

THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

convenes

MEETING 53

ADVISORY BOARD ON
RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

The verbatim transcript of the 53rd
Meeting of the Advisory Board on Radiation and
Worker Health held telephonically on Feb. 20, 2008.

STEVEN RAY GREEN AND ASSOCIATES
NATIONALLY CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS
404/733-6070

C O N T E N T S

Feb. 20, 2008

WELCOME AND OPENING COMMENTS	7
DR. PAUL ZIEMER, CHAIR	
DR. CHRISTINE BRANCHE, DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL	
CHAPMAN VALVE SEC UPDATE	15
DOW CHEMICAL SEC UPDATE	34
LINDE UPDATE	43
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOSE RECONSTRUCTION UPDATE	56
WORK GROUP UPDATES	98
STATUS OF TRANSCRIPTS AND MINUTES AND UPDATE ON SELECTION OF BOARD CONTRACTOR	119
COMBUSTION ENGINEERING	123
BOARD WORKING TIME AND FUTURE PLANS	125
COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	170

TRANSCRIPT LEGEND

The following transcript contains quoted material. Such material is reproduced as read or spoken.

In the following transcript: a dash (--) indicates an unintentional or purposeful interruption of a sentence. An ellipsis (. . .) indicates halting speech or an unfinished sentence in dialogue or omission(s) of word(s) when reading written material.

-- (sic) denotes an incorrect usage or pronunciation of a word which is transcribed in its original form as reported.

-- (phonetically) indicates a phonetic spelling of the word if no confirmation of the correct spelling is available.

-- "uh-huh" represents an affirmative response, and "uh-uh" represents a negative response.

-- "*" denotes a spelling based on phonetics, without reference available.

-- (inaudible)/ (unintelligible) signifies speaker failure, usually failure to use a microphone.

P A R T I C I P A N T S

(By Group, in Alphabetical Order)

BOARD MEMBERS

CHAIR

ZIEMER, Paul L., Ph.D.
 Professor Emeritus
 School of Health Sciences
 Purdue University
 Lafayette, Indiana

DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL

BRANCHE, Christine, Ph.D.
 Principal Associate Director
 National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
 Washington, DC

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

WADE, Lewis, Ph.D.
 Senior Science Advisor
 National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
 Washington, DC

MEMBERSHIP

BEACH, Josie
 Nuclear Chemical Operator
 Hanford Reservation
 Richland, Washington

1 CLAWSON, Bradley
 2 Senior Operator, Nuclear Fuel Handling
 3 Idaho National Engineering & Environmental Laboratory

GIBSON, Michael H.
 President
 Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical, and Energy Union
 Local 5-4200
 Miamisburg, Ohio

GRIFFON, Mark A.
President
Creative Pollution Solutions, Inc.
Salem, New Hampshire

1 LOCKEY, James, M.D.
2 Professor, Department of Environmental Health
3 College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati

4 MELIUS, James Malcom, M.D., Ph.D.
5 Director
6 New York State Laborers' Health and Safety Trust Fund
7 Albany, New York

MUNN, Wanda I.
Senior Nuclear Engineer (Retired)
Richland, Washington

POSTON, John W., Sr., B.S., M.S., Ph.D.
Professor, Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

PRESLEY, Robert W.
Special Projects Engineer
BWXT Y12 National Security Complex
Clinton, Tennessee

ROESSLER, Genevieve S., Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus
University of Florida
Elysian, Minnesota

SCHOFIELD, Phillip
Los Alamos Project on Worker Safety
Los Alamos, New Mexico

IDENTIFIED PARTICIPANTS

ADAMS, NANCY, NIOSH
BEHLING, HANS, SC&A
BEHLING, KATHY, SC&A
BLOCK, SHARON, SEN. KENNEDY
BONSIGNORE, ANTOINETTE, LINDE
BROEHM, JASON, CDC WASHINGTON OFFICE
BURGOS, ZAIDA, NIOSH
BURN, JIM, SOCIETY FOR HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
CRAWFORD, CHRIS
DREW, SHANA, SEN. CANTWELL
ELLIOTT, LARRY, NIOSH
FITZGERALD, JOSEPH, SC&A
HOMOKI-TITUS, LIZ, HHS
HOWELL, EMILY, HHS
KOTSCH, JEFF, DOL
LEWIS, GREG, DOE
MAKHIJANI, ARJUN, SC&A
MARSCHKE, STEVE, SC&A
MCKEEL, DAN, SINEW
NETON, JIM, NIOSH
OH, KATHERINE, SEN. REID
OSTROW, STEVE, SC&A
RAMSPOTT, JOHN, ST. LOUIS
ROLFES, MARK, NIOSH OCAS
RUTHERFORD, LAVON, NIOSH

1 DR. ZIEMER: Yes.

2 DR. BRANCHE: Mr. Schofield?

3 MR. SCHOFIELD: Here.

4 DR. BRANCHE: Mr. Presley?

5 MR. PRESLEY: Here.

6 DR. BRANCHE: Ms. Munn.

7 MS. MUNN: Here.

8 DR. BRANCHE: Okay. We do have a quorum. Jim,
9 were -- you were -- Jim Lockey, you were going
10 to -- did you check your calendar?

11 DR. LOCKEY: Yeah, I'm looking at it right now.

12 DR. ZIEMER: Is Ray Green on the line?

13 DR. BRANCHE: Oh, he is. We'll get started in
14 just a second, Dr. --

15 DR. ZIEMER: Okay, just wanted to make sure Ray
16 was there. Morning, Ray.

17 THE COURT REPORTER: Yeah, hi, Dr. Ziemer.

18 DR. LOCKEY: November 6th is great for me.

19 DR. BRANCHE: Okay. All right, we'll get to
20 that in a minute. Dr. Ziemer, Dr. Lockey's
21 going to have to leave us at 2:30, but right
22 now we have quorum.

23 DR. ZIEMER: Let's wait just one more minute.

24 DR. BRANCHE: Okay.

25 DR. ZIEMER: I'm just looking here at the

1 official time. Well, it's 11:01 according to
2 the cell phone, which seems to pick up the
3 official time from some signal out in space.

4 **MS. MUNN:** Yes, and Microsoft says the same
5 thing.

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** Paul, this is Mark Griffon. I'm
7 on now.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, good morning, Mark.

9 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay, we still have quorum.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Let's see, did Dr. Melius come on
11 the line yet?

12 **DR. MELIUS:** Yep, I'm on, too.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

14 **DR. BRANCHE:** Dr. Poston, are you on?

15 (No response)

16 Dr. Ziemer, you have everyone except --

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Except Poston, okay.

18 **DR. BRANCHE:** And Ray is ready. I have a few
19 bookkeeping items, as you know.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, let's -- let's go ahead and
21 proceed. I'll officially call the meeting to
22 order. You -- you have just done a roll call
23 on the Board. Everyone was present except Dr.
24 Poston.

25 **MS. BURGOS:** Excuse me, Dr. Branche, this is

1 Zaida. I will call Dr. Poston.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

3 **DR. BRANCHE:** Thank you, Zaida.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** If you would proceed, Dr. Branche,
5 and check on other members who are present and
6 then give us some good instruction on protocol
7 for the use of the phone.

8 **DR. BRANCHE:** All right. As you said, I have
9 just done the Board roll call, and welcome to
10 the 53rd meeting of the Advisory Board on
11 Radiation and Worker Health. I'm Dr. Christine
12 Branche and I'll be your Designated Federal
13 Official today.

14 I've got -- Ray -- Ray Green, you're up and
15 ready?

16 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Yes, ma'am.

17 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay, great. I just wanted to --
18 we could -- if there are NIOSH reps on the
19 line, would you please identify yourself?

20 **DR. WADE:** This is Lew Wade --

21 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Larry Elliott --

22 **DR. WADE:** -- sitting in with Dr. Post-- with
23 Dr. Branche.

24 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Hi, this is Larry Elliott.

25 **DR. NETON:** This is Jim Neton in Cincinnati.

1 (No response)

2 I presume they'll join us later. Anyone from
3 the Department of Labor?

4 **MR. KOTSCH:** Jeff Kotsch in Washington.

5 **DR. BRANCHE:** Jeff, thank you so much for
6 joining us.

7 Are there -- is there anyone else who would
8 like to identify themselves?

9 **MS. OH:** This is Katherine Oh in Senator Reid's
10 office.

11 **DR. BRANCHE:** Hi, Katherine. How are you?

12 **MS. OH:** Good, how are you?

13 **DR. BRANCHE:** Very well.

14 **MS. DREW:** This is Shana Drew in Senator
15 Cantwell's office.

16 **MS. BLOCK:** And Sharon Block from Senator
17 Kennedy's office.

18 **MR. BURN:** I'm Jim Burn from the Society for
19 Human Resource Management.

20 **DR. MCKEEL:** This is Dan McKeel from SINEW.

21 **MR. RAMSPOTT:** John Ramspott, St. Louis.

22 **DR. BRANCHE:** Is there anyone else?

23 **MS. HOWELL:** This is Emily Howell with HHS.

24 **DR. BRANCHE:** Hi, Emily. Okay, just one quick
25 question. Mr. Fitzgerald, are you speaking for

1 SC&A today in John Mauro's absence?

2 **MR. FITZGERALD:** Yeah, there may be some
3 specific issues that some of the others will be
4 more directly involved with, but yes, I think
5 at this point (unintelligible).

6 **DR. BRANCHE:** Thank you so much. Just a few
7 pieces of information about telephone
8 etiquette. We are -- all of us are
9 participating by phone today. If you could
10 please mute your phone. If you do not have a
11 mute button you can use star-6 to engage the
12 mute function. And when you are ready to
13 speak, please use the same star-6 to unmute the
14 phone. If everyone will cooperate with the
15 mute function we will all be able to hear each
16 other speak. But most importantly, our tran--
17 our -- our court reporter will be able to get
18 everyone's comments and we all will be able to
19 enhance our quality of hearing today.

20 For those of you who will be participating in a
21 speaking role today, if at any time that you
22 speak, if you could please use the handset -- I
23 realize many of us have a speakerphone option.
24 However, the court reporter wants to make
25 certain that he has the highest quality for

1 transcribing purposes, and I remind you to
2 please pick up the receiver when you are ready
3 to speak. And again, if you could please mute
4 your phone 'cause I already hear someone
5 typing.

6 And so with that, I appreciate everyone's
7 participation today. I know we have a long and
8 full agenda. And so Dr. Ziemer, I know we said
9 we were going to have a moment of silence, but
10 I hand it over to you.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you very much, Dr. Branche.
12 Dr. Branche mentioned a moment of silence.
13 Many of you Board members know that Ed Walker,
14 who was the representative from Bethlehem
15 Steel, has recently passed away. We did
16 receive a request from Bill Greeley* who's with
17 Representative Brian Higgins' office in New
18 York asking that we consider having a moment of
19 silence in honor of Ed Walker, and we certainly
20 want to do that. Let me make a couple of
21 remarks and then we will proceed to have a
22 moment of silence.

23 As you know, Ed Walker's dedicated efforts over
24 the past several years on behalf of the
25 Bethlehem Steel claimants have really had a

1 significant impact on the Bethlehem Steel
2 Technical Basis Document. Ed was a very
3 persistent advocate for Bethlehem Steel
4 workers, and at the same time was a person who
5 conducted himself in a very courteous and
6 gentlemanly manner in his interactions with
7 those of us on the Board. So on behalf of the
8 Advisory Board I would like to express
9 condolences to Ed's wife [Name redacted], as
10 well as to his other family members and friends
11 and his coworkers.
12 But let us now observe a moment of silence in
13 memory of Ed Walker.

14 (Pause)

15 Thank you very much.

16 We will now proceed to our agenda as it's been
17 distributed and as it appears on our web site.

18 **CHAPMAN VALVE SEC UPDATE**

19 The first item on the agenda is an update on
20 Chapman Valve -- and I just dropped my papers
21 here.

22 **DR. BRANCHE:** Dr. Ziemer --

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes.

24 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- Dr. Poston is the chair of
25 that workgroup, but --

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

2 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- the follow-up item on this one
3 was that we were looking to see if there was
4 going to be any change in class definition?

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, we did receive some
6 materials on Chapman Valve. There has been a
7 revision in the evaluation report. I think
8 that was distributed a week or two ago by
9 NIOSH, and let me ask first, LaVon Rutherford -
10 -

11 **MR. RUTHERFORD:** Yes.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- you're on the line, aren't you?
13 And you want to make any comments -- or you or
14 Larry Elliott -- on the revised evaluation
15 report?

16 **MR. RUTHERFORD:** Yeah, Dr. Ziemer and Board,
17 this is LaVon Rutherford. As Dr. Ziemer
18 mentioned, on February 8th we sent out the
19 revised evaluation report for Chapman Valve.
20 What we did was we looked at the conclusions
21 that the Department of Energy came up with and
22 presented at the January board meeting. We
23 went back and looked -- we went back and looked
24 at that conclusion. We updated the evaluation
25 report to include the Dean Street facility. We

1 modified the class definition -- the proposed
2 class definition to clearly indicate the Dean
3 Street facility. We also took into
4 consideration the fact that Department of
5 Energy concluded that there were no new
6 activities -- radiological activities involved.
7 And I believe in the e-mail we sent out to the
8 Board that we included those sections that --
9 in the report that had been revised.
10 We also included the -- the official letters
11 that the -- from the Department of Energy and -
12 - concerning their conclusions on the O drive
13 for the Board members.
14 And I believe that's pretty much it. Our
15 feasibility determination did not change from
16 the information provided by the Department of
17 Energy.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Thank you. Let me ask if
19 there are any questions from the Board members
20 on this revised evaluation report or -- and the
21 related issue that generated that?

22 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, this is Jim Melius. I -- I
23 can't recall specifically where we left this at
24 the last meeting, but I do remember we had
25 discussed having SC&A review the revised report

1 once NIOSH had completed their activities, and
2 I just didn't know if that had -- I actually
3 don't believe that has occurred yet.

4 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Dr. Melius, this is Arjun. I
5 just wanted to follow -- I -- I believe you're
6 right. We have -- we have not (unintelligible)
7 asked to (unintelligible).

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** No, that's -- that is correct,
9 there's been no official assignment of that
10 task. It was awaiting this evaluation report.

11 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Dr. Ziemer, this is Ray.
12 Could I say something real quick?

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes.

14 **THE COURT REPORTER:** It was very hard to hear
15 Dr. Makhijani, so Dr. Makhijani, if you can do
16 something --

17 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Yeah.

18 **THE COURT REPORTER:** -- else, I'd appreciate
19 it. Thanks.

20 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Maybe I'll ju-- I'll just talk
21 louder. I was --

22 **THE COURT REPORTER:** That is much better.
23 Thank you.

24 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Yes. I -- I said that we had
25 not been assigned a task of reviewing the new

1 material on these --

2 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Well...

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Let me also ask, while we're
4 discussing Chapman, whether any of the
5 petitioners are on the line? Any of the
6 Chapman petitioners who might have comments at
7 this point? I believe the revised evaluation
8 report was sent to the petitioners, as well.

9 **MR. RUTHERFORD:** That is correct. I -- I do
10 want to clarify -- make sure everybody
11 understood that this revised evaluation report
12 -- this is LaVon Rutherford, by the way -- this
13 revised evaluation report was based on DOE's
14 find-- the Department of Energy's finding that
15 there were no new radiological activities.
16 Therefore, the technical determination in the
17 report is the same determination that SC&A has
18 already reviewed.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** That was previously reviewed --

20 **MR. RUTHERFORD:** That's correct.

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- that is what you're saying.
22 There are no changes, based on the findings of
23 the Department of Energy --

24 **MR. RUTHERFORD:** That is correct.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- as transmitted to NIOSH.

1 **MR. CLAWSON:** Dr. Ziemer, this is Brad Clawson.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes, Brad.

3 **MR. CLAWSON:** Well, then LaVon, help me kind of
4 with this. Basically it hasn't changed
5 anything, so you're telling us that yeah,
6 you've said that now Dean Street is a part of
7 it, but you don't know what went on in Dean
8 Street and that you're going to dismiss the one
9 sample of enriched uranium out of the three
10 samples. Is that correct?

11 **MR. RUTHERFORD:** What we're saying is that the
12 Department of Energy found no evidence of any
13 new radiological activities occurring at the
14 Dean Street facility, and we have taken that
15 into consideration. In addition, they have
16 found no information that would support
17 enriched uranium activities as well, and in our
18 additional report of FUSRAP data we found no
19 information that would support enriched
20 activities.

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** LaVon, this is Mark Griffon.

22 **MR. RUTHERFORD:** Uh-huh.

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Can you -- can you describe -- I
24 must admit I haven't rev-- looked through the
25 revised evaluation report in depth, but can you

1 describe what additional information you
2 reviewed regarding the FUSRAP activities?

3 **MR. RUTHERFORD:** Actually I think the -- the
4 specific information, Mark Rolfes would be
5 better at -- at addressing, or what was
6 reviewed. I can tell you that we did review
7 all the information that was provided to us by
8 the Department of Energy, but Mark Rolfes is on
9 the line and he can address --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** The FUSRAP data.

11 **MR. ROLFES:** Yes, LaVon, this is Mark. I --
12 it'll take me just a couple of minutes to look
13 through -- I will pull up some previous e-mails
14 --

15 **DR. BRANCHE:** Mark, you need to speak up,
16 please.

17 **MR. ROLFES:** Okay, I'm sorry. Can you hear me
18 a little better now?

19 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes, thank you.

20 **MR. ROLFES:** Okay. Some of the specific
21 information -- there was a FUSRAP report,
22 approximately 700 pages that were reviewed.
23 Let's see, in addition to that information, we
24 had looked into some of the references from
25 that FUSRAP report. We did not find any

1 additional information that would indicate that
2 enriched uranium was in fact processed or
3 handled in any manner at the Chapman Valve
4 facility.

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** And those reports, I'm assuming,
6 Mark, were added to the O drive?

7 **MR. ROLFES:** Yes, correct, they were.

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay, okay.

9 **DR. NETON:** Mark, I also think that we -- we
10 located the regulatory docket that was filed by
11 the DOE in relation to the FUSRAP
12 investigation.

13 **MR. ROLFES:** That is correct.

14 **DR. NETON:** We looked through that entire
15 regulatory docket and found nothing -- much of
16 it was similar to what was in the FUSRAP report
17 'cause it was based on that information, but
18 there were no data in those reports that spoke
19 to the issue of enriched uranium.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** And no more information, Mark or
21 Jim -- no more information on the cleanup --
22 you know, I know I had asked about shipments,
23 you know, waste shipments, if there was
24 anything that might have clarified what they
25 shipped out of the facility when they cleaned

1 it up, or receipts from Y-12, whe-- or some
2 question of whether we could check the shipping
3 records of -- of stuff that was -- materials
4 that were sent from Y-12, whether they were new
5 materials or -- or, you know, previously used
6 parts that may have been contaminated or
7 whatever. No luck on that front, I -- I guess.
8 Right?

9 **MR. ROLFES:** There was nothing additional.

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** No -- no paperwork found. Right?

11 **MR. ROLFES:** Nothing additional.

12 **DR. NETON:** What -- what I -- I might remind
13 folks, though, is that the enriched uranium
14 samples were not found in Building 23.

