US Department of Health and Human Services
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health
Uranium Refining Atomic Weapons Employers
(URAWE) Work Group
Thursday, February 17, 2022

The Work Group convened via Video Teleconference at 11:00 a.m. Eastern Time, Henry Anderson, Chair, presiding.

Members Present:

Henry Anderson, Chair
R. William Field, Member
David Kotelchuck, Member

Also Present:

Rashaun Roberts, Designated Federal Official
Nancy Adams, NIOSH Contractor
Dave Allen, DCAS
Bob Barton, SC&A
Finn Black, SC&A
Ron Buchanan, SC&A
Grady Calhoun, DCAS
Angelica Gheen, DCAS
Rose Gogliotti, SC&A
Chuck Nelson, DCAS
Michael Rafky, HHS
LaVon Rutherford, DCAS
Tim Taulbee, DCAS

Contents

## Proceedings

(11:00 a.m.)

## Welcome and Roll Call

Dr. Roberts: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health.

This is a meeting of the URAWE Work Group, and I'm Rashaun Roberts. I'm the DFO for the Board.

There is an agenda for today. It's on the NIOSH website under February 2022.

Since Board members who have conflicts with regard to these sites that the Work Group covers can't sit on the Work Group, there are really no conflicts of interest for Work Group members today.

So, as I go through the roll call, I won't be asking about conflicts for the Work Group members, but other staff do need to state any relevant conflicts, as I move through the roll call.

So, with that, let me start with the call, and we need to start with Anderson.

(Roll call.)

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Welcome. Thank you. So, welcome again to everybody.

Just to go over a couple of additional items before I give the floor over to Dr. Anderson, who is the Chair of the Work Group.

To keep things running smoothly, everyone please make sure you are on mute, unless you're speaking. So, if you're on Zoom, the mute button is near the lower lefthand corner of your screen. If you're attending via telephone, press *6 to mute, if you don't have a mute button, and then, *6 again to take yourself off.

And as I said before, the agenda, presentations, et cetera, relevant for today's meeting are on the DCAS or NIOSH website, and all materials were sent to Board members and to staff prior to the meeting.

So, with that, I'll turn the meeting over to Andy.

## NIOSH Presentation: Overview of SEC-00253 Reduction Pilot Plant (RPP) Petition Evaluation Report

Chair Anderson: Okay. I want to welcome everybody. And we'll start with the NIOSH overview, and I believe Angelica is the one that's taken over the lead on this and has put together a nice, concise set of presentation slides.

So, take it away, Angelica.

Ms. Gheen: Thank you so much. I'm very happy to be here. I just started with DCAS in February of 2020. So, I'm taking over this role from Tom Tomes, who left for the summer. So, please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like me to look into anything. I'm happy to do that.

Chair Anderson: And welcome.

Ms. Gheen: Let me see if I can figure out --

Chair Anderson: And welcome

Ms. Gheen: Oh, thank you so much. Let's see if I can figure out how to share my screen.

Okay. Can everybody see the presentation?

Chair Anderson: Yes.

Ms. Gheen: Perfect. Okay. So, I'm just going to go ahead and do a real quick overview. SC&A is going to do the heavy lifting today. We're going to go through the background and get us all up-to-speed. It's been a while since we all met. So, let's try to remember where we are. And it's, like I said, my first meeting. So, I'll try to meet you guys where you are.

So, this is for SEC-00253, the Reduction Pilot Plant; also known as the Huntington Pilot Plant. It's in Huntington, West Virginia; operated by INCO, the International Nickel Company. It manufactures nickel powder for use in gaseous diffusion plants.

It was a DOE facility from 1951 to November 26, 1978. It entered into its remediation period from November 27th, 1978 through May 18th, 1979, and what we're calling standby period from May 1st, 1963 to November 26th, 1978.

The remediation contractor that worked at the Reduction Pilot Plant was Cleveland Wrecking Company. And here, we've got a nice, little image, so we can try to visualize what it looked like at the time.

