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# THIRTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT RADIATION EXPOSURES FOR DOE AND DOE CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES 1980 

## 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/EV-0066/10, 11, and 12, respectively. This report contains 1980 radiation exposure data for DOE and DOE contractors. A revised version of the 1979 report was issued.

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 includes a summary of whole-body exposures 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 1980.

A total of 85,465 DOE and DOE contractor employees were monitored for whole-body ionizing radiation exposures in 1980. This represents $62.1 \%$ of all DOE and DOE contractor employees and is a decrease from the number of individuals monitored in 1979. In addition to the employees, 87,590 visitors were monitored.

Of all employees monitored, $52.72 \%$ received a dose equivalent that was less than measurable, $45.51 \%$ a measurable exposure less than 1 rem , and $1.77 \%$ an exposure greater than 1 rem. The exposure received by $87.96 \%$ of the visitors to DOE facilities was less than measurable. Only $12.03 \%$ of the visitors received a measurable exposure less than 1 rem, and $0.01 \%$ of the visitors received an exposure greater than 1 rem. No employees or visitors received a dose equivalent greater than 4 rem.

The collective dose equivalent for DOE and DOE contractor employees was 7,405 person-rem. The collective dose equivalent for visitors was 619 person-rem. The total dose equivalent for employees and visitors combined was 8,024 person-rem. The average dose equivalent for all individuals (employees and visitors) monitored was 46 mrem and the average dose equivalent for all employees who received a measurable exposure was 187 mrem . The highest average dose equivalent was observed for employees monitored at fuel processing facilities ( 333 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.

Five cases of internal depositions were reported in 1980. In all cases, the depositions were less than the annual dose-equivalent standard. Internal depositions were the result of accidental, not planned, exposures.

A total of 8,968 monitored employees terminated their employment in 1980. The average cumulative dose equivalent for terminated employees who worked one to two years was 0.36 rem; three to four years, 0.57 rem; five to six years, 0.57 rem ; and longer than six years, 2.97 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.

Seven individuals terminated their employment with two or more DOE employers during one calendar quarter in 1980. The average individual quarterly dose equivalent for these transient workers was 1.22 rem, which is less than the quarterly radiation protection standard of 3 rem.
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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 | $\begin{aligned} & 5(\mathrm{c}) \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 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( ${ }^{\text {d }}$ ) | Year Calendar quarter | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| Hands(d) and feet | Year <br> Calendar quarter | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ |

(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 ( $15 \mathrm{rem} / \mathrm{year}$ ).
(c) In special cases with the approval of the Director, Division of Operational and Environmental Safety, a worker may exceed 5 rem/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.

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).
This report is a summary of the data submitted in 1980 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, 1980"; Appendix B, "Distribution of Annual Whole Body Exposures by Contractor for Each DOE Field Organization, 1980"; and Appendix C, "Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures for DOE Government Employees and Visitors by DOE Field Organization, 1980."

## 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 into 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 ranges is presented in Table 2. There were no DOE employees or visitors who received a dose equivalent greater than 4 rem. A total of 85,465 DOE and DOE contractor employees were monitored for whole-body ionizing radiation exposure in 1980. This represents $62.1 \%$ of all DOE and DOE contractor employees. In addition to the employees, 87,590 visitors were monitored at DOE facilities. Visitors may include radiation workers from another DOE facility present on an interim basis.

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

Dose-Equivalent Interval


| Employess |  | Visitors |  | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 45,054 |  | 77,045 |  | 122,099 |
| 29,384 |  | 10,109 |  | 39,493 |
| 4,902 |  | 341 |  | 5,243 |
| 2,674 |  | 62 |  | 2,736 |
| 1,244 |  | 18 |  | 1,262 |
| 691 |  | 9 |  | 700 |
| 1,113 |  | 4 |  | 1,117 |
| 387 |  | 2 |  | 389 |
| 16 |  | 0 |  | 16 |
| 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 85,465 |  | 87,590 |  | 173,055 |


| Collective Person-rem |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employees | Visitors | Total |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1,470 | 505 | 1,975 |
| 858 | 60 | 918 |
| 1,003 | 23 | 1,026 |
| 777 | 12 | 789 |
| 604 | 8 | 612 |
| 1,670 | 6 | 1,676 |
| 967 | 5 | 972 |
| 56 | 0 | 56 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7,405 | 619 | 8,024 |

A comparison of DOE and DOE contractor employees, the number of employees monitored and the number of employees who did not receive a measurable dose equivalent in the last five years is presented in Figure 1. The number of employees monitored in 1980 decreased from the number reported in previous years (Figure 1). This was primarily due to the decision of a contractor to report only the dose-equivalent distribution for those employees for whom monitoring is required rather than all employees.

