

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

+ + + + +

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL
SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND
WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

64th MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY
SEPTEMBER 8, 2009

+ + + + +

The meeting convened by
teleconference at 11:00 a.m., Paul L. Ziemer,
Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

- PAUL L. ZIEMER, Chairman
- JOSIE M. BEACH, Member
- BRADLEY P. CLAWSON, Member
- MICHAEL H. GIBSON, Member
- MARK GRIFFON, Member
- WANDA I. MUNN, Member
- ROBERT W. PRESLEY, Member
- GENEVIEVE S. ROESSLER, Member
- PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member

THEODORE M. KATZ, Acting Designated Federal
Official

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ALSO PRESENT:

ADAMS, NANCY, NIOSH Contractor
AL-NABULSI, ISAF, DOE
BARRIE, TERRIE, ANWAG
FITZGERALD, JOE, SC&A
HOWELL, EMILY, HHS
KOTSCH, JEFFREY, DOL
LAUFER, LARA, GAO
RUTHERFORD, LAVON, NIOSH OCAS
MAURO, JOHN, SC&A
NETON, JIM, NIOSH OCAS
OSTROW, STEVE, SC&A
ROBERTSON-DEMERS, KATHRYN, SC&A
RUBINS, SUZANNE, GAO

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

| | |
|---|------|
| Roll Call | |
| Ted Katz. | .5 |
| Welcome | |
| Paul Ziemer | 11 |
| Votes and Status of Board Recommendations on Lake Ontario Ordnance Works, Baker-Perkins, Co., and Norton, SEC Petition | |
| Ted Katz. | 14 |
| Status of DOL Consideration of OCAS Review of Ruttenber Data | |
| Jeff Kotsch | 16 |
| Coordinating OCAS and SC&A/Board Data Captures Bradley Clawson. | 19 |
| Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition Status Updates - Update on Petitions Planned for Presentation at October Board Meeting | |
| LaVon Rutherford | 45 |
| Updates from Work Groups and Subcommittees | |
| Dose Reconstruction Subcommittee | |
| Mark Griffon. | 51 |
| Procedures Review Subcommittee | |
| Wanda Munn. | 55 |
| Linde Work Group | |
| Genevieve Roessler. | 59 |
| Board Work Group Transcript Review Policy | |
| Paul Ziemer. | 61 |
| Suggestions for Blockson Chemical Company Radon Model Validation | |
| Mark Griffon | 84 |
| Future Plans/Suggestion for October Board Meeting Agenda Items. | .125 |

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 11:02 a.m.

3 MR. KATZ: Welcome, everybody.

4 This is the Advisory Board on Radiation and
5 Worker Health conference call. And as usual,
6 we're going to begin with roll call, beginning
7 with Board members and with the Chair. To
8 make things easy, let me just run down the
9 list and, people, let me know if you're here.

10 Dr. Ziemer is here.

11 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

12 MR. KATZ: All right. Then, Mr.
13 Schofield?

14 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Here.

15 MR. KATZ: Dr. Roessler?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. KATZ: Mr. Presley?

18 MEMBER PRESLEY: Here.

19 MR. KATZ: Dr. Poston?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. KATZ: Okay. Ms. Munn?

22 MEMBER MUNN: Here.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: And, Jim Melius, I'll
2 let you know, he has a press conference that
3 was scheduled very recently that's going to
4 maybe keep him away for the whole meeting.

5 Dr. Lockey?

6 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: But he will join
7 us if we're still in session.

8 MR. KATZ: That's right: when he's
9 through.

10 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: When he's
11 through.

12 MR. KATZ: But he thinks he may
13 not be through until 12:30, 1:00 or later.
14 And I'm not sure what the length of this
15 meeting will be.

16 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes. Okay.

17 MR. KATZ: And, you know, he has
18 an agenda item, but I think he's communicated
19 with Mark so that Mark can carry some of that
20 water at least.

21 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

22 MR. KATZ: Dr. Lockey?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (No response.)

2 MR. KATZ: Actually, you know, I
3 think I recall that Dr. Lockey can't make
4 this.

5 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

6 MR. KATZ: So Mr. Griffon? Mark?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. KATZ: Okay. I know he's
9 intending to attend.

10 Mr. Gibson?

11 MEMBER GIBSON: Yes. I'm here,
12 Ted.

13 MR. KATZ: And, Mr. Clawson?

14 MEMBER CLAWSON: I'm here.

15 MR. KATZ: And, Ms. Beach, you
16 still with us?

17 MEMBER BEACH: I'm here.

18 MR. KATZ: Okay. Let me just
19 check back through the folks that didn't
20 respond.

21 Dr. Roessler?

22 MEMBER ROESSLER: I just tuned in.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: Great. Welcome.

2 Dr. Poston?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. KATZ: Okay. I have no notice
5 from Dr. Poston, I don't think.

6 Again, Dr. Lockey probably not to
7 be with us.

8 Mr. Griffon?

9 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, I'm here,
10 Ted, now.

11 MR. KATZ: Oh, great. Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: So we have a
13 quorum.

14 MR. KATZ: We have a quorum. And
15 then let me just also check and see for other
16 federal attendants, first OCAS and ORAU team.

17 DR. NETON: Jim Neton.

18 MR. RUTHERFORD: LaVon Rutherford
19 with OCAS.

20 MR. KATZ: Welcome. More with
21 OCAS?

22 (No response.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: How about the ORAU
2 team?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. KATZ: Okay. How about SC&A?

5 DR. MAURO: John Mauro, SC&A.
6 Good morning, everyone.

7 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Good morning,
8 John.

9 MR. KATZ: Good morning, John.

10 DR. OSTROW: Steve Ostrow, SC&A.

11 MR. KATZ: Good morning, Steve.

12 DR. OSTROW: Good morning.

13 MS. ROBERTSON-DeMERS: Kathy
14 Robertson- DeMers, SC&A.

15 MR. KATZ: Hi, Kathy.

16 MR. FITZGERALD: Joe Fitzgerald,
17 SC&A.

18 MR. KATZ: All right, then. How
19 about members of the public or staff of
20 congressional offices?

21 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Who want to be
22 identified.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. BARRIE: This is Terrie
2 Barrie, with ANWAG.

3 MR. KATZ: Welcome, Terrie.

4 MS. BARRIE: Good morning.

5 MR. KATZ: Okay. And finally,
6 other federal employees and contractors.

7 MS. HOWELL: Emily Howell, HHS.

8 MS. ADAMS: Nancy Adams, NIOSH
9 contractor.

10 MS. AL-NABULSI: Isaf Al-Nabulsi,
11 DOE.

12 MR. KOTSCH: Jeff Kotsch,
13 Department of Labor.

14 MS. RUBINS: Suzanne Rubins,
15 R-U-B-I-N-S, U.S. GAO.

16 MS. LAUFER: Lara Laufer, GAO.

17 MR. KATZ: Great. Welcome.
18 Welcome, all of you. And then let me just
19 remind everyone on the line to please mute
20 your phones except when you're addressing the
21 group. And if you don't have a mute button,
22 the *6 will work. And then to come back, to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be able to speak again, you just press *6
2 again. And if you have to leave this call at
3 any time, please don't put it on hold. Just
4 hang up and call back in, because the hold
5 will interrupt the call for everyone else.

6 And, Dr. Ziemer, it's yours.

7 MEMBER PRESLEY: Hey, Ted?

8 MR. KATZ: Yes?

9 MEMBER PRESLEY: This is Bob
10 Presley. Has anybody else got a bad
11 connection besides me?

12 MEMBER CLAWSON: Bob, this is
13 Brad. It's coming in clear to me and --

14 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, I'm real
15 clear.

16 MEMBER PRESLEY: I'm going to hang
17 up and try again, because I can't hardly hear
18 anybody.

19 MR. KATZ: Okay, Bob.

20 MEMBER PRESLEY: All righty.

21 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. I think
22 we can proceed, however, and Bob will join us

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here in just a second, but we still have a
2 quorum.

