and knowledge of the sites -- hopefully, in fact, knowledge of the specific sites. So we're -- you know, we're sort of starting at a running start, and the expectation is that we know the operations, we know the histories, we know some of the issues in the past and presumably if, again, we have access to the kind of information that we need to have and are able to talk to the workers -- I have to tell you that probably the most important thing is to get beyond the paper. Most of my perspective is as the further you go back in DOE operational history, the less the actual practice resembles the paper that you're looking at. And I think if there's a mantra, that's going to be the mantra in terms of looking back through what essentially is forensic health physics, in a way, and that's how we're going to treat it.

DR. MELIUS: Just in -- follow up that -- I agree it'd be nice to start with something less complex, but going back to the -- sort of the efficiency issue and so forth before, I think Savannah River's fairly complex to deal with and there's -- when you're -- in another task, presumably, that's awarded and for individual dose reconstructions, given what's been done already,

there's going to be a number -- you know, randomly selected from Savannah River to look at. So having that site profile underway I think's going to be necessary, and I think NIOSH has --

MR. FITZGERALD: Right.

DR. MELIUS: -- ended up -- you know, there's a lot of -- how they prioritize and --

MR. FITZGERALD: Savannah River wouldn't be one that I would consider a killer in the early phases. And that may sound contradictory, but in terms of what knowledge we have on the team and the source terms involved, even though it's a large site and has a long history, it's a fairly public history now, as compared with some other sites where, you know, the history is less known and the source terms are more diverse.

Los Alamos would frighten me a little bit in the beginning because, unlike Savannah River, there just hasn't been -- Savannah River has been turned inside-out over the last ten years, so to some extent we are the beneficiaries of all that information. Other sites, the information isn't quite as organized, available and picked over, so that's going to cause for a lot more digging. Savannah River, the challenge I think is in a

couple of areas -- tritium comes to mind -- where, you know, one has to go back and reconstruct some of the history of the dosimetry and how that was recorded. And I think it's important there to sample workers, because I think there and again, you know, the actual practice versus what was detailed on paper diverge as you go back in time, and that's what would worry me about perhaps relying on what the written records suggest. So that -- answer to that question, Savannah --

DR. MELIUS: (Off microphone) (Inaudible).

DR. ZIEMER: Wanda?

MS. MUNN: It helps a great deal to have this overview, I think. From my point of view, anyway, it's reassuring that it sounds as though your plan is very close to what I, and I think many of my colleagues, had in mind when we were putting together the task proposals. But I think I heard a real challenge for us in the last of the data that you were giving us, John, insofar as identifying the fields that we want to see in the database is concerned. I think we may have only scratched the surface when we started talking about how to opt for the sites that we wanted to look at and pull together that information for us

to review. Actually considering the data fields that we want to see in their product appears to me to be a potentially significant activity.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah, I might add to that that if it turns out that some of the data fields we can identify will have to be obtained and reviewed, you know, that's sort of a do-loop that if it's the first time, you know, it's going to take -- take time, as you can imagine, as NIOSH has already experienced, to get access and to make heads or tails of it. But you know, the site profile being a living process, to some extent, you know, we certainly won't stop and -- you know, and stop everything and go back to it. It'll be a process where we'll try to improve the analysis by virtue of being able to get the additional information. You know, those are some of the vagaries of, you know, trying to dig deep and finding perhaps sources of data or data fields that may not have been accessed in the original profile. And understandably so. I mean this is the first pass at the site profiles. They're living documents. They're going to improve over time. When we dig and do samples and verticals, I think what we can contribute is perhaps some

indications of data fields or information sources that ought to be reflected in whatever upgrades or iterations. So I see it as very positive feedback when we do the vertical. I think that was perhaps the intent of the Board is to have that kind of a check. So you know, hopefully we can actually answer some of the questions in terms of what data fields have been looked at on one hand, and what sources information data fields might be identifiable if -- if we do this kind of independent digging, as well.

DR. ZIEMER: Joe, I want to kind of clarify one point, and I have to keep reminding us of the difference between an audit and the difference between what the Agency does. And for example, if -- if our contractor, you folks, identified an area and said, you know, here's an area that we've got to dig into and get this information, I think in general we would pass that information along to NIOSH and say here's an area that has been identified.

MR. FITZGERALD: Uh-huh.

