Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585–0002, (301) 903–7147. For information on the Department's National Environmental Policy Act process, contact: Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Oversight (EH–25), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586–4600 or leave a message at 1–800–472–2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 22, 1990, the Department of Energy issued a Notice of Intent to prepare the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) (55 FR 42633). In the Notice of Intent and in an Implementation Plan issued in January 1994, the Department identified the proposed action as follows: ''to formulate and implement an integrated environmental restoration and waste management program in a safe and environmentally sound manner and in compliance with applicable laws, regulations and standards.'' The Notice of Intent and the Implementation Plan identified two separate sets of alternatives to be evaluated, for environmental restoration and for waste management.

The Department attempted to meaningfully analyze the environmental restoration alternatives that it originally defined as part of the ''proposed action.'' After considerable effort, the Department has concluded that it would not be appropriate to make programmatic decisions regarding cleanup strategies that would be applicable to all of the Department's sites. The fundamental reasoning behind the Department's conclusion is that cleanup decisions should reflect site-specific conditions, and, in any event, can only be reached with the approval of state and federal regulators and the involvement of the public. It would be inconsistent with the site-specific nature of cleanup decisions, therefore, to make these decisions under this PEIS that would be implemented nationwide.

Accordingly, the Department proposes to eliminate the analysis of environmental restoration alternatives and to modify the proposed action. As modified, the PEIS would consider how to manage the subject wastes and analyze alternative sites at which the wastes could be managed in the future. The PEIS would focus its programmatic evaluations on waste management facilities, and would henceforth be known as the ''Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.'' As previously set forth in the Implementation Plan, the PEIS would evaluate decentralized, regional, and centralized approaches for storage of high-level waste; treatment and storage of transuranic waste; treatment and disposal of low-level and low level mixed waste; and treatment of hazardous waste. Waste generated by restoration activities in the future that must be managed as part of the Department's program to manage all of its wastes would be considered in the PEIS's projected waste inventories. The draft PEIS is currently scheduled for publication in late spring of 1995.

In the October 22, 1990, Notice of Intent in the **Federal Register**, the Department of Energy discussed the preparation of a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement based on formulating and implementing an integrated environmental restoration and waste management program in a safe and environmentally sound manner and in compliance with applicable requirements. The Notice of Intent stated that the purpose of the integrated environmental restoration and waste management program was to provide a broad, systematic approach to addressing site cleanup and waste management. Although the proposed action was defined in terms of integrating environmental restoration and waste management, the description of the alternatives in the Implementation Plan set forth separate sets of alternatives for environmental restoration and waste management.

When the Department published the Notice of Intent in 1990, there were important national issues regarding the direction of its environmental restoration program that could be meaningfully evaluated in the PEIS. These issues focused primarily on the level and extent of cleanup of the Department's facilities. The Department continues to believe that cleanup of its sites involves important issues such as land use, public health, worker risks, and cleanup standards. The Department has concluded, however, that programmatic decisions regarding environmental restoration cannot be made because these decisions should reflect the particular conditions at each site, and require the approval of state regulators and the involvement of stakeholders. The Department believes that the proposed action originally considered in the PEIS should be modified by eliminating the analysis of environmental restoration alternatives. In view of this modification the PEIS would be renamed the ''Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.''

The modified proposed action would focus on the evaluation and analysis of waste management issues confronting the Department and would incorporate potential impacts of environmental restoration on the management of wastes. The Department believes the proposed action as modified will identify and analyze waste management issues and activities for which the Department is responsible. A summary of the comments received in response to this notice will be contained in an appendix to the draft Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Comments previously received during the public comment process on the scope of the PEIS that are still relevant in light of the proposed modification to the PEIS, and the issues raised by such comments, would be evaluated as discussed in the Implementation Plan. Comments on the scope of the PEIS that are relevant to other analyses being conducted in connection with site-specific environmental restoration at DOE's sites will be considered in the preparation of those analyses.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on January 18, 1995.

Thomas P. Grumbly,

Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management.

[FR Doc. 95–1754 Filed 1–23–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Research, Development and Demonstration of New and Advanced Technology for the Glass Industry; Financial Assistance

AGENCY: Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office.