3 So let me officially call the
4 meeting to order and welcome everybody.
5 Appreciate your taking time to participate in
6 the meeting today.

7 The agenda for today's meeting has
8 been posted on the website, and Board members
9 should have also received copies of the agenda
10 by email.

11 Any Board members who don't have
12 copies of the agenda?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Very good. Then
15 I'm going to proceed down through the agenda
16 with one exception in terms of order. You'll
17 notice -- and the agenda doesn't have numbers,
18 but bullet points -- the Blockson item, which
19 is the fourth bullet point. I'm going to
20 defer that to the end of the agenda in order
21 to provide a possibility for Dr. Melius to
22 participate, if in fact, he's able to join us

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 by the time his meeting is over, or before our
2 meeting is over, whichever occurs.

3 And, Mark, were you asking a
4 question there? Or somebody --

5 MEMBER GRIFFON: No, it wasn't me.

6 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Oh, okay.

7 MEMBER PRESLEY: Hey, Paul, this
8 is Bob Presley.

9 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Oh, Bob is back.

10 MEMBER PRESLEY: I'm on. I can
11 hear now.

12 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: You're back on.
13 Thank you.

14 So with that exception to the
15 order, we'll just proceed through the agenda
16 as given.

17 I want to point out for all the
18 participants that are on the conference calls
19 of this type, we mainly are doing updates and
20 gathering information that we wanted to have
21 prior to our face-to-face meeting. In
22 general, we do not conduct actions that have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 significance, such as voting on SECs or that
2 sort of thing on conference calls. So
3 primarily what we will do today will be
4 updates on particular items and informational
5 items. I do have one sort of what I might
6 classify as not a major action item. That has
7 to do with the transcript review policy where
8 I may ask for a motion to approve the policy,
9 but otherwise we're talking about
10 informational items primarily.

11 So with that, let's proceed on the
12 agenda. The first item we have is the update
13 on the voting for the SECs for Lake Ontario
14 Ordnance Works, Baker-Perkins and Norton. All
15 three of those were action items at our last
16 meeting. All three of those items were
17 recommended for SEC class by the Board by
18 majority vote. However, at the time of the
19 Board meeting we did not have all of the votes
20 recorded.

21 So, Ted, if you'll give us an
22 update.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: Thank you, Dr. Ziemer.

2 I need to slightly amend what you said,
3 though. But Lake Ontario --

4 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Oh, right. They
5 were not all recommended for SEC. We took
6 action on all three.

7 MR. KATZ: Exactly.

8 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right.

9 MR. KATZ: Exactly. And Dr.
10 Melius had to miss the second day of the Board
11 meeting, so I had collected votes from Dr.
12 Melius on all three action items. And on
13 August 24th he voted with the Board on Lake
14 Ontario Ordnance Works, and that was for the
15 addition of that class. And he also at that
16 time abstained from the Norton SEC vote of the
17 Board, which was for the addition of a class
18 at Norton. And on August 28th he voted in
19 support of the Board's position that doses can
20 be reconstructed at Baker-Perkins for the
21 five- day period that was evaluated by OCAS.

22 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right. And that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 action was to not recommend the class.

2 MR. KATZ: Exactly.

3 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: So that was the
4 correction in my original statement.

5 MR. KATZ: Not add a class for
6 Baker- Perkins.

7 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: But, so all of
8 those votes now are officially on the record.

9 The letters have been prepared as required
10 and transmitted to the Secretary. So those
11 actions are complete as far as the Board's
12 work is concerned at the moment.

13 Are there any questions on those
14 actions?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: If not, we will
17 proceed. The next item is the status of
18 Department of Labor considerations of the OCAS
19 review of the Ruttenber data. The Ruttenber
20 data, you recall, is the data that was
21 utilized, and there was some question on the
22 utilization for the Rocky Flats SEC Petition.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I should point out that in the time since our
2 meeting, you should have received a
3 transmission from Dr. Ulsh at OCAS that the
4 Ruttenber file information is on the O: drive
5 and that they have provided details on the
6 screening and analysis that OCAS did for the
7 claimants for whom the Ruttenber study
8 assigned neutron dose prior to '67.

9 So, I think at this point, I'll
10 ask Jeff Kotsch of DOL to give any remarks he
11 can relative to the Ruttenber information.

12 MR. KOTSCH: Okay. Good morning.
13 This is Jeff Kotsch. This will be very
14 brief.

15 DOL has completed a preliminary
16 review of both the NIOSH report and the
17 Ruttenber database and are discussing what
18 additional steps to take, if any, with NIOSH
19 based on results of that review. Hopefully,
20 we'll have some determination prior to the
21 October Board meeting.

22 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. So,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 basically simply reporting that you hope to
2 have something specific by the time we meet
3 face- to-face.

4 Let me ask the Chair of the Rocky
5 Flats Work Group, Mark Griffon. Mark, do you
6 have any additional comments or questions at
7 this time, or any of the Board members --
8 well, let me let Mark first ask and then open
9 it up here.

10 MEMBER GRIFFON: This is Mark
11 Griffon. I guess there's nowhere to question
12 there. It seems like any question I would ask
13 of Jeff may be premature since they say
14 they're still finishing their analysis.

15 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right.

16 MEMBER GRIFFON: So, but we really
17 do look forward to that, because we would like
18 to know if that's going to change your all's
19 approach in defining the cohort. So I guess I
20 have no questions to ask, really.

21 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Other Board
22 members, any questions or comments?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: I gather there
3 are none.

4 Jeff, thank you for that report,
5 brief though it was.

6 MR. KOTSCH: More later, then.

7 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Thank
8 you.

9 Then let's move on to the next
10 item. And this item, it's called the
11 Coordination of OCAS and SC&A Board Data
12 Captures. This item has arisen as a result of
13 some questions asked by Board Member Brad
14 Clawson, and I'll let Brad sort of detail the
15 concerns. But let me, as a preliminary thing,
16 indicate that Brad had indicated to Ted Katz
17 and to me that the data captured by OCAS,
18 which is available to the Board on the O:
19 drive, is very difficult to identify in terms
20 of document identities, that in many cases you
21 can only determine what the documents are by
22 actually opening them. So you can't simply

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 apparently scan the list of documents as they
2 appear on the O: drive files and determine
3 what documents are really there. There's some
4 additional concerns about the ability to
5 coordinate our document searches, since DOE
6 apparently doesn't keep a log, as it were, of
7 what documents have been retrieved by OCAS,
8 and OCAS simply refers one to the O: drive.

9 In any event, Brad, if you would
10 take a few minutes and outline the concern and
11 the sort of problems you've faced. And here,
12 we're talking about documents particularly
13 that have been involved in the classified
14 materials.

15 MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, yes, it's
16 kind of two-fold of what I said. When NIOSH
17 implemented Proc-10, you know, it served very
18 good up front. But where I'm seeing a kind of
19 lack is there's an inconsistency of how things
20 are portrayed to us, I guess. What I'm kind
21 of seeing, the on-site coordination still is
22 inconsistent in access to NIOSH-collected

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 documents. And when I say this, I'm not
2 giving this a blanket statement, because what
3 I have seen is, from some sites the
4 information that is portrayed back to us is
5 very clear of what they've captured, where
6 it's at in the O: drive, and so forth like
7 that. And I think it comes back a lot to the
8 point of contact and so forth.

9 But what I'm kind of looking for
10 is then, when we get into the classified
11 sites, it's even harder to determine what has
12 been captured, you know, where it's at, how it
13 is and so forth. You know, when I've raised
14 questions of, well now, where have we got this
15 document or so forth, they just say the O:
16 drive. And to go through the O: drive, you've
17 got to go through about every file to be able
18 to find out about it.