DR. ZIEMER: One thing we don't want our auditors to do is to do the work of the Agency, so we always need to be careful --

MR. FITZGERALD: Right.

DR. ZIEMER: -- and differentiate between what is the audit and what is the work. And I think you folks will also probably need to keep that in mind 'cause there will be a tendency to say here's an area where there needs to be more, we need to get out there and see what's there and so on. And it may be that if you identify an area like that and -- and bring it back to the Board and the Board says to NIOSH our contractor has identified this, is this something that should be looked at. The Agency is being, in a sense, tasked with doing that, so our job is to identify those areas. So I need to continually remind us and remind you as -- what our part of the job is, so...

MR. FITZGERALD: Actually --

DR. ZIEMER: 'Cause we will -- we will otherwise get overly ambitious and NIOSH will have nothing to do then.

MR. FITZGERALD: That sort of resonates in my past career. Yeah.

DR. ZIEMER: You understand.

MR. FITZGERALD: I understand exactly, and if one looks at it in terms of feedback, that we're

feeding back issues that need to be unpacked, the level of review I think that is appropriate is determine whether in fact to sniff again. I would not want to divert or distract the Board or NIOSH with, you know, we found this, this, this and that, but we haven't really spent time deciding whether it's important or not. It's got to be relevant and pertinent and something that's significant enough that would influence the dose reconstruction process; and if it isn't, then I don't think it's something that we'd want to surface. And that -- just that level of analysis, how important is this and how significant is it, is the level that I think we would contribute. And if that's the case, then we would pass it on. We certainly would not try to run those numbers or try to do anything more than point to it.

Now what I was raising a little earlier was the fact that to judge, you know, whether there's any there or there -- this is the trouble I have sometimes with requesting data from DOE. It's sort of like, you know, you have to know what you want, even if you don't know what you don't -- what you don't want, you know. It's sort of one of these things that you -- well, how can I ask

for it if I don't know what it is? That's -- that's the dilemma that, you know, I -- you almost have to at least look at the information to determine what's there and whether it's relevant or not, and that's the part where I think clearly we have some challenges. But you know, again, persistence and knowing the right kind of questions and being able to work with the Board, I think, you know, we certainly will get there.

DR. ZIEMER: Any other questions for John or Joe? Comments?

(No responses)

Thank you very much. We appreciate the exchange this morning. As you know, we will be deliberating this afternoon and you will hear back from us after that -- those deliberations.

In this connection, we may want to proceed with the issue of the site profile selections. Well, it's almost break time I guess. Let's take a break. People are getting a little antsy. We'll take our 10:00 o'clock break and then resume. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

BOARD DISCUSSION/WORKING SESSION

DOSE RECONSTRUCTION REVIEW PROCESS

DR. ZIEMER: I want to take just a moment and delineate the items we need to address here. We have the issue of selection of our initial group of site profiles. We have agreed to take from the table a motion to send a letter to Secretary Thompson relating to the Special Exposure Cohort rule-making. And it's been requested that we have the group look at or review the letter that I wrote to several Congressmen. Were there other items that we need to look at? I think those are the three. Anyone identify any other items we need to address? Okay. Yes, Jim.

DR. MELIUS: Let me -- I mean add to that list one specific sort of contract issue. We were asked to -- if we had suggestions for additional elements to the database that we relay them to the contractor, and I think we just need to understand how to do that procedurally since that deliverable's due in a month and it's easier to add things ahead of time. So I think we just need to figure out how to -- how to do that efficiently and not get in trouble.

DR. ZIEMER: Right, we can look at that database -- and my guess is that -- based on what

we provided and what they plan to do, they probably have most of it covered, but we -- if we can identify things, that's fine.

DR. MELIUS: (Off microphone) (Inaudible) us relaying individual comments to you and you relaying them in some way to (Inaudible).

DR. ZIEMER: Well, if we can identify things here as a group, that would be fine, too.

DR. MELIUS: (Off microphone) (Inaudible) after a meeting if we sent something (Inaudible).

MR. ELLIOTT: You can do that either way, open session discussion and tell them what you want, or you can send them a letter or written information, written direction.

DR. MELIUS: (Off microphone) I don't think (Inaudible).

Another item that I think we should discuss is at least lay out a plan for how we deal with the issue of a subcommittee and this further interaction with the contract and -- there's a whole bunch of issues there that I think --

DR. ZIEMER: In fact --

DR. MELIUS: -- have to be -- I don't think we -- I don't think we can --

UNIDENTIFIED: (Off microphone) Delegation of

authority?

