation exposure data for ERDA and ERDA contractor employees and visitors for 1974 through 1976 were reported in ERDA 76/119, ERDA 77-29, and DOE/EV-0011/9. The DOE and DOE contractor radiation exposure data for 1977, 1978, and 1979 were presented in DOE/EVO-0066/10, 11, and 12 respectively. This report is a revision of the 1979 document.

Previous reports for AEC/ERDA/DOE, government and contractor employees and visitors may be obtained from the U.S. DOE Technical Information Center, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37830.

## SUMMARY

All Department of Energy (DOE) and DOE contractors are required by DOE Order 5484.1, Chapter IV to submit occupational exposure records to a central repository. The data required include a summary of whole-body exposure to ionizing radiation, a summary of internal depositions of radioactive materials above specified limits, and occupational exposure reports for terminating employees. This report is a summary of the data submitted by DOE and DOE contractors for 1979 and is a revision of the previously published report.

A total of 104,986 DOE and DOE contractor employees were monitored for whole-body ionizing radiation exposure in 1979. This represents $81 \%$ of all DOE and DOE contractor employees and is a $3 \%$ increase over the number of individuals monitored in 1978. In addition to the employees, 89,585 visitors were also monitored.

Of all employees monitored, $47.6 \%$ received a dose equivalent that was less than measurable, $50.8 \%$ a measurable exposure less than 1 rem , and $1.6 \%$ an exposure greater than 1 rem . The exposure received by $89.1 \%$ of the visitors to DOE facilities was less than measurable. Only $10.8 \%$ of the visitors received a measurable exposure less than 1 rem , and $0.1 \%$ of the visitors received an exposure greater than 1 rem. Three DOE contractor employees at three separate facilities received whole-body dose equivalents greater than 5 rem during 1979.

The collective dose equivalent for the DOE and DOE contractor employees was 9,043 person-rem. The collective dose equivalent for visitors was 622 person-rem. The total dose equivalent for employees and visitors combined was 9,665 person-rem. The average dose equivalent for all individuals (employees and visitors) monitored was 50 mrem and the average dose equivalent for all individuals who received a measurable exposure was 150 mrem. The highest average dose equivalent was observed for employees monitored at fuel processing facilities ( 324 mrem ) and the lowest among visitors ( 7 mrem ) to DOE facilities. These averages are significantly less than the DOE 5-rem/year radiation protection standard for whole-body exposures.

Two reported cases of internal depositions were reported in 1979. In both cases, the depositions were less than the annual dose-equivalent standard. Internal depositions were the result of accidental, not planned, exposures.

A total of 9,868 monitored employees terminated their employment in 1979. The average cumulative dose equivalent for terminated employees who worked one to two years was 0.29 rem; three to four years, 0.40 rem; five to six years, 0.68 rem ; and longer than six years, 2.39 rem. The average cumulative dose equivalent for employees who terminated with more than six years of employment appears high in comparison with the other data. However, this average includes the cumulative exposure of individuals who worked for DOE or DOE contractors for over 20 years.
.

## CONTENTS

PREFACE ..... iii
SUMMARY ..... v
INTRODUCTION ..... 1
SUMMARY OF WHOLE-BODY IONIZING RADIATION EXPOSURES ..... 2
DISTRIBUTION BY DOSE INTERVAL ..... 3
DISTRIBUTION BY FACILITY TYPE ..... 9
DISTRIBUTION BY FIELD ORGANIZATION ..... 11
SUMMARY OF INTERNAL EXPOSURES ..... 14
SUMMARY OF WORKER TERMINATIONS ..... 15
APPENDIX A—DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE-BODY EXPOSURES BY FACILITY TYPE FOR EACH DOE FIELD ORGANIZATION, 1979 ..... A. 1
APPENDIX B-DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE-BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR FOR EACH DOE FIELD ORGANIZATION, 1979 ..... B. 1
APPENDIX C—DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE-BODY EXPOSURES FOR DOE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND VISITORS BY DOE FIELD ORGANIZATION, 1979 ..... C. 1