Of all employees monitored, $52.72 \%$ received a dose equivalent that was less than measurable, $45.51 \%$ a measurable exposure less than 1 rem , and $1.77 \%$ an exposure greater than 1 rem (Figure 2). The exposure received by $87.96 \%$ of the visitors to DOE facilities was less than measurable. Only $12.03 \%$ of the visitors received an exposure between measurable and 1 rem, and $0.01 \%$ of the visitors received an exposure greater than 1 rem (Figure 2).
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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 7,405 person-rem for all DOE and DOE contractor employees, and 619 person-rem for visitors to DOE facilities, for a total collective dose equivalent of 8,024 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 1965-1980 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 in the occupational exposures can be observed in Figure 4 that shows the collective dose equivalent for all individuals from 1965 to 1980 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. This trend reflects 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, 1980
TABLE 3. Distribution of Whole-Body lonizing Radiation Exposures for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees, 1965-1980

| Year | Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Monitored |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0-1(a) |  |  | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | 10-11 | 11-12 | >12 |  |
|  | <Meas. | Meas. -1 | 1-2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1965 |  | 360 | 4,158 | 1,704 | 515 | 294 | 70 | 32 | 26 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 2 |  | 135,214 |
| 1966 |  | 522 | 3,706 | 1,630 | 593 | 313 | 88 | 47 | 24 | 6 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 137,932 |
| 1967 |  | 510 | 3,472 | 1,572 | 555 | 168 | 35 | 29 | 23 | 17 | 4 | 1 |  |  | 108,386 |
| 1968 |  | 206 | 2,799 | 1,408 | 425 | 144 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 107,986 |
| 1969 |  | 625 | 2,554 | 1,313 | 335 | 86 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 102,918 |
| 1970 |  | 185 | 2,698 | 1,329 | 279 | 158 | 5 | 4 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 96,661 |
| 1971 |  | 640 | 2,380 | 888 | 275 | 118 | 8 | 3 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 94,315 |
| 1972 |  | 077 | 2,130 | 929 | 219 | 95 | 8 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 89,460 |
| 1973 |  | , 071 | 1,944 | 727 | 172 | 60 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 91,977 |
| 1974 | 43,184 | 32,500 | 1,667 | 688 | 149 | 40 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 78,232 |
| 1975 | 43,310 | 42,141 | 1,846 | 753 | 232 | 142 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 88,425 |
| 1976 | 40,083 | 47,886 | 1,679 | 475 | 70 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 90,200 |
| 1977 | 43,017 | 49,948 | 1,579 | 545 | 103 | 23 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 95,220 |
| 1978 | 44,898 | 55,296 | 1,323 | 439 | 53 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 102,020 |
| 1979 ${ }^{(b)}$ | 50,003 | 53,235 | 1,286 | 416 | 33 | 10 | 1 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 2 | 104,986 |
| 1980 | 45,054 | 38,895 | 1,113 | 387 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 85,465 |

(a)Separation of data prior to 1974 is unavailable.
(b)The 1979 data differs slightly from those listed in the original 1979 report because of an error in the dose-equivalent calculation by a contractor.


FIGURE 4. Total Collective Dose Equivalent for All DOE/DOE Contractor Employees Who Received an Exposure Greater Than 1 rem, 1965-1980

## 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 radioactive waste handling and construction. "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
TABLE 4. Distribution of Annual Whole-Body Exposures for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors by Facility Type, 1980


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 46 mrem . The highest average dose equivalent per individual monitored was observed at fuel processing facilities ( 333 mrem ) and the lowest was observed for visitors to DOE facilities ( 7 mrem ). The average dose equivalent per individual monitored with a measurable exposure was 158 mrem . The highest average dose equivalent for all monitored employees was observed at fuel processing facilities ( 442 mrem ) and the lowest was observed for DOE office personnel ( 56 mrem ).