19 So what I'm trying to get to is a
20 consistency that SC&A or the Board goes onto
21 one of these sites and we know what has been
22 captured. It was my understanding in some of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the phone calls that we had had and also in
2 Albuquerque -- because I questioned Larry
3 about this -- this means that the
4 documentation that you guys have retrieved,
5 the data retrieval plan, that you will let
6 SC&A and the Board know what has been
7 captured. And the comment was yes, this is so
8 that we will not be duplicating -- having DOE
9 have to duplicate a lot of this information
10 and so forth. It was a reduction of that.
11 And I'm not seeing that yet.

12 Now as I said earlier, some of the
13 sites are doing very good on it. But several
14 of them, we don't know what has been captured.

15 I'll just give an example, one of them that I
16 just came from, Savannah River, we don't know
17 what has been captured or not. There's no
18 kind of a record of what has already been
19 taken or anything else like that. And kind of
20 what I'd like to be able to see is that -- in
21 our procedure, when we went into our 10 and 11
22 or 11 and 12, we laid out that SC&A, and I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 might say here too, is SC&A does it. We've
2 got a few areas that we can improve on, too,
3 of letting NIOSH know what we have collected
4 and so forth, because I still see
5 communications back and forth from some of the
6 NIOSH POCs, or site people, of what has SC&A
7 reviewed and where is it at and so forth.

8 This Proc-10 has improved, but I'd
9 like to be able to see the communication
10 improved of what has actually been recovered
11 from these sites and how is it put on the O:
12 drive. Because the O: drive, still it's very
13 vast, but also how it's put into the
14 documentation. Sometimes it may say bioassay,
15 but it's got a lot of other stuff with it, or
16 searching back and forth. And I was just
17 wondering if there's some way that we can
18 communicate this a little bit better, because
19 I thought when we started into these
20 procedures that it was to save copying and so
21 forth like that, or duplication.

22 And one of the areas that I really

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 see as a concern to me personally is,
2 especially with classified sites, I know that
3 we can't have a data retrieval list or
4 whatever else like that because these things
5 are classified. But there should be something
6 left with the site that lets us know what
7 documents have already been retrieved. And as
8 I'm seeing so forth, there isn't anything like
9 that and I'm just wondering if there's somehow
10 that we can improve a little bit on this data
11 capture.

12 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: And, thank you,
13 Brad, for that, as kind of introductory
14 remarks to it, and this may not be an issue we
15 can solve today, but maybe we could get some
16 comments first of all from NIOSH. I don't
17 know if that would be LaVon or perhaps LaVon
18 can start.

19 And then also from SC&A, and I
20 don't know if Kathy might want to comment,
21 Kathy Robertson- DeMers or Joe Fitzgerald.

22 And then also I think Isaf from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the DOE group is on the phone. And this may
2 be not something, Isaf, that you were aware we
3 were discussing, but you might have some
4 comments as well.

5 So could I ask each of those or
6 someone from those groups to comment, NIOSH,
7 SC&A and DOE?

8 MR. RUTHERFORD: Dr. Ziemer, this
9 is LaVon Rutherford. I'll start. Jim may
10 want to add something; I'm not sure.

11 But I totally agree with you,
12 Brad. You know, this is something that we
13 have talked about doing and something that we
14 committed to doing, was trying to make sure we
15 weren't duplicating efforts. And I believe
16 that information is prepared, for the most
17 part, from ORAU when we do the data captures.

18 Now, there may be documents and things that
19 are on the O: drive that have been on the O:
20 drive for some time that haven't been broke
21 down and -- you know, into the separate files
22 that they should be -- but I think for the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 most now they should have a pretty good trail
2 and a pretty good list of the documents when
3 we do capture them so we don't duplicate
4 efforts. So, I'm actually kind of surprised
5 that's not happening, to be honest.

6 MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, LaVon, and
7 understand I'm not criticizing in any way or
8 anything else. When this Proc-10 and 11 came
9 out, this was so that both sides kind of knew
10 what each other had. When we talked about
11 this in Albuquerque, one of the comments was,
12 was that there was going to be like a
13 data-capture plan when NIOSH or OCAS went into
14 these sites of everything that they had
15 captured, and that was going to be portrayed
16 to the point of contact for the site, you
17 know, the work group chair and SC&A. And I
18 can't say that it's all sites, because it kind
19 of depends on who the point of contact is of
20 how this gets back to us. Because some sites
21 I've seen are very good. But I thought that
22 we were going to kind of have an outline of,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this is everything we've pulled from this
2 site. And so, you know, you can find it on
3 the O: drive here. But some sites, I have not
4 been seeing that.

5 And I'm not trying to put a
6 blanket statement over it, because, LaVon,
7 some of these sites have been very good with
8 it and that's kind of what I was looking for.

9 That's where I see an inconsistency.

10 DR. NETON: Brad, this is Jim
11 Neton. Larry Elliott, unfortunately, can't
12 join us today; I'm sure he'd have maybe some
13 more input on this issue. But it sounds to me
14 like where you're having some issues are where
15 there are data captures are going on in real
16 time. And, you know, it may be. I'm not
17 making excuses for anyone, but it may be that
18 these data sets or these captured documents
19 have not yet been sufficiently digested, you
20 know, internally by OCAS to give them, you
21 know, some sort of a structured format that
22 could be retrievable.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, yes, it's
2 also so that we know, and all I can talk about
3 is the sites that I have been involved in.
4 And I'll bring one of them up, and that is
5 Savannah River.

6 DR. NETON: Savannah River is very
7 active in collecting documents at this point,
8 I'm aware of that.

9 MEMBER CLAWSON: Oh, okay. Well,
10 and now I understand what your point is, but
11 --

12 DR. NETON: I guess let me start
13 back a little bit, you know, in all of the
14 documents that we issue that are official
15 write-ups like the evaluation report or the
16 site profile, we go to great lengths to
17 reference the site research database number so
18 one can actually go right to the database and
19 look up those documents. But those are
20 documents that have been retrieved and
21 assimilated into the system, you know, over
22 some period of time.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The new ones -- and Tim Taulbee I
2 know is the one involved with Savannah River,
3 is going out capturing documents real time.
4 We collect them and then they may be just
5 indexed by some very generic numbers until
6 such time as we can go through them and make
7 some sense of them. So part of that I think
8 is this real-time issue that's maybe driving
9 this. I don't know.

10 MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, and that
11 could be, Jim. All I'm doing is I'm bringing
12 up that I'm seeing an area where we could
13 improve a little bit. But also too, as I saw
14 in our last visit there, we had no idea what
15 actual documents had been retrieved at all.
16 As a matter of fact, we went to the point of
17 asking Savannah River's document control
18 people if they actually had a list of what had
19 already been captured, because we were opening
20 up binders and going through and all of a
21 sudden we'd come across a tab that OCAS had
22 copied part of this or whatever else like

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that. And so kind of where I'm seeing is,
2 it's true when it gets onto the O: drive
3 that's part of an issue, but at the site we
4 don't know what has actually been captured as
5 of yet. And it could be the real time before
6 they process through it and so forth.

7 DR. NETON: I hear you. I
8 understand the issue now. And I can bring
9 that back. And I guess I suggest that maybe
10 you could work a little closer with the POCs
11 in maybe defining what the issues are. But
12 I'll take that from our end to work with the
13 POCs and make sure that we are following what
14 we said we were going to do in Proc-10.

15 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. Because at
16 another site, and this is Pantex, I know that
17 we've requested this information and we
18 haven't received anything, and we've proceeded
19 ahead. And what it's actually doing, I think,
20 sometimes is we're requiring DOE to duplicate
21 a lot of information, or possibly -- but see,
22 we don't know and that's where I'm hoping that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we can get a little bit better communication
2 with one another so that we're not duplicating
3 it, we're not putting an added burden onto DOE
4 or the document retrieval people and so forth
5 like that.