## FIGURES

1 Comparison of Number of Employees, Number of Employees Monitored, and Number of Employees Monitored Who Received No Measurable Dose Equivalent ..... 4
2 Percent of Monitored Employees and Percent of Monitored Visitors Who Received an Exposure Less Than Measurable, Less Than 1 rem, or Greater Than 1 rem ..... 5
3 Contribution of Each Dose Equivalent Interval to the Total Collective Dose Equivalent, 1979 ..... 6
4 Total Collective Dose Equivalent for all DOE/DOE Contractor Employees Who Received an Exposure Greater Than 1 rem ..... 8
5 Contribution of Each Facility Type to the Total Collective Dose Equivalent ..... 9
TABLES
1 Radiation Protection Standards for External and Internal Dose Equivalents for Individuals in Controlled Areas ..... 1
2 Distribution of Whole Body Ionizing Radiation Exposures for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors by Dose-Equivalent Interval ..... 3
3 Distribution of Whole Body Ionizing Radiation Exposures for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees, 1965-1979 ..... 7
4 Distribution of Annual Whole Body Exposures for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors by Facility Type, 1979 ..... 10
5 Collective Dose Equivalent by Facility Type for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors, 1979 ..... 11
6 Collective Dose Equivalent for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors by Field Organization, 1979 ..... 12
7 Fraction of Collective Dose Equivalent for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors Attributed to a Facility Type Within Each Field Organization, 1979 ..... 13
8 Collective Dose Equivalent for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors by Field Organization, 1974-1979 ..... 14
9 Dose Distributions for Cases of Internal Body Depositions, 1977-1979 ..... 15
Average Cumulative Dose Equivalent for Individuals Terminating in 1979 ..... 15
A. 1 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Facility Type- Albuquerque Field Organization, 1979 ..... A. 1
A. 2 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Facility Type- Chicago Field Organization, 1979 ..... A. 2
A. 3 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Facility Type- Grand Junction Field Organization, 1979 ..... A. 3
A. 4 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Facility Type- Idaho Field Organization, 1979 ..... A. 4
A. 5 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Facility Type- Nevada Field Organization, 1979 ..... A. 5
A. 6 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Facility Type- Oak Ridge Field Organization, 1979 ..... A. 6
A. 7 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Facility Type- Pittsburgh Naval Reactor Field Organization, 1979 ..... A. 7
A. 8 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Facility Type- Richland Field Organization, 1979 ..... A. 8
A. 9 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Facility Type- San Francisco Field Organization, 1979 ..... A. 9
A. 10 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Facility Type- Savannah River Field Organization, 1979 ..... A. 10
A. 11 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Facility Type- Schenectady Naval Reactor Field Organization, 1979 ..... A. 11
B. 1 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Contractor- Albuquerque Field Organization, 1979 ..... B. 1
B. 2 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Contractor- Chicago Field Organization, 1979 ..... B. 4
B. 3 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Contractor- Grand Junction Field Organization, 1979 ..... B. 6
B. 4 . Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Contractor- Idaho Field Organization, 1979 ..... B. 7
B. 5 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Contractor- Nevada Field Organization, 1979 ..... B. 10
B. 6 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Contractor- Oak Ridge Field Organization, 1979 ..... B. 13
B. 7 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Contractor- Pittsburgh Naval Reactor Field Organization, 1979 ..... B. 16
B. 8 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Contractor- Richland Field Organization, 1979 ..... B. 17
B. 9 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Contractor- San Francisco Field Organization, 1979 ..... B. 19
B. 10 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Contractor- Savannah River Field Organization, 1979 ..... B. 21
B. 11 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures by Contractor- Schenectady Naval Reactor Field Organization, 1979 ..... B. 22
C. 1 Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures for DOE Government Employees and Visitors by DOE Field Organization, 1979 ..... C. 1
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## INTRODUCTION

One of the basic Department of Energy (DOE) radiation protection policy objectives is that radiation exposures be maintained as low as is reasonably achievable (ALARA) and within the occupational exposure guidelines provided in DOE Order 5480.1, Chapter XI (Table 1). Assurance that occupational exposures do not exceed the guidelines is not considered, in itself, sufficient. All operations are to be conducted "in a manner to assure that radiation exposures to individuals and population groups are limited to the lowest levels technically and economically feasible."

TABLE 1. Radiation Protection Standards for External and Internal Dose Equivalents for Individuals in Controlled Areas

| Type of Exposure | Exposure Period | Dose Equivalent (Dose or Dose Commitment)(rem)(a) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Whole body, head and trunk, gonads, lens of the eye,(b) red bone marrow, active blood forming organs. | Year <br> Calendar quarter | $\begin{aligned} & 5(\mathrm{c}) \\ & 3^{3} \end{aligned}$ |
| Unlimited areas of the skin (except hands and forearms), other organs, tissues, and organ systems (except bone). | Year <br> Calendar quarter | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 5 \end{array}$ |
| Bone | Year <br> Calendar quarter | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| Forearms(d) | Year <br> Calendar quarter | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| Hands(d) and feet | Year <br> Calendar quarter | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ |

[^0]To assist in the determination that exposures to individuals are maintained at the lowest level practicable, DOE requires the submittal of occupational radiation exposure records to a central repository. The data required includes a summary of whole-body exposure to ionizing radiation, a summary of internal depositions of radioactive materials, and occupational exposure reports for terminating employees. The central data base also includes occupational radiation exposure information for the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) and the Energy Research and Development Agency (ERDA).

The DOE Office of Operational Safety initiated a study during FY-80 to review the status of the Radiation Records Repository. As part of that study, this revision of the Twelfth Annual Report of Radiation Exposures for DOE and DOE Contractor Employees was prepared. This report is a summary of the data submitted in 1979 by DOE and DOE contractor offices. For the purpose of trend analysis, the data is compared to that reported in previous years. The data used to prepare this report is presented in Appendix A, "Distribution of Whole Body Exposures by Facility Type for Each DOE Field Organization, 1979"; Appendix B, "Distribution of Annual Whole Body Exposures by Contractor for Each DOE Field Organization, 1979"; and Appendix C, "Distribution of Annual Whole Body Exposures for DOE Government Employees and Visitors by DOE Field Organization, 1979."

## SUMMARY OF WHOLE-BODY IONIZING RADIATION EXPOSURES

Monitoring is required by DOE Order 5480.1, Chapter XI, where the potential exists for an individual to receive a dose or dose commitment in any calendar quarter in excess of the $10 \%$ of the quarterly or annual occupational exposure guidelines shown in Table 1. Depending on the administrative policy of the contractor, monitoring may also be provided to individuals, such as clerical workers, for whom the exposure potential is extremely low.

The number of individuals who received an occupational whole-body exposure in one of 18 doseequivalent intervals ranging from "less than measurable" to "greater than 10 rem" is provided annually by each DOE contractor and DOE office. A positive, measurable exposure is any recorded exposure greater than the minimum sensitivity of a personnel monitoring device. The data is further subdivided into one of 10 facility types.

Contractors have the option of reporting the distribution of whole body-occupational dose equivalents only for those individuals for whom monitoring is required, or for all those for whom monitoring is provided. Many contractors choose to report the latter, thus increasing the number of individuals who are considered to be radiation workers. To account for this effect, the average dose equivalent per individual receiving a measurable exposure is calculated as well as the average dose equivalent per individual monitored.

The annual collective dose equivalent is calculated by multiplying the number of individuals in each dose range by the midpoint of the range, and then summing the products. This procedure allows an estimate of the collective dose equivalent to be calculated without knowledge of each individual's annual dose. However, a source of error is introduced to the calculation by the assumption that the midpoint of the dose-equivalent range is the mean dose equivalent of the individuals reported in each dose-equivalent range. Frequently, the actual mean dose equivalent in each range is less than the assumed arithmetic mean. Thus, collective dose equivalents presented in this report may be slightly higher than the actual collective dose equivalents.