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

16 **DR. NETON:** And the SEC class that we are
17 specifically recommending not be added is the
18 activities that occurred in Building 23.
19 Doesn't preclude anything from being added at a
20 later date if it's discovered in other parts of
21 the plant or the Dean Street facility, for that
22 matter.

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Where were those samples found,
24 Jim -- just remind us. I thought they were ra-
25 - adjacent to Building 23.

1 **DR. NETON:** Oh, they were near -- I think one
2 was near --

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** By the loading --

4 **DR. NETON:** -- loading dock --

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- yeah.

6 **DR. NETON:** -- outside and --

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** That's right.

8 **DR. NETON:** -- one was somewhere just inside,
9 but to my knowledge they were not in Building
10 23 at all, and so, you know, our class
11 evaluated whether Building 23 should be added,
12 the activities, and we have a very detailed --
13 extremely detailed report of all those
14 activities. Nothing indicated any enriched
15 uranium was in Building 23 during that time
16 period. That's what we're trying to address
17 here. Doesn't preclude anything being added at
18 a later date.

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, right.

20 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** This is Phil, I -- I'm still a
21 little bothered by this enriched uranium
22 samples they found. Is there any data in the
23 records that you can see of them doing any kind
24 of chem analysis?

25 **DR. NETON:** Well, Phil, we -- we tried hard to

1 go back -- Oak Ridge -- ORAU actually did the
2 analysis and we -- we were not successful in
3 getting the original laboratory analyses. We
4 have some -- some information that leads us to
5 believe they may have been germanium
6 spectroscopy analyses, which in my mind
7 indicates that the uncertainty would be pretty
8 large about the degree of enrichment in the
9 analysis, but we -- we have not been able to
10 identify or locate those individual
11 (unintelligible).

12 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** Okay.

13 **DR. NETON:** They weren't highly enriched, as I
14 recall, though, by their analysis.

15 **MR. ROLFES:** The specific enrichment that was
16 believed to have been observed was 2.16 percent
17 enriched.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, any further questions or
19 comments?

20 (No responses)

21 I -- I -- this is Ziemer again. I believe that
22 our intent at our last meeting was that we
23 would plan to have a vote on this at the face-
24 to-face meeting in April and, depending on the
25 interim findings, we would or would not have

1 additional review by SC&A. It doesn't appear
2 to me at the moment that we would need that.
3 We -- we could instruct the workgroup to be
4 sure to look at this additional data closely on
5 the O drive and -- and be prepared for a -- a
6 recommendation at the next meeting.

7 **MS. MUNN:** This is Wanda. Paul, your statement
8 with respect to expectation for a vote at the
9 next face-to-face meeting agrees with my memory
10 of what transpired. With respect to the need
11 for additional SCA review, since there's been
12 no change in either the findings of fact or
13 with the NIOSH position, I -- it's hard to see
14 what value would be achieved by additional
15 review.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you. Other comments?

17 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, this is Jim Melius, and I
18 would respectfully disagree and I would much
19 prefer that we have an -- that SC&A review the
20 new report, as well as -- in the context of the
21 DOE findings before we complete our review of
22 this particular evaluation report.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** What about others of you on the
24 Board, pro or con, on that? Let -- let me see
25 if --

1 **MR. PRESLEY:** Hey, Paul --

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- we can get kind of a consensus
3 here on what direction to go. There -- there
4 are some sort of new materials on the O drive,
5 so those certainly could be looked at. That
6 could be done by the workgroup, and whether or
7 not they need additional assistance from the
8 contractor is not obvious to me at the moment,
9 but perhaps they would.

10 Was that Mr. Presley?

11 **MR. PRESLEY:** Yeah, Bob Presley. Hey, Jim, you
12 got any recommendations on the stuff that you
13 think that they might go back and look at or
14 further study on?

15 **DR. MELIUS:** I think -- Jim Melius, I think
16 that's -- simply what Paul outlined.

17 **MR. PRESLEY:** Okay. All righty.

18 **DR. MELIUS:** And that -- I don't think -- I
19 don't think it's an extensive review, but I
20 would -- you've -- given our record of review
21 at this site, what's happened this site, I
22 would feel much more comfortable -- we're going
23 to take a vote to, you know, close out on the
24 evaluation, that you -- that SC&A complete a
25 review 'cause SC&A was the one that -- their

1 site visit that uncovered the -- you know, some
2 of these -- the Dean Street facility issue and
3 so forth, so I'd like to make sure that we
4 looked at all this material, but I -- and I
5 don't believe they've had an opportunity -- as
6 I recall, DOE provided the -- the new materials
7 to us just before the last meeting, and this
8 report just now, so...

9 **MR. PRESLEY:** I have -- I have no problem with
10 that. I just don't want a full-blown study
11 that'll take a year to go -- ongoing -- do
12 this.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, I'm assuming that what is
14 being recommended here would be something that
15 would come to some kind of closure in time for
16 us to have a report by our April meeting. Did
17 -- was that what you were suggesting, Dr.
18 Melius?

19 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, correct, I don't see this
20 needing to take a long time. I can't speak for
21 SC&A, and I actually was -- as of yesterday, I
22 don't think even John Mauro was aware that
23 there was a updated report from NIOSH, at least
24 not from e-mail correspondence I had with him.

25 **MS. BEACH:** And -- this is Josie Beach -- I

1 think that SC&A review would be important, and
2 a report from the workgroup, if the vote in
3 April is a good path forward.

4 **MR. CLAWSON:** Dr. Ziemer, this is Brad.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes, Brad.

6 **MR. CLAWSON:** I -- I agree with Dr. Ziemer.
7 Being on the workgroup and so forth like that,
8 especially with some of the petitioners and so
9 forth like that, and more discussions, I think
10 it'd be beneficial for us to have SC&A review
11 the data that was there and give a report back
12 to us -- possible and -- so that we could
13 proceed on with this.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** In order to determine whether we
15 have a sort of a consensus on this, let me ask
16 for a simple motion. Dr. Melius, perhaps you
17 would make the motion since you've suggested
18 this direction.

19 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, and I would move that we
20 instruct SC&A to review the updated SEC
21 evaluation report on the Chapman Valve facility
22 recently issued by NIOSH, and the accompanying
23 new material provided by the Department of
24 Energy, and report back to the workgroup and to
25 the full Board before our -- for our April

1 meeting.

2 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley, I'll second
3 that motion.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you. So --

5 **DR. BRANCHE:** Would you like me to do a roll
6 call, Dr. Ziemer?

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, let me see if there's any
8 discussion first.

9 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Any discussion on the motion?

11 **MS. MUNN:** This is Wanda. Question, when will
12 the workgroup meet to review this? First --
13 first of all, what's -- what's our time line
14 here? What do we anticipate -- what would SC&A
15 anticipate their time requirement being to
16 review this?

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Joe, can you respond to that?

18 **MR. FITZGERALD:** Well, I think Arjun's probably
19 been the most involved in this. I'd defer to
20 his -- his recommendation.

21 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Well -- well, I'm on the -- I'm
22 on the (unintelligible) server right. There's
23 quite a few new documents and -- and
24 yesterday's the first time I became aware that
25 there had been a new evaluation report. I

1 think it'll probably take us a month to review
2 these materials, and I don't know whether the
3 report would be short or long, depending on
4 what we find. But we -- we will confine the
5 review, as I understand it, only to the new
6 material that DOE has added and whatever NIOSH
7 has written interpreting those --

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Uh-huh.

9 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** -- new materials.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** I think that was the intent.

11 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Yeah, so I -- I'd like a chance
12 to -- to -- to look at the extent of these
13 materials if -- they do seem to be -- quite a
14 large number of files here. I don't know how
15 extensive they are. Most of them appear to be
16 small. I haven't --

17 **DR. NETON:** Arjun, I think --

18 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** -- actually opened them.

19 **DR. NETON:** -- this is Jim. I think you'll
20 find most of those are engineering drawings of
21 --

22 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Oh, okay.

23 **DR. NETON:** -- manifolds and valves.

24 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Okay. So if the large files
25 are engineering drawings, then it should --

1 **DR. BRANCHE:** Phillip Schofield?

2 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** Yes.

3 **DR. BRANCHE:** Paul Ziemer.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes. Okay, motion carries. Thank
5 you very much.

6 I think we can then proceed to the Dow Chemical
7 update.

8 **DR. BRANCHE:** Before you proceed, Dr. Ziemer --

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh --

10 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- if I could, this is Dr.
11 Christine Branche, we -- thank you for the
12 people who recently joined the call. If you
13 could use your mute button, please, so that we
14 can all hear everyone else's discussion. If
15 you don't have a mute button on your phone,
16 please use star-6 to mute yourself, and then
17 when you're ready to speak please use that same
18 star-6. Thanks so much, Dr. Ziemer.

19 **DOW CHEMICAL SEC UPDATE**

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Our -- our next item is Dow
21 Chemical update. Just a minute here -- grab
22 the right files myself.

23 **DR. BRANCHE:** On this one, Dr. Ziemer, the
24 Department of Labor is going to have some
25 information for us.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. And also we're going to
2 have -- I've -- I've indicated to Dr. McKeel
3 that --

4 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- we'd be pleased to hear some
6 comments from him on this --

7 **DR. BRANCHE:** I'm sorry, forgive me -- forgive
8 me, I -- I -- tha-- forgive me. The Department
9 of Labor was going to say something about the
10 next item. Dow Chemical was simply an update
11 and (unintelligible) said Mr. Elliott has
12 something here.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Larry Elliott, you want to
14 proceed?

15 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Sure, this is Larry Elliott.

16 I'll -- I'll start this off and ask LaVon
17 Rutherford to assist me in giving status on
18 where we are with Dow.

19 As you know, the Department of Energy provided
20 letters on Dow Chemical and the residual period
21 -- or actually on the thorium that was produced
22 by this company during the AEC covered period,
23 and that leads us to adding into our evaluation
24 thorium during the residual period -- residual
25 contamination period. So we are busy

1 evaluating what information we have already.
2 We are busy seeking additional information.
3 We've sent letters to the State of Illinois
4 looking for information regarding Dow Chemical
5 and thorium production that went on there, as
6 well as the cleanup activities. We are
7 touching base with the owners of the facility
8 after Dow Chemical was sold off to others, and
9 it's our full intent that by the April Board
10 meeting we will have a revised evaluation, or
11 an amended evaluation report which will speak
12 to how we will deal with thorium during the
13 residual period at this facility.

14 **MR. RUTHERFORD:** Hey, Larry -- Larry, this is
15 LaVon Rutherford. I want to correct -- we --
16 we had -- I -- I don't think we will make the
17 April Board meeting with that. We intended to
18 make the -- that we would make the following
19 Board meeting with that revised evaluation
20 report. We -- we don't expect --

21 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Right, I -- I misspoke. I wasn't
22 -- I didn't attend that part of the Board
23 meeting in Las Vegas and I -- from my notes, I
24 misspoke here. You're right, we -- we agreed
25 or committed to try to provide our revised or

1 amended report at the next meeting after the
2 April meeting. I think that's scheduled to be
3 in St. Louis area. Correct, LaVon?

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, there'll be a full Board
5 meeting in --

6 **DR. BRANCHE:** June twen-- June --

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- June.

8 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- yeah, late June.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Uh-huh, okay. Thank you Larry.
10 LaVon, did you have additional comments?

11 **MR. RUTHERFORD:** No, the only additional
12 comments I will say is that as we receive new
13 information and we're evaluating that, we will
14 make that information available on the O drive
15 to the Board members as well.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you. Let me ask Dr.
17 McKeel if he'd wish to comment at this time
18 also.

19 **DR. MCKEEL:** Dr. Ziemer, can you all hear me
20 okay? I -- I'm on the handset --

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** I -- I can hear you very well
22 myself.

23 **DR. MCKEEL:** Okay.

24 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes, thank you, Dr. McKeel. You
25 can proceed.

1 **DR. MCKEEL:** All right. Well, I -- one -- I
2 thank you very much for just letting me update
3 you on what I perceive to be the case with
4 respect to the Dow SEC extension. One thing
5 that I am looking forward to -- Dr. Ziemer
6 mentioned that the letter from DOE and Glenn
7 Podonsky was in the process of being posted on
8 the OCAS web site. I think that's a useful
9 document for all to have access to.

10 The other thing I had a -- a question about is
11 whether Larry Elliott or LaVon had an idea on
12 when their revised report on the thorium in the
13 residual period -- when that might be
14 available, just a ball park figure.

15 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Dr. McKeel, this is Larry
16 Elliott. I -- now --

17 **DR. MCKEEL:** Yes.

18 **MR. ELLIOTT:** -- we're -- we're in the early
19 stages of trying to assemble the information
20 and -- and make sure that we've done our due
21 diligence in that regard. Again, we'll try to
22 deliver the report in a timely manner so that
23 you and members of the Board have adequate time
24 to prepare for the face-to-face meeting that
25 occurs in St. Louis, so -- that...

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, we were shooting for June.

2 **MR. ELLIOTT:** For June, yes.

3 **DR. BRANCHE:** June 24th through the 26th.

4 **MR. ELLIOTT:** But I -- I understand your
5 interest, Dr. McKeel, to see our position as
6 early as possible.

7 **DR. MCKEEL:** Right. Well, the other comment
8 and reason why is, as you know, with this
9 particular SEC there's been a -- a serious
10 issue about my belief that there are documents
11 still that have not yet been uncovered. And I
12 understand that the first approach is by
13 letter-writing to, I assume, Illinois -- both
14 the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
15 and the Emergency Management Agency, nuclear
16 safety division have some relevant documents,
17 Illinois being an agreement state. I assume
18 that the cleanup documents you're referring to
19 are those from the Pangea Group who's carrying
20 out the thorium license decontamination today,
21 so actually the -- the thorium contamination
22 period, you know, continues until right now,
23 until that license is decommissioned, and that
24 -- that's ongoing.

25 And the other thing, just to comment on, is we

1 certainly have tried to get many of those
2 documents, particularly the ones from the
3 present owner and -- the Spectrulite Consortium
4 and -- and Mag-- Magnesium Electron, and we
5 have been unable to get them to cooperate. So
6 I -- I just want to put on the record that if
7 those letters don't produce documents --
8 responsive documents, and we certainly are
9 going to be interested in asking once again, as
10 we did a -- a long time ago when the first Dow
11 SEC was considered by the Board in May, and
12 even earlier than that, in February of 2007 we
13 asked that the 7384W subpoena power be invoked
14 by Department of Labor. And of course to do
15 that, that would require a request from -- from
16 NIOSH. So we certainly hope you'll consider
17 that and keep that possibility.

18 The other thing I wanted to mention is --

19 **MS. HOMOKI-TITUS:** I'm sorry, Dr. McKeel, this
20 is Liz Homoki-Titus with the General Counsel's
21 office at HHS.

22 **DR. MCKEEL:** Uh-huh.

23 **MS. HOMOKI-TITUS:** Could -- I don't think there
24 necessarily has to be a request from HHS. DOL
25 can also issue those on their own. I just

1 wanted to clarify that for everyone.

2 **DR. MCKEEL:** Well, Department of Labor can do
3 it on their own, but they've been unwilling to
4 do it despite many requests, so I'm saying that
5 I'm going to be asking everybody. But since
6 NIOSH is the one who's going to write the
7 revised report, I -- I do know that that --
8 that if you all saw the necessity, you could
9 also request from DOL. I'm -- I'm just
10 suggesting that possibility again.

11 The other thing I want to mention is, if there
12 is any possible way, not only do I need this
13 new report but I am still waiting for the final
14 response to a FOIA that I wrote on April the
15 17th of 2007 regarding the initial evaluation
16 report of the SEC. And I would certainly think
17 after ten months that that information should
18 be soon forthcoming.

19 The other thing I wanted to mention is that I
20 have been asking Pat Worthington of the
21 Department of Energy to please send me the
22 documents that were the basis for concluding
23 that Dow Madison processed thorium alloys for
24 nuclear weapons work in that January 8th letter
25 that DOE wrote to Peter Turcic, and --

1 **MR. LEWIS:** Dr. McKeel, this is Greg Lewis from
2 the Department of Energy. I --

3 **DR. MCKEEL:** Yeah.

4 **MR. LEWIS:** I've spoken to Dr. Worthington and
5 that information should be -- we had to make
6 sure that both -- the FBI document was stamped
7 "official use only" so we had to check with the
8 FBI to make sure we could release that, and
9 then we had to go through a declassification
10 process to make sure that the information from
11 the Livermore facility was -- was allowed to be
12 released to the public. And both of those we
13 can release and will be sent to you this week.

14 **DR. MCKEEL:** Well, I -- I appreciate that and I
15 just wanted to comment that -- I was going to
16 comment that that has been promised -- looking
17 forward to those documents, and I assume -- is
18 it true that that same set of documents will go
19 to NIOSH and the Board and SC&A?

20 **MR. LEWIS:** Yes, I believe that's the case.
21 We'll be sending those to everyone just so
22 they'll have the background information.

23 **DR. MCKEEL:** Okay. Well, I think that's --
24 that's the main issues that I had about --
25 about Dow, and I appreciate the Board's work.

1 If -- if -- if there is time a little bit later
2 on or whenever is appropriate, I do have a
3 couple of comments to make about the Texas City
4 Chemicals SEC and about GSI and dose
5 reconstructions that I would like to tell the
6 Board this morning, at whatever time it's
7 appropriate.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Thank you. Now on -- on
9 the Dow -- or, sorry -- on the Dow Chemical,
10 are there any -- this is mainly to be an
11 update. Any other comments, Board members, or
12 questions?

13 (No responses)

14 **LINDE UPDATE**

15 If not, we will proceed on to the next item.
16 The next item is an update on -- on the Linde
17 petition. Let's see, Dr. Roessler is on the
18 line, or --

19 **DR. BRANCHE:** Dr. Ziemer, this is the one where
20 our colleagues from the Department of Labor
21 were going to make a comment.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, and then I think --

23 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes, we do have --

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- Ms. Bonsignore also has some
25 comments from the petitioners.

1 **DR. BRANCHE:** And if she's not on the line now,
2 she said she'd be available when we do the
3 workgroup update later on.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh --

5 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** Actually I -- I am on the
6 line.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, very good, okay.

8 **DR. BRANCHE:** Great. Okay, good.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Dr. Roessler, do you want to make
10 some comments?

11 **DR. ROESSLER:** I had planned to make the
12 comment on the technical part later on the
13 workgroup update. I think this part is up to
14 DOL.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Well, let's go ahead with
16 the -- the DOL -- and it was sort of the
17 question of why the status of that site was
18 changed and -- or a portion of that site, and
19 Jeff, are you going to speak for DOL?

20 **MR. KOTSCH:** Yeah, let me -- let me do that
21 presentation.