DR. MELIUS: Yeah --

DR. ZIEMER: Delegation --

DR. MELIUS: That, but I think we need to plan on how we do that and probably complete it at the next meeting.

DR. ZIEMER: Particularly those items -- this included everything from the invoice approvals to our working with our subgroups to work on the dose reconstructions, so that's -- that'll be an ongoing thing.

Let's direct our attention then to the site profile issue. We have now -- you have a handout which is Jim Neton's chart with the 15 facilities for which site profiles are either completed or in process, plus a number of AWEs. You also have the information on the site statistics that were -- was provided by Larry and is now included in the handout.

MR. ELLIOTT: Could I make a comment on that?

DR. ZIEMER: Yes.

MR. ELLIOTT: I think on that -- this is your third page on that -- what's been provided. Jim included a column there that says estimated work force, and I guess I would like to offer this as a

qualification. I think these numbers came from --

DR. NETON: Labor.

MR. ELLIOTT: -- Labor's presentation, but I don't believe that these numbers in all cases represent all the workers that worked at a site over the course of history of that site. For example, Hanford has more than 60,000 workers have ever worked at that site. They have many more than that.

DR. MELIUS: If I recall right, it excludes the construction work force. It's only the production work force at each of these facilities. That's what he said when he presented it now.

Isn't that right, Pete?

MR. ELLIOTT: Pete, is that -- are we correct in understanding the numbers that you presented at a given site didn't include construction trades, are just the production work force?

MR. TURCIC: That's correct.

MR. ELLIOTT: And in some cases is that the estimated current population or is that the estimated population who have ever worked there in production?

MR. TURCIC: (Off microphone) That was the estimated (Inaudible) program (Inaudible)

production people who had worked at that site.

DR. ZIEMER: Now I think as we proceed, we also may need to have some internal ground rules. If one is propos-- and this could work both ways, but if one is proposing to include a site, I suppose that we should ask people to recuse themselves from proposing or voting for a site with which they are -- are or have been affiliated. Is that fair enough? In other words, Tony perhaps would not vote on whether Los Alamos would be included in this list, for example.

Roy, you have a comment or a question?

DR. DEHART: I'm not sure when I look over the --

When I look over the diagram that we have here, the table, just which of these facilities have a complete -- a full, complete profile site status that would be able to be audited over the next --

DR. ZIEMER: Jim --

DR. DEHART: -- several weeks --

DR. ZIEMER: Jim Neton can --

DR. DEHART: -- or months?

DR. ZIEMER: -- help us or Larry -- looks like -- as I look at this, it looks like Hanford

and Savannah River are complete, but is that true or not?

DR. NETON: That's correct. The only two that have all chapters or Technical Basis Documents finished are Hanford and Savannah River, although you can see Y-12 is very close with one green dot that is undergoing comment resolution with NIOSH at this time.

DR. DEHART: Jim, is there an estimate over the next two to three months? That's probably as important.

DR. NETON: I figured that question would be coming. It's difficult to say. Some -- some of these comment resolutions go very quickly, they're just minor technical issues. Sometimes we end up with some -- some serious discussion about, you know, how to resolve an issue with missed dose or something of that nature. So it's hard to say, but -- but -- you know, I wish I could put a little better -- better time frame on that.

DR. MELIUS: But the --

DR. NETON: I could go with past history, maybe. You know, past history would dictate that we could resolve these --

DR. MELIUS: I guess is there a corollary to

that, is there some that we shouldn't -- can you go the other way and say some that we shouldn't start now because you know it's --

DR. NETON: Where there are --

DR. MELIUS: Where they are that -- that there isn't just going to be enough there in the next few months.

DR. NETON: I'm honestly not up to speed enough on all of these individual chapters. Maybe perhaps Dick Toohey could help -- he may be more aware of where -- where our more serious discrepancies lie.

MR. ELLIOTT: Obviously Iowa Ordnance Plant is not close.

DR. NETON: No.

DR. ZIEMER: Mark?

MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, just before -- before Dick went into that, I had a question for clarification. When you say "approved", that means that they could theoretically be audited right -- today or --

DR. NETON: Yes, they've been signed by OCAS and they're either on our web site or will be within -- as quickly as we can get it out there.

MR. GRIFFON: Okay, 'cause that was my point.