ACTION: Solicitation for Financial Assistance: Research, Development and Demonstration of New and Advanced Technology for the Glass Industry.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given pursuant to Public Law 93–577, the Federal Non-nuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974, that the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Idaho Operations Office (ID), is seeking cost-shared applications for research, development and demonstration of new and advanced technologies to assist the glass industry to remain competitive, reduce energy consumption, and reduce negative environmental impacts. A minimum 20% non-DOE cost-share for research and development phases and a minimum 50% non-DOE cost-share for the demonstration phase is required.

This is a complete solicitation document.

DATES: The deadline for receipt of applications is 4:00 p.m. MDT, March 22, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Applications shall be submitted to: B. G. Bauer, Contracting Officer; Procurement Services Division; U. S. Department of Energy; Idaho Operations Office; 850 Energy Drive, MS 1221; Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401–1563. [NUMBER DE-PS07–95ID13346]

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dallas Hoffer, Contract Specialist, Telephone (208) 526–0014, Facsimile (208) 526–5548.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

Projects sponsored by the DOE Office of Industrial Technologies (OIT) are based on the needs and concerns of industry. The program advances technology to the point of commercialization. Historically, activities have focused on industrial competitiveness, the development of energy efficient, environmentally benign technology and equipment. As part of this program, this solicitation for DOE financial assistance applications is being issued.

B. Project Description

DOE anticipates awarding one or more Cooperative Agreements in accordance with DOE Financial Assistance regulations appearing at Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Chapter II Subchapter H, Part 600 as a result of this solicitation, and funds are available. Federal funds appropriated for this solicitation are approximately $2,000,000 and are to be used to fund the entire research effort. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number for this program is 81.078. All projects shall be cost shared by DOE and the participant. Applicants should be aware that any awardee shall be required to have a cost share of not less than 20% of the total cost of the program for the research and development phases and 50% of the total cost of the program for the demonstration phase. For the purpose of cost share determination, Phase I and Phase II tasks are considered to be research and development while Phase III tasks are demonstration. **NO FEE OR PROFIT WILL BE PAID TO THE AWARD RECIPIENTS.** Under Cooperative Agreements it is anticipated there will be substantial involvement by DOE.

DOE suggests, but does not require, a multi-phase approach and projects may be initiated at the bench scale (Phase I), laboratory/pilot scale (Phase II), or demonstration (Phase III), levels. Individual project duration will not exceed 3 years. Project(s) with durations of less than 3 years and in any phase of development are eligible, if conclusive evidence is presented that previous phase(s) have been completed successfully. All applications with project periods of 3 years or less will be given equal consideration. The period of performance for the first phase is anticipated to be 12 months. At the end of Phase I, provided satisfactory progress has been made and funds are available, DOE may award a continuation of work to undertake further development if the participant demonstrates a continuing need for federal assistance, shows sufficient progress in the research effort, has completed the work in compliance with a mutually agreed management plan, and identifies the new research planned.

The objective of this solicitation is research, development and demonstration of new and advanced technologies to assist the glass industry to remain competitive, reduce energy consumption, and reduce negative environmental impacts. Utilizing the recommendations of the flat, fiber, container and specialty glass industry sectors the below listed priority research subject areas have been identified. Proposals for research in areas not included in the list below will not be considered. Proposals shall have applications that cut across two or more of the flat, fiber, container or specialty glass industry sectors. Applications must identify the priority area being addressed, explain why industry is not already performing the proposed research, and why DOE funding is appropriate.

C. Glass Industry Research Priorities

This solicitation is to be focused on the following glass industry research priorities identified by the industry.

1. Materials

a. Develop improved, cost effective refractories that have greater service capabilities, do not contain materials that are classified as hazardous, or that are well suited for applications of oxy-fuel and gas reburn.

2. Equipment

a. Develop equipment that will improve energy recovery from the melter (for example: preheating of glass cullet and batch raw materials, generation of electricity, or drive processes).

b. Improve recycling equipment (i.e. recycled material sorting, separation, size reduction, processing).

c. Develop equipment to recycle facility waste products and remove or render harmless hazardous material.

d. Develop improved, cost effective air emissions systems or optimized furnace designs to meet the more stringent regulations of the future (i.e. removal of NO_X, SO_X and particulate emissions). Integrated process improvements are preferred over add on devices.

e. Improve process water treatment and control.