So, during the INCO operations, the Reduction Pilot Plant encompassed 3.47 acres of a fenced area next to the Pilot Plant in Huntington, West Virginia. The facility was built and operated in 1951. Security clearances were required by all staff members. The operations included the use of LEU-contaminated nickel scrap, supplied by DOE, and it was placed on standby in 1963. Set to be demolished in 1978 to 1979.

The petition for SEC-00253 was received on June 25th, 2019, and the requested class included all of the INCO security personnel that worked at any of the locations within the RPP during this period from June 7th, 1976 through November 26th, 1978.

The requested class is within the standby period. So, the operations ended and the facility was placed on standby, as previously stated, from May 1st, 1963 to November 26th, 1978. The standby period was not previously covered under the (audio interference) when the petition was received.

So, on July 31st, 2019, we asked DOL to review the petitioners' claim that the standby period should be covered. And during that period, INCO was under contract for maintenance and security. November 15th of the same year, DOL notified us that the standby period was going to be added to the DOE's facility-covered time period.

So, at that point, the petition qualified for review, December 13th, 2019, on the basis that we have no radiation exposure records for that requested class.

So, when we went into the Evaluation Report, the evaluated class encompasses all International Nickel Company security personnel who worked at any of the

locations from June 7th, 1976 through November 26th, 1978.

We approved the ER on April 24th, 2020. And our feasibility determination was that the dose reconstruction can be successfully completed with sufficient accuracy for all members of the evaluated class.

So, a little of background period about this specific time period that was going to be covered by the SEC. So, this was the time period when the facility was completely idle. Nickel production had ended at this point. It ended in 1962. And the plant was being maintained in a standby condition by INCO.

The security guards were required to check the production building and the compressor building once per shift. So, that's three times a day. And all maintenance activities were terminated in March 1975. INCO security guards made the rounds through November 26th, 1978, and demolition began on November 27th, 1978.

So, as a real quick background of how we had initially calculated how long these security routes would take, because that's going to be part of another presentation today about the recalculation.

For the original calculation here, we've got the layout in front of you, which shows the process building being measured 130-feet long. It's a five-story-tall building. The compressor building was 150-feet long with a single floor. And then, there's a small, two-story structure in one corner. It's 3.67 acres, and it's a rectangle 500 feet by 320 feet. So, the total perimeter distance here, because we're going to calculate the guards walking the perimeter, is 1,640 feet.

So, the original walkthrough exposure time for the security guards was estimated as listed here. So, we estimated five minutes, allowing for staff to walk the length of the compressor building. So, walking 150 feet at 4.4 feet per second. A factor of three was applied to allow for walking both through the process building and the compressor building, as well as the complete grounds. So, that yields about 15 minutes a day at RPP

and 15 minutes multiplied by 365. So, the total exposure time was 91.3 hours per year.

And that's all I've got for background. So, please let me know if you have any questions.

Chair Anderson: Anyone have any questions?

Member Field: Andy, this is Bill. I just have a quick question.

As we've heard, there were maintenance folks at the plant as well? Or was this just security at this time?

Ms. Gheen: The class that we are looking into is just security.

Member Field: Just security. Okay. I'm just curious. Do you know if there was maintenance there at that time, though?

Ms. Gheen: Go ahead, Tim.

Dr. Taulbee: Okay. Actually, the maintenance activities were shut down about a year before.

Member Field: Okay. Thanks. Angelica, what did the security guys do the rest of the time? What were their responsibilities and where were they? Do you know what else they did? I mean, if there were 15 minutes a day here and the place was all closed down, what did they do?

Ms. Gheen: Somebody else can correct me if I'm wrong here. But I believe that they were at a guard station, not on the plant ground itself.

Chair Anderson: Okay. So, there was no -- just knowing a lot about some of the security folks here, was there a place, in inclement weather, if they had another station, but would they have had an opportunity to sit, or whatever, inside one of the buildings?

Member Kotelchuck: Yes. Dave.

That's a good point. I think that should be checked when there are conversations with the employees, or that may have already been checked, just to affirm that. I think that's probably correct.

Mr. Barton: This is Bob.

Angelica or, also, Ron Buchanan is on the line directly.

But, I mean, this was just one building as part of the facility. So, the security would go through the building three times per day, but this wasn't the only location at the site. So, they weren't there just to protect that building, which was in the shutdown mode. So, there weren't many people in there. It was just the security guards walking through the building.