## DISTRIBUTION BY DOSE INTERVAL

The number of employees and visitors who received a dose equivalent in each of 18 dose-equivalent intervals is presented in Table 2. A total of 104,986 DOE and DOE contractor employees were monitored for whole body ionizing radiation exposure in 1979. This represents $81 \%$ of all DOE and DOE contractor employees. In addition to the employees, 89,585 visitors were also monitored. Visitors may include radiation workers employed by a DOE contractor present on an interim basis at another DOE facility.

TABLE 2. Distribution of Whole Body Ionizing Radiation Exposures for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors by Dose-Equivalent Interval

| Dose Equivalent Interval (rem) | Number of Persons |  |  | Collective Person-rem |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Employees | Visitors | Total | Employees | Visitors | Total |
| <Measurable | 50,003 | 79,841 | 129,844 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Measurable to 0.10 | 42,266 | 9,333 | 51,599 | 2,113 | 467 | 2,580 |
| 0.10 to 0.25 | 5,630 | 243 | 5,873 | 985 | 43 | 1,028 |
| 0.25 to 0.50 | 3,011 | 83 | 3,094 | 1,129 | 31 | 1,160 |
| 0.50 to 0.75 | 1,512 | 46 | 1,558 | 946 | 28 | 974 |
| 0.75 to 1.00 | 816 | 13 | 829 | 714 | 11 | 725 |
| 1 to 2 | 1,286 | 23 | 1,309 | 1,929 | 34 | 1,963 |
| 2 to 3 | 416 | 3 | 419 | 1,040 | 8 | 1,048 |
| 3 to 4 | 33 | 0 | 33 | 115 | 0 | 115 |
| 4 to 5 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 45 | 0 | 45 |
| 5 to 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 6 to 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 to 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 to 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 to 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| $>10$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| TOTAL | 104,986 | 89,585 | 194,571 | 9,043 | 622 | 9,665 |

A comparison of the number of DOE and DOE contractor employees, the number of employees monitored and the number of employees monitored who did not receive a measurable dose equivalent for the past five years is presented in Figure 1. A gradual increase in the total number of employees can be observed. However, the number of employees monitored who did not receive a measurable dose equivalent has remained relatively constant until 1979, when this number increased slightly.

Of all employees monitored in 1979, 47.6\% received a dose equivalent that was less than measurable, $50.8 \%$ a measurable exposure less than 1 rem, and $1.6 \%$ an exposure greater than 1 rem (Figure 2). The exposure received by $89.1 \%$ of the visitors to DOE facilities was less than measurable. Only $10.8 \%$ of the visitors received an exposure between measurable and 1 rem , and $0.1 \%$ of the visitors received an exposure greater than 1 rem (Figure 2). Three DOE contractor employees at three separate facilities received whole-body dose equivalents greater than 5 rem during 1979.


FIGURE 2. Percent of Monitored Employees and Percent of Monitored Visitors Who Received an Exposure Less than Measurable, Less Than 1 rem, or Greater Than 1 rem

The collective dose equivalent was 9,403 person-rem for all DOE and DOE contractor employees, and 622 person-rem for visitors to DOE facilities, for a total collective dose equivalent of 9,665 person-rem. The contribution of the individuals in each dose-equivalent interval to the collective dose equivalent is shown in Figure 3. Individuals whose exposure was less than 1 rem contributed the greatest portion of the total person-rem.

The distribution of whole-body exposures for the years 1965-1979 is presented in Table 3. As can be observed in Table 3, the number of employees who received a dose equivalent greater than 1 rem has gradually declined since 1965. This same downward trend is shown in Figure 4, which shows the collective dose equivalent for all individuals from 1965-1979 who received an exposure greater than 1 rem. The collective dose equivalent for individuals who received an exposure less than 1 rem was not included because prior to 1974, a less-than-measurable exposure was not distinguished from measurable exposures in the reporting system. This decrease in the collective dose equivalent has been achieved even though some work was performed in older facilities which were not constructed using current design criteria. These trends reflect both changes in the nature of the work performed at DOE facilities and the consistent application of ALARA practices throughout all DOE operations.


FIGURE 3. Contribution of Each Dose-Equivalent Interval to the Total Collective Dose Equivalent, 1979
TABLE 3. Distribution of Whole-Body Ionizing Radiation Exposures for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees, 1965-1979


[^1]

FIGURE 4. Total Collective Dose Equivalent for All DOE/DOE Contractor Employees Who Received an Exposure Greater Than 1 rem

## DISTRIBUTION BY FACILITY TYPE

The number of individuals and the distribution of the annual whole-body exposures in each of 11 facility categories was reported to the central repository. For the purpose of this report, visitors were considered a facility type. The contribution of each facility type to the collective dose equivalent is shown in Figure 5. The largest percentage of the total collective dose equivalent was in the category "Other." Examples of facilities included in the "Other" category include construction and radioactive waste handling. "General Research" was a close second. As would be expected, the"smallest contribution was from DOE offices. A summary of the data submitted is presented in Table 4.


FIGURE 5. Contribution of Each Facility Type to the Total Collective Dose Equivalent

The average dose equivalent by facility type, per individual monitored, and per individual monitored with measurable exposure, is shown in Table 5 . The average dose equivalent per individual monitored for all facilities combined was 50 mrem. The highest average dose equivalent per individual monitored was observed at fuel processing facilities ( 324 mrem ) and the lowest was observed for visitors to DOE facilities (7 mrem).