3. Computer Modeling

a. Develop models to improve basic understanding of the glass chemistry. This includes chemical kinetics of pre-melting, solid state reactions, batch melting and reactions in glass, chemical equilibria and solubility data, and chemical kinetics during (re)fining.

b. Study effect of gas bubbles on the physical and transport properties of the glass melt.

c. Develop models with ability to correlate furnace design and operation with glass quality, or elimination of defects.

d. Develop furnace models that can calculate transient thermal and chemical behavior and can be used to develop methods to optimize energy use and reduce air emissions.

e. Develop models to optimize fuel combustion and heat release, heat transfer models to calculate glass melting and temperature conditioning, or improved combustion models for prediction of pollutant production.

4. Instrumentation and Control

a. Advanced instrumentation to measure glass chemical and physical properties required for optimizing production (cost effective non-contact or direct contact types).

b. Develop non-contact stress analyzers and surface property analyzers.

c. Develop low cost direct contact sensors that can be used in molten glass so that relatively large arrays can be used to provide information to improve process control.

d. Develop improved monitoring and process control systems to reduce air emissions.

e. Instrumentation to measure refractory thickness (condition/serviceability).

f. Develop methods to correlate numerical data and operating parameters and use them for development of control systems (i.e. expert, fuzzy logic, or neural networks)

including systems for melting, processing, or emissions control to improve glass quality and yield.

g. Develop instrumentation for recycled glass streams.

D. Proposal Requirements

Each proposal must contain the following:

1. Identify the priority area being addressed, explain why industry is not already performing the proposed research, and why DOE funding is appropriate;

2. Demonstrated support of the glass industry by describing:

a. how industry has participated in deciding what research activities will be undertaken;

b. how industry will participate in the evaluation of the applicant's progress in research and development activities;

c. the extent of industry involvement in conducting trials at their facilities to accomplish or validate the research; and

d. the extent to which industry funds are committed to the applicant's proposal;

3. Demonstrated commitment for cost sharing funds from non-federal sources, which shall consist of:

a. cash, and/or

b. as determined by DOE, the fair market value of equipment, services, materials, appropriate technology transfer activities, and other assets directly related to the proposed project;

4. Provide a management plan that outlines how the research, development, and technology transfer activities will be carried out and administered. The management plan shall:

a. outline the research, development, and technology transfer activities by Task expected to be performed;

b. include a detailed statement of work of technical work to be performed;

c. outline who will conduct those research activities and their qualifications;

d. establish the time frame over which the research activities will take place; and

e. define the overall program management and direction by:

1. identifying managerial, organizational and administrative procedures and responsibilities;

2. outlining how the coordination of work between the individuals and organizations involved will be achieved;

3. demonstrating how implementation and monitoring of the progress of the research project after receipt of funding from DOE will be achieved;

4. demonstrating how recommendations and implementations on modifications to the plan, if any, will be achieved; and

5. providing sufficient rationale to support the project costs.

5. State the annual cost of the proposal and a breakdown of those costs for each task and a break down of the percentage of time devoted for each key individual performing the work;

6. Provide a critical review of existing and emerging technologies, relevant patents, on-going research, and practices, and a description of the hurdles that must be overcome to ensure commercial viability and commercialization of the proposed technologies;

7. Justify the project with an initial economic evaluation indicating the potential for a significant reduction in manufacturing cost and/or a significant improvement in product value resulting from the proposed research;

8. Identify the technical hurdles for commercialization and how they will be addressed; and

9. Provide evidence of having the facilities and equipment or industrial partner(s) capable of conducting laboratory scale and demonstration testing.

10. All proposals shall include a demonstration phase.

11. Proposals shall have applications that cut across two or more of the flat, fiber, container or specialty glass industry sectors.

Note: Underlying assumptions along with detailed calculations to support the claimed economic and energy efficiency benefits must be included in the application.

E. Qualified Applicants

Government-owned laboratories, private research organizations, nonprofit institutions, or private firms.

