original? Several do, okay. We'll get those run off. Okay.

BOARD DISCUSSION/WORKING SESSION FOR SANFORD COHEN AND ASSOCIATES

Now we will be discussing the task order proposal in closed session this afternoon. This morning we're discussing issues relating specifically to the tasks that have already been awarded and general issues. John Mauro is here. Joe Fitzgerald is here. And John and Joe, I'm wondering if it would be useful for you to maybe pull around to the front here and -- do we have a mike that they can use? Maybe -- maybe this one. Do we have a portable mike that could be used by these gentlemen? Yes, we do.

Yeah, Joe and John, why don't you just pull a couple of chairs in the front there and you can share that portable mike. You don't necessarily have to stand -- huh? He's going to give you a mike. He's going to give you a mike. Do you need a podium?

DR. MAURO: (Off microphone) I could use the tabletop.

DR. ZIEMER: You're welcome to use the podium, if you wish. Is that easier?

DR. MAURO: (Off microphone) (Inaudible)

DR. ZIEMER: Yeah, we'll pull the podium over.

(Pause)

DR. ZIEMER: John, I believe it would be in order if you would like to begin the discussion with points and issues that -- and concerns or questions that you might have, and I'll kind of let you take the lead here at this point.

DR. MAURO: Fine, thank you. I appreciate that. Joe and I --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm not getting a feed.

DR. MAURO: (Off microphone) -- had a chance to --

UNIDENTIFIED: (Off microphone) That mike's not working.

DR. MAURO: (Off microphone) Hold it closer or --

DR. ZIEMER: Hold it closer or put it in the stand and raise the stand up a little bit. Oh, it won't fit.

DR. MAURO: (Off microphone) It's not working?

(Pause)

DR. MAURO: We got it. Okay, thank you. I

sat through yesterday's meeting and also the day before yesterday SC&A did receive official authorization to begin work on task two, which is the site profile reviews, and task four, which is the -- I guess the tracking system relational database. As a point of confusion, I have been informed by contracts that it turns out that those two tasks, which we have all been calling task two and task four, administratively -- according to -- when we put in our progress reports -- are actually going to be called tasks one and two because they came in first and second -- just to avoid confusion. But I'm going to continue, since I see everyone is comfortable with the two and four reference, we'll continue with the tasks two and four.

Now let's first talk a little bit about -- I'm going to talk more, as the program manager for SC&A, on some high level or global issues. And Joe certainly is here, who is our task manager for task two on site profiles, and we'll get down a little bit into the more of the specific issues with Joe. So -- and I have a few notes that I took yesterday -- a little scrambled, so it's almost like a little freewheeling thoughts that

have gone through my head -- spinning through my head, but I -- I'm going to sort of unload them a little bit.

First let's talk about our first deliverable, which is a report that's going to be due to you -- or really two reports -- one month from the day before yesterday. The first deliverable is going to be our proposed plan or procedure for performing our review of the site profiles. The other one is going to be a description of the relational database for tracking information and querying to support you in evaluating the degree to which your stratified sampling is meeting your needs. I'll talk about both of those briefly.

With regard to the first deliverable, which is this procedure, in our proposal we laid out our approach for performing site profile reviews. And in fact, we identified -- in about seven or eight pages -- our plan for doing that work. And it's a generic plan. It identifies in effect four areas that we're going to explore. It's almost like sub-tasks on the things that we plan to do. I'm sure you've all had a chance to look them over.

What dawned on me yesterday -- or day before yesterday -- is I read through the -- just

randomly select -- not randomly. I selected the site profile for Savannah River, which appears to be a fairly complete document and I believe one of the documents that is very mature, and went through it. And one of the things that struck me was that it was not -- it was a little different than I thought it would be. And one of the things that struck me regarding our deliverable -- now I sort of married that knowledge I gained from reading the site profile with our plan to -- for our first deliverable, and it struck me that I think we're going to have to write plans. And I'm throwing this onto the table and to Joe, also, for consideration. I think our plans for performing site profiles need, to some degree, be site-specific. Each site, it would appear, is very -- most sites -- many of the sites, very complex. The amount of technical information of potential importance and potential not importance is not immediately apparent of course until you go through the process of evaluating how important the information is. So we're -- we are going to have to be efficient in zeroing in and delving into aspects of each of these site profiles in a way that is very focused.

So my first thought is that our plans that we'll be submitting to you -- I'd like them, as the project manager, to keep control and keep focused and hold onto budget and schedule, is to write a plan that's of a generic nature, almost like an umbrella plan, but have an attachment to it that would specifically identify the strategies we currently think are the best strategies for coming at, for example, the site profile for Savannah River 'cause it contains certain information, when I look at it, that says where I think -- and this becomes a judgment call based on experience -- where the most important information lies, the places where -- it's almost like within our mandate and the time scale and the budget, we can't do an exhaustive evaluation of every aspect that might be of importance.