TABLE 5. Collective Dose Equivalent for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors by Facility Type, 1980

| Facility Type | No. Individuals Monitored | No. Individuals With Measurable Exposure | Total No. Person-rem | Average Dose Equivalent (mrem) Per Individual Monitored | Average Dose Equivalent (mrem) Per Individual Monitored With Measurable Exposures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reactor | 6,921 | 4,267 | 1,185 | 171 | 277 |
| Fuel Fab. | 2,102 | 1,368 | 323 | 153 | 236 |
| Fuel Proc. | 3,147 | 2,369 | 1,047 | 333 | 442 |
| Uran. Enrich. | 1,871 | 1,336 | 156 | 83 | 117 |
| Weapon F\&T | 15,904 | 7,245 | 869 | 54 | 120 |
| Gen. Research | 36,110 | 13,177 | 1,611 | 44 | 122 |
| Accelerator | 5,315 | 1,968 | 412 | 77 | 209 |
| Other | 12,037 | 8,167 | 1,773 | 147 | 217 |
| Visitors | 87,590 | 10,545 | 619 | 7 | 58 |
| DOE Offices | 2,058 | 514 | 29 | 14 | 56 |
| TOTAL | 173,055 | 50,956 | 8,024 | 46 | 158 |

## 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 for those for whom monitoring is required. Table 7 provides an indication of the work done at each field organization by showing what fraction of the collective dose equivalent at each field organization is attributed to each facility type. Trends in collective dose equivalent from 1975 to 1980 can be observed for each field organization in Table 8.
TABLE 6. Collective Dose Equivalent for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors by Field Organization, 1980

| Average Dose Equivalent (mem) |
| :---: |
| Per Individual Monitored |
| With Measurable Exposures |
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TABLE 7. Fraction of Collective Dose Equivalent for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors Attributed to a Facility Type Within Each Field Organization, 1980

| Field Organization | Facility Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{\text { Reactor }}$ | Fuel Fab. | Fuel Proc. | Uran. Enrich. | Weapon F\&T | Gen. Research | Acceler. | Other | Visitor | DOE Office |
| Albuquerque |  |  |  |  | 0.45 | 0.30 |  | <0.01 | 0.24 | 0.01 |
| Chicago | 0.04 |  |  |  |  | 0.32 | 0.44 | 0.09 | 0.11 |  |
| Grand Junction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| Idaho | 0.31 |  | 0.68 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01 |
| Nevada |  |  |  |  | 0.44 |  |  |  | 0.46 |  |
| Oak Ridge |  | 0.18 |  | 0.26 | 0.08 | 0.36 |  | 0.10 | 0.02 |  |
| Pittsburgh Naval Reactor | 0.42 |  |  |  |  | 0.52 |  | 0.01 | . 04 | 0.01 |
| Richland | 0.29 | 0.02 |  |  |  | 0.09 |  | 0.58 | 0.02 | <0.01 |
| San Francisco |  | 0.21 |  |  | 0.01 | 0.69 | 0.03 |  | 0.06 |  |
| Savannah River | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.46 |  | 0.02 | 0.06 |  | 0.22 | 0.01 | <0.01 |
| Schenectady Naval Reactor | 0.56 |  |  |  |  | 0.37 |  | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.01 |
| ALL FIELD ORGANIZATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMBINED | 0.15 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 0.20 | 0.05 | 0.22 | 0.08 | <0.01 |