TABLE 5. Collective Dose Equivalent for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors by Facility Type, 1979

| Facility Type | No. Individuals Monitored | No. Individuals With Measurable Exposure | Total No. Person-rem | Average Dose Equivalent (mrem) <br> Per Individual Monitored | Average Dose Equivalent (mrem) <br> Per Individual Monitored With Measurable Exposures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reactor | 6,995 | 4,368 | 1,389 | 199 | 318 |
| Fuel Fab. | 1,095 | +948 | 278 | 253 | 293 |
| Fuel Proc. | 3,730 | 2,611 | 1,209 | 324 | 463 |
| Uran. Enrich. | 11,144 | 8,680 | 466 | 42 | 54 |
| Weapon F\&T | 18,409 | 10,827 | 1,247 | 68 | 115 |
| Gen. Research | 41,711 | 13,554 | 1,845 | 44 | 136 |
| Accelerator | 3,402 | 1,615 | 492 | 145 | 305 |
| Other | 16,180 | 11,720 | 2,074 | 128 | 177 |
| Visitors | 89,585 | 9,744 | 622 | 7 | 64 |
| DOE Offices | 2,320 | 660 | 43 | 18 | 65 |
| TOTAL | 194,571 | 64,727 | 9,665 | 50 | 149 |

## DISTRIBUTION BY FIELD ORGANIZATION

For each field organization the number of employees monitored and the collective dose equivalent are shown in Table 6. Differences in the collective dose equivalent at each field organization reflect differences in the nature of the work performed and the administrative policy concerning whether the dose distribution is reported for all employees or only those for whom monitoring is required. Table 7 provides an indication of the work done at each field organization by showing the fraction of the collective dose equivalent at each field organization which is attributed to each facility type.

Trends in collective dose equivalents from 1974 to 1979 can be observed in Table 8 for each field organization.
TABLE 6. Collective Dose Equivalent for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors by Field Organization, 1979

| Field Organization | No. Individuals Monitored | No. Individuals With Measurable Exposure | Collective Dose Equivalent (Person-rem) | Average Dose Equivalent (mrem) Per Individual Monitored | Average Dose Equivalent (mrem) Per Individual Monitored With Measurable Exposures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albuquerque | 30,110 | 17,250 | 1,873 | 62 | 109 |
| Chicago | 20,101 | 5,078 | 1,061 | 53 | 209 |
| Grand Junction | 157 | 47 | 8 | 51 | 170 |
| Idaho | 41,256 | 2,552 | 876 | 21 | 343 |
| Nevada | 19,094 | 256 | 31 | 2 | 0.121 |
| Oak Ridge | 27,584 | 18,481 | 1,332 | 48 | 72 |
| Pittsburgh Naval Reactor | 2,596 | 2,091 | 196 | 76 | 93 |
| Richland | 9,729 | 8,807 | 2,571 | 264 | 292 |
| San Francisco | 30,271 | 2,593 | 264 | 9 | 102 |
| Schenectady Naval Reactor | 2,565 | 1,596 | 114 | 44 | 71 |
| Savannah River | 11,108 | 5,976 | 1,343 | 121 | 225 |
| total | 194,571 | 64,727 | 9,669 | 50 | 150 |

TABLE 7. Fraction of Collective Dose Equivalent for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors Attributed
Facility Type

| Field Organization | Facility Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{\text { Reactor }}$ | Fuel <br> Fab. | Fuel Proc. | Uran. Enrich. | Weapon F\&T | Gen. <br> Research | Acceler. | Other | Visitor | DOE Office |
| Albuquerque |  |  |  |  | 0.524 | 0.273 | 0.001 | 0.191 | 0.012 |  |
| Chicago | 0.056 |  |  |  | 0.307 | 0.456 | 0.055 | 0.126 |  |  |
| Grand Junction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| Idaho | 0.293 |  | 0.697 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.010 |
| Nevada |  |  |  |  | 0.774 |  |  |  | 0.226 |  |
| Oak Ridge |  | 0.072 |  | 0.350 | 0.158 | 0.228 |  | 0.173 | 0.017 | 0.001 |
| Pittsburgh Naval Reactor | 0.311 |  |  |  |  | 0.648 |  | 0.010 | 0.020 | 0.010 |
| Richland | 0.296 | 0.020 |  |  |  | 0.115 |  | 0.541 | 0.026 | 0.002 |
| San Francisco |  |  |  |  | 0.004 | 0.602 | 0.030 | 0.326 | 0.038 |  |
| Schenectady Naval Reactor | 0.623 |  |  |  |  | 0.316 |  | 0.009 | 0.044 | 0.00 |
| Savannah River | 0.134 | 0.098 | 0.447 |  | 0.023 | 0.065 |  | 0.221 | 0.010 | 0.002 |
| ALL FIELD ORGANIZATIONS COMBINED | 0.144 | 0.029 | 0.125 | 0.048 | 0.129 | 0.191 | 0.051 | 0.215 | 0.064 | 0.004 |

TABLE 8. Collective Dose Equivalent for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors by Field Organization, 1974-1979(a)

| Field Organization | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albuquerque | 2,405 | 2,324 | 1,437 | 2,300 | 2,399 | 1,873 |
| Chicago | 1,943 | 1,638 | 1,354 | 1,373 | 1,167 | 1,061 |
| Grand Junction | 0 | 5 | <1 | <1 | 2 | 8 |
| Idaho | 686 | 611 | 790 | 929 | 899 | 876 |
| Nevada | 58 | 55 | 25 | 49 | 47 | 31 |
| Oak Ridge | 1,178 | 1,284 | 1,351 | 1,300 | 1,566 | 1,332 |
| Pittsburgh Naval Reactor | 587 | 1,876 | 1,609 | 653 | 252 | 196 |
| Richland | 2,079 | 2,257 | 2,265 | 3,197 | 2,596 | 2,571 |
| San Francisco | 320 | 283 | 285 | 334 | 307 | 264 |
| Schenectady Naval Reactor | 261 | 1,022 | 203 | 148 | 111 | 114 |
| Savannah River | 1,434 | 1,268 | 1,278 | 1,298 | 1,289 | 1,343 |
| TOTAL | 10,951 | 12,622 | 10,597 | 11,581 | 10,635 | 9,669 |

(a)Throughout this report, minor variations in collective dose-equivalent values may occur due to computer rounding.