F. Proposal Evaluation

a. Application Deadline

The deadline for receipt of applications is 4:00 p.m. MST, March 22, 1995. Late applications will be handled in accordance with 10 CFR 600.13.

b. Selection of Proposals

Only those proposals which meet all of the requirements of this solicitation will be considered for selection. Selections will be made in accordance with the following selection criteria and programmatic considerations:

Criterion 1—The research proposal demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the glass industry by highlighting its technology needs, barriers to their development and commercialization, and provides a credible management plan to achieve, and evidence to support the benefits identified in the proposed research.

Criterion 2—The research proposal contains evidence of strong support by the glass industry by identifying significant industry involvement in preparation of the proposal and in performing the research activities.

Criterion 3—The research proposal identifies a viable mechanism to facilitate the transfer of the technology to the glass industry at the earliest practicable time; Proposals that include conducting trials at multiple plants to accomplish or validate work are preferred.

Criterion 4—The research proposal offers technology which is new and advanced and is based upon sound scientific, environmental, and engineering principles, are technically feasible and cost effective, have practical industrial application, and will provide the greatest benefits per dollar invested in the U.S. glass industry.

c. Weighting of Criteria

Criterion 1, 2, 3, and 4 are each weighted 25% of the total score.

d. Programmatic Selection Considerations

In conjunction with the evaluation results and rankings of individual proposals, the Government will make selections for negotiations and planned awards from among the highest ranking proposals utilizing the following programmatic considerations:

(1) The proposed cost of the project will not be point scored. Applicants are advised, however, that notwithstanding the lower relative importance of the cost considerations, the evaluated cost may be the basis for selection. In making the selection decision, the apparent advantages of individual technical and business applications will be weighed against the probable cost to the government to determine whether the application approaches (excluding cost considerations) are worth the probable cost differences.

(2) It is desirable to implement each research and development project as a continuing collaborative effort in which the participants represent both the scientific/engineering research disciplines as well as members of the glass industry engaged in its practical, daily operations and experienced in the application of glass industry processes.

(3) Proposals that have the potential to save significant energy, reduce negative environmental impacts and provide significant cost benefits are preferred.

e. Merit Reviews

All Applications will be evaluated under the procedure for ''Objective

Merit Review of Discretionary Financial Assistance Applications'' which was published in the **Federal Register** on May 31, 1990 (Vol. 55, No. 105). Selections for negotiations are expected to be made May 10, 1995, and financial assistance awards are expected to be made beginning July 21, 1995.

SECTION III—GENERAL CONDITIONS

The applications will be evaluated in accordance with the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Merit Review Procedure, and the criteria and programmatic considerations set forth in this solicitation. In conducting this evaluation, the Government may utilize assistance and advice from non-Government personnel. Applicants are therefore requested to state on the cover sheet of the applications if they do not consent to an evaluation by such non-Government personnel. The applicants are further advised that DOE may be unable to give full consideration to an application submitted without such consent. DOE reserves the right to support or not to support any, all, or any part of any application. All applicants will be notified in writing of the action taken on their applications in approximately 90 days after the closing date for this solicitation, provided no follow-up clarifications are needed. Status of any application during the evaluation and selection process will not be discussed with the applicants. Unsuccessful applications will not be returned.

A. Instructions for Preparation of Applications

Each application in response to this solicitation should be prepared in one volume. One original and nine copies of each application are required. Proposals shall be a maximum of 30 pages excluding costing information and, assurance and certification forms provided in the DOE Application Instruction package. The application facesheet is the Standard Form 424. The application is to be prepared for the complete project period.

a. Proprietary Proposal Information

Applications submitted in response to this solicitation may contain trade secrets and/or privileged or confidential commercial or financial information which the applicant does not want used or disclosed for any purpose other than evaluation of the application. The use and disclosure of such data may be restricted provided the applicant marks the cover sheet of the application with the following legend, specifying the pages of the application which are to be restricted in accordance with the conditions of the legend:

> The data contained in pages ____ of this application have been submitted in confidence and contain trade secrets or proprietary information, and such data shall be used or disclosed only for evaluation purposes, provided that if this applicant receives an award as a result of or in connection with the submission of this application, DOE shall have the right to use or disclose the data herein to the extent provided in the award. This restriction does not limit the government's right to use or disclose data obtained without restriction from any source, including the applicant.