Chair Anderson: All right. Okay.

Ms. Gheen: Correct. This is adjacent to the rest of the facility.

Chair Anderson: Oh.

Member Field: This is Bill. I just have one other question. It sounds like you have pretty specific information about how long it took to walk through it. Was that based on interviews with the security personnel? Or was that just an estimate based on somebody walking through themselves?

Mr. Barton: I think we're going to get to that.

Member Field: Oh, okay. Sorry. Sorry.

Ms. Gheen: Yes. No, that's fine.

Member Field: Jumping ahead too far.

Ms. Gheen: We're going to get to how it's -- so, the revision that we're suggesting is going to calculate that a little bit more precisely.

Member Field: Okay. Thanks.

Ms. Gheen: But the initial one is just based on what's called biological preferred walking speed --

Member Field: Okay. Yes.

Ms. Gheen: -- along perimeters and things like that.

Member Field: Okay. Sorry.

Ms. Gheen: But we'll get into a little bit more specifics.

Chair Anderson: And while this period wasn't covered before, do we know, have there been claims from this facility prior to that?

Ms. Gheen: I do not know the answer to that.

Do you know that, Tim?

Mr. Barton: There are definitely claims for this facility. In fact, the information that Dr. Field was just referring to, interviews, came from that population of information. So, we do know people who performed that job, and that's where a more specific estimate of the time spent actually doing these walkthroughs and the number of levels, how long it took, that's where it comes from. And that's why the revision is suggested.

Chair Anderson: There were 77 claims. Okay. That's helpful. And were measurements available for any of those exposures?

Dr. Buchanan: This is Ron Buchanan. We'll get to that.

Chair Anderson: Okay.

Dr. Buchanan: Not dosimetry, but there was some indication of the walkthrough time.

Chair Anderson: But my question is, was there any dosimetry for not necessarily people in this class, but in the facility?

Dr. Taulbee: This is Tim. No.

Chair Anderson: Okay.

Dr. Taulbee: But we do have radiation measurements for the areas, which is why this walkthrough time becomes important.

Chair Anderson: Yes. Okay. So, no measurements on anybody in this facility?

Dr. Taulbee: No personal dosimetry, no.

Chair Anderson: Yes, yes. Okay. Thanks. Okay. Well --

Ms. Gheen: And during this time, as mentioned, there's no maintenance being done or anything. So, the only people who are going into the facility at all are these security personnel.

Chair Anderson: No, my question was more, if there was other workers there that did have some monitoring done, that would give a sense of what might have been present in the facility, other than general information that you have now.

Dr. Taulbee: The rest of the facility, Dr. Anderson, was not a radiological facility. So, there was no other operations. This was just this operation within that confines.

Chair Anderson: Okay. Thank you. That, I wasn't sure about. Okay, let's move on to SC&A's review, if there are no more questions. I know we're asking some of the questions that we're going to ask the SC&A people.

Ms. Gheen: Yes, it might be a little clearer after their presentation.

Chair Anderson: Yes, right.

## SC&A Presentation: Review of SEC-00253 RPP Petition Evaluation Report

Dr. Buchanan: Okay. This is Ron Buchanan with SC&A, and Rose will be turning the slides for me today.

So, this is SC&A's review of NIOSH's ER report for SEC-0253 for the Reduction Pilot Plant, and it's RPP in Huntington, West Virginia.

Next slide. Okay. On September 2nd of 2020, SC&A was tasked to review the ER for this SEC for the focused worker group for the time period stated. And SC&A did that review and delivered our report in April of 2021. And then, NIOSH issued a response memo to our review in April of 2021. A lot occurred in April.

Next slide. Now, the way we approached this was that SC&A reviewed 77 claimant files in NIOSH's files that were associated with RPP to identify any information relevant to dose reconstruction feasibility for this security personnel group during the period June 7th,

1976 to November 26th, 1978.

We found that there was a total of 44 of these claimants out of 77 that worked a portion or all of 1976 through 1978 at RPP. Now, just a little bit of clarification.

