

3812

NJ.21

NJ.21-2
CAP

MEMORANDUM

TO: FILE

DATE 11/18/87

FROM: Andrew Wallis

SUBJECT: Elimination of Bloomfield Tool Corp.

SITE NAME: Bloomfield Tool Corp.

ALTERNATE NAME: _____

CITY: Bloomfield STATE: NJ

OWNER(S)

Past: Bloomfield Current: _____
Owner contacted ☐ yes ☒ no; if yes, data contacted _____

Facility is not listed in the Telephone directory

TYPE OF OPERATION

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ Research & Development | ☒ Facility Type |
| ☐ Production scale testing | ☐ Manufacturing |
| ☐ Pilot Scale | ☐ University |
| ☐ Bench Scale Process | ☐ Research Organization |
| ☐ Theoretical Studies | ☐ Government Sponsored Facility |
| ☐ Sample & Analysis | ☐ Other <u>Machine Shop</u> |
| ☒ <u>Test machining</u> | <u>and Tool maker</u> |
| ☐ Production | |
| ☐ Disposal/Storage | |

TYPE OF CONTRACT

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Prime | ☐ Other information (i.e., cost + fixed fee, unit price, time & material, etc) _____ |
| ☐ Subcontractor | |
| ☐ Purchase Order | |

Contract/Purchase Order # AT-30-1-GEN-129 (no record of what this was for)

CONTRACTING PERIOD: Records of support to the AEC indicate work was done in the early 1950's and late 1940's. Only the 1951 work was known to involve radioactive material.

OWNERSHIP:

	AEC/MED OWNED	AEC/MED LEASED	GOVT OWNED	GOVT LEASED	CONTRACTOR OWNED	CONTRACTOR LEASED
LANDS	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
BUILDINGS	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
EQUIPMENT	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
ORE OR RAW MATL	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
FINAL PRODUCT	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
WASTE & RESIDUE	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

A few Billets of Uranium were machined and ground at this facility however, efforts were generally unacceptable and as a result the scope was reduced. The Uranium was AEC owned and maintained Central of Utah the waste

AEC/MED INVOLVEMENT AT SITE

Control

- ☐ AEC/MED managed operations
- ☒ AEC/MED responsible for accountability
- ☒ AEC/MED overviewed operations
- ☐ Contractor had total control
- ☐ unknown

- ☐ Health Physics Protection
 - ☐ Little or None
 - ☐ AEC/MED responsibility
 - ☐ Contractor responsibility

MATERIALS HANDLED:

Type (on basis of records reviewed)

- ☐ No Radioactive
- ☒ Natural Radioactive from Feed Materials Production (uranium metal)
 - ☐ Ore
 - ☐ Refined Source Material
 - ☐ Residue

- ☐ Natural Radioactive Material from Non-Nuclear Activities
- ☐ Man-Made
- ☐ Other

Comment There is no record of what materials were involved in the 1947 contract work. However, the 1951 effort suggests Bloomfield had little or no experience with uranium indicating it may have been their first experience with it.

Quantities (on the basis of records reviewed)

- ☐ None
- ☐ Production Quantities
- ☒ Small Amounts

Comment AEC Representatives brought the uranium billets to the site and maintained control over it. Due to the poor results, it appears only a few billets were machined.

OTHER PERTINENT FACTS:

- ☐ Facility was Licensed
 - ☐ During AEC/MED-Related Operations
 - ☐ For Similar Activities
 - ☐ For Other Activities

Comment _____

- ☐ Commercial Production Involving Radioactive Material during AEC/MED Operations

- ☐ Facility was Decontaminated and Released

- ☐ Availability of Close Out Records

☐ None

☐ Some

☐ Sufficient

- ☐ Radioactive Status:

YES MAYBE PROBABLY NOT

Contaminated	---	---	NOT	---
Potential for Exposure (accessible)	---	---	---	X

QUANTITY OF RECORDS AVAILABLE:

☒ Very Little

☐ Some

☐ Sufficient

PROBABILITY OF FINDING ADDITIONAL RECORDS:

☒ Low

☐ Possible

☐ High

RECOMMENDATIONS:

☒ Eliminate

☐ Consider for Remedial Action

☐ Collect More Data

Comment Because only a small amount of material was processed, the operation was not really successful, and AEC control over these operations generally ensure good accountability of the uranium. There is no potential for exposures from residual material from this operation to exceed guidelines.

REFERENCES:

Attached.

SUMMARY

Bloomfield had a small contract with the AEC in 1947 for an unknown activity and conducted limited experimental machining of uranium in 1951. The operation or experiments were less than successful and were reduced in scope by the field representative for the AEC. Records suggest a very small operation. This was also implied in interviews with former AEC employees involved in the uranium metal development program. None had any detailed recall of any significant activities and as a result they suggested it must have been one of several small experiments conducted under the development program. These include Belmonte who was copied on a June 21, 1951 memo on the operation, Noto who overviewed many similar operations and Benwigan who was responsible for fire safety in NYOO and survey many of the metal working sites. None of the other AEC employees remembered this site.

Based on this review potential for exposures in excess of guidelines at the former Bloomfield site does not exist and the site does not warrant further review under FUSRAP.