22 The issue was basically DOL's determination
23 that Buildings 30, 31, 37 and 38 at Linde
24 Ceramics are now a Department of Energy
25 facility rather than a portion of the Atomic

1 Weapons Employer or AWE facility.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

3 **MR. KOTSCH:** First, to clarify the agency
4 roles, DOE is responsible, under the Act, for
5 making AWE facility and beryllium vendor
6 designations, whereas DOL determines whether a
7 facility meets the requirements of a DOE
8 facility. The Linde Ceramics Plant was
9 originally designated as an AWE by DOE.
10 The term "Department of Energy facility" means
11 any building, structure or premise, including
12 the grounds upon which building, structure or
13 premise is located -- that's from the Act --
14 which operations are or have been conducted on
15 the behalf of the Department of Energy,
16 excluding Naval nuclear propulsion program.
17 And also with regard to the Department of
18 Energy, has or had a proprietary interest or
19 entered into a contract with an entity to
20 provide management services and operation
21 management and integration, environmental
22 remediation, construction or maintenance.
23 After Part E was enacted in October of 2004, we
24 had former Linde Ceramics Plant employees and
25 their advocates petition DOL to review

1 documentation that they believed would
2 demonstrate that at least a portion of the
3 Linde Ceramics Plant met the defin-- met the
4 definition of a DOE facility as specified in
5 the Act. (Unintelligible) to change because
6 DOE -- I'm -- I'm sorry, because the Part E of
7 the Act provides additional benefits of up to
8 \$250,000 to contractors and subcontractors of
9 DOE facilities. These are benefits that are
10 not available to employees at AWE facilities.
11 In response to the petition Labor reviewed more
12 than 900 pages of documentation pertaining to
13 the Linde Ceramics Plant, including portions of
14 the original Manhattan Engineer District
15 contract, that indicated four of the five
16 buildings at the site were owned by DOE --
17 DOE's predecessor. DOL determined that
18 Buildings 30, 31, 37 and 38 -- but not 14,
19 which is the Tonawanda Lab -- met the
20 definition of a DOE facility for the years 1942
21 through 1953. (Unintelligible) reviewed the
22 analysis and concurred, in our view, by
23 changing their web site.
24 As a result of the determination that -- on
25 these four buildings being DOE facilities,

1 employees that worked there at any time between
2 1942 and 1953 are now eligible to apply for
3 compensation and benefits under both Parts B
4 and E of the Act, and they're also able to
5 apply for compensation not only for cancer, but
6 for other illnesses related to exposure to
7 toxic materials in the workplace. In addition,
8 workers involved in remediation activities have
9 DOE facility coverage for the years 1988
10 through '92 and 1996. (Unintelligible) in
11 making this change, the employees who worked
12 exclusively in these four buildings, and only
13 during the period of residual radiation as
14 determined by NIOSH, have been -- 1954 to 1987,
15 1993 to '95, and '97 to July 2006 -- they are
16 no longer covered -- have covered employment
17 under Part B of the Act. The period of
18 residual radiation only pertains to AWE
19 facilities.

20 In addition, DOL determined that the Tonawanda
21 Laboratory, which is Building 14, met the
22 definition of an AWE facility for the years '42
23 -- 1942 to 1953. Under the Act, employees at
24 these types of facilities are not eligible for
25 benefits under Part E of the Act. However, the

1 period of residual radiation does apply to the
2 Tonawanda Lab. Therefore, employees at Linde
3 Ceramics and any other subsequent owners or
4 operators who were present in the laboratory,
5 which is Building 14, are covered under Part B
6 of the Act during the years 1942 to '53, and
7 the residual contamination period of 1954 to
8 1987, 1993 to '95, and 1997 to July 2006.
9 DOL published on September 5th, 2007 a circular
10 number 7-7 which was posted on the web site and
11 implemented these decisions.

12 One last thing is that while DOE's confident
13 that the determination that part of the site is
14 a DOE facility -- that -- that the
15 determination that part of the site is a DOE
16 facility is correct, our legal people are
17 currently re-examining the -- the issue -- the
18 legal analysis underlying our decision with
19 respect to the residual contamination period.
20 So that hopefully presents the background and
21 the basis for both Circular 7-7 and -- and the
22 change from an AWE to a DOE facility for those
23 four buildings.

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Jeff, thank you very much for that
25 report. Let me ask if Board members have

1 questions or comments on the Department of
2 Labor report.

3 **DR. ROESSLER:** This is Gen Roessler.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes, Gen.

5 **DR. ROESSLER:** This is quite complicated. I
6 think it would help the workgroup in particular
7 and the Board and the claimants if -- if
8 someone could prepare a matrix that would list
9 the buildings, the dates and the coverage
10 that's now appropriate so we could better
11 understand the implications of all of this.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** And also perhaps a copy of -- of
13 the report that Jeff just delivered would be
14 helpful.

15 **DR. ROESSLER:** Right.

16 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Good idea, Gen.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Could we do that readily, Jeff?

18 **MR. KOTSCH:** Yeah, no problem. I mean I can --
19 I und-- I don't have that table. I can -- but
20 that's easy enough to put together.

21 **DR. BRANCHE:** But can we get a copy of what you
22 just -- this is Christine -- can we ask -- can
23 we get a copy of what you just stated?
24 Electronic copy of -- of the statement that you
25 just made?

1 **MR. KOTSCH:** Yeah, well, I -- I actually just -
2 - just picked and choose -- chose from some
3 other documents. I'll have to get that
4 together to send that out.

5 **DR. BRANCHE:** Thank you.

6 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Jeff, this is Larry Elliott.
7 Isn't the circular on the DOL web site?

8 **MR. KOTSCH:** Yeah, the circular's on the web
9 site.

10 **MR. ELLIOTT:** And I believe I sent that around
11 to the Advisory Board members -- I don't know,
12 it's been a month or so --

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** We did get that. It was actually
14 much briefer than what was just described, I
15 think, but I -- I thought Jeff's explanation
16 was -- it clarified a number of issues much
17 better than what I had seen before.

18 **MR. KOTSCH:** All right, let me commit to
19 forwarding that stuff. Should I just forward
20 it to -- who -- who do you want me to forward
21 that --

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** You can send it to Christine --

23 **MR. KOTSCH:** Okay.

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- and she'll see that it's
25 distributed.

1 **MR. KOTSCH:** Okay, we'll do that.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** We do also want to hear from Ms.
3 Bonsignore.

4 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** Thank you very much. I -- I'd
5 like to thank the Board for providing me an
6 opportunity this morning to address this issue.
7 I do have a couple of questions for Jeff Kotsch
8 regarding a couple of items he just mentioned.
9 First, you mentioned that there was a petition
10 that was initiated by workers and advocates for
11 Linde workers that began the review process.
12 Can you clarify when that petition was
13 initiated and what advocates and workers were
14 involved in that because I am not aware of
15 anyone that was involved in that and I -- as I
16 have understood, the process actually began in
17 January of 2006 and was initiated by an e-mail.

18 **MR. KOTSCH:** It could -- it -- it could well --
19 like I -- I'll have to clarify this when
20 (unintelligible) and I have talked about this
21 before. I was not intimately involved in this
22 process from the beginning and it's just
23 through -- just through actually the summary
24 process that -- you know, getting involved in
25 this. I think -- think you are correct. I

1 think it just originated, though I can't be
2 absolutely sure, with just an e-mail.

3 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** Okay. Because from -- from
4 wh-- from the information I received from John
5 Vance's office at the Department of Labor, the
6 process began with an e-mail from Richard
7 Miller in January of 2006 and there were no
8 workers involved in that -- in that -- in that
9 initial request. I -- I would know that
10 because I've been involved with all of the
11 workers since 2003 so I would have been aware
12 of any requests that were made by workers for
13 any kind of review process for -- for this
14 facility, just to clarify that.
15 Secondly, just to update the -- the Board, I
16 did send a letter last Wednesday, January --
17 I'm sorry, it was January 6th, but -- to the
18 Department of Labor to Peter Turcic's office
19 requesting an appeal of this decision and
20 specifically requesting the -- the -- the legal
21 documents or memorandum that has been used by
22 the Department of Labor to authorize and
23 justify the re-designation, and to also provide
24 the names of any other facilities that have
25 been similarly re-designated from an AWE to a

1 DOE or are in the process of being considered
2 for such a re-designation. And I -- I think
3 that -- that -- that issue has not really been
4 addressed by myself or anyone else, and I just
5 would like to point out that despite the
6 addition-- the additional ability for the
7 workers to submit claims under the Part E
8 program, all the residual radiation workers at
9 Linde who are the overwhelming number of
10 workers that I -- that I am currently
11 representing, have been eliminated from Part B
12 coverage. And if this process is being
13 initiated at other facilities across the
14 country, I think it would be of paramount
15 importance for the Board to be aware of the
16 fact if the Department of Labor is currently
17 under some sort of review process that would
18 lead to the elimination of thousands of
19 residual radiation workers from Part B
20 eligibility.

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you for those comments. Let
22 me also point out that I've received a letter
23 from Ms. Bonsignore, I think a copy of which
24 also went to Larry Elliott and John Howard, and
25 I don't know if that letter was copied to the

1 Board members. Antoinette, was --

2 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** Yes, actually th-- that --
3 that actually was the letter that -- that I
4 entered into the record at the January --

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, at the January meeting. I
6 was trying to recall whether everybody got a
7 copy of that letter or not, 'cause I would
8 distribute it if they didn't. I just didn't
9 recall.

10 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** Right, I -- I -- I'd -- I had
11 assumed that if I entered it into the record
12 that all the Board members would receive a
13 copy.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, certainly if it's on the
15 record, it's there. But in any event, there --
16 there is one comment in that letter where you
17 have asked -- basically asked the Board to
18 ignore the -- the Department of Labor's
19 decision on this. And you know, I don't think
20 we're in a position to -- to do that. We -- we
21 need to get this resolved one way or the other,
22 but --

23 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** Right.

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- sort of procedurally we -- we
25 can't simply ignore these designations, so --

1 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** I -- I understand that --

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- yeah, yeah, I --

3 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** -- yeah, right --

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- just wanted to make sure that
5 was --

6 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** -- right. Yeah, I -- I --

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- not really an option for us at
8 this point, so --

9 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** Right, I'm sorry.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

11 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** At the time that I prepared
12 that letter, I -- I was -- I was really just in
13 the dark as to the status --

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Ah, okay, right --

15 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** -- of the bulletin --

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- right.

17 **MS. BONSIGNORE:** -- and whether it was
18 discretionary document, whether -- whether the
19 Board had any discretion to -- to review it at
20 all and then you -- all those questions were
21 clarified when I -- when I addressed the Board
22 on -- during the public comment period.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right. Okay, thank you. Board
24 members, any questions or comments for Ms.
25 Bonsignore?

1 (No responses)

2 Okay. Now we -- we will also have a report
3 from the workgroup on Linde later in the
4 meeting, so this is simply an update for
5 information on that site status at this point.

6 **SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOSE RECONSTRUCTION UPDATE**

7 Now I think we can proceed to our next item,
8 which is the subcommittee on dose
9 reconstruction update. Mark Griffon, you want
10 to take the lead on this for us?

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** Sure. Yeah, I -- there's several
12 things I think we should go through. I made a
13 little listing to flesh out the agenda, but --

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, we -- we have the fourth and
15 fifth sets of cases --

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- to finalize. We have some
18 discussion on -- a sort of wrap-up of the first
19 100 cases, and then also assignments for the
20 next sets.

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right. And -- yeah, and the
22 fourth and fifth set -- I just sent out -- and
23 I wanted to get it to the Board a week ahead of
24 time, but that didn't happen, so I think
25 everyone received yesterday an updated matrix

1 of the fourth set and the fifth set? I hope
2 that's true?

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** I did. Board -- Board members,
4 did you all or -- all receive that?

5 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Yes.

6 **DR. ROESSLER:** (Unintelligible)

7 **MR. CLAWSON:** Mark, this is Brad -- yes.

8 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I got mine.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Sounds like people received them.

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay. And -- and my -- I mean my
11 -- my thoughts were that these -- there's only
12 -- I think in each one of them there might be
13 one or two little things that are still
14 highlighted in yellow or left with a question
15 mark, but as of yesterday afternoon I think
16 even those were resolved. I just didn't send
17 out another final revision yet, but I was in
18 communication with Kathy Behling yesterday and
19 Jim Neton, who was out, was helping us with a -
20 - a last couple resolutions on items that we
21 had sort of forgotten where they stood and we
22 had to follow -- follow up and check on them.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Well, why don't we -- let's
24 start with the fourth set, Mark --

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- and we can go through -- see if
2 there's any questions on any of the items. I
3 think over the past number of months we've had
4 sort of status reports on this, but we're --
5 we're basically at closure.

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** And if we can agree that the
8 issues are, in essence, closed, then we're in a
9 position to make a report to the Secretary on
10 this one, as well as on the fifth one, and
11 we'll talk in a few minutes about what that's
12 going to look like, but -- so why don't you
13 take us through this --

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** That's fine, yeah, I -- I mean --
15 you know, just a reminder on these that -- that
16 the -- when you look through the matrix, the
17 case ranking is just that provided by SC&A. I
18 even see on one of the -- on the first page I
19 left the -- first page of the fourth set I left
20 the UR, which is unresolved, that was my
21 editing mistake here. But anyway, the -- the
22 categories are as we used before, and the last
23 column is the Board action, which basically all
24 these are now falling into -- for me, as I'm
25 putting this categ-- action down, either a one,

1 a six or a seven. A one is that NIOSH agreed
2 with the finding. A six is that we're
3 deferring it to either a procedure review or a
4 site profile review or -- or PER, there's one
5 instance of a PER review. And a seven is that
6 -- that the -- the Board drops the iss-- you
7 know, the finding. So we had seven different
8 criteria, I think they're at the bottom --
9 listed at the footnote --

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, they're in the footnote.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- (unintelligible) table, but
12 most of these fall into one, six or seven
13 you'll notice as you scan through. And they
14 should all, like I said, be resolved. There
15 may be one that I didn't -- I was waiting for
16 e-mails back and forth --

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, can you ta-- that's -- issue
18 70.2 --

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, and --

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- and is -- should appear in
21 yellow on everybody's -- it's in the right-hand
22 column, the resolution item is in yellow.

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, and 70.2 now should be a -
24 - we should have a -- a one on that. I'm not
25 sure I have --

1 DR. ZIEMER: You showed a one already, but --

2 MR. GRIFFON: Okay.

3 DR. ZIEMER: -- what about the -- it is yellow
4 where it says "effect, case (unintelligible)" -
5 -

6 MR. GRIFFON: Okay, okay, and then it should
7 say no likely effect on the case, and we just
8 wanted to verify that but -- and Jim Neton help
9 -- help -- helped us out in that regard, so --

10 DR. ZIEMER: So --

11 MR. GRIFFON: -- we followed through with that
12 and I shared Jim's response with Kathy Behling
13 and she was in agreement, so --

14 DR. ZIEMER: Okay, so --

15 MR. GRIFFON: -- yeah, that should read "no
16 likely effect on the case" now --

17 DR. ZIEMER: No effect on case --

18 MR. GRIFFON: -- right.

19 DR. ZIEMER: -- and I also note on 76.2 that
20 you have something in red -- showed up in red
21 on mine. Is that --

22 MR. GRIFFON: Oh, it was just a copy and paste
23 from another document and --

24 DR. ZIEMER: Oh, okay.

25 MR. GRIFFON: -- I sh-- I'll change the font --

1 I mean the --

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, so that shouldn't have any
3 significance --

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** It shouldn't be in red.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- for us at all.

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** Nope -- yeah, that was just a
7 font thing. I'll change that.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. How do you want to do this,
9 Mark? Do you want to ask for people -- if
10 people have questions on the iss-- any -- any
11 of the issues on the --

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, that'd be fine if you want
13 to question it now, or if people didn't have
14 time to review -- I mean that -- you know, my -
15 - my other offer was going to be that I would -
16 - I wanted to set up a subcommittee meeting in
17 March in Cincinnati, and I was planning on --
18 on drafting a letter report to go with these
19 matrices and to discuss any details of the
20 entire package at that point and then bring it
21 back, you know, and have a -- a letter and
22 matrix ready to go for an April vote, you know.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, we can certainly do that.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Why don't we see if there's any

1 questions and -- and then I'm going to suggest
2 that we, for both four and five -- sets four
3 and five, that we combine them into one report
4 to the Secretary, as we did on sets two and
5 three --

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- and Mark, I think we can use a
8 similar structure on that report letter, modify
9 it appropriately --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** That's what I was -- I was going
11 to edit from the previous report --

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- if that was okay, yeah.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, use that as a template --

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Uh-huh.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- and summarize the findings for
17 these two, and then we -- we can have that
18 ready at the face-to-face meeting for any final
19 editing.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** But why don't we see if there's
22 questions on -- on any of the items here.

23 **MS. MUNN:** This is Wanda, and my only question
24 is actually for Kathy with respect of where we
25 are with the new format with this group.

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh, yeah, I -- I don't -- that's
2 a good question. We -- I discussed that with
3 Kathy briefly yesterday, but I don't know if we
4 officially tasked SC&A with -- with doing that
5 or what.

6 **MS. MUNN:** I thought it --

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** Kathy?

8 **MS. MUNN:** -- was kind of generally understood.

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

10 **MS. MUNN:** Wasn't it, Kathy?

11 **MS. BEHLING:** Yes, it was. We have started to
12 look at that. Doug Farver and I are giving
13 that some thought. We're still in the process
14 of trying to close out the eighth set also, and
15 we've been working with Mark yesterday in -- in
16 closing out the fourth and fifth sets. But we
17 -- we've started to look at it but I don't have
18 anything in hand that I can send over to you
19 yet, but we should be very close to doing that.
20 And Mark and I have discussed briefly some
21 changes that we would make to the Task III
22 matrix that would work well with the Task IV
23 matrix.

24 **MS. MUNN:** I guess my real bottom line question
25 is would we have that format available for us

1 at our March subcommittee meeting.

2 **MS. BEHLING:** I think that's possible, yes.

3 **MS. MUNN:** Good.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** I think it will be, yeah, 'cause
5 even in preparation for this, Wanda, I couldn't
6 help myself and I took the Word-based documents
7 and you can import them right into access and I
8 started putting them together, and then I
9 realized I was getting a little off task. But
10 I mean I don't think it would take much time to
11 at least form-- put -- put all this together in
12 an access database and part of the -- I think
13 it would be very helpful 'cause I -- one of the
14 struggles I had in doing this was consistency
15 across matrices.

16 **MS. MUNN:** Right.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** You know, we've had several
18 repeat type of findings and I wanted to make
19 sure that I was ranking them the same and, you
20 know -- or, you know, in a consistent fashion -
21 -

22 **MS. MUNN:** That's always a problem.

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- yeah, yeah, so I -- I hope we
24 -- that would be good to have. And my feeling
25 right now is -- I think we had a notice go out

1 for a Fernald workgroup meeting around March
2 24th or 5th and maybe we can tag along a
3 subcommittee meeting.

4 **DR. BRANCHE:** Actually, Mark -- this is
5 Christine -- we actually could try to pin that
6 down now because we would need to get this
7 announced in the *Federal Register* --

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, right.

9 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- and we'd have to put it
10 together like tomorrow.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

12 **DR. BRANCHE:** So if the group -- if you can get
13 the group to come to some idea of what date
14 right now, that would be very helpful to us.