This was a nickel plant which was a large plant, and this was just a small facility to the side, the way I understand it, that reprocessed material from, I believe it was Oak Ridge, nickel that had some contamination of uranium in it. So, the main company was not concerned with radiation. It was just this fenced-in area.

Okay. Next slide. So, our review results was that we found that we didn't identify any information that would impact the feasibility of dose reconstruction during the SEC period for the security folks.

We did, however, look at the Site Profile issues and found that a key facet of the ER process was to include the exposure time, which we touched on a little bit. It's important to ensure that the exposure time was estimated during the relevant activities, and that it properly characterizes in pounds the possible time it took to walk through the facility.

Now, in this case, we used exposure time to mean the time spent inside of the facility where residual contamination are precedent or to walk the perimeter of the facility, which the security guards, we understand they just came in, did this, then left, once per shift. So, that was the only exposure that took place to radioactive material.

Next slide. Now we did have Observation 1, which suggested further refinement of the exposure time. We looked at the CATIs, and they indicated that the exposure time may be longer than the original 15 minutes that previously was described.

And we interviewed with Claimant A, who said they kept all seven floors and perimeters. And Claimant B estimated it took about 30 minutes per day.

And we recommended to NIOSH that it would be beneficial to attempt to contact and interview these guards and other workers with specific knowledge to maybe determine a more accurate or at least a better

bounding estimate of time required to walk through the facility.

And we also wanted to emphasize that we don't think that the exposure time should include the ER feasibility and can be considered a Site Profile issue.

Next slide. NIOSH's response to our Observation 1, in April of '21, they revised the estimate of time spent in the facility: 52 minutes per day, six days per week, for 250 days per year. That led to 260 hours per year, and they estimated that it took five minutes per floor. And multiply the seven floors, and then, walking the rate around the perimeter at 4.4 feet per second, I think is what was intended. And this increased the exposure time by about a factor of three from what was previously estimated, 92 to about 260. So, it's approximately a factor of three greater.

Next slide. And now, the cautious response to our observation concerning the dose rate. NIOSH used a maximum dose rate of .035 millirem per hour in the ER in a timely manner. That was the maximum dose rate calculated. And NIOSH will evaluate all the dose rates for the Site Profile, and it will be revised to consider all the various dose rates that potentially exposed the security guards to. And the Site Profile will also be revised to include the standby period of 1963 to 1978 as the covered period.

Next slide. So, NIOSH's response to Observation 1, in summary, was that the overall annual doses remain lower, even though they would be using an increased exposure time, because in the Site Profile they'll look at all the dose rates, and the actual dose rates may decrease. And if you multiply that by an increased exposure time, you might get the same or even less total dose assigned, but it would be more accurate.

Next slide. So, our evaluation to NIOSH's response to our Observation 1, we concur with NIOSH's reevaluation of potential overexposure time and find that it's reasonable. We concur with NIOSH's having used the maximum dose rate to facilitate the completion of the ER. And we find it appropriate to consider all the dose rate data in the revised Site Profile. We recommend that this remain in abeyance until the Site Profile is revised

and we'll be able to review both the exposure time and the revised dose rate approach.

Next slide. Now, Observation 2 that we originally had was ingested intake not addressed in the SEC period. Now, in the Site Profile, originally it was. On 318, Tables 3 and 4 give an ingestion intake value. However, the ER did not consider ingestion intake for the SEC period. Although this will probably be very small, it should be an accurate estimate.

And so, next slide. So, NIOSH responded to Observation 2 that ingestion for the security guards had been estimated based on the contamination level, and the ER used a bound alpha contamination value of 19 dpm per hundred square centimeters to estimate the intake inhalation, and applied that using the NRC guides to determine the potential ingestion intake of 0.19 disintegrations per hour of alpha ingestion rate for the security guards, which would obviously be very low, but it will be addressed. And details for assigning this ingested intake will be included in the revised Site Profile.

Next slide. So, we reevaluated NIOSH's response to Observation 2, and we concur with NIOSH's recommendation for addressing ingestion intake, and we recommend that this observation also remain in abeyance, pending the issue of the revised Site Profile and our review of that Site Profile.