## SUMMARY OF INTERNAL EXPOSURES

Internal body depositions of radioactive material result from accidental, not planned, exposures. A report of internal body deposition of radioactive materials is required when:

1. any uptake of radioactive material occurred during the reporting year that either independently or when added to a current burden was estimated to result in a dose commitment to the critical organ in excess of $50 \%$ of the pertinent annual dose equivalent standard set forth in DOE Order 5484.1, Chapter XI; or when
2. any previously unreported uptake of radioactive material was determined to have been reportable according to the above criteria by reason of the most recent dose-equivalent estimates.

Table 9 gives a three-year comparison of new cases of internal body depositions. Only those cases occurring within each year are included. Cases where the effects of prior years' depositions are continuing or where a new uptake is not clearly identified are not included.

TABLE 9. Dose Distributions for Cases of Internal Body Depositions, 1977-1979

| Year | Radionuclide | Critical Organ | Dose Equivalent Interval (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 7.5-10 | 10-15 | 15-25 | 25-50 | 50-100 | 100-200 |
| 1977 | ${ }^{238} \mathrm{Pu}$ | Lung | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| 1978 | $\begin{aligned} & { }^{239 P \mathrm{Pu},{ }^{240} \mathrm{Pu},{ }^{241} \mathrm{Pu}} \\ & { }^{255} \end{aligned}$ | Lung Thyroid | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1979 | ${ }^{234} \mathrm{U},{ }^{235} \mathrm{U},{ }^{238} \mathrm{U}$ | Lung | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |

Of 16 reported body deposition cases for 1979, two are considered new and are included in Table 9. The 14 remaining cases are not included for the following reasons: in five cases, the current burden has decreased from the measured level of previous years. These instances are judged as continued tracking of a previous uptake. In eight other cases, the reported current burden was slightly higher than was previously measured, indicating either a re-evaluation of the burden, or a possible new uptake. In one final case, a 1979 dose commitment of 33.75 rem to the bone was noted to be a translocation of a reported 1977 lung deposition.

## SUMMARY OF WORKER TERMINATIONS

There were 8,968 monitored workers in 1979 who terminated their employment with DOE or DOE contractors. Table 10 gives the length of employment as well as the average cumulative dose equivalent for the workers in each time interval. These data indicate that the average cumulative dose equivalent for workers terminating in 1979 after 1 to 365 days of employment was significantly less than the 5 rem-per-year radiation protection standard for the whole body.

The average cumulative dose equivalent for workers who terminated after more than six years of employment was 2.39 rem. This average appears high in comparison with the average cumulative dose equivalent for employees who terminated with less than six years of employment. However, this average includes the cumulative exposure of individuals who worked for DOE or DOE contractors for more than 20 years.

TABLE 10. Average Cumulative Dose Equivalent for Individuals Terminating in 1979

| Length of Employment | Number of Terminated Employees | Total Cumulative Dose Equivalent (Person-rem) | Average Cumulative Dose Equivalent Per Terminated Employee (rem) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-90 days | 2,229 | 1,066 | 0.48 |
| 90-180 days | 1,003 | 222 | 0.22 |
| 180-365 days | 970 | 180 | 0.19 |
| 1-2 years | 1,240 | 364 | 0.29 |
| 3-4 years | 1,019 | 404 | 0.40 |
| 5-6 years | 490 | 332 | 0.68 |
| $>6$ years | 2,017 | 4,829 | 2.39 |

## APPENDIX A

## DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE-BODY EXPOSURES BY FACILITY TYPE FOR EACH DOE FIELD ORGANIZATION, 1979

TABLE A. 3
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY
GRAND JUNCTION FIELD O
1979

| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility Type | Total Monitored | Meas. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Meas.- } \\ 0.10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.10- \\ 0.25 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.25- \\ 0.50 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | $\underline{9-10}>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| Reactor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel Fabrication |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel Processing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uran. Enrichment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weapon F\&T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gen. Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accelerator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | 148 | 101 | 18 | 20 | 8 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| Visitors | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DOE Offices | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total | 157 | 110 | 18 | 20 | 8 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| TOTAL PERSON-REM |  |  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |


| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility Type | Total Monitored | Meas. | Meas.- $0.10$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10- \\ 0.25 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.50- \\ 0.75 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.75- \\ 1.00 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| Reactor | 3024 | 1780 | 691 | 257 | 155 | 84 | 33 | 21 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 256 |
| Fuel Fabrication |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel Processing | 2066 | 910 | 421 | 193 | 173 | 98 | 68 | 142 | 58 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 609 |
| Uran. Enrichment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weapon F\&T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gen. Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accelerator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors | 35929 | 35922 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DOE Offices | 237 | 92 | 133 | 10 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |
| TOTAL | 41256 | 38704 | 1251 | 461 | 329 | 183 | 101 | 163 | 61 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | - |  | 876 |
| TOTAL PERSON-REM |  |  | 63 | 81 | 123 | 114 | 88 | 245 | 152 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 876 |