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** I think everyone's on except for
16 Dr. Poston is on the phone call so maybe
17 whenever we're discussing (unintelligible) --

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, let's get that -- do that
19 when --

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, yeah --

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- we're doing dates. That way --

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- right, right.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- we get any issues here -- Mark,
24 let me start by asking a -- a question, and
25 this has to do with a lot of the sixes. Some

1 of them, in a sense, appear to be closed. I --
2 I'll just pick one out at random, it's -- it's
3 73.2 is the finding number, where it says
4 "NIOSH agrees the OTIB has been revised and
5 SC&A is reviewing the OTIB as part of
6 procedures review" so that -- that looks pretty
7 good on a closure for six and it dumps it into
8 procedures review --

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- group. But on the other hand,
11 I'm looking at 68.2 --

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** Uh-huh.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- which -- with a finding of
14 failure to account for angular response and on
15 the resolution there it says "NIOSH and SC&A to
16 resolve in procedures review" like it's
17 something that's going to happen in the future
18 but it's not really in the pipeline yet, and
19 that also falls into a six category, but --

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- there's a number of these that
22 -- another one that's sort of like that --

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Some of that may be just my
24 wording --

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well --

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- Paul, but I'm not sure yet.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well --

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** It's good to check.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- finding 69.2 it says "NIOSH is
5 preparing an overall response," it looks like
6 it's still open and it -- it puts it in a six
7 category. And the finding following that is
8 similar, so -- well, here's -- here's one,
9 69.7, "NIOSH will provide a technical basis for
10 this approach," so it -- and it -- the action
11 is six, which means we -- obviously we have to
12 follow up on it, but some of these sixes --

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- NIOSH has already done it and
15 it's in the -- it's in the review path.

16 Others, it's going to happen in the future. I
17 -- I'm wondering --

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** Well, they -- and they're -- most
19 of these -- I mean some of it is -- may be a
20 little sloppy on the wording, but I -- and they
21 should be clarified --

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, we --

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- and something like
24 (unintelligible) --

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- all I'm getting at is we --

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- have sixes that are -- the work
3 has already been done by NIOSH, it's in the
4 pipeline. Others, it looks like it's going to
5 be done --

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- either by NIOSH or SC&A, but
8 I'm wondering -- on all of those it looks like
9 they all fall into some kind of a procedures
10 review bin.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yes.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** And so I'm wondering --

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** (Unintelligible) site profile
14 (unintelligible).

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- I -- yeah, or a site profile
16 review bin --

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- but I'm wondering if -- if we
19 can ask the procedures group, Wanda, if -- if
20 it would be appropriate for someone to go
21 through all of these and -- and identify the
22 ones that should show up in procedures review
23 and make sure -- you know, maybe there -- and
24 may-- and maybe we can have -- it's our -- our
25 new helper, Nancy -- is it Nancy?

1 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes, that's correct, Nancy Adams.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- who's helping with some of the
3 tracking and so on, maybe someone like Nancy
4 could go through this document and -- and
5 identify all those sixes and see which ones
6 need to be sort of put into the -- formally
7 into the hamper of the -- of the procedures
8 review group and which of them are going to be
9 covered in some kind of a site profile review.
10 We just --

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, right, right.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- need to be sure that we don't
13 lose the --

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** I agree that some linking
15 mechanism --

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** A linking mechanism.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- (unintelligible) we get this
18 data-- yeah, that would be good, too. One
19 thing that -- that -- that is important just
20 for all of us to understand is that, you know,
21 as far as these showing up in -- in the
22 procedures review group, some of these -- like
23 you indicated, Paul -- have yet to be named.
24 You know, they don't -- they don't have a
25 number assignment necessarily. For instance,

1 you know, we've talked about some of these
2 overarching global documents like for ingestion
3 -- uranium ingestion --

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- which -- which NIOSH has
6 committed to doing an overarching sort of white
7 paper or document on this, but we don't have a
8 procedure or TIB number or anything like that -
9 - I don't think, anyway -- at this point.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** So that's the ones we -- we sort
12 of have -- yeah, I agree, we need to have a way
13 to track these and link them to the procedures
14 workgroup or site profile groups and make sure
15 they don't just get --

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- get lost, yeah.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Other questions or
19 comments? It -- it just -- there's an awful
20 lot of these items that are sixes, that's
21 (unintelligible) --

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** I -- I -- yeah, I agree, yeah.

23 **MS. MUNN:** And one of the concerns we've had in
24 procedures of course from the outset --

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

1 **MS. MUNN:** -- and how to really establish
2 reliable procedure.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah. Well, as long as we can
4 agree that we're going to follow up on these,
5 well, then it's -- I think it'll be okay to
6 consider them closed out. And when -- when we
7 make the report to the Secretary we'll have to
8 indicate something along that line.

9 **MS. MUNN:** Well, we have them clearly
10 documented --

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

12 **MS. MUNN:** -- as to what type of --

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

14 **MS. MUNN:** -- follow-up is required --

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, exactly.

16 **MS. MUNN:** -- and that's the key element --

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

18 **MS. MUNN:** -- at this juncture.

19 **DR. BRANCHE:** Dr. Ziemer, this is Christine
20 Branche, and yes, Nancy Adams will work with
21 Mark to look at these -- examine --

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

23 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- these sixes and make certain
24 that they -- a ledger's put together for
25 getting them over to the procedures group.

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** And we'll -- and we'll coordinate
2 it with -- with Wanda, yeah, as well, and I'm
3 on that group, too, so we can, you know, work
4 together on that.

5 The other thing, Paul, I would say is that
6 there -- there are -- it does seem like there -
7 - and there are a lot of sixes. I should point
8 out that many of these are -- are the same
9 findings for different cases --

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, exactly.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- so you know --

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, I understand --

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- yeah, it looks like we're de--
14 it looks like we're deferring everything, but -
15 -

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** No, I'm (unintelligible) --

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- actually (unintelligible) --

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** I agree, I agree.

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- they -- they repeat a lot,
20 yeah.

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah. So I don't know if there's
23 anything else on that. I mean I think I still
24 would stand on trying to finalize this and --
25 and have a letter -- a draft letter report for

1 discussion in our March subcommittee meeting,
2 and then bring the whole --

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Sure.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- package to the Board. And in
5 the interim if anybody has any comments on the
6 matrices -- I mean you only ha-- you only got
7 them yesterday so I would certainly welcome any
8 e-mail comments or anything, you know, and I'll
9 bring that to the subcommittee process and go
10 from there I guess.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right. Well, why don't we ask for
12 comments on either --

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- on four --

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Four or five.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- four or five. I noticed on
17 five there were a whole lot of "site profile
18 review needed" resolutions. All of the 84 --
19 the 84.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12
20 --

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah --

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- findings.

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- and that was a particular --
24 that's one -- that's one site, I think Harshaw.
25 Right?

1 DR. ZIEMER: All one site, so that's -- that's
2 really the same finding --

3 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, it's just the same --

4 DR. ZIEMER: -- all the way down.

5 MR. GRIFFON: Right, and it's --

6 DR. ZIEMER: And that's another six and -- and
7 --

8 MR. GRIFFON: This is one where the -- the
9 matrix got modified while the review was going
10 --

11 DR. ZIEMER: Right, right.

12 MR. GRIFFON: -- being conducted, yeah.

13 DR. ZIEMER: Again, the same kind of thing --

14 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.

15 DR. ZIEMER: -- with another tracking of -- of
16 the outcomes on those.

17 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.

18 DR. ZIEMER: Yeah. Any -- Board members, any
19 issues on four or five in terms of the
20 resolutions that are proposed?

21 (No responses)

22 Again, you would have an opportunity -- since
23 you just got these yesterday and if you haven't
24 had a chance to go through them, why Mark is
25 going to give you another crack at it at the

1 next face-to-face meeting. Right, Mark?

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah. Yeah.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** And then we would have coupled
4 with that the -- a draft of the reports to the
5 Secretary. And Mark, I want to work with you
6 on that --

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- make sure that -- keep me in
9 the loop on it as you're drafting that.

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Certainly.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** I want to be involved --

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- in the draft of that report.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** All right.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. So maybe that will take
16 care of the fourth and fifth sets. We -- we
17 were going to talk about the letters to the
18 Secretary. I think, unless there's any
19 objection, we'll -- we'll report on these 40
20 cases in a format similar to the last 40 that
21 we reported.

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** And then you were going to propose
24 some kind of a wrap-up for the first 100 cases,
25 Mark?

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, well, it had been discussed
2 and I'm not even sure who initially brought it
3 up, but I think it's a good idea that -- to
4 have a summary report of the first 100 cases.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, I think the Chair actually
6 asked --

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, did you? Well --

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- for that.

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- I thought so. I wasn't sure.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** And I -- I would like us, if we
11 could, to incorporate some of the materials
12 Kathy provided on what the sort of demographics
13 of the review have been, as well as a summary
14 of the findings.

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** And maybe the subcommittee can
17 give some thought to that between now --

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I was --

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- and the next meeting and --

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** I was going to ask the same
21 thing, that I -- I'd try to draft something and
22 I can work with you, Paul, if you want, and
23 bring something to the subcommittee first and
24 then flesh it out there and -- and try to have
25 it for the April meeting as well.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah. But I thought the -- I
2 think Kathy prepared a -- a report, I think it
3 was the first 100 -- Kathy, was it --

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** I think it was the first 60,
5 wasn't it?

6 **MS. BEHLING:** Yes, I did prepare a report on
7 the first 60 and I have the statistics --

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

9 **MS. BEHLING:** -- for all of the additional 100
10 cases and can put something togeth--

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, in fact I thought you went
12 up to like 140 cases or something.

13 **MS. BEHLING:** I -- yes, 148 cases.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh, okay.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** If we could prepare for the
16 Secretary the demographics of the first 100 --

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- you know, the -- the types of
19 cases, the representation of the facilities
20 that they're from, I thought that was an
21 excellent --

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** Useful, yeah, yeah.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** And then couple that with the
24 findings would be very good.

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay. Yeah, that sounds good.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** What do we need to do on assigning
2 or selecting the next set of cases, Mark?

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, the -- moving on -- I
4 wasn't sure if everybody was done on that
5 topic. Stu Hinnefeld sent out two -- two
6 separate e-mails to the Board members, I think
7 everyone got those. One was labeled the ninth
8 set of cases, and what that is is -- is he --
9 he went through the set that we picked in Las
10 Vegas and he removed any that were -- removed
11 by DOL, basically, that they were not available
12 for our review or they're under a PER review or
13 other -- for other reasons, they couldn't be in
14 our -- our -- in our audit function here. And
15 he -- he did the more descriptive parameters
16 that we had asked for, he filled them in for
17 the remaining cases. And I think, if I counted
18 correctly, we have 45 --

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes, that's what I counted, 45
20 cases.

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, on --

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** I think your --

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- the ninth set --

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- I think you originally had
25 maybe 46 or 7.

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** Well, I thought we had more like
2 60 in the -- I -- I forget, though, but I --
3 anyway, it's -- some got eliminated.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, okay. I know there were more
5 than 45, but --

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- did the subcommittee decide to
8 select as many as they could, up to 60, for
9 this next -- or how -- how --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I think -- I mean -- I -- I
11 was -- my -- my -- I guess my proposal here
12 today is to look at this ninth set and make a
13 final approval for SC&A to take at least some
14 of these cases, maybe not -- there's a few on
15 here, now that I look at the -- the exten-- the
16 expanded parameters, that I would choose to
17 drop off the list, but get as many cases out of
18 this ninth set as we can, and then I was going
19 to ask if -- if -- I know the tenth set was
20 provided for our consideration, to move it
21 forward in the same process as we did the last
22 set, you know, the two-step process.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Uh-huh.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** I didn't -- I would -- I would
25 prefer to do that at the March subcommittee

1 meeting and then bring back a list to the April
2 meeting, just because it's easier -- I think
3 it's a little easier to do that in person
4 around a table --

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, I -- I don't think --

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- we want to deal with the tenth
8 set certainly today, and I'm --

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** I was just going to ask about the
11 ninth. Do you want the Board to do anything on
12 that today?

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** I would like the Board to vote
14 this so SC&A can start moving on it.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** My -- the only thing I would say
17 is there are -- I have five -- six cases that I
18 thought we might want to remove from the list,
19 and maybe other people -- we can discuss this
20 (unintelligible) --

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** How many cases do we need to end
22 up with on this set?

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Well, I guess it would be as many
24 as possible. I talked to Lew briefly on this
25 and --

1 **DR. BRANCHE:** You need 60 for the year, Mark.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** Sixty for the year, so if we can
3 -- can -- you know, the more we get, the
4 better, I suppose. And then we can move the
5 tenth set along (unintelligible) --

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** In other words, they can -- they
7 can start at auditing groups and --

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- move along --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- not necessarily restricting it
12 to 20 at a time.

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, and --

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** But the ones you want to remove
15 are ones that (unintelligible) --

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** Well, they were -- they were
17 basically -- a couple of these are -- are -- I
18 -- I think not very -- they're not going to be
19 very fruitful reviews. They're -- some of
20 these that are underestimates based on external
21 exposure only. I can just read down the
22 numbers and if anybody, you know, disagrees, we
23 can certainly discuss them. But otherwise, I
24 propose removing them.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Why don't you tell us what those

1 are then.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** All right. They're -- I'll read
3 the last three digits, starting on the first
4 page -- four of them are on the first page.
5 It's the last three digits of the ID number are
6 143 --

7 **UNIDENTIFIED:** (Unintelligible)

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Excuse me? I didn't --

9 **DR. BRANCHE:** No, Mark, before you continue,
10 there's -- if you could please mute your phone
11 if you're not speaking, we would very much
12 appreciate it. If you don't have a mute
13 button, then please use star-6. Thank you.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay. I thought that was a
15 question. All right, 143, 159, 188, 194, 568
16 and 571. Those two are on the third page, 568
17 and 571. And that -- those are the ones that I
18 thought, based on the additional data Stu
19 provided, probably were not, you know, that
20 useful for our review.

21 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Mark -- Mark, this is Larry
22 Elliott. I just want to make sure that folks
23 on this conference call understand that the
24 numbers that you're speaking of there are not
25 claim --

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

2 **MR. ELLIOTT:** -- tracking numbers or personal
3 ID numbers on a claim.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Thank you, Larry, yeah.

5 **MR. ELLIOTT:** They are numbers that have been
6 assigned to this set of claims for the Board's
7 consideration in their review of completed dose
8 reconstructions.

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** Thank you, Larry. Yeah, these
10 are ran-- random ID numbers. These are not
11 NIO-- not case ID numbers.

12 **MR. ELLIOTT:** I wouldn't want somebody --

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

14 **MR. ELLIOTT:** -- thinking that their claim with
15 those last four digits isn't worthy of review.

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** No, right, right, I -- I
17 apologize. I should have been clear on that.
18 Yeah, these are just random ID numbers that
19 were selected for this table that's in front of
20 us.

21 **MS. MUNN:** And Mark, this is Wanda, I'm sorry,
22 I didn't realize we were going to do this on
23 this call and (unintelligible) the leading role
24 in "Camille" for the last week and do not have
25 our working files in front of me --

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh -- oh --

2 **MS. MUNN:** -- so I'm going to go off the call
3 for just a few minutes to go elsewhere to get
4 the working file before I can comment on those.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you.

6 **DR. ROESSLER:** Mark --

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** Paul --

8 **DR. ROESSLER:** -- this is Gen Roessler. While
9 she's doing that, would --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Uh-huh.

11 **DR. ROESSLER:** -- you quickly give the numbers
12 again? I didn't get them.

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Certainly, yeah. It's 143, 159,
14 188, 194, 568 and 571.

15 **DR. ROESSLER:** Thank you.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** And would it be helpful,
17 particularly for other subcommittee members who
18 are on the call, to have Mark indicate the
19 reason -- since the subcommittee selected these
20 originally, to indicate the reason for removal?

21 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. That would
22 be nice, just a short sum-- just a short thing.

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay. I -- the -- the reason --
24 okay, I can go through one by one. I thought
25 maybe if somebody objected, I could go through

1 the reasons then, but --

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, there's only six of them.

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, yeah -- 143 is an
4 overestimate on internal and external, and we
5 had several other cases from that facility, and
6 the job title led me to believe that, you know,
7 it wasn't going to be very -- a very
8 interesting case as far as adding to our
9 understanding of that facility or the -- you
10 know, the -- the more difficult cases in that
11 facility. So it was job title, related to the
12 fact that it was just an over-- overestimate of
13 internal and external.
14 The -- 159, underestimate -- oh, underestimate,
15 primarily external. My sense here is that you
16 have -- and it's over 50 percent, so they --
17 these are just these underestimating ones that
18 are over 50 percent. I think they just had --
19 they took any badge data they had, they
20 realized they were over the 50th percentile and
21 they stopped. Again, not a very fruitful
22 review as far as reviewing the quality of dose
23 reconstructions, I don't think, and that's the
24 same argument for 188 and 194. They're the
25 exact same type of cases.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** But 188 --

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** (Unintelligible) facility --

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- is indicated as being a best
4 estimate.

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** 188? Maybe I'm reading it wrong.
6 I have underestimate, primarily external.

7 **DR. ROESSLER:** I have underestimate.

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

9 **DR. NETON:** But the update -- annotated column
10 on the right reads differently.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** Best estimate (unintelligible)
13 photon.

14 **DR. NETON:** Right.

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Best estimate based on monitored
16 pho-- yeah, I'm not sure I understand that.
17 Well, they -- they didn't do internal, and I
18 think it's best estimate based on what -- the
19 data they -- you know, like if they had badge
20 data, they added it up. That's -- that's my
21 sense.

22 **DR. NETON:** Yeah, I think that's
23 (unintelligible) --

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, yeah. But still, it's over
25 50 and they only used external --

1 **DR. NETON:** Right.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- dose data to get there.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, I see what you're saying. In
4 other words, it's --

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, yeah.

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- it's a best estimate, but you
7 stopped -- they stopped --

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, they stopped 'cause the
9 badges --

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- because it went over.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- added up and it went over,
12 yeah.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, yeah.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** So there's not much very exciting
15 or interesting to review there. At least
16 that's my sense, you know.

17 And then the last two, 568 and 571 -- 568, it
18 was -- it is a full external -- full internal
19 and external, it's over 50 percent and it's a
20 Savannah River Site. I guess that's why I was
21 considering dropping that. That -- that
22 actually may be more interesting to some
23 people, I would grant that.

24 And the next one, Linde Ceramics Plant, again,
25 it was over 50 percentile and we had another

1 Linde site, I believe, another Linde case. And
2 I thought if the argument was that we want to
3 review that site, that probably wasn't the best
4 one to do it with.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** There's two Linde ones in this
6 batch.

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, and I thought other one --
8 well, the other one's over 50 percent also,
9 isn't it? So I think one -- you know, I think
10 we should look at one of those, at least to
11 cover the -- you know, looking at a case from
12 the facility. I'm not sure we need two over 50
13 percent, would be my 'druthers there. So 554,
14 also --

15 **DR. BRANCHE:** So Mark, you're talking about
16 removing now 554?

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** No, no, no, I -- it -- 554's also
18 a Linde case.

19 **DR. BRANCHE:** Oh, okay.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** So I would --

21 **DR. BRANCHE:** So you're going to keep that,
22 554, but you're suggesting to drop
23 (unintelligible) --

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I'm saying if people -- if
25 people want one Linde case over the other, I

1 would go either way on that is what I'm saying.
2 (NOTE: There was an apparent telephonic
3 failure in transmission as Mr. Griffon
4 concluded his remarks. It rendered his words,
5 as well as the subsequent exchange with Dr.
6 Branche, so broken and distorted as to be
7 untranslatable.)

8 **DR. BRANCHE:** (Unintelligible)

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** (Unintelligible)

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** The -- on the Savannah River one,
11 were you proposing dropping that simply because
12 we have a number of Savannah Rivers?