6 But when I speak of this, I'm just
7 speaking from what I have personally seen.
8 Now SC&A may have other things to be able to
9 say, but this is what I've personally seen.
10 And I thought that when we went into these
11 procedures, we were going to try to stop the
12 duplication and so forth. And I know that
13 we've had a great effort for that, but I
14 believe that we can make a few improvements on
15 both sides.

16 MS. ROBERTSON-DeMERS: This is
17 Kathy Robertson-DeMers. I can kind of tell
18 you what's going on from our side and where I
19 haven't been receiving information from NIOSH.

20 Let me define the data as current
21 data captures, meaning data captures that are
22 ongoing right now, and then we have data that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is legacy data from previous reviews.

2 For the current data captures, at
3 this point, I develop a data capture plan.
4 And I took the model actually from the ORAU
5 Hanford data capture plan. Hanford is a site
6 where I am receiving the data capture plan, so
7 I know what their plans are as far as visits
8 and what they're going to look at, what
9 keywords they're searching and so on. The
10 only other site I have received these data
11 capture plans from is Lawrence Livermore
12 National Lab. Even if they come after the
13 fact, they are helpful to me in planning my
14 visits.

15 When I go to plan a visit and I'm
16 making my keyword search terms and author
17 search terms, I will actually go to the NIOSH
18 POC and ask him or her if they want to add to
19 that. There's a lot of preliminary
20 interaction between the POC and DOE and myself
21 even before a data capture plan is put
22 together. Before the trip occurs, a data

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 capture plan from what we're doing on-site is
2 sent to Ted and to the NIOSH POC so that NIOSH
3 knows what we're doing. If the time allows, I
4 also give NIOSH the opportunity to review this
5 plan and say, hey, we've already collected
6 that data so I can take it off my list.

7 When I am ready to pull records, I
8 will cross-reference to the O: drive. Now one
9 of the difficulties in the cross-referencing
10 is that the DOE document is not always
11 identical to what name that is given on the O:
12 drive. So there's still some overlap
13 occurring because of the inconsistent naming
14 of documents.

15 With respect to the legacy
16 material, we are actually compiling a list of
17 documentation that we do have in our
18 possession. This is taking a while because
19 there is a lot of it. And this will be
20 provided to NIOSH.

21 With the current data capture
22 effort we are trying to, first of all, ask DOE

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to, if possible, provide a duplicate copy of
2 any imaged documents that they might send. If
3 that doesn't occur, then when I receive it, I
4 will send it on.

5 With hard copies, we are trying to
6 provide hard copy data to one of the ORAU
7 contractors. Actually the last batch that we
8 delivered was for Lawrence Berkeley and Sandia
9 National Lab, Livermore to Art at DMA so that
10 they can do scanning. If the document is
11 small enough, I will do the scanning and
12 forward it to NIOSH. If the documents are
13 very large, then I tend to give them in hard
14 copy to NIOSH.

15 With respect to the current sites
16 that we're working on, NIOSH and ORAU should
17 have the data that we have. Part of this list
18 that we're compiling is obviously the legacy
19 records, and if we have provided the records
20 to NIOSH, there's a note in the database that
21 we have provided it. We have to go through
22 and identify the gaps in what records we have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and what records we've already given NIOSH and
2 provide NIOSH with the difference. So this is
3 not going to be an overnight task.

4 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Thank you,
5 Kathy. Am I correct, then, in concluding that
6 you're having a little less difficulty with
7 this issue than Brad might have encountered?

8 MS. ROBERTSON-DeMERS: I think
9 there are some events going on at a lower
10 level that are occurring.

11 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

12 MS. ROBERTSON-DeMERS: I am not
13 receiving data capture plans for other sites,
14 other than Hanford and Lawrence Livermore
15 National Lab.

16 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. And also
17 the issue of the naming of the files and
18 matching with the DOE names is also presenting
19 some difficulty, as I understand it.

20 MS. ROBERTSON-DeMERS: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Thank
22 you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Let's see, Joe, did you have any
2 additional comments? Joe Fitzgerald?

3 MR. FITZGERALD: Really just an
4 elaboration on Brad's comment on Pantex. I
5 think we've sort of hit a new wrinkle that we
6 haven't hit at some other sites, which is, you
7 know, how to extend the data capture listing
8 for classified documents. And this is
9 something I think we're working with Mark
10 Rolfes and the site to figure out, because,
11 you know, before we make a request of, you
12 know, classified documents, of course we would
13 want to know if they were, you know, retrieved
14 or redacted by NIOSH. So we're trying to
15 cross-reference that. But that's a slightly
16 different issue, but one that we're going to
17 have to resolve so we don't have a site like
18 Pantex going after the same documents for us.

19 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right. Right.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: So that's just a
21 new wrinkle and I think we didn't address that
22 per se in the procedures.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right. Let's
2 see, Isaf, are you on the line?

3 MS. AL-NABULSI: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Did you have any
5 comments from --

6 MS. AL-NABULSI: No.

7 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: I'm sorry. Did
8 you say no?

9 MS. AL-NABULSI: Yes. No. No
10 comment.

11 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: No comments,
12 okay.

13 It appears to me that, at the
14 moment, we probably aren't in a position to
15 take any formal action, but simply we've aired
16 the issue. The parties involved: the Board,
17 NIOSH, OCAS, ORAU, SC&A and DOE, will need to
18 be cognizant of the issue as it's been
19 described and see if we need to formalize
20 anything further, or it's just a matter of
21 being more prudent on working with the points
22 of contact and making an effort to achieve

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 better coordination.

2 Brad, I'm wondering if you had any
3 specific recommendations now, if you would
4 report back to the Board, for example, maybe
5 again in October and then we need to monitor
6 this and at some point, if formal action is
7 needed or some additional changes in
8 procedures are needed, we can formalize that.

9 MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, what I was
10 wanting to do, Paul, was I wanted to bring
11 forth the information that I was seeing and
12 that I saw some weaknesses. And when I say
13 weaknesses, I say weaknesses on both sides
14 that we may be able to improve this data
15 capture and so forth.

16 But one of the points that I
17 wanted to bring forth to NIOSH, and also to
18 OCAS and so forth, was that these data capture
19 plans are important for us in the sense of
20 knowing what has already been captured.

21 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right.

22 MEMBER CLAWSON: And I saw

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 weakness in that. And I know that the Proc-10
2 and 11 were kind of mirror images of one
3 another and so forth like that. But what I
4 was wanting to bring forth to the Board, and
5 also to NIOSH and everyone, is that I saw that
6 there was a weakness there and that we need to
7 see how we could improve these. And all I was
8 doing was just bringing forth the information
9 that I was seeing and just seeing if we could
10 do something to improve a little bit.

11 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right. Well, I
12 think as a first step, the awareness and the
13 concerns expressed having been aired, that has
14 sensitized everyone to the issue. Jim Neton
15 has indicated that NIOSH is in a position here
16 perhaps to look at this further and see what
17 steps might be taken in terms of the
18 coordinating issue. And as I said, Brad, if
19 you would continue to report back to us in
20 terms of whether or not the coordination
21 improves as people become more aware of the
22 issues or whether or not we need to formalize

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 something, that would be good.

2 MEMBER CLAWSON: That would be
3 fine. I just figured on this Board call, this
4 would be a good opportunity to be able to just
5 be able to air this and let also NIOSH, so
6 that they understand that we're seeing this,
7 and, you know, we can maybe follow up with
8 this at the full Board meeting and so forth.

9 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right.

10 MEMBER CLAWSON: And be able to
11 address a few of the things even more.

12 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Very good. Let
13 me also ask if any of the other Board members
14 have either questions or comments relating to
15 this issue.