Further, to protect such data, each page containing such data shall be specifically identified and marked, including each line or paragraph containing the data to be protected with a legend similar to the following:

> Use or disclosure of the data set forth above is subject to the restriction on the cover page of this application.

It should be noted, however, that data bearing the aforementioned legend may be subject to release under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), if DOE or a court determines that the material so marked is not exempt under the FOIA. The Government assumes no liability for disclosure or use of unmarked data and may use or disclose such data for any purpose. Applicants are hereby notified that DOE intends to make all applications submitted available to non-Government personnel for the sole purpose of assisting the DOE in its evaluation of the applications. These individuals will be required to protect the confidentiality of any specifically identified information obtained as a result of their participation in the evaluation.

b. Budget

A budget period is an interval of time (usually 12 months) into which the project period is divided for funding and reporting purposes. Project period means the total approved period of time that DOE will provide support contingent upon satisfactory progress and availability of funds. The project period may be divided into several budget periods. The project period shall not exceed three years. Each application must contain Standard Forms 424 and 424A. The budget summary page only needs to be completed for the first budget period; all other periods of support requested should be shown on the total costs page. The proposal should contain full details of the costs regarding the labor, overhead, material, travel, subcontracts, consultants, and other support costs broken down by task and by year. Every cost item should be justifiable and further details of the costs may be required if the proposal is selected for the award. It is essential that requested details be submitted in a timely manner for the actual award. Items of needed equipment should be individually listed by description and estimated cost, inclusive of tax, and adequately justified. The destination and purpose of budgeted travel and its relation to the research, should be specified. Anticipated consultant services should be justified and information furnished on each individual's expertise, primary organizational affiliation, daily compensation rate and number of days of expected service. Consultant's travel costs should be listed separately under travel in the budget.

c. Cost Proposal

In the event there are multiple projects proposed in a submittal, a separate cost proposal should be included for each project proposed for funding. The cost proposal should have sufficient detail that an independent evaluation of the labor, materials, equipment and other costs as well as a verification of the proposed cost share can be performed.

B. Notices to Applicants

a. False Statements: Applications must set forth full, accurate, and complete information as required by this solicitation. The penalty for making false statements is prescribed in 18 U.S.C. 1001.

b. Application Clarification: DOE reserves the right to require applications to be clarified or supplemented to the extent considered necessary either through additional written submissions or oral presentations.

c. Amendments: All amendments to this solicitation will be mailed to recipients who submit a written request for the DOE Application Instruction package.

d. Applicant's Past Performance: DOE reserves the right to solicit from available sources relevant information concerning an applicant's past performance and may consider such information in its evaluation.

e. Commitment of Public Funds: The Contracting Officer is the only individual who can legally commit the Government to the expenditure of public funds in connection with the proposed award. Any other commitment, either explicit or implied, is invalid.

f. Effective Period of Application: All applications should remain in effect for at least 180 days from the closing date.

g. Availability of Funds: The actual amount of funds to be obligated in each fiscal year will be subject to availability of funds appropriated by Congress.

h. Assurances and Certifications: DOE requires the submission of preaward assurances of compliance and certifications which are mandated by law. Prospective applicants intending to submit an application in response to this solicitation should request a DOE Application Instruction package, which includes standard forms, assurances and certifications, by notifying the DOE Contract Specialist. It is advised that prospective applicants submit their requests in writing no later than February 21, 1995.

i. Questions & Answers: Questions regarding this solicitation should be submitted in writing to the DOE Contract Specialist no later than February 15, 1995. Questions and answers will be issued in writing as an amendment to this solicitation.

j. Preaward Costs: The government is not liable for any costs incurred in preparation of an application. Awardees may incur preaward costs up to ninety (90) days prior to the effective date of award. Should the awardee take such action, it is done so at the awardee's risk and does not impose any obligation on the DOE to issue an award (10 CFR 600.103)

k. Patents, Data, and Copyrights: Applicants are advised that patents, data, and copyrights will be treated in accordance with 10 CFR 600.33.

l. Environmental impact: An applicant environmental checklist will be provided in the DOE Application Instruction package. Award will not be made until all environmental requirements are completed.

m. EPACT: Applicants shall be required to comply with Section 2306 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPACT) [42 U.S.C. 13525], in the event EPACT applies to financial assistance instruments issued as a result of this solicitation. A copy of Section 2306 will be included in the DOE Application Instruction package.