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** We -- we have quite a few
14 Savannah Rivers and this one is over 50
15 percentile. But like I said, that -- that one
16 I don't have a strong argument for dropping.
17 It's -- it's mainly that we had several
18 Savannah River cases and this one was yet
19 another one which is over 50. There's one
20 rated above it which is all male genitalia also
21 and it's, you know --

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** It's very close to 50, which --
23 yeah.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, 40, so they -- they looked
25 almost similar, those two cases in a row there.

1 **DR. ROESSLER:** Mark, on the two Linde cases,
2 I'm looking them over, I -- I would recommend
3 keeping 571. It seems the two cases --

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

5 **DR. ROESSLER:** -- although they're both
6 overestimate, other than that they're quite
7 different and I think there could be some
8 information derived by looking at them. This
9 is Gen, but --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah. Yeah, they are different
11 type of cancers and they -- I may mean they --
12 they're site models, I assume, so they're both
13 using the same site model was my point.

14 **DR. ROESSLER:** Well, I don't feel strongly on -
15 - on either way.

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** No, I -- I don't -- yeah. I
17 guess the first -- the ones on the first page I
18 felt more strongly about than the last two
19 there, the Savannah River and the Linde. The
20 four on the first page I felt, you know, were
21 probably the stronger arguments to drop.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah. Let me make an additional
23 comment here. I'm -- I'm looking at Kathy
24 Behling's comparison of numbers of cases
25 compared to our goal. Interestingly enough,

1 for Linde, in terms of -- if we take the two
2 and a half percent of available cases, we would
3 do one Linde case overall.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, right, right.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** For Savannah River, we -- based on
6 numbers of claims, we need like 41 cases and
7 we're in the 20s right now.

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

9 **DR. ROESSLER:** I think --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** But I think those numbers were to
11 guide us, not to --

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** No, no, I --

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- I understand, but --

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, right.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- but --

17 **DR. ROESSLER:** I think that helps, and because
18 of that interpretation I would just withdraw my
19 comment.

20 **MS. MUNN:** But then overall we have to remember
21 the fact that we have other criteria than sites
22 alone.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, well, this --

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Sure, yeah.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- will -- we're -- we have

1 already done one Linde case, this would be the
2 second and third where we only need one to
3 start with on the -- in the goal. That's the
4 only point I was making. Also I'll point out
5 on Los Alamos -- I was a little surprised by
6 this, but based on numbers of claims, we only
7 need seven total cases. We already have four,
8 and on this list there are five more.

9 **MS. MUNN:** Well, as I pointed out, if we -- if
10 we accept the site category as only one of
11 probably at least a half-dozen criteria that we
12 established in the subcommittee to look at
13 these, then we just simply can't take that site
14 criteria as being the overwhelming --

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, no -- no, no, just --

16 **MS. MUNN:** -- (unintelligible).

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- just -- it's just a factor to
18 consider.

19 **MS. MUNN:** Right, but we do -- I think we have
20 tried to consider that factor. I suspect the
21 rest of the subcommittee members will agree
22 that we've always taken site into
23 consideration. But when we are attempting to
24 look also at period of employment, when we're
25 attempting to look at type of cancer, when

1 we're attempting to look at the percentages of
2 -- of how near or far away from the 50 percent
3 criteria we are, then -- then we -- you begin
4 to blur the lines very clearly. It's obvious
5 we're not going to be able to do it on site
6 alone. If we could do that, then that would
7 simplify the committee's task.

8 **DR. BRANCHE:** This is Christine and just to let
9 you know that Mark, you said you had very
10 strong feelings about the first four that you
11 recommended be taken off the list. If you
12 leave the two for Savannah River and Linde,
13 you'd have 41 cases, not 39 -- 39 or 41 will
14 allow SC&A to get started.

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, right.

16 **MS. MUNN:** I have no objections to following
17 Mark's recommendation. We can remove the first
18 four.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Any objections to moving the --
20 removing the first four by anybody? That was
21 148 --

22 **MS. MUNN:** 143.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- 143, 159, 188 and 194.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** And how about the last two,
25 Wanda?

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** The last two?

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** 588 and -- or 568 and 571.

3 **MS. MUNN:** I would prefer that we leave them.

4 I -- I just -- you know, we've reviewed these
5 already, and replacing a significant number of
6 them sort of --

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

8 **MS. MUNN:** -- you know, it nullifies our
9 efforts.

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Well, how about -- how about this
11 offer? I -- I think the Savannah River, which
12 I agree was -- I would concede that that -- you
13 know, you can make a good argument to keep that
14 one in there. I will drop that off my list.
15 But I would like to drop one of those Linde
16 ones, and it can be either 554 or 571. I think
17 they're using the same site model and they're
18 both over 50 percentile, and it may be that 571
19 actually might be the more appealing case now
20 that I look at it closer, but...

21 **MS. MUNN:** Either.

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** But can we take one or the other
23 of those, Wanda?

24 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah.

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** Do you have a preference on that,

1 or anybody else?

2 **DR. ROESSLER:** I think, too, that 571 might be
3 the more informative.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

5 **MS. MUNN:** I think so.

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** So can we modify my list to have
7 the first four on the first page, Paul --

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- and then 554 drop -- that's
10 the other Linde case, which is the 77
11 percentile non-melanoma skin, basal cell
12 cancer.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Any objections to that by anyone?

14 **MS. MUNN:** Not here.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** That gives us --

16 **DR. BRANCHE:** Forty.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- 40 --

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** Forty exactly, too, yeah.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- cases.

20 **DR. BRANCHE:** Wonderful. So then Mark, we'll
21 deal with the tenth set that Stu prepared, and
22 that'll be part of -- one of your agenda items
23 for your subcommittee meeting.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yes.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. I'm going to take it by

1 consent that that's acceptable. So we have our
2 --

3 **DR. BRANCHE:** Dr. Zie--

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- the ninth set will be 40 cases.

5 **DR. BRANCHE:** So Dr. Ziemer -- this is
6 Christine. So now we can instruct SC&A to go
7 ahead and get started on these 40 cases.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, and I will now assign -- I
9 will assign the teams for those 40 cases. I
10 have the list of -- of conflicts of interest,
11 and I will simply distribute the list to the
12 Board members and to NIOSH and to SC&A of those
13 assignments. I'll do that in the next week or
14 so.

15 **MS. MUNN:** Great.

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** And NIOSH will get the listing
17 and the cases to SC&A and take that task on.
18 Right?

19 **DR. NETON:** Yes.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

21 **DR. NETON:** I'm a little confused here. We
22 said that leaves 40 cases?

23 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes -- Jim, this is Christine --
24 because --

25 **DR. NETON:** I thought we were removing six

1 cases --

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** No, no, no, we --

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** We removed five.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- changed that, yeah. I can
5 read down the ones we're going to remove again.
6 I'll just read through them.

7 **DR. NETON:** Yeah, please.

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** 143, 159, 188, 194, and now the
9 change is going to be 554.

10 **DR. NETON:** And you're leaving 568.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** Leaving 568 and leaving --
12 leaving 571, yeah.

13 **DR. NETON:** Okay, thanks.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** All right. So that should wrap
15 that up, Paul --

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yep, very good.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** And then the tenth set we'll --
18 we'll take on in the subcommittee meeting --

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- and I think that's it. The
21 only other thing I was going to say is that the
22 sixth set -- I think we're far along in our
23 resolution process and I was going to try to
24 get that on the agenda for the subcommittee
25 meeting as well.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, that sounds good. Thank
2 you, Mark. Appreciate the work of the
3 subcommittee.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Thank you, and sorry to get these
5 so late to people. I've been dealing with a
6 lot of other stuff and --

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Understood.

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- (unintelligible) a little
9 reprieve.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Understood.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** Thank you.

12 **MS. MUNN:** It's amazing you got them at all.
13 Thank you, Mark.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** All right.

15 **WORK GROUP UPDATES**

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, I think we can move on to
17 our working group updates.

18 **DR. BRANCHE:** Dr. Ziemer, would you like me to
19 go down the list?

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

21 **DR. BRANCHE:** The first one is Blockson
22 Chemical; Ms. Munn, you're the chair.

23 **MS. MUNN:** We have no action at this time. As
24 you know, the Board discussed Blockson Chemical
25 at our last meeting. We had two individuals on

1 the Board who wanted additional time or
2 additional information to look at something. I
3 have not heard back from those, although I've
4 made an inquiry. We hope to have a report on
5 the additional review that those folks have
6 given the documentation at our next meeting.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you.

8 **DR. BRANCHE:** Chapman Valve, Mr. -- Dr. Poston
9 is the chair and I think he's not on this call.
10 I think actually he's out of the country.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** But we have discussed Chapman
12 already so --

13 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- I think we can proceed.

15 **DR. BRANCHE:** Fernald site profile and Special
16 Exposure Cohort; Mr. Clawson, you're the chair.

17 **MR. CLAWSON:** Yes, right now NIOSH has been
18 putting -- at our last meeting we had several
19 things that had to be put onto the O drive, and
20 then SC&A had to be able to have time to be
21 able to view it and so forth. At this time
22 we're waiting for a white paper that was
23 explaining how they were going to do some of
24 these processes. Right now I'm trying to set
25 up tentatively a workgroup meeting for the 24th

1 to be able to review this information -- March
2 24th.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

4 **DR. BRANCHE:** Hanford site profile and Special
5 Exposure Cohort petition; Dr. Melius is the
6 chair.

7 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, I -- this is Jim. We're in
8 the -- I'm in my third try at trying to
9 schedule a workgroup meeting and I think when
10 we can -- when we do scheduling later I think
11 we might even be able to work out a date for
12 that. And I just would add that SC&A has also
13 just submitted another short report on -- on
14 that particular site. But I expect we'll have
15 our -- our work meeting sometime in the next
16 couple of weeks.

17 **DR. BRANCHE:** Los Alamos National Lab site
18 profile and Special Exposure Cohort; Mr.
19 Griffon is the chair.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** We have no update at this point.
21 I do -- I -- I would like to ask if NIOSH has
22 any update on -- I know we're waiting for
23 changes in the site profile.

24 **MR. RUTHERFORD:** Mark, this is LaVon
25 Rutherford. We actually are anticipating a

1 revision or report from our contractor -- from
2 ORAU on March 7th is the anticipated date for
3 that. Once we get that and review that and
4 we'll get that issued and out to the working
5 group.

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** And -- and -- okay, and just to
7 clarify, do we -- I'm asking the entire Board
8 here. I don't know if -- if we've asked SC&A
9 to review that revision already, or do we need
10 to -- I guess we need to wait to see the report
11 first.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, we --

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** I don't know if they've been
14 tasked with that or --

15 **UNIDENTIFIED:** I can answer that. We -- we
16 were tasked originally, but we have held off,
17 given the circumstances of the site profile
18 being revised. So we're essentially deferring
19 at this point.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, till it's completed.

21 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Till it's completed and the
22 Board provides the report and we can begin with
23 that review.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** That's what I was saying, once
25 it's completed, then that process begin-- SC&A

1 review process, or do we need to come back to
2 the full Board and ask to -- you know, if it's
3 coming out March 7th, once it comes out can
4 SC&A initiate their review, Paul? Is that --
5 or are we --

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** I'm trying to recall and I don't
7 remember if we had that on the tasking list
8 already. Do you -- Christine, do you know if
9 we do? We can check on that. We may have to
10 task them.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay. All right, but I guess we
12 can che--

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** But we can move ahead --

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- check on that. Right?

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- on that if we need to rapidly,
16 yeah.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Once that's out.

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** Thank you.

20 **DR. BRANCHE:** Linde Ceramics site profile; Dr.
21 Roessler's the chair.

22 **DR. ROESSLER:** Hi, I think I have my mute off.

23 **DR. BRANCHE:** You do, thank you.

24 **DR. ROESSLER:** Okay. The Linde site profile
25 workgroup held a meeting in Las Vegas. I was

1 present by phone. After that meeting we had
2 one item left on the matrix to discuss. It was
3 decided that this item would be discussed on a
4 technical call between SC&A and NIOSH/ORAU.
5 This call was held on February 13th. SC&A had
6 Kathy DeMers, John Mauro and Steve Ostrow
7 present. NIOSH had Chris Crawford and Joe
8 Guido. Josie Beach and I listened in as
9 workgroup members. We also had a Linde worker
10 who talked about his experiences at the site
11 and Antoinette Bonsignore was -- was present on
12 the call. The worker presented information
13 with regard to this item, which was the -- some
14 questions about burlap bags at the site. He
15 had worked there from June 27th, 1951 to
16 September 1993, so he presented information.
17 Antoinette also had also spoken to another
18 worker and she presented some of the
19 information from him.
20 After discussion about this it was decided that
21 NIOSH should respond -- evaluating all the
22 information that had been presented, prepare a
23 brief white paper addressing these issues and
24 this, as I understand it, is being prepared.
25 I'm hoping that we'll be able to have a

1 workgroup meeting to address this before the
2 April meeting, and then at the April meeting
3 perhaps we can come to some resolution.

4 One thing I think would help the workgroup
5 would be if someone could review the
6 information that was presented this morning by
7 DOL and advise the workgroup at least on what
8 the implications are on these. So I think if
9 we could -- later on this morning when we talk
10 about schedule, perhaps if -- I think Steve
11 Ostrow's on the phone and somebody from NIOSH
12 is on, if we could pick a time before the April
13 meeting and in anticipation of this white paper
14 and have a workgroup -- perhaps a
15 teleconference.

16 **DR. OSTROW:** Hi, this is Steve. When we do --
17 well, when does NIOSH think it's going to
18 finish its white paper or at least have a draft
19 of it? Maybe that would set when we'd have a
20 telephone meeting.

21 **DR. NETON:** Yeah, this is Jim Neton. I don't
22 have that information available to me right
23 now. Chris Crawford's the one developing it.
24 I can try to get a hold of him and get back to
25 you fairly quickly here, though.

1 **DR. ROESSLER:** If we could do that today while
2 the workgroup members are on the phone, I think
3 that would help. If not, it's not a real
4 problem --

5 **DR. NETON:** Yeah. No, I think I can get a hold
6 of Chris Crawford and we can get that done
7 today.

8 **DR. ROESSLER:** Okay.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** If you're not able to do it by
10 phone, you can do it by e-mail afterwards.

11 **DR. ROESSLER:** Sure.

12 **DR. NETON:** Right.

13 **DR. ROESSLER:** Sure.

14 **DR. NETON:** Okay.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you, Dr. Roessler.

16 **DR. BRANCHE:** Mound; Ms. Beach is the chair.

17 **MS. BEACH:** Yes. Right now I'm currently
18 reviewing draft documents that I -- I asked
19 SC&A to prepare. We hope to have those out to
20 NIOSH and the workgroup very soon, with a plan
21 to schedule a conference call after that.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you.

23 **DR. BRANCHE:** Nevada Test Site site profile;
24 Mr. Presley is the chair.

25 **MR. PRESLEY:** The site profile -- SC&A and

1 NIOSH had a telephone meeting. They talked
2 about one of the last issues. That issue has
3 been resolved. We're in the process of trying
4 to come up with a short telephone call before
5 the April meeting to make a recommendation,
6 everybody get together and make sure
7 everybody's on board, then we will make a
8 recommendation hopefully at the April meeting.
9 And nothing has been done on the SEC petition
10 yet.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you. Incidentally,
12 I'm going to assume as we proceed through these
13 brief reports, Board members, if any of you
14 have questions for any of the workgroup chairs,
15 just speak up. Okay? Let's proceed.

16 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay, procedures review; Ms. Munn
17 chair.

18 **MS. MUNN:** We have a face-to-face meeting
19 scheduled in Cincinnati on the 13th, and at
20 that time --

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** That will be March 13. Right?

22 **MS. MUNN:** March 13th in Cincinnati, yes. It's
23 our expectation at that time to be able to
24 review for the first time a good compilation of
25 the new format matrices that Kathy Behling has

1 been carefully postulating for us for the last
2 few weeks. We haven't had a specific report
3 from Kathy, I haven't talked to her about it,
4 but so far as I know, that's on track. Kathy,
5 would you like to make any comment?

6 **MS. BEHLING:** You are correct, that is on
7 track, Wanda, and we should be prepared for the
8 March 13th meeting.

9 **MS. MUNN:** Other than that, I have no report.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you.

11 **DR. BRANCHE:** Rocky Flats site profile and
12 Special Exposure Cohort petition; Mr. Griffon
13 chair.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I -- I do have a little
15 update on the Rocky Flats workgroup. We -- I --
16 -- I think I mentioned in Las Vegas I -- we had
17 a follow-up call with Margaret Ruttenber and
18 discussed some of the -- the data regar-- or
19 her data from the University of Colorado, and I
20 have -- I still have not sent out the draft
21 minutes from that call. I will get those out.
22 But I would like to have a -- a workgroup phone
23 call meeting. I don't think we need a face-to-
24 face for this one, but a workgroup phone call
25 meeting to discuss that, along with -- I mean

1 the -- the real topic of the discussion would
2 be the application of the -- of the SEC
3 recommendation that the Board made, and
4 particularly the concerns of how it's being put
5 in place that have arose (sic), you know,
6 through this newspaper article and other things
7 that have come up. So I think we need to --
8 I'd like to have a workgroup phone call. I'll
9 get minutes out to the workgroup members before
10 the phone call and then we can report back to
11 the full Board in -- in April, would be my --
12 my hope. And that's -- that's all I have at
13 this time.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you.

15 **DR. BRANCHE:** Special Exposure Cohort issues,
16 250-day issue and preliminary review of 83.14
17 SEC petitions; Dr. Melius, chair.

18 **DR. MELIUS:** The -- on the 250-day issue, we're
19 still waiting reports from -- one report from
20 NIOSH and one report from SC&A, and I've been
21 in touch with both of them and we have some
22 idea soon when those may be available.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Thank you.

24 **DR. BRANCHE:** Savannah site profile, Mr.
25 Griffon chair.

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** No update at this point on the
2 Savannah River. It's been a little bit on the
3 back burner, but no update right now.

4 **DR. BRANCHE:** I'll skip subcommittee unless you
5 have something else, Mr. Griffon.

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** Nope.

7 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay. Use of surrogate data,
8 back to you, Dr. Melius.

9 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, I've drafted a report -- the
10 work -- Mark has given me some comments and I
11 should be circ-- circulating a revised report
12 to the full workgroup next week and we should
13 be meeting hopefully by conference call
14 sometime later in March.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you.

16 **DR. BRANCHE:** Worker outreach, Mr. Gibson
17 chair.

18 **MR. GIBSON:** Yeah, Dr. Ziemer, we had a meeting
19 February 1st, face-to-face meeting at the
20 Cincinnati airport. We had representatives
21 from NIOSH and SC&A there to get an overview of
22 the current status that -- that NIOSH is using
23 for worker outreach and the different types of
24 meetings they have. We also got an overview
25 from SC&A concerning their activities to date

1 in the area of worker outreach, and then we
2 heard from -- comments from workers and their
3 representatives and we have another meeting
4 scheduled March 13th via conference call
5 (unintelligible) get there.

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you. I believe that
7 completes all of our workgroups, does it not?

8 **DR. BRANCHE:** It does, Dr. Ziemer.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you.