16 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: This is Phil.
17 I've had some of the same problems that Brad
18 has that, when you're doing a document search,
19 a lot of times it's really difficult to find
20 all the documents they have, because some of
21 them are by number rather than by name. So, I
22 mean, if they can make it a little simpler for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 us when we go on, like, the O: drive or
2 something to collate the documents we want,
3 that would really be a great help.

4 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right. So, part
5 of it's that naming issue, as Kathy indicated
6 earlier, and then it appears to me that good
7 coordination with the points of contact is
8 going to be very, very crucial as well.

9 DR. MAURO: Paul, this is John
10 Mauro.

11 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, John?

12 DR. MAURO: Yes, I'm listening and
13 it sounds like we may have, like, a challenge
14 in terms of -- I'm envisioning going through
15 this baseline process. And let's say NIOSH
16 has downloaded 10,000 documents at a site. I
17 don't know if it's even that large, or 1,000
18 documents.

19 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Whatever.

20 DR. MAURO: Whatever the documents
21 are. And SC&A and everyone is, in good
22 intentions, okay, let's baseline. We'll come

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in and we'll work with the POC at NIOSH.
2 Let's see what you've got. And the reality is
3 for a practical matter, checking what you have
4 is maybe a little naive on my part to think
5 that we can just go in and see what they've
6 got and make sure we don't duplicate. Maybe
7 it can't be done that way; that is, the nature
8 of the way the bibliographic database is
9 compiled, at least initially, and loaded up
10 onto an O: drive or wherever it is located.
11 It's not a very simple matter to see what is
12 there already so that we don't ask for a
13 duplicate. Perhaps the solution is simply
14 when that document is downloaded from DOE
15 there is some notation in the DOE database
16 that, yes, this has already been captured.
17 Maybe that's the only solution, that all we
18 will ever really know is whether or not this
19 particular document that we may try to
20 capture, let's say during our word searches --
21 even if we coordinate our word searches and
22 our data capture searches, in the end, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question is going to be very difficult to
2 determine whether this particular document has
3 in fact already been downloaded, cleared and
4 is now sitting on the O: drive and available
5 for SC&A to review. So it may just be a
6 simple matter that mechanistically this is not
7 easy to do.

8 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Thanks
9 for that comment, John.

10 And those of us on the Board who
11 haven't been involved with this particular
12 process may not have a good feel for it, but
13 it appears to me from the comments I've heard
14 that there are cases where you don't know
15 until you've actually pulled something that
16 the document or a part of the document has
17 already been retrieved by another group.

18 I think what you're suggesting is
19 that there be some way to flag it in advance
20 so you don't even have to, for example,
21 download it or capture it to find out that
22 it's already been looked at.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. MAURO: Yes, that may be just
2 one way to come at the problem, I'm not sure.

3 It sounds like this is probably a classic
4 problem, bibliographic records management,
5 that many, many -- this a challenge to many
6 folks.

7 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

8 DR. MAURO: Maybe this problem has
9 been solved in the past through software.

10 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes. Well, I
11 think those in our group from all of the
12 different agencies that are involved in this
13 process, as we proceed, will have a better
14 idea of what might be done to improve both the
15 coordination and the capture process and avoid
16 redundancy and duplication. So, as we proceed
17 and get feedback on this, then we will be in a
18 better position, if necessary, to formalize
19 something.

20 MEMBER CLAWSON: Paul, this is
21 Brad again.

22 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, Brad.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER CLAWSON: I guess one of
2 the main reasons why I threw this out is
3 because actually the people out in the field
4 that are actually doing this, they may have
5 something in the back of their mind that, you
6 know, this would make this a lot easier for us
7 to communicate what we have. And I guess this
8 is why I wanted to throw this out, is to make
9 sure that all parties, if there are some areas
10 that we may be able to improve and so forth
11 like that, I hope that we'd have the ability
12 to be able to bring that up.

13 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right. Right.

14 MEMBER CLAWSON: That's one of the
15 things. Because the people out in the field
16 are one of the ones that really know what it
17 is. And I would suggest to any of the other
18 Board members, this has been very educational
19 to me. You know, when we ask them for a
20 document, what it actually takes to get some
21 of this documentation. Actually, I've been
22 treated just like any other person. I mean,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they gave me boxes of files to go through and
2 it was very educational to me.

3 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Very
4 good.

5 Any further comments or questions?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Thank you
8 very much.

9 Let's proceed to the next item,
10 which is updates on SEC petitions. And LaVon
11 Rutherford is just going to give us an update,
12 sort of what's planned, particularly for the
13 October Board meeting, what's going to be on
14 the agenda there. I know at our last meeting
15 the status of some of these evaluation reports
16 and so on were not finalized.

17 But, LaVon, are you ready to give
18 us an update for what's coming down the pike
19 here?

20 MR. RUTHERFORD: Sure, Dr. Ziemer.
21 Again this is LaVon Rutherford.

22 It's going to be a pretty busy

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Board meeting. We have plans to present eight
2 evaluation reports at the October Board
3 meeting. Of those eight, six of those are
4 83.13 petitions, which is the standard
5 petition that was submitted by a petitioner.
6 And then two of them will be 83.14s. Of the
7 83.13s we have, Brookhaven National Lab will
8 be presented, United Nuclear, Piqua Organic
9 Moderated Reactor, Electro Met, Bliss &
10 Laughlin and University of Rochester.

11 The United Nuclear; you probably
12 received a hard copy over the weekend.

13 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

14 MR. RUTHERFORD: And you'll
15 receive an electronic version of that. Should
16 be out today. Electro Met and Bliss &
17 Laughlin you should have already received as
18 well. Piqua Organic Moderated Reactor will be
19 to the Board and to the petitioners within the
20 next couple of weeks. Brookhaven National Lab
21 and University of Rochester by the end of the
22 month will be with the Board.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We have two 83.14s we're working
2 on. Hanford and Metals and Controls. Metals
3 and Controls is just finishing DOE review and
4 should be to the Board this week. And then
5 Hanford is in its final stages. And I would
6 expect that report to be to the Board within
7 the next two weeks or so.

8 Also, just some additional
9 information. Recently we did qualify a couple
10 of petitions for Weldon Spring, so that
11 evaluation process will begin, and Hangar 481
12 as well. So, that's pretty much it.

13 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Board
14 members, any questions?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. So a
17 total of eight evaluation reports for our
18 consideration at the October meeting.

19 And at that point, Board members,
20 we will have to make a determination as to
21 which of these we are in a position to act on,
22 or whether we will need additional information

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and review by work groups or with the help of
2 our contractor.

3 So, how far in advance did you say
4 we would get the evaluation reports on these
5 six, particularly?

6 MR. RUTHERFORD: Dr. Ziemer, you
7 have Bliss & Laughlin.

8 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: I have United
9 Nuclear. I think we have Bliss & Laughlin,
10 don't we, already?

11 MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, you do. You
12 should have Electro Met as well, I believe.

13 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay.

14 MR. RUTHERFORD: And then the
15 other three, the Piqua Organic Moderated
16 Reactor should be with you within the next
17 couple weeks.

18 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay.

19 MR. RUTHERFORD: And then the
20 University of Rochester and Brookhaven
21 National Lab by the end of the month.

22 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. So we'll

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have some lead time to review those. Very
2 good.

3 Any questions or comments, Board
4 members?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Updates
7 from work groups and subcommittees. I've
8 asked that we only hear from work groups and
9 subcommittees that have specific actions or
10 items they need to share with us, not simply
11 reports such as the work group has not met, or
12 something like that.

13 Before we go down the list, Ted,
14 if you would remind us which work groups have
15 meetings scheduled between now and our
16 upcoming full Board meeting. I know there are
17 at least four, I believe, scheduled.