1979

TABLE A. 7
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY
PITTSBURGH NAVAL REACCOR FI
1979
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY FACILITY TYPE
PITISBURGH NAVAL REACTOR FIELD ORGANIZATION
TABLE A. 8
distribution of annual whole body exposures by facility type RICHLAND FIELD ORGANIZATION
1979

| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility Type | Total Monitored | $<$ <br> Meas. | Meas.- <br> 0.10 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.25- \\ 0.50 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.50- \\ 0.75 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.75- \\ 1.00 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $\geq 10$ | Total Person-rem |
| Reactor | 667 | 13 | 85 | 88 | 85 | 46 | 41 | 140 | 157 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 761 |
| Fuel Fabrication | 84 | 1 | 6 | 20 | 17 | 16 | 12 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52 |
| Fuel Processing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uran. Enrichment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weapon F\&T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gen. Research | 2205 | 90 | 1525 | 367 | 109 | 45 | 31 | 36 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 296 |
| Accelerator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | 4913 | 248 | 2607 | 709 | 481 | 319 | 195 | 300 | 53 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1391 |
| Visitors | 1807 | 566 | 1206 | 30 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 67 |
| DOE Offices | 53 | 4 | 42 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| TOTAL | 9729 | 922 | 5471 | 1220 | 698 | 426 | 279 | 485 | 215 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2571 |
| TOTAL PERSON-R |  |  | 274 | 213 | 262 | 266 | 244 | 728 | 538 | 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2571 |

TOTAL PERSON-REM

| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility <br> Type | Total Monitored | Meas. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Meas.- } \\ 0.10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.50- \\ 0.75 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| Reactor | 981 | 232 | 331 | 133 | 182 | 85 | 13 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 180 |
| Fuel Fabrication | 411 | 56 | 181 | 47 | 41 | 28 | 20 | 32 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 131 |
| Fuel Processing | 1664 | 209 | 600 | 267 | 207 | 138 | 70 | 134 | 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 600 |
| Uran. Enrichment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weapon F\&T | 153 | 24 | 76 | 26 | 15 | 5 |  | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 |
| Gen. Research | 994 | 438 | 425 | 51 | 32 | 22 | 15 | 10 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 87 |
| Accelerator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | 4791 | 2387 | 1787 | 387 | 134 | 46 | 23 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 297 |
| Visitors | 1891 | 1614 | 272 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| DOE Offices | 223 | 172 | 51 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| TOTAL | 11108 | 5132 | 3723 | 916 | 611 | 324 | 141 | 212 | 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1343 |
| TOTAL PERSON-R |  |  | 186 | 161 | 229 | 203 | 123 | 318 | 123 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1343 |

APPENDIX B
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE-BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR FOR EACH DOE FIELD ORGANIZATION, 1979
TABLE B. 1
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
ALBUQUERQUE FIELD ORGANIZATION
1979
Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem)

| $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29 | 5 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 95 |
| 29 | 5 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 95 |
| 19 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| 19 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| 8 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 8 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 172 | 61 | 21 | 9 | 28 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 185 \\ 16 \end{array}$ |
| 172 | 61 | 21 | 9 | 28 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 201 |
| 73 | 40 | 15 | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 92 \\ 2 \end{array}$ |
| 73 | 40 | 15 | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 94 |兹잉

 Contractor
Albuquerque Misc.
Employees
Visitors
Total
General Electric Co.
Employees
Visitors
Total
Inhalation Toxicology
Employees
Visitors
Total
Mason \& Hanger-Silas
Employees
Visitors
Total
Monsanto Research Co.
Employees
Visitors
Total

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Contractor } \\
& \text { Rockwell International } \\
& \text { Employees } \\
& \text { Visitors } \\
& \text { Total }
\end{aligned}
$$

DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
ALBUQUERQUE FIED ORGANIZATION
1979
1979

[^2][^3][^4]\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 잇 } \\
& \text { 웅 } \\
& \Phi \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{\wedge} \mid \\
& \hat{\dagger} \mid \\
& \stackrel{\circ}{i} \mid
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { O- 욷 } \\
& \text { 8 }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ) } \sim \stackrel{m}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

(pənu!uo) L’g $318 \forall 1$


| Contractor | $<$ <br> Meas. | Meas.0.10 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The Zia Company |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 1238 | 144 | 54 | 19 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |
| Visitors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1238 | 144 | 54 | 19 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |
| U. of California/LASL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 2862 | 1060 | 231 | 154 | 84 | 41 | 64 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 360 |
| Visitors | 1207 | 78 | 17 | 4 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| Total | 4069 | 1138 | 248 | 158 | 84 | 41 | 66 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 371 |

TABLE B. 2
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR CHICAGO FIELD ORGANIZATION
1979
Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem)

(panu!ıuo)) $\boldsymbol{\sim} \cdot \boldsymbol{g} \mathbf{3 1 9} \forall 1$
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
CHICAGO FIELD ORGANIZATION
1979
TABLE B. 3
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
GRAND JUNCTION FIELD ORGANIZATION
1979

잇

$$
\stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \mid
$$

$$
\stackrel{\oplus}{\infty} \mid
$$

$$
\stackrel{\otimes}{\mathrm{N}}
$$

$$
\hat{\dot{\phi}} \mid
$$

$$
\mid
$$

$$
|\dot{f}|
$$

$$
r \quad r
$$

Contractor

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Allied Chemical Corp. } \\
& \text { Employees } \\
& \text { Visitors } \\
& \text { Total }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Arrington Const. } \\
& \text { Employees } \\
& \text { Visitors }
\end{aligned}
$$

Total
on Const.

## Biggers Const.

Employees
Visitors
Total
Bingham Mechanical


$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { TABLE B. } 4 \\
\text { DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR } \\
\text { IDAHO FIELD ORGANIZATION } \\
1979
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\begin{array}{c}
\text { Total } \\
\text { Person-rem }
\end{array} \\
\hline \\
316 \\
316 \\
\\
1 \\
1
\end{gathered}
$$

| Contractor | $<$ <br> Meas. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Meas.- } \\ 0.10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EG\&G, Idaho, Inc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 1316 | 523 | 181 | 105 | 55 | 25 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 168 |
| Visitors | 26942 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 28258 | 523 | 182 | 105 | 55 | 25 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 169 |
| Exxon Nuclear Co. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 588 | 116 | 79 | 74 | 38 | 30 | 55 | 9 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 202 |
| Visitors | 3111 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 3699 | 122 | 79 | 74 | 38 | 30 | 55 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 203 |
| Idaho Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors | 203 | 156 | 63 | 51 | 26 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 85 |
| Total | 203 | 156 | 63 | 51 | 26 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 85 |
| Jones-Boecon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors | 6 | 23 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Total | 6 | 23 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Lehigh Design Co. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors Total | 27 27 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE B. 4 (Continued)
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR IDAHO FIELD ORGANIZATION
TABLE B. 5
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR NEVADA FIELD ORGANIZATION
1979