10 **DR. BEHLING:** Dr. Ziemer, this is Hans Behling.
11 Can I interrupt and just ask a couple of
12 questions now?

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** You certainly can.

14 **DR. BEHLING:** Yeah. This is Hans Behling for
15 the reporter, anyway. I have a question for
16 Brad Clawson with regard to the upcoming
17 meeting regarding Fernald SEC. I believe there
18 was a few action items that were also directed
19 towards SC&A, but I've never received a formal
20 description of those -- those action items.
21 And I believe perhaps Mark Griffon could also
22 elaborate on that issue.

23 The second issue is the Hanford meeting that is
24 currently under review for -- for a date by Dr.
25 Melius. And I wanted to just make a statement

1 here. Back in July of this past year, in 2007,
2 I had submitted a fairly elaborate report
3 regarding the neutron/photon ratio, which is an
4 ongoing issue, and I have yet to receive any
5 kind of response from NIOSH and perhaps if --
6 if that can be also put on the table for -- for
7 the upcoming meeting, I would appreciate that.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. So one of those comments
9 deals with the --

10 **DR. BEHLING:** Fernald action items.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- Hanford (unintelligible) and
12 Fernald. Brad, did you have any comment on...

13 **MR. CLAWSON:** Well, I've -- Hans, I -- I
14 understand what you're saying on that. We did
15 -- we had several action items that were under
16 the matrix. Several of them were information
17 that was put onto the O drive for us. Also one
18 of them was that white paper, and I believe
19 there was also something about renal damage,
20 too, that still had to get back to you. What I
21 was trying to do was just tentatively set up a
22 date if -- if you haven't -- if you haven't had
23 enough time to review that, then we'll have to
24 postpone it. It's -- I just -- I didn't want
25 this to -- to keep lagging behind. I wanted to

1 try to put I guess a little bit of pressure to
2 be able to keep moving forward on this. Does
3 that answer your questions or --

4 **DR. BEHLING:** Yes and no. I have only some
5 very diffuse wording regarding specific action
6 items that were cited during the actual working
7 group meeting that were to be done by SC&A, and
8 I think I was under the impression that perhaps
9 Mark Griffon was going to put those action
10 items into a statement that would more closely
11 define what it is that we were supposed to do -
12 - that is, action items for SC&A.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** This is on the -- from the Fernald
14 workgroup?

15 **DR. BEHLING:** Yes, it is.

16 **MR. CLAWSON:** I -- I think -- I think, if I
17 remembered right, Hans, that we were going to -
18 - actually what we were going to have you do is
19 review the information, I believe, because some
20 of the questions was is how were they using
21 certain procedures to be able to redo this, and
22 I believe there was going to be a white paper
23 that was to come to us, and part of the thing I
24 think we were trying to address was to have you
25 review this before the next meeting and so

1 forth, if I remember right.

2 **DR. BEHLING:** Yeah, and --

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** I -- I will -- Hans, I must
4 admit, I -- I'll have to look back at my notes,
5 but I -- I'd be willing to review our notes
6 from the last meeting and the actions that we
7 had --

8 **DR. BEHLING:** Yes.

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- and I'll -- I'll -- I'll
10 forward my interpretation to Brad and we can --
11 the three of us can talk and try to straighten
12 this out in the next day or two. Okay?

13 **DR. BEHLING:** Yeah, I would very much like to
14 have a -- I have also notes that I took, but I
15 think they're somewhat diffuse and I would want
16 to be sure that I'm -- I'm on target in trying
17 to come up with the response and the action
18 items --

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** I'll (unintelligible) --

20 **DR. BEHLING:** -- for the next meeting.

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** I apologize if I dropped the ball
22 on that --

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, let me insert at this point
24 --

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- if I could insert just a
2 question or comment, it may be Dr. Branche can
3 help us out here, what -- or maybe Ray can, Ray
4 Green -- what -- what is the status of the --
5 of the transcripts for that workgroup meeting?
6 I don't have my list before me here so --

7 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yeah, the status of the one for
8 Fernald?

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

10 **DR. BRANCHE:** And when was that?

11 **DR. BEHLING:** That was October -- no, no, it
12 was November -- let's see here, I should have
13 it in front of me.

14 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yeah, if it was November, we do
15 not have the workgroup meeting -- any of the
16 workgroup meeting transcripts because we've
17 made a higher priority all of the Advisory
18 Board meetings.

19 **DR. BEHLING:** Okay, Dr. Branche, the date was
20 November 13th of 2007.

21 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay, thank you. We don't have
22 the transcript from that -- it is not -- we
23 don't -- we don't have that in hand from --
24 from Ray Green at this --

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, in the meantime, perhaps we

1 ask our -- or Brad to check back in their notes
2 and (unintelligible) --

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I'll -- I'll work -- I'll
4 work with Brad --

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- clarification to Hans on -- on
6 those issues.

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** I'll certainly work with Brad.
8 Christine, is it possible to get a -- I know in
9 the past we've got draft versions of the
10 minutes. Is that possible for that Fernald
11 meeting, just -- just to have to review what we
12 said as far as actions? I just want to --

13 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes, it -- it's certainly
14 possible. Actually I have a couple of comments
15 when we talk about transcripts --

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

17 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- but we can work on getting the
18 one for Fernald for -- to you.

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** Thank you.

20 **DR. BRANCHE:** Or rather to Brad and you.

21 **DR. BEHLING:** And -- and the -- the second
22 issue that I'd hoped that perhaps Dr. Melius
23 could -- could respond to, and that is sort of
24 a white paper or report I'd written back, as I
25 said, in July of 2007 that deals with the issue

1 of Hanford neutron/photon ratios, and to date
2 I've not seen a response to that report and I
3 was wondering if that's going to be a topic of
4 discussion for the next unscheduled workgroup
5 meeting.

6 **DR. MELIUS:** This is Jim. It will not be on
7 the schedule for that meeting. My
8 understanding is that NIOSH is looking at
9 revising their dose reconstruction methods in
10 regard to that particular issue and, because of
11 some other delays in getting access to data
12 from the Hanford site because of DOE's budget
13 problems, I -- I don't believe that they've
14 (unintelligible) that work yet. I don't know
15 if Jim -- Neton, if you can -- have any updates
16 on that, but it was not planned that that would
17 be the subject of the next conference call.

18 **DR. NETON:** I -- I agree, we're not ready to go
19 with the Hanford neutron/photon issue yet.

20 **DR. BEHLING:** Okay, that -- that certainly is
21 helpful for me.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you. Any other
23 questions or comments on the workgroup reports?

24 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Dr. Ziemer?

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes.

1 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Hey, this is Ray. I have
2 submitted that Fernald workgroup, just as a
3 coincidence. I guess it's still being
4 redacted.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, so that may be available
6 fairly soon then, Brad.

7 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Yeah, I -- when you
8 mentioned that, I thought that sounds familiar,
9 and I'm looking in my e-mails. I submitted
10 that February 9th.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, so that -- that should be --

12 **THE COURT REPORTER:** So it may be out soon.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- available very soon then.

14 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Yeah.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Thank you, Ray.

16 **MS. MUNN:** And this is Wanda. Before we go
17 away from -- from our workgroup issues, Mike
18 Gibson, what date did you say you were looking
19 to have a worker outreach phone call?

20 **MR. GIBSON:** That was the 13th, just after your
21 meeting of the procedures workgroup.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, did -- after the procedures
23 workgroup?

24 **DR. BRANCHE:** Right. Wanda, you may rec-- this
25 is Christine. Wanda, you may recall that when

1 were scheduling this --

2 **MS. MUNN:** Yes, I do -- I do recall now --

3 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- the (unintelligible) --

4 **MS. MUNN:** -- it's just that I had not noted it
5 on the calendar I'm looking at now.

6 **DR. BRANCHE:** Your meet--

7 **MS. MUNN:** I wanted to double-check that date.

8 **DR. BRANCHE:** Wanda, your meeting we have
9 scheduled for 9:30 in the morning on the 13th
10 and Michael was gracious to schedule his worker
11 outreach meeting by phone to begin at 3:00 p.m.
12 Eastern Standard Time.

13 **MS. MUNN:** You jogged my memory. I -- I recall
14 that now.

15 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** This -- this is Arjun. Just to
16 inquire, is one of those meetings face-to-face
17 and one is by phone or --

18 **MS. MUNN:** Yes, pro--

19 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** -- both are by phone?

20 **MS. MUNN:** -- procedures is by face -- is face-
21 to-face, worker outreach by phone.

22 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Thank you.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Board members, I -- we're about
24 two hours ahead of schedule and, if no one
25 objects, we'll push ahead and not have a lunch

1 break. Is that -- any objection? Wanda,
2 you're not ready for a lunch break anyway, are
3 you?

4 **MS. MUNN:** I'm always ready for a lunch break,
5 but...

6 **STATUS OF TRANSCRIPTS AND MINUTES AND UPDATE ON**
7 **SELECTION OF BOARD CONTRACTOR**

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Our next item is status of
9 transcripts and minutes, and I'm going to ask
10 if Dr. Branche would just take the lead on
11 that, and then also where we are on the Board
12 contractor selection process.

13 **DR. BRANCHE:** I'd be happy to. This is
14 Christine Branche, and I'm -- I'm actually
15 happy to report that, save the January Board
16 meeting from Las Vegas in January of this year,
17 all of the Board meeting transcripts, either
18 face-to-face or by phone, have been posted, so
19 they're available on the web site. Now, the
20 application of the new -- or the revised
21 redaction policy to those meetings that took
22 place during May and October are still being
23 reviewed with the new redaction policy being
24 applied to them, so those will be re-posted
25 when they are ready.

1 We're scheduled to have the transcripts from
2 January 2008 meeting posted within the 45-day
3 window that we promised. We already -- those --
4 -- those minutes are -- sorry, those transcripts
5 are already in our redaction -- sorry, what is
6 it, Privacy Act office and are being reviewed
7 now, and it is my anticipation that we're going
8 to post that in a timely fashion.

9 Now as it concerns transcripts, as I said in
10 our January meeting, we have made the top
11 priority dealing with the transcripts from the
12 Board meetings and the Board conference calls.
13 We do understand that there is a considerable
14 lag in many of the workgroup meetings, and we
15 have a couple of things that are going on. We
16 do have Nancy Adams who's joined us and she's
17 helping with our dealing with all these
18 transcripts. We also have a new Privacy Act
19 officer whose primary responsibilities are to
20 deal with our Privacy Act needs. And so we're
21 expecting that the time delay that we've
22 experienced with the transcripts in the past
23 will be dealt with over the next several
24 months.

25 For those of you who are workgroup chairs, I

1 know that customarily you've asked for
2 transcripts, but please understand that every
3 single time you've asked for transcripts from
4 your workgroup meeting, that has made for a
5 delay in our getting the Board meeting
6 transcripts ready in a timely fashion. And so
7 until we get -- until we reach a steady state
8 with all of our Board meeting and Board
9 conference call transcripts prepared, there's
10 going to -- you're not necessarily going to be
11 able to get a copy of the transcripts for your
12 workgroup meetings. And so I think we'd like
13 to work with the Board chairs to make certain
14 that at the end of each of your meetings you
15 have a full -- you've prepared a full list of
16 what are the to-do items so that you aren't
17 necessarily needing to have a transcript very
18 quickly.

19 So any questions about the transcripts?

20 (No responses)

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** Apparently not. Thank you.

22 **DR. BRANCHE:** Hearing no questions, as it
23 concerns the selection of the Board contractor,
24 thank you so much for all the comments that
25 we've received. I really appreciate your

1 honoring the time sensitivity that I urged in
2 my e-mail to you last week. We received
3 comments from several of you, and please
4 understand that all of your comments will be
5 reflected in the version that Mr. David Staudt
6 will be putting in the final version of the --
7 of the announcement for the Board contractor.
8 Once that final announcement is ready, you will
9 receive a copy for your own files and we will
10 post them because we do want to keep things
11 moving along as -- as rapidly as we can so that
12 we have no -- no lag in the work of a Board
13 contractor.

14 Any questions about that?

15 (Pause)

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Apparently not.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** Just -- just one, Christine.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** Do -- do you have any final
20 draft? I -- you said all comments would be
21 considered. I didn't know if you've put them
22 all in and we can see it one more time as if we
23 had -- you know. I -- I don't know, I mean I -
24 -

25 **DR. BRANCHE:** I -- I know that I -- I know I'm

1 If that -- hearing none, Dr. Ziemer, I would
2 like to let the Board know about the -- the
3 vote on Combustion Engineering.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, yes, please report that for
5 us.

6 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay, as you -- you all may
7 recall that Mr. Griffon was -- was not at the
8 Board meeting on January 17th when we voted on
9 Combustion Engineering while we were in Las
10 Vegas. Please know that in advance of -- I
11 organized the call with Dr. Ziemer, Mr. Griffon
12 and myself. We had that on January 17th, and
13 in advance of the call I e-mailed an electronic
14 copy of the draft that the Board used in its
15 deliberations regarding Combustion Engineering,
16 and the draft was sent so that he had the exact
17 wording of the motion that you all voted on. I
18 described that there was unanimous approval of
19 the petition with an 11 to noth-- to zero
20 voting structure. Mr. Griffon read the draft
21 during the January 17th conference call. He
22 did not need any additional information that
23 was offered. Dr. Ziemer shared that there were
24 a few minor edits to the draft, but I clarified
25 that the intent of the draft had not been

1 altered and that Mr. Griffon voted in favor of
2 the motion so that now our vote is 12 to
3 nothing.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you for that update.

5 **BOARD WORKING TIME AND FUTURE PLANS**

6 I think we're ready to look at -- in our work
7 time now -- the proposed dates for upcoming
8 meetings. There's one change has been
9 proposed. Christine, why don't you take us
10 through that?

11 **DR. BRANCHE:** Thank you. It turns out that as
12 we were looking at the calendar in order to
13 verify our dates and to -- to propose dates for
14 2009, I realized that the -- you all had
15 approved a November 4th teleconference. That's
16 Election Day this year. Believing that
17 scheduling a multiple-hour conference call on
18 that day would likely be quite difficult, I've
19 -- I'm suggesting that Thursday, November 6th
20 or Tuesday, November 18th are possible
21 alternatives for us to consider. And Dr.
22 Locky already told us that he was going to
23 have to leave our call today -- sorry, Dr.
24 Locky, you're probably still on the line,
25 aren't you?

1 **DR. LOCKEY:** Yes, I am.

2 **DR. BRANCHE:** Oh, well, there you are. So
3 anyway -- so Dr. Ziemer, I leave it for the
4 Board to make a decision about (a), if November
5 4th is indeed a challenge, and if the two
6 alternatives that I've suggested are -- are --
7 either of those dates will work.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Let's look at November 6th, any
9 problems with that? Anyone have conflicts for
10 the 6th? I assume we would begin at 11:00
11 o'clock --

12 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes, that --

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- Eastern time --

14 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- that is correct, Dr. Ziemer.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- 8:00 o'clock Pacific time.

16 **DR. BRANCHE:** That is correct, Dr. Ziemer.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** There appear to be no problems
18 with the 6th. Let me ask the same question for
19 November 18th, just as a backup. Any problems
20 on the 18th?

21 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, it's Jim Melius. I have a -
22 - a conflict on the 18th.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you. Apparently no
24 conflicts for the 6th so can we agree then
25 we'll move it to the 6th at 11:00 a.m. Eastern

1 time?

2 (No responses)

3 Thank you, will do.

4 **MS. BEACH:** And -- and this is Josie Beach.
5 Can you send out a final version of this when
6 it's ready as well?

7 **DR. BRANCHE:** That is exactly my intent and
8 that's why I have to go through all the dates.
9 As you've heard Dr. Zie-- sorry, Dr. Melius say
10 in the past, when we set these dates up we -- I
11 wanted to provide them as early as possible so
12 that people can make provisions and clear their
13 calendars, and if they're not clear, we can
14 make alternative dates now, and that -- that's
15 why I sent these dates to you in the -- within
16 the body of the agenda so that you could
17 examine your calendars accordingly.
18 So what we're suggesting is for 2009 we would
19 then be due for a conference call, and I'm
20 suggesting the date of January 13th, and that's
21 a Tuesday.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** And actually that was already on
23 our previous schedule.

24 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes, previously sched-- as was
25 the face-to-face Board meeting on February --

1 DR. ZIEMER: Right.

2 DR. BRANCHE: -- 17th through the 19th --

3 DR. ZIEMER: Right.

4 DR. BRANCHE: -- for the new -- sorry, so the
5 new date that I'm proposing is March 31st, and
6 that would be a teleconference. That would be
7 on a Tuesday.

8 DR. ZIEMER: Uh-huh.

9 DR. BRANCHE: 11:00 o'clock Eastern -- Eastern
10 time.

11 DR. ZIEMER: Well, if -- if people know of
12 conflicts right now, let's speak up. If --

13 DR. WADE: Could come in costume.

14 DR. ZIEMER: March 31st, right.

15 DR. BRANCHE: Okay, so we're okay with that
16 date so far?

17 DR. ZIEMER: Uh-huh.

18 DR. BRANCHE: And then May 6th through 8th,
19 which would be a Wednesday through a Friday, is
20 the date we're -- are the dates we're
21 suggesting for a face-to-face meeting. Any
22 conflicts there?

23 DR. MELIUS: This is Jim Melius. I have a
24 conflict on the 6th. I can be there for the
25 7th and 8th. I have another NIOSH-related

1 meeting that meets the first Wednesday of every
2 month, but I would just miss the -- presumably
3 we'd have the -- subcommittee's in the morning
4 and then I'd just miss the afternoon, so --

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, let -- let me comment on
6 that, Jim. As we -- I -- I've been --
7 Christine and I have been looking ahead at
8 workload in terms of petitions and so on coming
9 down the pike, and I think it's entirely
10 possible that we may have to go to full three-
11 day meetings and have workgroups and
12 subcommittees do their work at other times. So
13 I -- again, this is a -- a year away, more than
14 a year away, but I don't think there's any
15 guarantee that we'll be in a two and a half day
16 mode yet. So I -- I don't want to necessarily
17 assume that at this point is what I'm saying,
18 so --

19 **DR. MELIUS:** Okay, no, I appreciate that.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- so I think -- I think probably
21 -- let's see, that's -- that was the May
22 meeting, right, 6th through 8th --

23 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes, and --

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- then we may want to see whether
25 there's any alternatives there.

1 (No responses)

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, appears not.

3 **DR. BRANCHE:** And for a face-to-face Board
4 meeting, July 27th through the 29th. That's a
5 Monday through Wednesday. Let me ask the Board
6 a question. Dr. Ziemer is right that we might
7 -- we're -- we're likely moving to full-day
8 Board meetings. Would it be prudent for us to
9 make that the 28th through the 30th and start
10 the Board meeting on a Tuesday? Would that be
11 better?

12 **MS. MUNN:** This is Wanda. I guess those of us
13 who live out here in the other time zone would
14 always of course have the issue of having to
15 travel the previous day so that any time you
16 have a Monday through Wednesday meeting, I can
17 do it and obviously Josie's been doing it when
18 she needs to, and Phil seems to be able to get
19 there, but -- and -- and so does Brad, but it
20 does create a travel problem for us to have a
21 Monday meeting. You know, I -- I have no
22 objection to it, it's just an issue to keep in
23 mind. Some of us can't travel on the day of
24 the meeting; we must travel the preceding day.