18 MR. KATZ: Let me check that, Dr.
19 Ziemer. Let's see, between now and the Board
20 meeting, we have Worker Outreach on September
21 29th. We have Oak Ridge Hospital on October
22 7th. We also have the Procedures Work Group

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on the 6th. Procedures Subcommittee. And
2 again, I have the Procedures Subcommittee
3 showing for the 15th. I'm not sure that
4 that's correct.

5 MEMBER MUNN: The 15th is the
6 correct one.

7 MR. KATZ: Okay. So, I have that.

8 MEMBER MUNN: Right. We replaced
9 --

10 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, we
11 replaced, yes.

12 MR. KATZ: And I think, you know,
13 someone correct me, but I think that's all.

14 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Actually, we
15 have --

16 MR. KATZ: Oh, and then we have
17 also --

18 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: We have the
19 6000/6001 Work Group scheduled for October
20 14th. And I thought we had Mound scheduled as
21 well.

22 MEMBER BEACH: Yes. This is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Josie. We do have a Mound Work Group
2 scheduled for October 13th as well.

3 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: October 13th is
4 Mound. October 14th is TBD-6000/6001.
5 October 15th is Procedures. So those work
6 group meetings are coming up.

7 Now, let's go back and pick up,
8 first of all, subcommittee reports. Do we
9 have anything to report from the Dose
10 Reconstruction Subcommittee, Mark?

11 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, a brief
12 report for the Dose Reconstruction
13 Subcommittee. We just had a meeting last
14 week, I think. It was last week, and we
15 continued our regular work. One thing we did
16 was the --

17 MEMBER MUNN: Mark, this is Wanda.
18 I'm not hearing you because there's some kind
19 of a --

20 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: There's some
21 kind of an echo.

22 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, I was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 getting some kind of an echo, too, so took it
2 off speaker. Is that better?

3 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, that's
4 better. Yes.

5 MEMBER GRIFFON: Okay. Yes, the
6 Board had authorized the Subcommittee to
7 complete the case selection for the twelfth
8 set of cases, if you recall the last Board
9 meeting.

10 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

11 MEMBER GRIFFON: And we did do
12 that. We actually picked 48 cases with the
13 hope that there will be approximately 42, I
14 think is the number that John needed to
15 complete the contract obligation, anyway, for
16 the year. And 48 we selected on the
17 assumption usually this happens that some
18 cases are either in appeal or under PER review
19 or something. We lose a few after this final
20 cut. We did identify those and NIOSH has
21 those and is checking on those right now for
22 availability for SC&A, and SC&A should get

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 those cases in the very near future.

2 The only other update I have is,
3 at the last full Board meeting we had
4 discussed the First 100 Cases Report which we
5 submitted to the Secretary. And I guess we,
6 in our discussions at the full Board, we had
7 asked the subcommittee if the subcommittee
8 could explore the summary findings more and
9 generate some recommendation out of those
10 summary findings. In other words, what kinds
11 of deficiencies are we finding. Also, on the,
12 you know, sort of the more positive side, you
13 know, what has NIOSH done since these findings
14 to improve the process, improve the program?
15 So we started a discussion of that. We're
16 going to internally circulate a draft before
17 the next Subcommittee meeting and we would
18 hope to have that to the full Board, not at
19 the October meeting, but probably at the next
20 full Board meeting for discussion by the full
21 Board.

22 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Well, Mark, this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is Ziemer. I want to ask a question on that.

2 We did submit to the Secretary a report on
3 the first 100 cases.

4 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: So you're
6 talking about an additional sort of summary
7 statement that would summarize or make some
8 conclusions based on that report?

9 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes. I guess the
10 discussion at the Board, if you recall, Paul,
11 was that, you know, this was fine, but we
12 still had some -- you know, what's the bottom
13 line.

14 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right. The
15 bottom line relative to the idea of, what can
16 we say about the scientific validity and so on
17 of the dose reconstruction process.

18 MEMBER GRIFFON: Exactly. So we
19 started to explore that a little more. And
20 Larry was at the meeting and had some good
21 input from NIOSH's perspective on that. And
22 so we have some points that I'm going to take

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 an initial draft at.

2 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Very good.

3 MEMBER GRIFFON: And then bring
4 them back to the Subcommittee and we're
5 working on that.

6 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Very good.

7 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Any questions
9 for Mark, Board members? Comments?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. How about
12 the Procedures Review Subcommittee? Wanda,
13 did you have anything to report?

14 MEMBER MUNN: I don't have
15 anything concrete to report.

16 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay.

17 MEMBER MUNN: We're continuing our
18 actions with respect to the outstanding issues
19 that we have. The one thing that we do have
20 coming up, which all the Board members will be
21 privy to, is our expectation that we will
22 produce a second report to the Secretary with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 regard to the progress that we have made and
2 what our observations are with respect to how
3 the findings and the various procedures should
4 be handled. That is happening behind the
5 scenes and we'll have a draft circulating
6 among the Subcommittee members prior to the
7 next Board meeting. We hope to be able to
8 provide, at least a preliminary draft for
9 Board review prior to that time.

10 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Very good. And
11 I'll just remind the Board that the Procedures
12 Subcommittee did submit a report to the
13 Secretary about one year ago.

14 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: And this was
16 more of a status report on what the Procedures
17 Subcommittee was doing. Because at that point
18 they did not have enough information to reach
19 conclusions on the extent to which the
20 procedures -- what shall I say, procedure
21 support, and properly provide a basis for the
22 scientific validity of dose reconstructions

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and related activities. So, hopefully this
2 second report will be one where more specific
3 conclusions can be reached.

4 MEMBER MUNN: We anticipate more
5 concrete information in this one.

6 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right.

7 MEMBER MUNN: Not a great deal of
8 it, but better specifics on numerical data.
9 We've also had quite an issue with the
10 change-over, the improvement of the electronic
11 systems and the change from one mode of
12 operation to another. And so it made it
13 difficult for those of us who operate with
14 this particular database all the time.

15 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right.

16 MEMBER MUNN: That seems to be
17 pretty well smoothed out now.

18 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. We also
19 have the new, I guess I'll just call it the
20 new subcommittee, which is Mike Gibson's. Are
21 we officially in subcommittee status, Mike, on
22 your worker outreach group?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: Paul, just to remind
2 you, it is not a subcommittee yet.

3 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: That's right.
4 We're still in process working on --

5 MR. KATZ: Well, we're not even in
6 the process of turning it into a subcommittee
7 at this point, because really it hasn't gone
8 through --

9 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: That's right.
10 We had finished the charge. I think we agreed
11 we would operate for while as a work group
12 until we --

13 MR. KATZ: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right. So let's
15 move on. Any work groups that have items that
16 they need to report? Speak up if you're a
17 work group chair and want me to report an
18 anything.

19 MEMBER ROESSLER: Paul, this is
20 Gen.

21 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Gen
22 Roessler.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER ROESSLER: We have made
2 progress with the Linde Work Group, and I'd
3 like to make a brief report.

4 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

5 MEMBER ROESSLER: We held the
6 first meeting of our reestablished work group
7 last week on September 2nd. Our
8 responsibility now is to review the SEC
9 petition and things associated with it.

10 This petition, just to remind
11 everyone, covers the Linde residual period,
12 which is January 1st, 1954 through July 31st,
13 2008.

14 At our meeting last week we were
15 fortunate to have [identifying information
16 redacted], the petitioner's representative,
17 present at our meeting, and I think that was
18 very productive.

19 We also had a very productive
20 meeting. We have three action items for OCAS
21 NIOSH to complete. They are associated with
22 handling bounding on radon exposures at Linde,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some inhalation exposures of uranium, radium
2 and thorium. And the third item is giving
3 more attention to exposures during the
4 renovation period.

5 They expect that they'll have this
6 completed so that the work group can meet
7 again. We're trying to set up a meeting time
8 for sometime in hopefully early November or
9 sometime in November. So that's where we are
10 on that.

11 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Thank
12 you.