TABLE 8. Collective Dose Equivalent for DOE/DOE Contractor Employees and Visitors by Field Organization, 1975-1980(a)

| Field Organization | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albuquerque | 2,324 | 1,437 | 2,300 | 2,399 | 1,873 | 1,700 |
| Chicago | 1,638 | 1,354 | 1,373 | 1,167 | 1,061 | 918 |
| Grand Junction | 5 | <1 | <1 | 2 | 8 | 9 |
| Idaho | 611 | 790 | 929 | 899 | 876 | 593 |
| Nevada | 55 | 25 | 49 | 47 | 55 | 50 |
| Oak Ridge | 1,284 | 1,351 | 1,300 | 1,566 | 1,332 | 604 |
| Pittsburgh Naval Reactor | 1,876 | 1,609 | 653 | 252 | 196 | 186 |
| Richland | 2,257 | 2,265 | 3,197 | 2,596 | 2,571 | 2,256 |
| San Francisco | 283 | 285 | 334 | 307 | 264 | 240 |
| Schenectady Naval Reactor | 1,022 | 203 | 148 | 111 | 114 | 79 |
| Savannah River | 1,268 | 1,278 | 1,298 | 1,289 | 1,343 | 1,391 |
| TOTAL | 12,622 | 10,597 | 11,581 | 10,635 | 9,693 | 8,024 |

$\overline{\text { (a)Throughout this report, minor variations in collective dose-equivalent values may occur due }}$ to computer rounding.
(b)The 1979 data differ slightly from those listed in the 1979 report because of an error in the dose-equivalent calculation by a contractor.

## 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 four-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, 1977-1980

| Year | Radionuclide | Critical <br> 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 | $\begin{aligned} & { }^{239} \mathrm{Pu},{ }^{240} \mathrm{Pu},{ }^{241} \mathrm{Pu} \end{aligned}$ | Lung <br> Thyroid | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1979 | ${ }^{234} \mathrm{U},{ }^{235} \mathrm{U},{ }^{238} \mathrm{U}$ | Lung | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1980 | $\begin{aligned} & { }^{238} \mathrm{Pu} \\ & { }^{234} \mathrm{U}, 235 \mathrm{U},{ }^{238} \mathrm{U} \end{aligned}$ | Bone Lung | 1 |  | 3(a) | 1(b) |  |  |

[^0]Of 13 reported internal deposition cases for 1980, five are considered new and are included in Table 9. The 8 remaining cases are not included for the following reasons: in seven 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 one other case, the reported current burden was slightly higher than was previously measured, indicating either a re-evaluation of the burden, or a possible new uptake.

## SUMMARY OF WORKER TERMINATIONS

A total of 8,929 monitored workers terminated their employment with DOE or DOE contractors in 1980. 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 1980 after 1 to 365 days of employment was significantly less than the 5 rem/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 2.97 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 1980

| Length of Employment | Number of Terminated Employees | Total Cumulative Dose Equivalent (Person-rem) | Average Cumulative Dose Equivalent Per Terminated Employee (rem) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-90 days | 1,709 | 596.54 | 0.35 |
| 90-180 days | 892 | 265.42 | 0.30 |
| 180-365 days | 1,164 | 472.32 | 0.41 |
| 1-2 years | 1,267 | 460.31 | 0.36 |
| 3-4 years | 1,281 | 735.59 | 0.57 |
| 5-6 years | 566 | 321.30 | 0.57 |
| $>6$ years | 2,050 | 6082.14 | 2.97 |

## SUMMARY OF TRANSIENT WORKERS

Seven individuals terminated their employment with two or more employers during one calendar quarter in 1980. The average individual quarterly dose equivalent for these transient workers was 1.22 rem, which is less than the quarterly radiation protection standard of 3 rem for the whole body (Table 1). This average dose equivalent is greater than that observed in 1979, when the two individuals who terminated with two or more employers in one calendar quarter did not receive a measurable dose equivalent (Table 11).