25 **DR. BRANCHE:** I -- I appreciate that. In

1 trying to be sensitive to a number of things
2 while -- may I offer that we would change this
3 to the 28th through the 30th of July 2009,
4 Tuesday through Thursday?

5 **DR. MELIUS:** Jim Melius, I have a conflict on
6 the 30th and 31st, so I would end up missing
7 one day.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Any other conflicts?

9 **MS. MUNN:** I have no problem with traveling on
10 Sunday.

11 **MS. BEACH:** I don't have a problem traveling on
12 Sunday, either.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, so maybe we'll keep this one
14 then 27 through 29.

15 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay. Okay, and -- yeah, maybe
16 we'll try to make this one in the middle of the
17 country so that --

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Or west coast.

19 **DR. BRANCHE:** Or west coast. All right. And
20 then September 8th is a Board meeting by
21 teleconference. We would begin at 11:00
22 o'clock Eastern time.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Uh-huh, okay.

24 **DR. BRANCHE:** That is a Tuesday -- it is the
25 Tuesday following Labor Day, but that -- you

1 all apparently have met often --

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, phone -- phone calls are a
3 little easier because we can -- we can be on
4 the road even and do those sometimes.

5 **DR. BRANCHE:** Any objection to that date?

6 (No responses)

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

8 **DR. BRANCHE:** And then on October 26th through
9 the 27th (sic) for a face-to-face Board
10 meeting? Or we could -- we could easily
11 consider the 27th through the 29th, making that
12 -- if I -- would that -- with that alteration
13 it would be a Tuesday through Thursday.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Why don't we do that?

15 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay, so the 27th through the
16 29th. Any conflicts?

17 (No responses)

18 Then December 8th, which is a Tuesday, would be
19 a conference call. We would begin at 11:00
20 o'clock Eastern time.

21 (No responses)

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

23 **DR. BRANCHE:** And then lastly we're suggesting
24 -- and I really don't have the 25th in front of
25 me -- we're suggesting the -- January 25th to

1 the 28th of 2010 for a face-to-face Board
2 meeting.

3 **DR. ROESSLER:** That one might be a conflict --
4 this is Gen. It's a little bit hard to project
5 two years ahead of time and realize that some
6 of us might still be involved in this, but the
7 Health Physics Society mid-year 2010 is January
8 24th through 27th, and there may be people who
9 would find that a conflict.

10 **DR. BRANCHE:** It sounds like you would find it
11 a conflict. Is that right, Gen?

12 **DR. ROESSLER:** Well, I'm saying it's kind of
13 hard to think two years ahead and think I'll
14 still be involved, but if I am, that would be a
15 conflict for me.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** And it could be for me.

17 **MS. MUNN:** Well, regardless of who's --

18 **DR. BRANCHE:** I -- I would imagine that anyone
19 on the Board with -- given the background that
20 you all have, would have a similar conflict.

21 **MS. MUNN:** That's true.

22 **DR. BRANCHE:** It's just as easy to move that to
23 February 1st -- sorry, February 2nd through the
24 4th. Is that a viable alternative?

25 **MS. MUNN:** Or the preceding week.

1 **DR. BRANCHE:** I think the preceding week might
2 be a challenge for us here at NIOSH.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Any-- anyone have problems with
4 2nd to 4th?

5 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, I have that first Wednesday
6 --

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** You -- you've got that first
8 Wednesday meeting.

9 **DR. BRANCHE:** Gen, you said the 24th through
10 the 27th?

11 **DR. ROESSLER:** 24th through the 27th, I'm
12 looking at the Health Physics web site and I
13 can't -- the 24th -- I don't know what day of
14 the week that is.

15 **DR. BRANCHE:** The 27th is a Wednesday.

16 **DR. ROESSLER:** So it certainly would be the --
17 then -- yeah, the 24th through the 27th for
18 people who would be going to that meeting may
19 be involved on those days.

20 **DR. BRANCHE:** Well, what -- what about -- well,
21 the -- we could actually consider -- what about
22 the -- February 9, 10 and 11? Before I go back
23 into January, what about February 9, 10 and 11?

24 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Looks good to me.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** That works.

1 **DR. BRANCHE:** 9 to 11. Dr. Ziemer, I'm
2 finished, and thank you.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, I think with those -- again,
4 they're tentative in a certain sense because
5 it's possible even that we may have additional
6 Board members by then.

7 **MR. CLAWSON:** Dr. Ziemer, this is Brad. Before
8 we get off our dates and stuff, and I know that
9 we're clear out to 2010, but could we review
10 kind of the ones that we've got coming up for
11 this year? My -- my computer died and I just
12 wanted to make sure that -- I had to dump all
13 the information out of --

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes, if Dr. Branche has those
15 available, I'd ask her to read through them.

16 **DR. BRANCHE:** I would be happy to.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Starting with our next phone
18 meeting -- or our next full -- face-to-face.

19 **DR. BRANCHE:** April 7 through 9th is a full
20 Board meeting in Tampa, Florida; May 4th -- am
21 I going too fast?

22 **DR. LOCKEY:** What -- what -- this is Jim
23 Lockey. I -- I think tol-- I told Paul
24 earlier, I'll be out of town those dates so I
25 won't be at that Board meeting.

1 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay. If in the future you could
2 copy me as well, I'd appreciate it, Jim.

3 **DR. LOCKEY:** Okay.

4 **DR. BRANCHE:** May 14th is a Board meeting by
5 conference call. You would begin at 11:00
6 Eastern time. June 24th through 26th is a
7 face-to-face Board meeting. We're looking at
8 St. Louis. August 5th is a teleconference. We
9 would begin at 11:00 Eastern time.

10 **DR. LOCKEY:** August 5th. Right?

11 **DR. BRANCHE:** August 5th, yes, it's a Tuesday.
12 September 2nd through 4th is a face-to-face
13 Board meeting. We're hoping it will be in
14 California.

15 **MR. CLAWSON:** Okay, that's the one I -- I just
16 wanted to make sure because that was the day
17 right after Labor Day and I just wanted to make
18 sure we hadn't changed that one for sure.

19 **DR. BRANCHE:** No, we have not changed that one.

20 **MR. CLAWSON:** Okay, I was just trying to set up
21 everything.

22 **MR. PRESLEY:** Hey, Christine.

23 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes?

24 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley.

25 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes.

1 **MR. PRESLEY:** It's going to be hard to fly on
2 Labor Day.

3 **DR. BRANCHE:** I understand. I mean these --
4 these dates were sel-- you all selected and
5 voted on these dates --

6 **MR. PRESLEY:** Right.

7 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- before I came into this
8 position, and I -- I remember that when we
9 reviewed these dates on a previous occasion
10 last fall and I remember Board members saying
11 that they had made other arrangements reserving
12 these dates, so -- we could certainly entertain
13 a change, but some of your peers have talked
14 about how that's already a challenge for them.

15 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, and Bob, I could be wrong, but
16 I might guess that actually flying on the date
17 itself might not be as difficult as an ordinary
18 workday.

19 **DR. LOCKEY:** It would be -- this is Jim Lockey.
20 It'd be a challenge for me to change.

21 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah.

22 **MR. PRESLEY:** I'm -- I'd -- I just brought that
23 up.

24 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah.

25 **MR. CLAWSON:** I have no problem with it. I was

1 just trying to clear my schedule and I wanted
2 to make sure that that one especially hadn't
3 been changed or whatever --

4 **MR. PRESLEY:** Yeah.

5 **MR. CLAWSON:** -- because of Labor Day. I've
6 already set my calendar for that, but I just
7 wanted to make sure I hadn't missed any updates
8 or anything.

9 **MR. PRESLEY:** Yeah, this is -- that's -- Bob
10 Presley, this is -- that's what I have 'cause I
11 have it circled in red.

12 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah.

13 **MR. PRESLEY:** I wanted to make sure that...

14 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay.

15 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Dr. Branche, this is Arjun. Is
16 the 2nd to 4th that we're talking about of
17 September?

18 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes, for 2008, yes.

19 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Thank you.

20 **DR. BRANCHE:** Continuing, November 6th -- sorry
21 -- yes, we just made the change to November 6th
22 for the teleconference.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

24 **DR. BRANCHE:** And December 8th through the 10th
25 is a face-to-face Board meeting and a -- a

1 request has been made to make that east of --
2 to make the location east of the Mississippi
3 River, and that's the end of the 2008, and we
4 will -- I'll ask Zaida to prepare the full list
5 of these dates and get them out to you as --
6 probably in the next couple of weeks.

7 **DR. MELIUS:** On the December one I had down
8 December 9th through 11th. Did that change?

9 **DR. LOCKEY:** I have it down the 8th to the
10 10th.

11 **DR. BRANCHE:** I have 8th to 10th.

12 **DR. MELIUS:** I'll not be attending that.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** December -- what is it?

14 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yeah, I -- I think I originally
15 had 8th to 11th, but now I have -- I'm reading
16 -- I -- I am reading what I have on the piece
17 of paper that Zaida distributed, so I have 8 to
18 10.

19 **MS. MUNN:** And I -- I have --

20 **DR. MELIUS:** I --

21 **MS. MUNN:** -- 9 to 11.

22 **DR. MELIUS:** I had 9 to 11 'cause I was the one
23 that requested it be on the east coast 'cause I
24 have commitments on the -- the 9th -- 8th and
25 9th.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, I think it originally was 9,
2 10, 11, and got changed somehow.

3 **DR. BRANCHE:** Well, let me ask this. We're in
4 a position now -- and Jim, I think a lot of
5 accommodations were to -- to -- a lot of things
6 were done to try to accommodate you, so I'm --
7 certainly could be misspeaking, so what do most
8 of you have and what -- can you all accommodate
9 the 9th through the 11th?

10 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I've got
11 the 8th, 9th and the 10th --

12 **DR. LOCKEY:** Yeah, this is Jim Lockey --

13 **MR. PRESLEY:** -- (unintelligible) on mine.

14 **DR. LOCKEY:** Yeah, I have conflict on the 11th
15 and 12th. I'm in UAW/GM* so I can't...

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** I think we originally had 9, 10,
17 11 and then I show 11 crossing out and changed
18 to 8, 9, 10 for some reason.

19 **DR. BRANCHE:** I have that as well.

20 **MS. BEACH:** That is what I have --

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** Maybe --

22 **MS. BEACH:** -- as well.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Maybe we had -- Lockey had a
24 conflict on the 11th and Melius on what, the
25 8th was it?

1 DR. MELIUS: 8th and 9th.

2 DR. ZIEMER: 8th and 9th?

3 DR. WADE: Previous week?

4 DR. ZIEMER: So -- so either way we're going to
5 -- for that week we have a -- a problem.

6 DR. BRANCHE: Well, do I -- do I dare ask if we
7 can -- if you want to try to schedule it for
8 the week of the 1st or the week of the 15th of
9 December? Again, we're talking about 2008.

10 MS. MUNN: If --

11 DR. ZIEMER: Week of the 1st, I'm out the 3rd,
12 4th and 5th.

13 MS. MUNN: Yeah, the week of the 1st is tough,
14 but --

15 DR. BRANCHE: What about the (unintelligible)?

16 MS. MUNN: -- I could certainly make the
17 following week.

18 DR. ZIEMER: Following week is okay.

19 MS. MUNN: 15, 16, 17 or 18.

20 DR. BRANCHE: Or -- or I -- I would actually
21 try to suggest 16, 17 and 18 -- again, starting
22 on a Tuesday if we can.

23 DR. ZIEMER: Any--

24 MS. MUNN: (Unintelligible)

25 DR. ZIEMER: Anyone have conflicts on those

1 days?

2 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I don't
3 have a conflict those days.

4 **DR. LOCKEY:** No, they're good for me.

5 **DR. BRANCHE:** Who just said that? Was that --

6 **DR. LOCKEY:** Lockey, Jim Lockey.

7 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay. Dr. Melius?

8 **DR. MELIUS:** That's fine with me.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Anyone have conflicts, 16, 17,
10 18th?

11 **DR. BRANCHE:** Josie, Phil, Brad, Michael?

12 **MS. BEACH:** No conflict.

13 **MR. CLAWSON:** No conflict.

14 **DR. MELIUS:** We'll all miss Christmas parties,
15 but...

16 **DR. LOCKEY:** Where are you going to have it --
17 where do you think you're going to have that
18 meeting?

19 **DR. BRANCHE:** Well, this is your chance to tell
20 us. What would be good?

21 **MR. PRESLEY:** You've got east of the
22 Mississippi somewhere.

23 **DR. LOCKEY:** Yes, I agree with that.

24 **MR. CLAWSON:** Oh, come on, you guys, come see
25 the snow.

1 **MS. MUNN:** Not necessarily.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, I don't think we need to
3 decide that today, but we do need to decide the
4 date so let's -- we'll change it then to 16,
5 17, 18. Right?

6 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes --

7 **MS. MUNN:** 16th through 18th.

8 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- 16th through the 18th. Please
9 make these accommo-- please make these changes.
10 We would like to lock these dates in because
11 Zaida really is working more in advance than
12 has been previously done so we can get the best
13 rates and arrangements for our hotels.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

15 **MS. BEACH:** Once again, will you please send
16 out these changes officially?

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

18 **DR. BRANCHE:** Oh, absolutely.

19 **MS. BEACH:** Thank you.

20 **DR. LOCKEY:** This is Jim Lockey. One question
21 about the 2009 dates. They're tentative at
22 this point. Right?

23 **DR. BRANCHE:** No, they're not.

24 **DR. LOCKEY:** Oh, you --

25 **DR. BRANCHE:** That's why -- that's why I wanted

1 to spend this time in the Board call to take
2 care of these.

3 **DR. LOCKEY:** Well, there's a -- there's a
4 couple of meetings that I'm not -- all right,
5 I'll have to -- if I have any problems, I'll
6 let you know as soon as I can. Okay?

7 **DR. BRANCHE:** If you would, please. Thank you.

8 **DR. MELIUS:** Let us all know, Jim, and then we
9 can -- there's some problems for -- on a number
10 of them.

11 **DR. BRANCHE:** Well --

12 **DR. MELIUS:** Hard to do it that far ahead.

13 **DR. LOCKEY:** Well, yeah, like the ATS meetings,
14 I -- they're (unintelligible) -- and I don't
15 normally have those in my calendar two years
16 ahead of time. That's why I have to do some
17 looking.

18 **DR. MELIUS:** And -- and you don't schedule the
19 hotels until just, you know, a couple of months
20 before the meeting so it's not --

21 **DR. BRANCHE:** Well, but Dr. Melius, to be
22 honest, it was -- you were the one who
23 admonished that we be careful to -- once we
24 locked in these dates, that we try to honor
25 them because people were making accommodations

1 based on these dates, so I've taken up the
2 Board time to talk about these because we
3 really are going to be locking in to these on
4 the calendar. Just like --

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, and let -- let me add now,
6 and this is further ahead than we've usually
7 gone. If -- if some of you find by our next
8 meeting that you have conflicts you didn't know
9 about -- you know, professional meetings or --
10 or whatever it might be, the earlier we know
11 that, the better if we do need to make a
12 change. I think Dr. Branche rightfully wants
13 to try to lock these in, and it's helpful for
14 all of us to know in terms of scheduling other
15 things. So only tentative in the sense that
16 yeah, the further out they are, the easier it
17 will be to make a change if we absolutely need
18 to.

19 **DR. LOCKEY:** Hi, Jim Lockey. I was having -- I
20 was having my administrator look -- look at --
21 so I should know by the end of this call.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

23 **DR. LOCKEY:** Okay.

24 **MS. BURGOS:** Dr. Branche, it's Zaida.

25 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes, (unintelligible) --

1 **MS. BURGOS:** -- do we have a date -- I'm good.
2 Do we have a date for December?

3 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes, six-- you and I can confirm
4 other dates when -- when -- when you get back.

5 **MS. BURGOS:** Okay.

6 **DR. BRANCHE:** But Dr. Ziemer, there was a
7 question I had. I believe the Board members
8 wanted to talk about workgroup meetings in
9 March?

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, Christine, I -- I did want
11 to ask if -- for the subcommittee especially --
12 and --

13 **DR. BRANCHE:** Oh, the subcommittee, there's
14 Hanford, there's Fernald --

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, the subcommittee and I
16 think Fernald -- it looks like it's going to be
17 the 24th. Is that correct, March 24th?

18 **MR. CLAWSON:** If possible, if -- if -- if we've
19 got enough information on it, my -- my main
20 thing was that -- that Hans (unintelligible) --

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah, but I -- so
22 I was going to suggest the 25th for a
23 subcommittee meeting in Cincinnati.

24 **DR. BRANCHE:** Face-to-face, right, Mark?

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

1 **DR. BRANCHE:** Beginning at what time?

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** 9:00 a.m.

3 **DR. BRANCHE:** That sounds good.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Is that -- is that okay with
5 other --

6 **DR. BRANCHE:** Excuse me, that sounds good to
7 me. What about your subcommittee members?

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, is that okay with other
9 subcommittee members?

10 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, it's fine for me.

11 **UNIDENTIFIED:** What is that date, Mark?

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** The 25th of March.

13 **UNIDENTIFIED:** That's --

14 **MS. HOWELL:** This is Emily. I had a question
15 about the Fernald meeting on the 24th. What
16 time were we planning on starting that? The
17 23rd is Easter Sunday and I didn't know if that
18 would impact people's travel plans.

19 **MR. CLAWSON:** Oh, my -- yeah, I didn't even
20 think about that. Yeah, that'd -- that'd kind
21 of impact me. I think -- I can -- maybe I'd
22 better -- I'd better re-- reassess that
23 situation now. I didn't look at that. Thank
24 you, Emily.

25 **MS. MUNN:** (Unintelligible)

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, we don't know if Fernald can
2 meet yet. Right?

3 **MR. CLAWSON:** That's -- that's correct.

4 **DR. BRANCHE:** But Mark, you still want to lock
5 in on the 25th at 9:00?

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** If that's possible, yeah, and
7 Brad, maybe you can put it the day -- you know,
8 on the Wednesday after, if that works.

9 **DR. BRANCHE:** It might be that if -- if you do
10 confirm that date, we've got potentially
11 something else going on and I think -- and Lew
12 might end up being your DFO, but we'll -- we'll
13 have you covered.

14 **MR. CLAWSON:** Okay. I'll -- I'll let you know
15 as soon as -- it's kind of tentatively. I just
16 wanted to try to start locking some dates in
17 for these (unintelligible) -- I'll -- I'll look
18 at it. I -- I didn't look at that Easter
19 Sunday and I know [Identifying information
20 redacted] be a little bit up-- upset with me.

21 **DR. BRANCHE:** Can I go back to Mark for a
22 moment? Mark, did -- just because we -- we
23 have to get this in the *Federal Register* --

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

25 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- you want to deal with

1 finalizing the fourth and fifth sets, begin to
2 address the sixth set, and then deal with --

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** The tenth set -- or preliminary -
4 -

5 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- the tenth -- okay, the tenth
6 set --

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- preliminary selection, and
8 also the letter reports for the fourth and
9 fifth set, but that -- that's finalizing the
10 fourth and fifth set, though.

11 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay.

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

13 **DR. BRANCHE:** Is that it?

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** And the first 100 cases summary
15 report.