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \xrightarrow{\begin{array}{c}
\text { Total } \\
\text { Person-rem }
\end{array}} \\
& \stackrel{\circ}{\lambda} \mid \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\circ \\
\hline 1 \\
\hline
\end{array} \\
& \text { ¢ } \\
& \stackrel{\infty}{\wedge} \mid \\
& \hat{\dagger} \mid \\
& \stackrel{\bullet}{i} \mid \\
& \stackrel{?}{4} \mid \\
& \text { m } \\
&
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Contractor } \\
\hline \\
\text { Air Resources Lab. } \\
\text { Employees } \\
\text { Visitors } \\
\text { Total } \\
\text { CER Geonuclear } \\
\text { Employees } \\
\text { Visitors } \\
\text { Total } \\
\\
\text { Defense Nuclear Agency } \\
\text { Employees } \\
\text { Visitors } \\
\text { Total } \\
\text { EG\&G, Inc. } \\
\text { Employees } \\
\text { Visitors } \\
\text { Total } \\
\text { EPA/NERC } \\
\text { Employees } \\
\text { Visitors } \\
\text { Total }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

TABLE B． 5 （Continued）
distribution of annual whole body exposures by contractor NEVADA FIELD ORGANIZATION

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { Total } \\
\text { Person-rem } \\
\hline
\end{array} \\
& -\quad- \\
& \text { の } ワ \\
& \text { 시 } \\
& \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \mid \\
& \text { \& } \\
& \text { iㅇ } \\
& \text { ค| } \\
& \stackrel{\circ}{i} \\
& \text { f| } \\
& \text { ¢ } \\
& \widetilde{\sim} \mid \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) } \\
\begin{array}{ccc}
0.25- & 0.50- & 0.75-
\end{array}
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
0.75- \\
1.00 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 웅 }
\end{aligned}
$$

Fenix \＆Scisson，Inc．
Employees
Holmes \＆Narver，Inc．
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Holmes \＆Narver，Inc．} \\ & \text { Employees } \\ & \text { Visitors }\end{aligned}$
Total
Nevada Miscellaneous
Employees
Visitors
Reynolds Electrical
U．S．Dept．of Interior
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Employees } \\ & \text { Visitors }\end{aligned}$
B． 11
TABLE B. 5 (Continued)
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR

| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contractor | $\underset{\text { Meas. }}{<}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Meas.- } \\ 0.10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| Wackenhut Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 244 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors | 67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 311 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Westinghouse Electric |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 141 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors | 91 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 232 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total nevada | 14037 | 134 | 21 | 12 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 26 |
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$$
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\infty \vee \underset{\sim}{\sim}
$$

$$
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$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& o \\
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& \sigma
\end{aligned}
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\begin{aligned}
& \infty \\
& \infty \\
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TABLE B. 6
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
OAK RIDGE FIELD ORGANIZATION
1979

$$
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$$
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$$
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\end{aligned}
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n \\
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Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem)
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\left.\begin{aligned}
& n \\
& \dot{N}
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i n & 0 \\
& 0 \\
0 & \dot{O}
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\left.\begin{array}{ll}
\dot{\theta} & n \\
\dot{0} & n \\
\dot{0} & 0
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Contractor

Comp. Animal Res. Lab.
Employees
Visitors
Total
Goodyear Atomic Corp.
Employees
Visitors
Total
National Lead Co.
Employees
Visitors
Total
Oak Ridge Assoc. Univ.
Employees
Visitors
Total
Puerto Rico Nuclear Ctr. Comp. Animal Res. Lab.
Employees
Visitors
Total
Goodyear Atomic Corp.
Employees
Visitors
Total
National Lead Co.
Employees
Visitors
Total
Oak Ridge Assoc. Univ.
Employees
Visitors
Total
Puerto Rico Nuclear Ctr.

N N N


412
412
푞ㄲㄲ Puerto Rico Nuclear Ctr. Employees Visitors
Total

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { TABLE B. } 6 \text { (Continued) } \\
& \text { DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR } \\
& \text { OAK RIDGE FIELD ORGANIZATION } \\
& 1979
\end{aligned}
$$

| Contractor | Meas. | Meas.0.10 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RMI Company |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors | 14 | 45 | 19 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| Total | 14 | 45 | 19 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| Rust Engineering Co. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors |  | 1374 | 97 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 86 |
| Total |  | 1374 | 97 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 86 |
| Union Carbide Corp./ORGDP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors |  | 7578 | 88 | 4 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 398 |
| Total |  | 7578 | 88 | 4 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 398 |
| Union Carbide Corp./Y-12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors |  | 6132 | 173 | 53 | 14 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 366 |
| Total |  | 6132 | 173 | 53 | 14 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 366 |
| Union Carbide Corp./ORNL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors | 5441 57 | 468 31 | 202 8 | 112 6 | 68 | 22 | 46 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 254 |
| Total | 5498 | 499 | 210 | 118 | 72 | 26 | 51 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 273 |

TABLE 8.7
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
PITTSBURGH NAVAL REACTOR FIELD ORGANIZATION
1979

| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contractor | Meas. | Meas.- $0.10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| Duquesne Light Co. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 1 | 204 | 72 | 37 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |
| Visitors | 14 | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Total | 15 | 244 | 72 | 37 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 42 |
| Westinghouse Electric/BAPL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 180 | 863 | 71 | 27 | 4 | 11 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 84 |
| Visitors | 76 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Total | 256 | 883 | 71 | 27 | 4 | 11 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 85 |
| Westinghouse Electric/NRF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 145 | 513 | 97 | 43 | 7 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64 |
| Visitors | 52 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64 1 |
| Total | 197 | 530 | 97 | 43 | 7 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65 |
| Westinghouse Plant Appa. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors | 29 | 12 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Total | 29 | 12 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| TOTAL PITTSBURGH | 497 | 1669 | 241 | 109 | 16 | 12 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 193 |