Next slide. So, in summary, on the Site Profile issues: Observation 1, we concur with NIOSH's approach and to reevaluate all the applicable dose rate data. And we recommend that that remain in abeyance until we have a chance to review that for both the (audio interference) and the time component.

And Observation 2, ingestion intake, we concur with the recommendations and, again, recommend that it remain in abeyance, pending review of the revised Site Profile.

Next slide. Okay. In conclusion, as far as the SEC is concerned, we concur with NIOSH that upper bounds can be established for internal intake and external exposures. And we concur that the ER is feasible for the security guards during the SEC period.

Okay. Next slide. Okay. That completes my presentation, and I open up for questions.

## Work Group Discussion

Chair Anderson: Board Members, any questions?

If you're talking, Dave, you've got to be off mute.

Member Kotelchuck: All right. No, I don't have any. It seems, because they have a very clear pattern of how they walked, we know what the exposure levels are. We know what the contamination levels are area wide. And it seems reasonable.

Chair Anderson: Bill, any thoughts?

Member Field: I just was curious, can you remind me, where's the .035 millirem per hour come from? What's the source of that?

Mr. Barton: I think maybe I can take this. Or, Ron, if you want to step in?

But, I mean, those were from contamination surveys of the building --

Member Field: Okay.

Mr. Barton: -- and that was, I think, the maximum read level that was used, I think, simply to confirm feasibility of dose reconstruction. However, in the updated TBD, NIOSH is going to go back and look at all of those survey measurements and get a more reasonable level than just the maximum seen. And as you can tell, it's rather low.

Member Field: Right. Thanks.

Chair Anderson: Any other comments?

Member Kotelchuck: I mean, it is normally vague. I mean, normally, we're in a bind; we don't have any personal radiation measurements. On the other hand, this is such a routinized walkthrough; I think it's safe to say we really know where the people were and about how long it took. And we have some CATI reports from them, which we're following. So, I don't see any problem here.

Chair Anderson: There are some area measurement data that can be applicable here.

Member Kotelchuck: Right.

Chair Anderson: And I think taking the highest measurement found is certainly erring on the side of protection.

Member Kotelchuck: Yes, I agree.

Chair Anderson: And just a question for the 77 claims. Do we know, were any of them paid?

Dr. Taulbee: This is Tim.

I don't know that off the top of my head here. In fact, getting that information now is rather difficult for us, given the current task.

Chair Anderson: Yes, I know.

Dr. Taulbee: It's not --

Chair Anderson: Yes, it doesn't really -- I think what you've got for this period, since there wouldn't have been accidents or things going on, but it would be interesting just to have a sense of, was most of the exposure in the processing, the basis, you know, the background measurement sort of things that were made that are just being applied through this down period?

Mr. Barton: This is Bob again.

I think, yes, this is sort of a unique situation in which we're in the residual period and it's really there's nobody in there. The building was shut down and it was in stasis. Where a lot of times we have production processes still going on during the residual period, in this case it was really them just checking to make sure like nobody else was in there, essentially.

Chair Anderson: Yes, yes.

Mr. Barton: So, it was just those walkthroughs occurring three times a day, which I think is a very conservative estimate. And I think that it just came down to, well, what is the exposure time there, and what is the exposure rate based on measurements that were made

in the building? So, in a lot of ways, this is sort of a very straightforward one.

Chair Anderson: From the CATI interviews, I mean, if there was nothing going on and no maintenance staff, there's going to be dust settling out. And it's a four-year period. So, it wouldn't get to be inches, you wouldn't think, but that would potentially have more particulate to be raised in a dust cloud, if they're walking through the entry or part of the building.

Dr. Taulbee: If I could interject here?

Chair Anderson: Yes. Sure.

Dr. Taulbee: The survey data that we have is January of 1975. So, it's actually right before this particular -- the SEC period of evaluation. So, we kind of have the point where it would be the maximum from the settling part that you're talking about.

Chair Anderson: Right. It had been closed before then, right? Yes. Okay.

Dr. Taulbee: That's correct, it had been closed since 1961.

Chair Anderson: Yes, yes.