16 **DR. BRANCHE:** Got it.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** And I think we need, you know,
18 9:00 to 5:00, just in case --

19 **DR. BRANCHE:** 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, yeah.

21 **DR. BRANCHE:** Thank you very much.

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** Thank you.

23 **MS. BEACH:** And this is Josie Beach. I have a
24 comment, question, or just want to throw
25 something out for discussion. We don't

1 currently have anything -- a schedule for
2 workgroup meetings that we can go to other than
3 the NIOSH web page that shows our meetings. Is
4 there some way we could -- or Zaida or somebody
5 could put together the workgroup schedule for
6 the -- if I want to plan a meeting for Mound, I
7 could go where these meetings are already
8 scheduled and then maybe piggyback on them?
9 Does that make sense?

10 **DR. BRANCHE:** It does. Let me just ask a
11 question of the people who maintain the web
12 site for NIOSH. Right now as soon as a Board
13 member wishes to schedule a meeting, it's
14 posted on the web site.

15 **MS. BEACH:** Oh, let me -- just -- just now I
16 looked up for -- on the web site, and the only
17 meeting there is Feb-- is the February meeting
18 and April meeting. Wanda's March meeting has
19 not been posted and that's the kind of stuff
20 that would be helpful. That 13th is not
21 posted.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** So the question is could we post
23 the workgroup meetings.

24 **MS. BEACH:** Or something less formal that we
25 could look at.

1 **DR. BRANCHE:** Zaida, what do you think?

2 **MS. BURGOS:** Every -- every time I make a
3 change or an addition to the list I could just
4 send it to the Board members.

5 **DR. BRANCHE:** I guess -- I think what we're
6 asking for is maybe a spreadsheet that has all
7 the -- all of the proposed dates.

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** A master calendar of workgroup
9 meetings or something, yeah.

10 **MS. BEACH:** I think it would be helpful for me,
11 and then to know who's involved that way 'cause
12 a lot of us are involved in several different
13 ones.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** I mean it seems like it could be
15 something that you could post on the -- on our
16 web page, a little master calendar.

17 **MR. ELLIOTT:** This is Larry Elliott.

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

19 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Let me talk to Chris Ellison
20 about this. I agree, Mark, I think a calendar
21 of events --

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

23 **MR. ELLIOTT:** -- the Advisory Board's pages
24 would be helpful. I believe that -- that the
25 procedures workgroup is -- is -- scheduled

1 meeting -- workgroup meeting is -- is actually
2 posted, but I think you've got to go to the
3 right page to find that. I don't think it's on
4 the Board page.

5 **MS. BEACH:** Oh, I see, that could --

6 **MR. ELLIOTT:** But I'll check.

7 **MS. BEACH:** -- be it --

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, yeah.

9 **MS. BEACH:** -- that could be true.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Maybe -- maybe a Board calendar
11 would be --

12 **MR. ELLIOTT:** But you're absolutely right,
13 Josie. I think some kind of a calendar where -
14 -

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

16 **MR. ELLIOTT:** -- you could just screen through
17 the -- the months, you could see where things
18 are scheduled, that would be helpful.

19 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, that would be.

20 **MR. ELLIOTT:** I'll talk to Chris Ellison about
21 that.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

23 **DR. MELIUS:** And if you could put the holidays
24 on there so we don't miss Easter.

25 **MS. BEACH:** Thank you.

1 **MR. CLAWSON:** (Unintelligible) out there, Jim,
2 I appreciate that.

3 **MS. MUNN:** I guess it's never been really
4 completely clear to me exactly whose
5 responsibility it is to see that those
6 postings, especially for workgroups, occur. As
7 -- as the chair of the procedures group, I have
8 never made an effort to see that they were
9 posted. We establish those dates during our
10 meeting time and magically, usually by means
11 I'm sure of either NIOSH staff or the
12 Designated Federal Official, things appear.

13 **DR. BRANCHE:** Wanda, it is our responsibility
14 to make certain that those get posted. And I
15 think -- I think the idea of -- you've heard a
16 few people talk about it, like a master
17 calendar for the Board, and we can look at some
18 solutions and Larry has graciously suggested
19 that we'll -- we'll examine that 'cause his --
20 his are the staff who maintain the web site.

21 **MS. MUNN:** That would be helpful.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Be very helpful, yeah.

23 **MS. BEACH:** Well, could you -- someone tell me
24 where I'd go to find that because I've gone to
25 the OCAS directory and to the Advisory Board

1 directory and I -- it's not posted on either
2 one.

3 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Well, if it's posted, Josie --
4 we'll get you the IPA address where you --

5 **MS. BEACH:** I'd appreciate that.

6 **MR. ELLIOTT:** It may not be posted. I'm just
7 saying it -- one of the con-- concerns I have
8 is that this information is placed in different
9 areas on the web site and it's not
10 straightforward in all cases and --

11 **MS. BEACH:** And that should be.

12 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Yeah, I agree.

13 **MS. BEACH:** Okay.

14 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** This is Phillip. If you could
15 send that to me, too, I'd appreciate it.

16 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Will do.

17 **DR. MELIUS:** This is Jim Melius. I'd also like
18 to try to schedule the Hanford workgroup
19 conference call, and I've got responses back
20 from everyone who's in the country except for
21 you, Paul. And --

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** No, I e-mailed you a couple of
23 days ago, but --

24 **DR. MELIUS:** Oh, no, there's a new -- I just
25 sent out a new e-mail this morning

1 (unintelligible) --

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, well, I haven't seen today's
3 e-mail but --

4 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, well, I'll make it simple.
5 It's -- now by elimination it's down to either
6 March 6th or March 18th.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** March 6th is fine any time, and
8 March 18th -- that's Tuesday, I'm okay except
9 from 11:30 to 1:30.

10 **DR. MELIUS:** Why don't we go with March 6th.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

12 **DR. BRANCHE:** What time, Jim?

13 **DR. MELIUS:** Oh, say 1:00 o'clock?

14 **DR. BRANCHE:** How long do you think it'll be?

15 **DR. MELIUS:** At most, two hours, but...

16 **DR. BRANCHE:** And this is Hanford. Right?

17 **DR. MELIUS:** Hanford workgroup.

18 **DR. BRANCHE:** Now all the NIOSH staff who could
19 possibly have anything to do with posting it
20 now have heard it's at 1:00 o'clock p.m. on
21 March 6th.

22 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, and all the NIOSH staff who
23 I think need to be involved have also -- are
24 all available that day, as well as workgroup,
25 so...

1 **DR. BRANCHE:** This is a conference --

2 **MR. ELLIOTT:** So when Zaida sends out this
3 listing of new dates, are you going to include
4 workgroup meetings or just Board meetings?

5 **DR. BRANCHE:** I think --

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, I think --

7 **DR. BRANCHE:** -- it could be workgroup meetings
8 as well 'cause that's what Josie's saying she
9 wants to be able to avoid dates that have
10 already been committed for other workgroups.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** I think that would include
12 conference calls.

13 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Yes.

14 **MS. BURGOS:** Yes, I will --

15 **MS. MUNN:** Yes.

16 **MS. BURGOS:** Yes, I will send everything.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you. Any -- are there any
18 others we need to schedule today?

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, one more I'd like to, while
20 we've got everybody here. Rocky Flats, just a
21 phone call workgroup meeting, and I was going
22 to propose March 3rd at 11:00 Eastern time if -
23 - if that's possible.

24 **DR. BRANCHE:** I can't do March 3rd, but I'm
25 looking to my -- no, you won't have a DFO for

1 that.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** March 3rd doesn't work? Okay.

3 How about --

4 **DR. BRANCHE:** The 18th is open.

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** How about the -- is March 4th?

6 **MS. MUNN:** That's fine.

7 **DR. BRANCHE:** No, it won't work for me.

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Won't work for you.

9 **DR. BRANCHE:** I can tell you right -- right
10 now, based on our scheduling of the Hanford
11 call, unless you want to make your call another
12 time on the 6th, the 3rd, 4th and 5th are --
13 and -- and the 7th are a problem for me.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay. Okay. Then we're going
15 into the next week.

16 **MS. MUNN:** Ooh.

17 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yeah, the next week is kind of
18 ugly. The 11th through the 13th is a challenge
19 for many of us at NIOSH.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, right, right.

21 **MR. PRESLEY:** Hey, Mark, this is Bob Presley.
22 You make it and I'll try to sit in on it.

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

24 **MR. PRESLEY:** Anything after the 4th, I can't
25 guarantee anything for about four weeks.

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh, right, right, right. How
2 about March 17th?

3 **DR. BRANCHE:** That looks good for me.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Same time, 11:00 a.m.

5 **DR. BRANCHE:** And you said this -- you want
6 this by conference call. Right?

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

8 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** And Mark, how long do you
9 expect this --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Two to three hours, probably --
11 probably just two hours.

12 **MS. MUNN:** You're going to miss the St.
13 Patrick's Day parade.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh, yeah, it's St. Paddy's Day,
15 right.

16 **DR. BRANCHE:** We'll just wear green.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I believe a couple hours
18 should do it, but --

19 **MS. MUNN:** Okay, 11:00 a.m. Right?

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- (unintelligible) three in case
21 -- yeah.

22 **DR. BRANCHE:** Are we agreeing to the 17th at
23 11:00 a.m. by ca-- by conference call?

24 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Mark --

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yes.

1 **MS. MUNN:** That's what I thought we were.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yes.

3 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Mark, this is Arjun. I might
4 have to leave at about 1:00, 1:15.

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay. Well, hopefully it -- it
6 should be over by then, I hope, yeah.

7 **MS. MUNN:** Will you get us a good solid agenda
8 here ahead of --

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yes, I will, and I'll send out --
10 there's a few things, including the minutes,
11 that I'll send out.

12 **MS. MUNN:** Good.

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

14 **MS. MUNN:** Thank you.

15 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay, so I just want to confirm
16 so that everyone understands. Mark, we're
17 agreeing to Monday, March 17th, 11:00 a.m. by
18 conference call for Rocky Flats.

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yes.

20 **MS. HOWELL:** This is Emily. The Hanford
21 meeting on the 6th, is that a call or in
22 person?

23 **DR. MELIUS:** A call, Emily.

24 **MS. HOWELL:** Thank you.

25 **DR. ROESSLER:** This is Gen. I wonder if Jim

1 Neton found out anything about the Linde white
2 paper.

3 **DR. NETON:** Yeah, Gen, I think Chris Crawford
4 is on the phone now. Chris, are you there?

5 (No response)

6 Hello, Chris?

7 (No response)

8 Are you on mute?

9 (No response)

10 Well, I had -- I had Chris available and I
11 guess he had to drop off, so I don't now.

12 **DR. ROESSLER:** Well, we can do -- we can do
13 this by e-mail or --

14 **DR. NETON:** Okay, sorry.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** And then be sure to let Dr.
16 Branche know so we can get it posted.

17 **DR. ROESSLER:** Right.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, any other scheduling issues?

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh, just one other note, Paul,
20 maybe if you can talk to Dr. Poston about maybe
21 scheduling a Chapman workgroup call right --
22 shortly before the April meeting, you know,
23 give SC&A time to get the report out, but just
24 mention to him that -- that we might need one
25 before the April meeting.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** I think that'd be wise. We can
3 do it by e-mail, but you know...

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** Thank you.

6 **MR. CLAWSON:** Hey, doc-- Dr. Ziemer, this is
7 Brad. I was wondering if -- while we've got
8 everybody on here, especially the Fernald
9 workgroup, I'm wondering if the 26th would work
10 for anybody or that's going to be a conflict.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** That's March 26th. Right?

12 **MR. CLAWSON:** That's correct.

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** 26th is good with me.

14 **DR. BEHLING:** It's okay by me, Brad.

15 **MR. PRESLEY:** Hey, Brad?

16 **MR. CLAWSON:** Yes?

17 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I'll make
18 it if I can.

19 **MR. CLAWSON:** Well, I realize that, and maybe
20 if you -- you know, if you can just join us by
21 phone, that's fine. It's just -- I wanted to
22 try to bring some of these issues to -- to bed
23 and stuff, so --

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** I can do the 26th. That's better
25 than the 24th.

1 **MR. CLAWSON:** Okay. How about with NIOSH, Mark
2 Rolf (sic) or any of those?

3 **DR. NETON:** Yeah, this is Jim Neton. I don't
4 know that Mark is on the phone right now, but
5 I'll check with him and we'll have somebody
6 there.

7 **MR. CLAWSON:** Okay. Well, I'll tell you what,
8 I'll go ahead and send -- send an e-mail out to
9 the whole Fernald workgroup and we'll -- we'll
10 -- we'll try to set something up from there.
11 But I've got you courtesy cop'd on it,
12 Christine and Zaida, so we'll go from there.

13 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay, the 26th at -- you want to
14 do face-to-face. Right?

15 **MR. CLAWSON:** Yeah, at Cincinnati.

16 **DR. BRANCHE:** 9:00 a.m.?

17 **MR. CLAWSON:** That's correct, 9:00 to 5:00.

18 **DR. BRANCHE:** That sounds great.

19 **MR. CLAWSON:** All right.

20 **DR. BRANCHE:** Thank you.

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** So the Chapman Valve group --
22 let's see, that's Griffon, Clawson, Roessler
23 and Gibson. Right?

24 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** I think Dr. Poston is on that.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, he's the chair, but the

1 others are on the line. But do we know when
2 Poston's back in the country, Christine? Did
3 he give you his schedule?

4 **DR. BRANCHE:** No, actually he just happened to
5 copy -- I was just copied on an e-mail message
6 that I believe he sent you, and he indicated
7 that he was -- it was a -- another set of --
8 flurry of -- of e-mails back and forth and it
9 was sort of a by the way, I'm not going to make
10 the call.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, but I -- I don't recall his
12 schedule. I'll -- I'll --

13 **DR. BRANCHE:** I don't either.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** I'll -- I'll have to track it
15 down, but -- well, we'll have to find out when
16 he's available and then he'll have to contact
17 the other committee members then. I'll just --
18 I'll just send him a reminder that they need to
19 meet.

20 Okay, any other scheduling issues?

21 (No responses)

22 Are there any other items that need to come
23 before us today?

24 **MR. CRAWFORD:** Dr. Ziemer, I believe Dr.
25 Roessler was looking for Chris Crawford. I'm

1 on the phone now.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, very good. Gen, are you still
3 there -- Gen Roessler?

4 (No response)

5 Did we lose Dr. Roessler now?

6 **DR. BRANCHE:** No, she maybe ha-- she may be --
7 Dr. Roessler, are you on mute?

8 **DR. ROESSLER:** I'm -- I'm sorry, I was off.
9 I'm on now I think?

10 **DR. BRANCHE:** Yes, yes, you are.

11 **DR. ROESSLER:** Okay. And we have Chris on?

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Chris is on.

13 **MR. CRAWFORD:** Yes.

14 **DR. ROESSLER:** Okay. The question was when can
15 we expect the white paper that was going to be
16 put together for the -- for the Linde
17 workgroup?

18 **MR. CRAWFORD:** Right. As you know, we just had
19 a phone conference last week about this --

20 **DR. ROESSLER:** Right.

21 **MR. CRAWFORD:** -- and I know Joe is working on
22 it, his response to that. The burlap bag issue
23 has morphed into something a little different
24 than was originally described. Joe doesn't
25 think it's going to have much impact, but he

1 does have to work something up on it.

2 We didn't set a date certain for the delivery,
3 so I would guess we could have something this
4 week, but I would think by the end of next
5 week.

6 **DR. ROESSLER:** That would be by the end of --
7 that would be like the 22nd? If possible, we
8 could set something up during March and then
9 have something to report on at the April
10 meeting. Why don't we just leave it open and
11 wait to see what happens and then we -- we can
12 get together by e-mail?

13 **MR. CRAWFORD:** That's fine with me, Doctor.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you. Any other items?

15 (No responses)

16 I think then we've completed our agenda. Thank
17 you everyone for your participation. Dr.
18 Branche, any final comments?

19 **DR. BRANCHE:** No, no final comments, and thank
20 you so much.

21 **DR. MCKEEL:** Dr. Ziemer?

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes?

23 **DR. MCKEEL:** This is Dan McKeel. I have one
24 sentence --

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, yes, Dan.

1 **DR. MCKEEL:** Yes.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** I'm sorry, I -- I forgot, you did
3 tell us you --

4 **DR. MCKEEL:** No, no, no --

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- wanted to have another comment
6 --

7 **DR. MCKEEL:** -- no, I don't want to hold
8 everybody longer.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- so go ahead.

10 **DR. MCKEEL:** But since this is in the -- the
11 last meeting before the April meeting when
12 we're going to take up the -- hopefully the
13 Texas City Chemicals SEC. NIOSH has prepared
14 and released their evaluation report on that
15 SEC 88, and my question was would it be
16 possible for the Board to task SC&A to do a
17 very targeted review of that evaluation report
18 since TCC is one of those sites that has
19 absolutely no monitoring data so the entire
20 NIOSH recommendation is based on surrogate data
21 from another site which at least, in my
22 opinion, has not really been well-justified as
23 -- as an adequate coworker model for Texas
24 City. So this is one case where I think
25 scientifically SC&A's input really is going to

1 be needed, and I -- I'd just ask to bring that
2 to your attention.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you for that question.
4 And Board members, I think you may have
5 received your copies -- should have received
6 your copies of the Texas City evaluation report
7 very recently. I don't know if you've had a
8 chance to look at it yet, but the -- the
9 question is whether we should task SC&A on this
10 at this point or not.

11 **DR. MCKEEL:** I -- I think the report was --
12 came out December the 8th.

13 **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Dr. McKeel, I think it was
14 January 8th.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** I was going to say I -- I -- I
16 think I got mine within the last couple of
17 weeks.

18 **DR. MCKEEL:** January the 18th, right -- sorry.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, yeah, I -- I know it's
20 fairly recent.

21 **DR. MCKEEL:** Sorry.

22 **MS. MUNN:** This is Wanda. It appears to be
23 premature for us to discuss or to identify work
24 for our contractor at this time. Perhaps by
25 the April meeting we will have had an

1 opportunity to all look at this material and to
2 give some thought to what may or may not be in
3 order at that time.

4 **DR. MCKEEL:** That's fine. Thank -- thank you.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** I think at least Dan is giving us
6 a heads up for his concerns, and take that into
7 consideration as you read the report, and then
8 we can go from there.

9 I -- any other comments on that, however?

10 (No responses)

11 Apparently not. Okay, thank you, Dan, for that
12 input.

13 **DR. MCKEEL:** Thank you very much.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Then if there's no other
15 business to come before us, I'll declare the
16 meeting adjourned. And again, thank you,
17 everyone, for your participation.

18 **MS. MUNN:** Thank you.

19 **DR. BRANCHE:** Thank you.

20 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 1:50
21 p.m.)

1

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER**STATE OF GEORGIA****COUNTY OF FULTON**

I, Steven Ray Green, Certified Merit Court Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported the above and foregoing on the day of Feb. 20, 2008; and it is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony captioned herein.

I further certify that I am neither kin nor counsel to any of the parties herein, nor have any interest in the cause named herein.

WITNESS my hand and official seal this the 1st day of March, 2008.

STEVEN RAY GREEN, CCR, CVR-CM, PNSC
CERTIFIED MERIT COURT REPORTER
CERTIFICATE NUMBER: A-2102