TABLE 11. Summary of Transient Workers, 1973-1980

| Year | Number of Transient Workers | Total Person-rem Accumulated | Average Individual Quarterly Exposure (rem) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1973 | 62 | 140.49 | 2.27 |
| 1974 | 26 | 31.19 | 1.20 |
| 1975 | 8 | 22.71 | 2.84 |
| 1976 | 9 | 2.48 | 0.28 |
| 1977 | 12 | 2.01 | 0.17 |
| 1978 | 9 | 0.20 | 0.02 |
| 1979 | 2 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 1980 | 7 | 8.55 | 1.22 |
| TOTAL | 135 | 207.63 | 1.54 |

## APPENDIX A

DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE-BODY EXPOSURES BY FACILITY TYPE FOR EACH DOE FIELD ORGANIZATION, 1980

TABLE A. 2
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY FACILITY TYPE
CHICAGO FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980

TABLE A. 4
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY
IDAHO FIELD ORGAN
1980

| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility <br> Type | Total Monitored | Meas. | Meas.- $0.10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.25- \\ 0.50 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.50- \\ 0.75 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 |  | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| Reactor | 3014 | 1934 | 682 | 219 | 100 | 41 | 14 | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 184 |
| Fuel Fabrication |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel Processing | 1350 | 617 | 298 | 104 | 80 | 65 | 34 | 109 | 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 404 |
| Uran. Enrichment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weapon F\&T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gen. Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accelerator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors | 34058 | 34057 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DOE Offices | 229 | 142 | 82 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| TOTAL | 38651 | 36750 | 1063 | 328 | 180 | 106 | 48 | 133 | 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 593 |
| TOTAL PERSON-REM |  |  | 53 | 57 | 68 | 66 | 42 |  | 107 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 593 |


| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility <br> Type | Total Monitored | Meas. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Meas.- } \\ 0.10 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10- \\ 0.25 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $\geq 10$ | Total Person-rem |
| Reactor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel Fabrication | 722 | 134 | 320 | 146 | 74 | 22 | 18 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 111 |
| Fuel Processing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uran. Enrichment | 1871 | 535 | 861 | 364 | 87 | 19 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156 |
| Weapon F\&T | 287 | 21 | 127 | 75 | 47 | 12 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 |
| Gen. Research | 1419 | 552 | 524 | 141 | 83 | 47 | 24 | 37 | 10 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 216 |
| Accelerator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | 1119 | 7 | 1098 | 11 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58 |
| Visitors | 410 | 329 | 56 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |
| DOE Offices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 5828 | 1578 | 2986 | 745 | 303 | 105 | 52 | 48 | 10 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 604 |
| TOTAL PERSON-RE |  |  | 149 | 130 | 114 | 66 | 45 | 72 | 25 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 604 |

TABLE A. 7
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY FACIIITY TYPE
PITISBURGH NAVAL REACTORS FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980

| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility Type | Total Monitored | Meas. | Meas.0.10 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.25- \\ 0.50 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| Reactor | 947 | 106 | 651 | 131 | 52 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 79 |
| Fuel Fabrication |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel Processing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uran. Enrichment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weapon F\&T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gen. Research | 1342 | 214 | 944 | 116 | 56 | 10 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 97 |
| Accelerator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | 26 | 11 | 14 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Visitors | 239 | 109 | 130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| DOE Offices | 52 | 9 | 41 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| total | 2606 | 449 | 1780 | 250 | 108 | 17 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 186 |
| TOTAL PERSON-REM |  |  | 89 | 44 | 40 | 11 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 186 |

dISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY FACILITY TYPE RICHLAND FIELD ORGANIZATION

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Total } \\ \text { Person-rem }\end{array}$ |
| :---: |
| 652 |
| 39 |

ce $s$
$\downarrow \varepsilon$
$.0 \downharpoonright \varepsilon \iota$

$9\llcorner Z$

| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility Type | Total Monitored | $<$ <br> Meas. | Meas.0.10 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.25- \\ 0.50 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.50- \\ 0.75 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $\geq 10$ | Total Person-rem |
| Reactor | 685 | 15 | 172 | 79 | 71 | 37 | 39 | 136 | 134 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 652 |
| Fuel Fabrication | 82 | 1 | 17 | 26 | 19 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39 |
| Fuel Processing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uran. Enrichment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weapon F\&T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gen. Research | 2273 | 273 | 1640 | 209 | 78 | 30 | 26 | 16 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 216 |
| Accelerator |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | 4664 | 498 | 2480 | 520 | 404 | 226 | 146 | 301 | 89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1310 - |
| Visitors | 1697 | 1086 | 596 | 10 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { DOE Offices } & 65 & 10 & 44 & 9 & 2 & \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total | 9466 | 1883 | 4949 | 853 | 577 | 303 | 213 | 456 | 230 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2256 |
| TOTAL |  |  | 248 | 149 | 217 | 190 | 186 | 684 | 575 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2256 |

$$
\dot{\infty} \mid
$$

$8 \cdot \forall 318 \forall 1$

[^1]distribution of annual whole abdo
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY FACILITY TYPE SAVANNAH RIVER FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980