Member Kotelchuck: Dave. For individual claimants, is there any possibility -- I assume that, for individual security guards, they would be assessed one walkthrough a day, since it's a 24-hour period, right, three shifts? But I wondered if there were times when one security guard went through as he/she came on, and then, went around before the end of the shift, just to kind of cover for the next person or if somebody was missing. It may be worth checking on the individual claim, individuals who are claimed, when there's a discussion with them. This is a small, this would be a small correction, if any, but --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Ms. Gheen: The current -- oh, sorry. Go ahead.

Member Kotelchuck: Go ahead. Go ahead.

Ms. Gheen: I was just going to say, the current calculations account for a six-day workweek. So, there is a lot of wiggle room there, I feel like, for being claimant-favorable, even if they were picking up extra shifts.

Member Kotelchuck: Mm-hmm. Okay. Good, good. Thank you.

Chair Anderson: So, any other thoughts?

Member Field: Henry, did you see the chat? You may just want to read that to get it into the record.

Chair Anderson: Okay.

Ms. Gogliotti: I can read it.

Chair Anderson: Well, I got it.

Member Field: Okay. Thanks.

Ms. Gogliotti: Okay.

Chair Anderson: I'll read it, too.

"To answer Henry's question on number of claims paid, I have old data, 2015, but at that point, 16 of the 75 claims had a POC of over 50 percent."

Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Barton: But, also, that would have probably included work that was outside this period in question.

Chair Anderson: Correct. Yes.

Mr. Barton: Right.

Chair Anderson: But it speaks to the activity and exposures that were going on inside the plant when it was operational. So, yes.

Mr. Barton: For sure.

Chair Anderson: And decontamination issues that would go on. I mean, this is clearly a period at the far end of the episode, but it does give a sense of the potential exposures that went on at the facility.

Mr. Barton: And also, just as, I guess, an editorial

comment -- and Angelica can probably correct me if I'm wrong here -- but, once they started actually tearing down the building, those workers were actually put on a pre-screen uranium bioassay and followed up on. So that, as they were tearing some of these things down, which is where you would expect a lot of the dust to be generated and exposures to happen, that was much more regulated than what we're talking about today, which is really simply a security check happening a couple of times a day in an empty building.

Chair Anderson: Yes. Was everything removed from the building already, the interior?

Mr. Barton: I believe it has gone completely down to maybe the slab is still there, but I think everything else was removed shortly after this period that we're talking about.

Chair Anderson: Yes. But all the equipment would have been removed prior to this period?

Dr. Taulbee: No.

Chair Anderson: No?

Dr. Taulbee: Prior to this, prior to the period of evaluation, it was placed in standby. So, all the equipment was present. And then, in May of 1975 is when they terminated all the maintenance on it, and it was just the security guards walking through. And actually, just before they terminated the maintenance is when they did the survey that we have the data for, the contamination and radiation dose rate measurements.

And then, after this time period of just security walking through is -- starting, then, in, let's see, November; I'm looking for the date here.

Ms. Gheen: November 27th.

Dr. Taulbee: November 27th, 1978 is when they started the demolition.

Chair Anderson: Oh, okay.

Dr. Taulbee: And tearing the building down to nothing.

Chair Anderson: Yes. I didn't know if they had ever moved the equipment that was inside prior to that or if it was just going to be abandoned. Yes.

Dr. Taulbee: No, it was maintained in standby condition from '61 through '75.

Chair Anderson: Yes.

Dr. Taulbee: Well, through '78, actually.

Chair Anderson: Yes.

Ms. Gheen: And like Tim mentioned, that year we're basing maximum removable contamination was taken in 1975. So, it was during the middle of the standby period, but way after the operations had ceased.

Chair Anderson: Yes. That sort of explains the levels that were found.

Okay. Other questions?

Member Field: Henry, I was just curious if we're going to hear from petitioners at all.

Chair Anderson: Yes, I was going to say, we'll go to them next.

Member Field: Okay.

Chair Anderson: And then we can talk about where do we go from here.

So, okay. Do we know who is going to speak for the petitioners?

Ms. Wood: I am here for [identifying information redacted].

Chair Anderson: Okay. Why don't you go ahead?