Now I'm looking for reaction to this. I think we have to be judicious in where we invest our resources so that we go after those things that we believe are -- are prioritized.

Now here's one of my concerns. My experience in doing work like this is it's a very iterative process. You dig. You step back, you look at what you have. You speak to your client, this is

what I'm seeing. And I think, based on what I'm seeing, we're going to move a little more in this direction versus that direction. And you step back and it's an -- it's an iterative process. It's not a linear process because you're growing as you proceed and you're realizing where your resources need to be focused.

Now one of my concerns is that -- I think Joe and I need the flexibility to make those judgments as we mature and move through the process. So though we will write a plan that we will deliver to you at the end of the month that will lay out, on a general approach, how we plan to do it, but also -- and I'd like to propose this -- we plan to try to make it tailored to the site profiles that you folks identify you would like us to take on initially. Okay? As best we can. But at the same time, I beg your indulgence that as we move through it and as we learn and get smarter, we will keep you apprised of the directions that -- that the information is taking us. So it's going to be a living process.

However, I think it's important that we have the freedom and flexibility to move down the paths that we consider to be important. We will

certainly keep you apprised of it. And if at any point in the process you feel that it's -- we're taking a path that perhaps the Board is uncomfortable with, you think that maybe it's not the best path to take or you're (sic) ignoring a path that you feel might be important -- here's where a collegial relationship is important to us, but I also realize that we have a very formal process here whereby approvals need to go through a process. So I'm at a little bit of a -- a little bit off-balance here because I like the idea of the interactive, but I also don't want to have hold points unnecessarily.

So I think I'd like -- I guess my first point to be made is that we have to learn together where the hold points are important, where we have to stop until you folks have a chance to deliberate, but where we're allowed to continue based on our judgment. We will always inform you of any direction we're taking that might be substantively different than what we originally laid out in the plan that you'll receive a month from now. I guess that's the first point I wanted to make.

DR. ZIEMER: John, do you want the Board to comment or react as you proceed here?

DR. MAURO: I very much would like --

DR. ZIEMER: Or ask questions -- okay. Let's -- on that point -- Tony.

DR. ANDRADE: John, and also for the members of the Board, based on your comments and my own thinking as of yesterday, I wholeheartedly agree with the general direction in which you'd like to push forward on. I don't think the criteria like the numbers of employees that have filed are necessarily -- I don't believe that that particular criterion is necessarily a good one at this particular point in time. I believe that you, contractor, would perhaps feel better getting on board that learning curve with addressing perhaps a site that had a limited number of functions -- perhaps a manufacturing function or something like that -- rather than jumping into say Los Alamos, that has everything from theoretical physics to plutonium work. So it's my belief that the Board should consider something like that for a site that we believe is important.

DR. ZIEMER: As we proceed here, you're simply hearing comments that do not constitute official direction from the Board. Your task is (off microphone) your task. You are to come with

us -- to us in one month with a proposal. You are reflecting some thoughts about that right now --

THE COURT REPORTER: Okay, he's off-mike.

DR. ZIEMER: (Off microphone) -- about the nature of what that will look like. I don't think that we can, in any definitive --

Oh, I lost the contact. I don't think, in any definitive way, that we can comment beyond some sort of general reactions and so on. Certainly the plan, if it's to be a plan that covers, conceptually, the whole gamut of site profiles, has to be a generic umbrella thing. And I think we understand that there may be specifics that would apply to one facility that might not apply to other facilities. And I presume the plan would spell out how you would get at what those would be for a Savannah River versus a Bethlehem Steel or something like that.

DR. MAURO: Well, that's -- that brings me -- in order for us to take the approach that I'd like to take, namely have an over-arching plan but have an addendum to it that explicitly addresses our plan for a particular facility, it would mean that very shortly you would need to provide us with direction on which ones you'd like us to begin

with. I realize we have a list. There's a potential for as many as I believe ten to 12 DOE and two to four AWEs. The sooner -- in light of my thinking now, the sooner we have an initial list of the two, three, four, five that would -- you'd like us to begin with, the -- it will -- it will allow us in our next -- in our first deliverable, to address those specific ones so that -- 'cause that's where the rubber meets the road. If that's possible, that would be very helpful. Otherwise what we're going to deliver to you is going to be, quite frankly, of limited -- I hate to say this, but -- it will give you a general idea of how we're going to come at the problem, but I think more importantly is we need specific ideas on how we're going to come at the problem because we're on a track that we're trying to be highly efficient. And how we see efficiency and how we apply our resources is going to be unique to each facility. So I'd like to request a --

DR. ZIEMER: I think based on our discussion yesterday, it was our hope that we would have some of those yet identified at this meeting, as I recall.