## APPENDIX B

## DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE-BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR FOR EACH DOE FIELD ORGANIZATION, 1980

| TABLE B. 1 <br> DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR ALBUQUERQUE FIELD ORGANIZATION <br> 1980 <br> Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contractor | $<$ <br> Meas. | Meas.- <br> 0.10 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | $\underline{9-10}>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| Albuquerque Misc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors |  | 862 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44 |
| Total |  | 862 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44 |
| General Electric Co. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors | 239 7 | $\begin{array}{r} 105 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | 18 | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| Total | 246 | 106 | 18 | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| Inhalation Toxicology |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 298 | 54 | 7 | 3 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors | 273 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| Total | 571 | 56 | 7 | 3 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| Mason \& Hanger-Silas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 106 | 448 | 117 | 43 | 28 | 5 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors Total | 861 | 78 | 1 | 43 | 28 | 5 | 27 | 10 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 153 |
| Total | 967 | 526 | 117 | 43 | 28 | 5 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 157 |
| Monsanto Research Co. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 613 | 860 | 61 | 18 | 8 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors | 707 | 20 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70 |
| Total | 1320 | 880 | 61 | 18 | 8 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 71 |

TABLE B. 1 (Continued)
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR

| Contraetor | $<$ <br> Meas. | Meas.0.10 | $0.10-$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \end{aligned}$ | $0.50-$ | $0.75-$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | $9-10>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rockwell International |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees |  | 3192 | 286 | 185 | 88 | 65 | 59 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 489 |
| Visitors |  | 6674 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 334 |
| Total |  | 9866 | 286 | 185 | 88 | 65 | 59 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 823 |
| Ross Aviation, Inc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 46 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 46 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sandia Laboratories, NM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 1968 | 492 | 66 | 19 | 13 | , | 5 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 69 |
| Visitors | 1370 | 313 | 24 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 |
| Total | 3338 | 805 | 90 | 20 | 16 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 92 |
| Sandia Laboratories, CA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 624 | 260 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 14 |
| Visitors | 147 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 771 | 261 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| Teledyne Isotopes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees <br> Visitors | 22 | 1 | 6 | 7 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Total | 22 | 1 | 6 | 7 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |

DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
ALBUQUERQUE FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980

| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contractor | $<$ <br> Meas. | Meas.0.10 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | >10 | Total Person-rem |
| The Bendix Corp. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors | 188 | 30 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Total | 188 | 30 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| The Zia Company |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors | 1082 | 264 | 23 | 15 | 4 | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 |
| Total | 1082 | 264 | 23 | 15 | 4 | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 |
| University of California |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 2719 | 1246 | 221 | 127 | 79 | 44 | 77 | 9 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors | 944 | 328 | 80 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 388 39 |
| Total | 3663 | 1574 | 301 | 135 | 81 | 45 | 79 | 9 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 427 |
| TOTAL ALBUQUERQUE | 12214 | 15237 | 918 | 433 | 228 | 126 | 174 | 24 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1687 |


| Contractor | $<$ <br> Meas. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Meas.- } \\ & 0.10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ames Laboratory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 75 | 31 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 |
| Visitors | 124 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Total | 199 | 45 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28 |
| Argonne National Lab. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 2239 | 439 | 176 | 104 | 69 | 34 | 13 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 192 |
| Visitors | 3703 | 79 | 24 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |
| Total | 5942 | 518 | 200 | 106 | 69 | 34 | 13 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 201 |
| Brookhaven National Lab. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 183 | 1281 | 267 | 105 | 59 | 29 | 39 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 300 |
| Visitors | 88 | 279 | 80 | 15 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47 |
| Total | 271 | 1560 | 347 | 120 | 62 | 33 | 41 | 11 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 347 |
| Chicago Misc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 308 | 310 | 74 | 16 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 89 |
| Visitors | 296 | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Total | 604 | 355 | 75 | 16 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 91 |
| Fermi National Accel. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 1185 | 648 | 152 | 61 | 22 | 15 | 21 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 143 |
| Visitors | 2189 | 482 | 56 | 16 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 42 |
| Total | 3374 | 1130 | 208 | 77 | 25 | 15 | 21 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 185 |


DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
CHICAGO FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980

ع`g $378 \forall 1$
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
GRAND JUNCTION FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980

distribution of annual whole body
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
IDAHO FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980

$\boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega}$
$\stackrel{\text { 잇 }}{\wedge}$
잏
が
$\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{p}{1}}$
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$\pm \mid$


$\begin{array}{ll}1 & n \\ \substack{n \\ 0 \\ 0} & 0\end{array}$
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m
$\underset{\sim}{N}$
Dose Equivalent Ranges
 $-$

| $d$ | $n$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0 |  |

- 



| ¢ |
| :---: |

Contractor
Contractor
Arrington Const.
Employees
Visitors
Total
Biggers Const

C-L Electric Company
Employees
Visitors
Total
EG\&G, Idaho, Inc.
Employees
Visitors
Total
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| Contractor |
| :---: |
| Exxon Nuclear Co. |
| Employees |
| Visitors |
| Total |
| Idaho Miscellaneous |
| Employees |
| Visitors |
| Total |
| Jones-Boecon |
| Employees |
| Visitors |
| Total |
| Lehigh Design Co. |
| Employees |
| Visitors |
| Total |
| Morrison-Knudsen |
| Employees |
| Visitors. |
| Total |

（pənu！u⿺辶）t゚g $378 \forall 1$
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
IDAHO FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980

TABLE B. 5
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
NEVADA FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980

 Contractor
Air Resources Lab. Employees Employees
Visitors

Total

CER Geonuclear
Employees
Visitors
Total
Defense Nuclear Agency
Employees
Visitors
Total
Eberline Instrument
Employees
Visitors
Total
EG\&G, Inc.
Employees
Visitors
Visitors
Total
B. 10
TABLE B． 5 （Continued）
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
NEVADA FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980
TABLE B． 5 （Continued）
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
NEVADA FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980

| Total |
| :---: |
| Person－rem |

$\stackrel{ }{ }$
잉
$\infty$
$\infty$
$\infty$

| $\infty$ |
| :--- |
|  |

6｜
6
$\dot{\circ}$
$n$
$\vdots$
$\vdots$
+1
$m$
Dose Equivalent Ranges（rem）


$\begin{array}{cc}\dot{n} & \\ \dot{\sim} & 0 \\ \dot{\sim} & 0\end{array}$
$V \underset{\underset{\sim}{\dot{\omega}}}{\dot{\sim}} \mid$
$N$
2 2－
$\boldsymbol{r}$
$\underset{\sim}{2}$
Contractor
Environmental Protec．
Holmes \＆Narver，Inc．
Employees
Total
Nevada Misc．
Employees
Visitors
Reynolds Electrical
Employees
Visitors
Total
旁芳荡
Environmental Protec．
Employees
Visitors
Total
Fenix \＆Scisson，Inc．
Employees
Visitors
Total
Holmes \＆Narver，Inc．
Employees
Visitors
Total
Nevada Misc．
Employees
Visitors
Total
Reynolds Electrical
Employees
Visitors
Total
TABLE B. 5
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
NEVADA FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980

| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. Department of Interior |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 100 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors | 20 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Total | 120 | 7 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wackenhut Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 258 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 290 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Westinghouse Electric |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 123 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors | 81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 204 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL NEVADA | 15717 | 388 | 45 | 8 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 |