## Petitioner Comments

Ms. Wood: Well, I think you all have the information that we've sent. [identifying information redacted], but she passed away this past October. So, [identifying information redacted]-- my [identifying information redacted], and I -- are

kind of taking that over. [identifying information redacted]and I, we were the ones that started the petition with my mother. My [identifying information redacted] was exposed and he had a very painful death.

And most of your petitioners, or the ones that we submitted as being in the plant at that time, most of them have passed, I believe.

But do you have any questions for me?

Chair Anderson: I guess that a question would be, based on your recollection for your mom and others who were security guards, does the description of what they did, and how much time it took to do that, does that sound reasonable to you?

Ms. Wood: I think the new, the 260 hours a year would be more accurate, if not more. They did walk through, you know, three times a shift. And, you know, my dad, in particular, was very meticulous about checking everything. And, you know, his medical records that we have submitted, you know, kind of go along with what had happened in there, and everything.

But one of the things that I guess you all know, because the thing was this was an undercover, well, a classified period of time. And that's why it was never submitted with the original claims.

Chair Anderson: Yes.

Ms. Wood: That's why we petitioned, you know, to get this for them.

Chair Anderson: Yes.

Board Members, do you have questions of her at all?

(No response.)

Chair Anderson: Thank you very much. Do we have anyone else?

(No response.)

Chair Anderson: For those on the phone, if you're muted

and you want to speak, please take yourself off mute.

Member Kotelchuck: My goodness, I'm sorry. Yes. Thank you.

Ms. LeMaster (sic), you had mentioned something, that they walked three times per shift. You mean three times a day, right?

Ms. Wood: For that shift.

Member Kotelchuck: Do I misunderstand?

Ms. Wood: Yes.

Member Kotelchuck: That is, each shift walked, each eight-hour shift walked through once?

Ms. Wood: Three times. Yes. Yes, three.

Member Kotelchuck: And that was perhaps then -- what was the timeframe? Are we talking about 24 hours, over 24 hours? Three times a --

Ms. Wood: It was not --

Member Kotelchuck: Go ahead.

Ms. Wood: It is my understanding that, for an eight-hour shift, they did it three times a day.

Member Kotelchuck: Okay.

Ms. Wood: But we submitted records that should show that.

Member Kotelchuck: Okay.

Ms. Wood: A lot of the records were gone, of course, or not at the plant, because they were, like I said, they had to get security clearance from the FBI, and everything. So, it was kind of hard to get a lot of records.

Member Kotelchuck: Right. So, really, it was during an eight-hour shift that these three walkthroughs were done?

Ms. Wood: Yes.

Member Kotelchuck: I didn't know whether the plant

was -- whether they inspected over a 24-hour day. No, just an eight-hour, an eight-hour normal workday, six days a week?

Ms. Wood: Right.

Member Kotelchuck: Okay. Fine. Thanks.

Ms. Wood: Thank you.

Chair Anderson: Okay. Any other comments or questions?

(No response.)

## Work Group Discussion & Path Forward

Chair Anderson: Well, now, we can have our Work Group discussion and plan forward.

We have really kind of two issues here. The first is dose reconstruction and the request to include this group as an SEC, that I think at least it appears to be an SEC -- and SC&A agrees -- that does reconstruction is feasible, even though the individuals did not have any personal biomonitoring conducted. But we have enough information, and especially the limited amount of time that they spent, and the protocol of what they did during their inspection. That gives us a pretty good set, so we can be sure we have a claimant-favorable assessment on the exposure.

So, the first question is for you other Board members, do we want to accept NIOSH's conclusion that they can be dose reconstructed?

Member Kotelchuck: I think so.

Chair Anderson: Bill?

Member Field: Yes. I think so as well. I think just following SC&A's recommendations seems appropriate.

Chair Anderson: Yes, I would agree. So, I think we're unanimous in accepting the SC&A review and their conclusion on the dose reconstructions. So, I think that's a unanimous decision as relates to the proposal to add this to the SEC.

The second issue, then, is, do we want to put the issues raised by SC&A, as they say, for the Site Profile in abeyance until those changes are made? I think we've done that in the past.

I also think there's good agreement, but do we now ask SC&A and NIOSH as to what changes need to be made? And now, it's just the implementation of that. So, once that's done, that will come back, and then, we'll close everything out, as we have with some of the other sites.