Dated: February 12, 1995.

Brad Bauer,

Director, Procurement Services Division.

[FR Doc. 95–1755 Filed 1–23–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Certification of the Radiological Condition of the Seymour Specialty Wire Site, Seymour, Connecticut, 1992–1993

AGENCY: Office of Environmental Management, Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of certification.

SUMMARY: DOE has completed remedial action to decontaminate the process building at the Seymour Specialty Wire Site in Seymour, Connecticut. The property was found to contain quantities of radioactive material from work performed for the Atomic Energy Commission. Post-remedial action radiological surveys show that the site now meets current guidelines for use without radiological restrictions. This notice announces the availability of the certification docket for remedial action taken at the site.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the docket may be inspected at:

Public Reading Room, Room 1E–190, Forrestal Building, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20585;

Public Document Room, Oak Ridge Operations Office, U.S. Department of Energy, P.O. Box 2001, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James W. Wagoner II, Director, Off-Site/Savannah River Program Division, Office of Eastern Area Programs (EM–421), Office of Environmental Restoration, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C. 20585, (301) 427–1721 Fax: (301) 427–1907.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: DOE (Office of Environmental Restoration, Office of Eastern Area Programs, Off-Site/Savannah River Program Division) has implemented remedial action at the Seymour Specialty Wire Site in Seymour, Connecticut, (Town of Seymour, Volume 135, pages 430–437) as part of the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP). The objective of the program is to identify and clean up or otherwise control sites where residual radioactive contamination remains from activities carried out under contract to the Manhattan Engineer District and the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) during the early years of the nation's atomic energy program. In December 1985, the Seymour site was formally designated by DOE for cleanup under FUSRAP.

The Bridgeport Brass Company, later known as the Seymour Specialty Wire Company, performed operations under contract to AEC from 1962 to 1964. The contract was for the development of a process for the extrusion of natural uranium metal. The portion of the Seymour Facility where the AEC work was conducted, the Rufert Building, is currently leased by the Electric Cable Company as an industrial manufacturing plant.

In 1964, AEC conducted a radiological survey of the 1.9-ha (4.8-acre) parcel of the Seymour site that included the Rufert Building. The survey was conducted after the Bridgeport Brass Company terminated all of the AEC-related work at the Seymour site to consolidate the AEC contract work at the Bridgeport Brass facility in Ashtabula, Ohio. Although there were no AEC standards for surface contamination with which to compare the survey data at that time, the survey report completed at the time states that the radionuclide concentrations observed were ''* * * quite low and certainly are insignificant with respect to any mode of exposure that can be hypothesized.''

After FUSRAP was established, review of former AEC records indicated that the Seymour site should be resurveyed because of the lack of satisfactory release criteria at the time of the first survey. At the request of DOE, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) Health and Safety Research Division conducted a preliminary radiological survey of the facility on January 26, 1977. This survey consisted of gamma exposure measurements at 1 m (3.3 ft) from the floor surface, beta-gamma exposure rate measurements at 1 cm (0.4 in.) above the floor surface, and direct alpha radiation measurements taken on contact with the floor.

Because of gamma radiation measurements observed during the preliminary survey, ORNL conducted a follow-up survey at the site on August 26, 1980. The purpose of the follow-up survey was to determine whether the site exceeded current DOE guidelines for residual contamination on structural surfaces. Therefore, this survey was limited to those areas of the building where the former AEC contract work was known to have been carried out. In addition to the same types of measurements that were taken during the 1977 survey, smear samples were taken to determine the extent of transferable contamination. Smear samples taken from the bowls and traps of several floor drains yielded transferable contamination concentrations of 70 to 150 dpm/cm^2. Because of these readings and visual inspection of the drains, samples of the residue from the three drains were also collected for analysis. These samples contained uranium concentrations ranging from 2,860 to 15,600 pCi/g (the 1980 report does not indicate whether this was total uranium or uranium-238).

Both the 1977 and 1980 surveys indicated that radioactive contamination was present in the Rufert Building, primarily in the Dynapack