TABLE B． 6
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
OAK RIDGE FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980

| 高镸\| | －－ | $\bar{\square}$ | 5 | \％ | 끙 |  | \％ | $\wedge \infty$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 잇 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{\square}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\dot{\oplus} \mid$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| m ${ }^{\text {｜}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { r｜}}{ }$ |  | － | － | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |  |  |  |
| مٌ |  | $\checkmark$ | ＋ | $\cong$ | $\cong$ |  |  |  |
| 骨迵 |  | $\%$ | $\%$ | ＊ | ～ |  |  |  |
| 突 ${ }_{0}^{0} \mathrm{O}$ |  | N | N | $?$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\sim$ | $\sim$ | in in |
|  |  | 욱 | 육 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\otimes}{\square}$ | ส | ＊ | $\bigcirc$ 2 |
|  | $F^{N}$ | \％ | \％ | ® | \％ | $F$ | $E$ | テの～～～ |
| $\checkmark \stackrel{\stackrel{\iota}{\dot{¢}}}{\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{E}}}$ | ざ セ～ | \％ | \＆ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | 8 | \％ |  |



| Contractor | $<$ <br> Meas. | Meas.- $0.10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $>10$ | Total Person-rem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Union Carbide Corp./Paducah |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors | 102 | 292 | 56 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 |
| Total | 102 | 292 | 56 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 |
| Woven Structures, Inc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees Visitors |  | 3 |  | 13 | 7 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| Total |  | 3 |  | 13 | 7 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| TOTAL OAK RIDGE | 1578 | 2986 | 745 | 303 | 105 | 52 | 48 | 10 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 605 |


TABLE B. 8
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
$\underset{1980}{ }$

TABLE B. 8 (Continued) distinuino or annuat whotr body extosuris



Rockwell International
Energy Systems Group
Employees
Visitors
Total
Stanford Linear Accel. Ctr.
Employees
Visitors
Total
University of California/LBL
Employees
Visitors
Total
University of California/LLL
Employees
Visitors
Total
University of California/LEHR
Employees
Visitors
Total
TABLE B. 9 (Continued)
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY EXPOSURES BY CONTRACTOR
SAN FRANCISCO FIELD ORGANIZATION
1980

| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 |
| University of California/LNM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 114 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Visitors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 114 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| University of California/MC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visitors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of California/NTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employees | 83 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Visitors | 993 | 77 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Total | 1076 | 85 | 8 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| TOTAL SAN FRANCISCO | 27614 | 2752 | 200 | 51 | 19 | 11 | 13 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 240 |


TABLE B. 11
DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE BODY
SCHENECTADY NAVAL REACTORS
1980


## APPENDIX C

## DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE-BODY EXPOSURES FOR DOE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND VISITORS BY DOE FIELD ORGANIZATION, 1980




## TABLE C. 1 (Continued) DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL WHOLE-BODY EXPOSURES FOR DOE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND VISITORS <br> BY DOE FIELD ORGANIZATION

| Dose Equivalent Ranges (rem) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Organization | Meas. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Meas.- } \\ 0.10 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10- \\ & 0.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25- \\ & 0.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50- \\ & 0.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75- \\ & 1.00 \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 | 5-6 | 6-7 | 7-8 | 8-9 | 9-10 | $\geq 10$ | Total Person-rem |
| Idaho Operations | 142 | 82 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| TOTAL | 142 | 82 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Nevada Operations | 5508 | 210 | 35 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 |
| TOTAL | 5508 | 210 | 35 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 |
| Pittsburgh Naval Reactors | 9 | 41 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| TOTAL | 9 | 41 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Richland Operations | 144 | 73 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| TOTAL | 144 | 73 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| San Francisco Operations | 61 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 61 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

C. 2


C. 3


[^0]:    (a)These previously unreported individuals exceeded $50 \%$ of the annual standard during 1980 as a result of chronic buildup due to translocation from the lungs from prior years' exposure. No acute exposure is known to have occurred.
    (b) One individual exceeded $100 \%$ of the annual standard in 1980 for unknown reasons. This individual received a Type B plutonium lung exposure as a result of an incident in 1971, and has been excluded from work with plutonium since that time. Since the systemic burden was less than half the standard in 1978, this new information was also reported. This individual's case is being closely followed to see if some mechanism for the increase in systemic burden can be determined.

[^1]:    TOTAL PERSON-REM