Mark, comment?

MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, I think the general approach that you described is consistent with what we were thinking and the over-arching plan I think is the deliverable. The only thing I would say is that the site-specific plan -- I tend to agree with you in that I think the site-specific plans -- you can get more specific, but I think there is going to be some iterative, you know, actions as you move through the process, so I'm not sure -- I guess -- I guess what I'm sort of saying is I'd hate to see a lot of time and man-hours spent on those site-specific plans, especially if there's going to be a lot of iterative, you know -- as you move along through the process. So -- but I think the deliverable, as we laid it out, is that first sort of umbrella, generic plan that would give you the flexibility to adapt on different sites as you need to -- you know, as you see fit.

DR. MAURO: That being the case -- that being the case, what I'm hearing is -- at least an initial impression -- is that our first deliverable will be a generic plan. But then as we are authorized to proceed with particular

profiles, particular sites, it probably would be a good idea for us to -- when we have our internal meetings, to lay out -- to draw upon our resources, our people. How we're going to break it up -- I could -- right now I have a very clear idea in my mind, for example, on Savannah River, how would I come -- how I would do that. When we get to that point, we'd probably want to inform you of that and may-- and how -- and we will deliver something to you to say this is our plan. Now whether that would be considered a deliverable as part of our initial plan procedure or just something that's part of a monthly progress report or -- or some interim reports, just to keep you apprised -- perhaps that's the best way to go. It keeps it simpler. Anyway, those are some thoughts.

I move on to my second thought. When we -- and I'm not too sure of the extent that we should talk about budget here, and when I say "budget", I mean work hour allocation and the way we do our work. We have gone through a negotiation process as -- and we're at a point where that process is fairly mature. And one of the things is the relationship between the four tasks. Though we

proposed each task as a separate item and they are being authorized independently, I see them as fully integrated activities. And I'm going to give you a very important perspective, in my opinion, in terms of having -- in having effects on efficiency, cost and schedule.

Let's say we receive a batch of cases that need to be processed, either basic, advanced or one of the two blind dose reconstructions. Let's say we get approval next week and a batch shows up. Okay? Now, visualize we're going to assign the appropriate people, either strong internal dosimetrists, neutron dosimetry, external dosimetry, whatever the needs are, we will have a team of people. And whether it's an advanced review or a basic review, we'll have a team of people working the problem. But I'm starting to realize from conversations during breaks and during -- with individual members of the Board, that a lot -- a lot of the dose reconstruction for the individual cases is drawing from the site profiles. That is, the site profiles are becoming very important documents.

Now what this means to me is that I envision -- let's say it's me doing a review of a case, and

I realize that I'm going to have to draw upon information that's in the site profile. Now here's the -- here's the -- the catch-22. Let's say for the moment that that site profile is not one of the site profiles that Joe is reviewing. Okay, here I am doing a case -- I'll use Savannah River as an example -- and I'm working it, but I say I need help from Joe on the site profile. And the way in which we budgeted our program was that's going to be available to me. That is, I'm going to be able to go say Joe, I'm looking at this person that worked at this location at this time. I have this bioassay data, or I don't; help me out a little bit here regarding the mix of radionuclides, chemical forms, any -- any information you have on CAMs and RAMs -- continuous air monitors and radiation area monitors -- data that might be available in the database because that's going to help me validate, check or fill out my ability to review the dose reconstruction. So there's a presumption here. The presumption is while I'm working out a case at Savannah River, Joe is going to be working on the site profile, Savannah River. If that's not the case, I'm at a loss. So one of the criteria when

you select your cases and you select your site profiles, as an operational -- from my -- from an operational perspective, they should be coupled so that I could draw upon that in an efficient way. Because the alternative is then me, as the reviewer of a case, I will have to do my own review of the site profile, independent of Joe, which is an inefficient way to do it. That is, I would -- it -- certainly what I do will be -- add value eventually when Joe gets to that, or when he's authorized to do that, but I see that as being an efficient way to run it.

Similarly, though task three has not yet been approved -- task three, by the way, is the review of the procedures, OCAS-1 and two and all the other procedures that ORAU has developed. Now, again, there's going to be a process where we're reviewing -- from a generic point of view, not as they apply to a particular case -- those procedures. The degree to which those reviews are ongoing while I'm doing my case review -- there is a synergy that will occur. I'm envisioning a synergy where we have several minds simultaneously working different aspects of a problem, one group looking at the procedures that are being use--