Member Kotelchuck: Yes, sounds fine.

Member Field: Yes.

Chair Anderson: So, I think that's the only followup actions that we have.

Rashaun, anything else we need to do?

You're on mute.

Dr. Roberts: Just in terms of the April Board meeting, we'll be having an agenda item where bringing this to the Board?

Chair Anderson: Yes, I think we can probably do -- I don't know whether we want to have -- SC&A, I don't remember; were you on the last Board meeting to talk about it? I mean, has the full Board seen your review?

Mr. Barton: No. I think this is the first time it's actually been broached with the Board.

Chair Anderson: Okay.

Mr. Barton: I think at the Board meeting --

Chair Anderson: So, I think at the Board meeting, to close this out, we could have you present your conclusions, and then, I can report on the Committee's action on it and the abeyance issue, and then, ask the full Board to agree to that.

Mr. Barton: We can certainly do that.

Chair Anderson: Okay.

Dr. Roberts: And about how much time do you guys

need for the agenda?

Mr. Barton: Well, this meeting itself is under an hour. I would think an hour would be max to allow time for comment and questions. So, probably 60 minutes would be fine, and it will probably take less than that.

Chair Anderson: Yes, I think the only unknown is whether other Board members will have any questions or comments to trigger further discussion. But I think circulating the report and the other reports, I can't imagine there will be a whole lot of concern with the decisions we've made. So, I think, you know, an hour at most. Probably a half-hour will suffice.

Okay, Rashaun?

Dr. Roberts: Yes, that's fine.

Chair Anderson: Tim, any other thoughts?

Dr. Taulbee: No. I think an hour is appropriate as well. I can't imagine it taking longer than that, but 30 minutes might actually push it, when you add in the other Board member questions.

Chair Anderson: Yes. Yes.

Dr. Taulbee: And our main go-to here is to update the Site Profile, based upon what we've all agreed to here today.

Chair Anderson: Yes. Right.

Dr. Taulbee: So, we will go forth and do that.

Chair Anderson: Yes. Okay.

Any other comments or issues?

Member Field: This is Bill. I just want to thank Angelica and Ron for the pretty clear presentation. Thank you for that.

Chair Anderson: Yes.

Member Kotelchuck: Agree.

Chair Anderson: Okay?

Ms. Gheen: Thank you so much.

Dr. Buchanan: Thank you.

## Adjourn

Chair Anderson: If there is nothing else, one or the other Board members want to recommend that we adjourn?

Member Kotelchuck: So moved.

Member Field: I would second.

Chair Anderson: Okay. Any final comments?

(No response.)

Chair Anderson: I think we're good moving forward.

Member Kotelchuck: It was a pleasure doing this on Zoom. That's what I found.

Member Field: Yes, it was. It was. Yes.

Member Kotelchuck: Yes. Nice to see people.

Member Field: Yes.

Member Kotelchuck: We can't shake hands anymore or have lunch.

(Laughter.)

Member Kotelchuck: But we can say, "Hello."

Chair Anderson: And I certainly appreciate the participation by the petitioner.

Member Field: Yes.

Member Kotelchuck: Yes.

Chair Anderson: And confirming that the description that we're basing our decisions on is an accurate depiction of how exposures occurred. Okay.

Ms. Wood: Thank you all so much.

Member Kotelchuck: Thank you.

Ms. Wood: I appreciate you.

Chair Anderson: We'll let you know about the April Board meeting, if you want to listen into that as well.

Ms. Wood: That would be great. I appreciate it.

Chair Anderson: Okay. Rashaun, I was looking through my notes. Do we have any other sites that we're now waiting on things here for this group?

Dr. Roberts: Not that I'm aware of. Nothing comes to mind immediately.

Chair Anderson: Okay. And there's no proposed new SECs for our group. So, it's just tracking the Site Profile changes that needed to be made for the various sites, and I think we're making good progress on those.

So, with that, I'll say, have a good weekend, everybody.

Member Field: Okay. Thank you.

Member Kotelchuck: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Anderson: Bye-bye.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:53 a.m.)