13 Other work groups?

14 MEMBER PRESLEY: Hey, Paul, this
15 is Bob Presley from NTS.

16 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, Bob? Okay.

17 MEMBER PRESLEY: We got in some
18 new data about a month ago. OCAS is going
19 through it, and we expect a very good report
20 at our next face-to-face meeting in October.

21 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. So you'll
22 be reporting on that in October?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER PRESLEY: Hopefully.

2 Hopefully.

3 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Thank

4 you.

5 Others?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: I will take it
8 by the silence that none of the other work
9 groups have specific items to report today.

10 Okay. Then we'll move on to the
11 next item on the agenda, which is Board work
12 group transcript review policy. And I might
13 edit that agenda item a little bit and call it
14 Board subcommittee and work group transcript
15 review policy. And you may recall at the last
16 meeting we talked briefly about a procedure
17 for reviewing the technical content and
18 quality of transcripts.

19 Sometimes transcripts, although
20 they pretty accurately reflect what is said,
21 sometimes the transcriber understands
22 particularly technical terms to be different

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 words than are actually spoken, and sometimes
2 there are simply edits that are needed in
3 terms of perhaps symbols of elements or
4 whatever it may be. So in addition to the
5 Privacy Act review that has been done by NIOSH
6 and CDC, we have seen a need for review of the
7 technical content of the transcripts prior to
8 posting them on the site as well, on the
9 website.

10 As far as the full Board
11 transcripts are concerned, I have been doing
12 those reviews and then recommending
13 corrections as needed and then certifying
14 those as being approved for putting on the
15 website.

16 I think we need something similar
17 for the subcommittee and work group
18 transcripts, a review process to make sure
19 that the information technically is correct or
20 if there are other edits needed. What I'm
21 suggesting is that we formalize the process,
22 if the Board is in agreement, and actually I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 think we can formalize it just so there's
2 concurrence for both the full Board
3 transcripts as well as the subcommittee and
4 work group transcripts.

5 And here is what I'm proposing,
6 and I'll ask someone then make a motion.

7 MR. KATZ: Paul?

8 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes?

9 MR. KATZ: Can I give a little bit
10 more information for you?

11 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Oh, yes. Yes,
12 please do, Ted.

13 MR. KATZ: A couple things that
14 might affect your proposed motion.

15 But one, the subcommittees are
16 treated as the full Board transcripts are
17 already. So, for example, Mark Griffon
18 reviews the Dose Reconstruction transcripts,
19 and Wanda receives the Procedures
20 Subcommittee. So that's already actually
21 handled the same way as the Board is, and it
22 has to be by law. The work group is a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 different situation. Those transcripts aren't
2 even required by law to exist whatsoever. So
3 there's no requirement in terms of their
4 review by the chair.

5 But the one other thing I would
6 just note for your consideration is my concern
7 about work group transcripts, about putting
8 them through a review process, technical
9 review process before they're posted for the
10 work groups, is the work groups, you know,
11 meet more often in general than the full Board
12 and so on, and there's a timeliness issue.
13 The work group members can get a draft
14 transcript prior, but for the public,
15 particularly those members of the public that
16 are involved with a specific work group,
17 there's a timeliness issue. And I would say
18 that there is the technical matters to review
19 about, you know, correct spelling and
20 technical terms, but there's also other sort
21 of types of errors that are sort of
22 challenging to review, too, including sort of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 correct attribution of statements to
2 individuals and so on. But it's quite a bit
3 of work to review these.

4 And I guess my pitch would be, I
5 like very much the idea of the work groups
6 taking a role in ensuring the quality of the
7 content of these transcripts, but I'm a bit
8 concerned about them doing that in advance of
9 posting these. I guess I would argue for
10 posting these and then posting, you know, a
11 final version after they've been through such
12 a review.

13 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Well, thank you,
14 Ted, for that comment because we can certainly
15 have a policy that allows early posting of the
16 transcript. I think it still has to go
17 through Privacy Act review before going on the
18 website. That would be required by law in any
19 event, right?

20 MR. KATZ: That's correct.

21 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: But what you're
22 suggesting, and I think this can certainly be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 part of the policy, would be to allow posting
2 of the unedited version on the website, and I
3 would suggest if that were done, that it be so
4 indicated that it has not been reviewed for
5 technical accuracy at that point. And then
6 once the chair has been able to review for
7 technical accuracy, then the appropriate
8 changes can be made and a final version could
9 be posted.

10 On technical accuracy, for
11 example, I know there has been recent Board
12 meeting minutes that talked about radon-226
13 decaying. And clearly whoever the speaker
14 was, was saying radium-226, but the
15 transcriber heard it as radon-226. They sound
16 similar. But, you know, there is no
17 radon-226. So that kind of technical
18 correction has to be made sometimes in the
19 transcript so that what would appear as an
20 unedited version might have those kind of
21 technical errors and that would have to be
22 understood by whoever is reading them from the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 website that those kind of errors have not
2 been addressed.

3 In any event, with that in mind,
4 and the gist of it would be that we would
5 agree that for work group transcripts,
6 following the PA review by NIOSH OCAS, or
7 NIOSH CDC I guess we would say, that the chair
8 of the work group would be responsible for
9 reviewing the transcript for technical
10 accuracy and would make editorial corrections
11 as appropriate. That would be the policy that
12 I would recommend. And we might add to that
13 that, until such corrections are made, the
14 unedited transcript may be posted on the
15 website and identified as not being reviewed
16 for technical accuracy.

17 But let me suggest that if the
18 Board is willing to do that by phone, that we
19 have a motion to that effect and then we can
20 discuss it. This would be for work group
21 transcripts.

22 MEMBER CLAWSON: Paul, this is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Brad. I kind of liked the first one when you
2 said it was just the chair. I thought you
3 were going to take it all over. But I think
4 this would be a very good --

5 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: No, no. I don't
6 think I want to review transcripts for
7 meetings that I didn't attend.

8 MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, I
9 understand that.

10 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

11 MEMBER CLAWSON: I guess as a work
12 group chair for one of them, I understand why
13 we need to do this, and I'm in full agreement
14 with it. But I'm wondering if also along with
15 this, because just as what you said, the
16 radium and radon, I'm sorry, but I probably
17 would not pick that up.

18 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Well, I think
19 the chair always has the option of checking
20 with others for technical accuracy on
21 particular things. For example, on one of the
22 recent Board meetings, I think it might have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 even been the Blockson discussion on the radon
2 model, we asked Mark and Jim Neton to review
3 that discussion that they had to make sure
4 that it had been captured correctly.

5 MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, and I guess
6 this is the only thing that I'd be saying is,
7 you know, I'd like to be able to have the
8 ability to be able to call, you know, like
9 LaVon or somebody like that, because some of
10 these questions would be above my head.

11 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Well, and that's
12 fine. And the other part of it is that, as
13 Ted mentioned, when I say technical accuracy,
14 part of that also is attribution; who really
15 said that? I've seen some where it's clear
16 that the attribution was to the wrong person,
17 somehow in the flow of the conversation either
18 the wrong person was identified, because the
19 transcribers sometimes have to recognize
20 voices and that doesn't always occur.

21 MEMBER BEACH: Paul, this is
22 Josie. I'd like to go ahead and make that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 motion.

2 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. The
3 motion is, approve a policy that gives the
4 work group chair the responsibility for
5 reviewing the transcript for technical
6 accuracy and making appropriate editorial
7 changes. And I think with the understanding
8 that the unedited version may go on the
9 website as soon as available after PA
10 clearance with an appropriate notation that it
11 has not been reviewed for technical accuracy.

12 MEMBER CLAWSON: I'd second that,
13 Paul. This is Brad.

14 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay.
15 Discussion on that?

16 As a practical matter, and maybe,
17 Ted, you can help us out there, for example,
18 currently if I have a list of corrections to
19 make, I typically transmit them to Nancy
20 Adams, who's serving as kind of a coordinator
21 for the Board transcripts.