TABLE B.8
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
RICHLAND FIELD ORGANIZATION
1979

| Contractor | Meas. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Meas.- } \\ 0.10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Automation Industries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 28 | 218 | 16 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| Visitors | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 30 | 220 | 16 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| Pacific Northwest Laboratory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 40 | 783 | 147 | 54 | 14 | 5 | 10 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 118 |
| Visitors | 40 | 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{3}$ |
| Total | 80 | 836 | 147 | 54 | 14 | 5 | 10 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BCS Richland Inc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 4 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 5 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hanford Eng. Dev. Lab. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 50 | 742 | 220 | 55 | 31 | 26 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 177 |
| Visitors | 32 | 40 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{3}$ |
| Total | 82 | 782 | 225 | 55 | 31 | 26 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 180 |
| Hanford Environ. Health Found. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

table b. 8 (Continued)
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
RICHLAND FIELD ORGANIZATION
1979

| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contractor | $<$ <br> Meas. | Meas.- $0.10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | >10 | Total Person-rem |
| J.A. Jones Const. Co. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors | 145 | 814 3 | 197 | 210 | 204 | 129 | 189 | 26 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 746 |
| Total | 145 | 817 | 197 | 210 | 204 | 129 | 189 | 26 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 746 |
| Rockwell Hanford Oper. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 71 | 1567 | 495 | 270 | 114 | 66 | 111 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 629 |
| Visitors | 435 | 958 | 21 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 629 53 |
| Total | 506 | 2525 | 516 | 273 | 114 | 66 | 111 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 682 |
| United Nuclear Ind. Inc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 14 | 91 | 108 | 102 | 62 | 53 | 149 | 160 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 812 |
| Visitors | 3 | 47 | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 812 4 |
| Total | 17 | 138 | 112 | 104 | 62 | 53 | 149 | 160 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 816 |
| TOTAL RICHLAND | 865 | 5329 | 1214 | 697 | 426 | 279 | 485 | 215 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2561 |

TABLE B. 9 DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
SAN FRANCISCO FIELD ORGANIZATION

1979 | Total |
| :---: |
| Person-rem |
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 | Contractor |
| :--- |
|  |
| Rockwell International |
| Energy Systems Group |
| Employees |
| Visitors |
| Total |
| Stanford Linear Accel. Ctr. |
| Employees |
| Visitors |
| Total |
| U. of California/LBL |
| Employees |
| Visitors |
| Total |
| U. of California/LLL |
| Employees |
| Visitors |
| Total |
| U. of California/LEHR |
| Employees |
| Visitors |
| Total |

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { TABLE B. } 9 \text { (Continued) } \\
\text { DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR } \\
\text { SAN FRANCISCO FIELD ORGANIZATION } \\
1979
\end{gathered}
$$


tableb. 11


| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contractor | $<$ <br> Meas. | Meas.- <br> 0.10 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $\geq 10$ | Total Person-rem |
| General Electric Co. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 745 | 1336 | 105 | 34 | 7 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 107 |
| Visitors | 192 | 73 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Total | 937 | 1409 | 107 | 35 | 8 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 112 |
| General Electric/MAO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 24 | 16 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Visitors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 24 | 16 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| TOTAL SCHENECTADY | 961 | 1425 | 108 | 35 | 8 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 113 |

TOTAL DOE CONTRACTORS

## APPENDIX C

## DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE-BODY EXPOSURES FOR DOE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND VISITORS BY DOE FIELD ORGANIZATION, 1979



| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Organization | Meas. | Meas.- $0.10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total <br> Person-rem |
| Albuquerque Operations | 196 | 120 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| Amarillo Area Office | 1 | 22 | 11 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Dayton Area Office | 5 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Kansas City Area Office | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Los Alamos Area Office | 252 | 79 |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| Pinellas Area Office | 6 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rocky Flats Area Office |  | 61 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Sandia Area Office | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 470 | 303 | 15 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 |
| Chicago Operations | 16 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental Meas. Lab. | 28 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| New Brunswick Lab. | 55 | 9 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| TOTAL | 99 | 19 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |

C. 1
Inate., 1 Coninimed
distribution of annual whole-body exposures for DOE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND VIIITORS BY DOE FIELD ORGANIZATION


 TOTAL DOE GOVERNMENT
Penalty for Private Use, $\$ 300$



[^0]:    (a)To meet the dose commitment standards above, operations must be conducted in such a manner that it would be unlikely that an individual would assimilate in a critical organ, by inhalation, ingestion, or absorption, a quantity of radionuclide(s) that would commit the individual to an organ dose which exceeds the limits specified in this table.
    (b)A beta exposure below a maximum energy of 700 keV will not penetrate the lens of the eye; therefore, the applicable limit for these energies would be that for the skin ( $15 \mathrm{rem} /$ year).
    (c) In special cases with the approval of the Director, Division of Operational and Environmental Safety, a worker may exceed $5 \mathrm{rem} / \mathrm{year}$ provided his/her average exposure per year since age 18 will not exceed 5 rem/year.
    (d)All reasonable effort shall be made to keep exposure of forearms and hands to the general limit for the skin.

[^1]:    (a )Separation of data prior to 1974 is unavailable.

[^2]:    Ross Aviation, Inc.
    Employees
    Visitors
    Total
    Sandia Laboratories, NM
    Employees
    Visitors
    Total

[^3]:    Sandia Laboratories, CA

[^4]:    Employees
    Visitors
    Total
    The Bendix Corp. Employees