22 But, Nancy, are you handling the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 work group transcripts as well?

2 MR. KATZ: Paul, this is Ted.
3 Yes, I mean, Nancy is helping me out with sort
4 of spot- checking a number of work groups, but
5 not all, not comprehensively for work group
6 transcripts, as well as the Board and
7 subcommittees. But really, she's taking on a
8 handful to help me with this quality assurance
9 effort.

10 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Well, all I'm
11 asking is who does the person communicate
12 with? With you, Ted?

13 MR. KATZ: Anyway, I would be the
14 one to receive --

15 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay.

16 MR. KATZ: I would like to receive
17 them from the work group chairs. I would be
18 the one who would send them the transcript at
19 the point it's ready to be sent to them, and
20 then I would receive their changes.

21 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. So as
22 part of the motion, as a friendly amendment,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we could indicate that the recommended changes
2 should be transmitted by the chairs to the
3 designated federal official who will assure
4 that the corrections are made or otherwise
5 resolved. Sometimes what I think should be
6 correct is actually incorrect, and sometimes
7 it's a matter of resolving either what was
8 said or what transpired, who really said what.

9 MEMBER CLAWSON: Hey, Paul, this
10 is Brad. I was just wondering, will these
11 transcripts come to us in a paper form or
12 electronically?

13 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: I've always
14 gotten them electronically.

15 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. I was just
16 wondering so that we could be able to put in
17 little comments and so forth like that and
18 then send them back to Ted.

19 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, I think
20 they're available both in PDF, where you can't
21 make a correction, and Word files. Is that
22 correct, Ted?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: That's correct. But I
2 would be sending them to you as Word files.

3 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: So you could
4 insert.

5 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. I just
6 wanted to make sure how we could make that
7 more clear for Ted and so forth.

8 MEMBER PRESLEY: This is Bob
9 Presley.

10 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, Bob?

11 MEMBER PRESLEY: Are these things
12 going to be checked for classification before
13 we release them, or --

14 MR. KATZ: Bob, this is Ted again.
15 The transcripts don't include classified
16 information because it's only discussions that
17 we've had publicly already.

18 MEMBER PRESLEY: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Currently our
20 transcripts don't go to DOE, do they?

21 MR. KATZ: No, they do not.

22 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Any of them.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Because they've all been at public meetings.

2 MR. KATZ: Right, and a lot of
3 care is taken to be certain that there's no
4 discussion in public of matters that are
5 sensitive.

6 MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. It's
7 easy to see the wisdom in the suggestion. My
8 concern from the outset has been that, unlike
9 so many popular television characters, my
10 memory function is not always as sharp as I
11 would like it to be. Trying to recall some of
12 the exactness creates a problem for an
13 individual who does not, for example, have the
14 tape itself to listen to.

15 I can understand how, especially
16 when in work groups we sometimes have a
17 tendency to talk over each other, and the
18 transcriber would have such a hard time trying
19 to sort out the voices and what's being said.

20 I'm always surprised that it comes out as
21 well as it does, actually. But there are
22 times clearly when even people who were there

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 cannot be absolutely certain exactly what was
2 being said at a precise time.

3 I guess it would be a comfort
4 factor for me; I don't know about other work
5 group chairs, but if we have the kind of
6 disclaimer which makes it clear that we --
7 certainly prior to the time the chair looks at
8 it, it would be very helpful for that release
9 on the web to carry a fairly strong disclaimer
10 that it has not been yet -- what is the
11 appropriate word: certified, authorized,
12 reviewed by the chair?

13 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Oh, yes. Yes,
14 that would be part of it.

15 As we are proceeding here, I'm
16 thinking that we might be better served, since
17 this is sounding a little more complex, to
18 actually defer the action on this, which won't
19 cause us a problem, until our face-to-face
20 when you can have in writing exactly what the
21 motion is. And you may have some further time
22 to think about the details. I would point

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 out, because I've reviewed a lot of
2 transcripts, and the reporters do a remarkable
3 job when there's multiple people talking of
4 putting that all together. And in fact, the
5 transcript sometimes reflects the kind of
6 confusion that occurs when multiple people
7 talk because you have all these partial
8 comments and sentences sort of superimposed on
9 each other.

10 Also, on a transcript, I'd never
11 try to edit it for grammatical correctness.
12 We don't always talk in full sentences and
13 with proper grammar. So that's not the kind
14 of editorial, I -- you know, it's okay if
15 there's a dangling participle because that's
16 what was there.

17 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, and as a
18 matter of fact --

19 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: So I'm not
20 talking about putting the transcripts in a
21 form that are proper grammar and that sort of
22 thing. We're only talking about things like

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 correct attribution. You know, if it says
2 Wanda said this and it's very clear that it
3 was Jim Melius, we need to correct that. If
4 there's something in the technical content; I
5 mentioned the radon-226 when it should have
6 been radium, those are fine. And I would not
7 claim as the reader that I have caught
8 everything, but at least I have gone through
9 it, and if I have a particular question, I can
10 call somebody and say, was that you that said
11 this. I thought it was so-and-so. Or, as
12 Brad has suggested, if there's some fairly
13 complex thing and you have some reason to
14 think that it wasn't captured correctly -- and
15 I think unless you have reason to think
16 there's something wrong with it, you would
17 accept it, Brad, you know, even though it's --
18 because all of us have --

19 MEMBER CLAWSON: I was just making
20 the comment that, you know, I would not have
21 caught something like that because it's not
22 something that I deal with or anything else

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 like that.

2 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: No, but for
3 example you know in the discussion of the
4 classified stuff, I had this question. I was
5 looking at the transcripts and it said Brad
6 was talking about sigma something and I said
7 that doesn't make any sense to me and I raised
8 it. I think you must have been talking about
9 something else. That's the wrong term. And
10 they checked with you, right? Do you remember
11 that?

12 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes, they did.

13 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: And see, and
14 there was a term I wasn't familiar with and we
15 got it. And it was sigma, something used in
16 --

17 MEMBER CLAWSON: So is Wanda
18 wanting to have an old-age disclaimer on this?

19 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: No, no. I think
21 you're okay, Wanda. In fact, the transcripts
22 will remind you of what did happen.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER CLAWSON: Because I was
2 going to say I need that, too.

3 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

4 MEMBER CLAWSON: You know, I think
5 in the review of this -- this is Brad again, I
6 think the basis of what -- the gist that
7 you're wanting to do is, to the best of our
8 ability and knowledge that these things are
9 correct.

10 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Right. Right.

11 MEMBER CLAWSON: We're not going
12 to catch everything.

13 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: You can't
14 guarantee that every minor thing in there is
15 absolutely right, but at least you've looked
16 at it. And if there's something that's
17 glaringly incorrect, you've at least reviewed
18 it. And we have had occasions where outside
19 members of the public have seen things in the
20 transcripts and they've said, what's this. It
21 doesn't make sense. And we found that the
22 transcript actually was in error. So we do

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 need to have sort of this quality control
2 process.

3 But let me ask Board members,
4 shall we go ahead and defer this to the
5 October meeting and have some formal words
6 before you for action?

7 MEMBER PRESLEY: This is Bob
8 Presley. I think we ought to.

9 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Then let me just
10 ask for a motion to defer to the October
11 meeting.

12 MEMBER PRESLEY: I'll make the
13 motion.

14 MEMBER CLAWSON: I second it.
15 This is Brad.

16 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. And
17 basically, this is equivalent to a motion to
18 table. Are there any Board members opposed?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Any abstaining?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Then I'm going

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to take it that all those remainders are ayes
2 and the motion to defer carries. Okay?

3 MR. KATZ: Very good. Dr. Ziemer?

4 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

5 MR. KATZ: This is Ted. I just
6 want myself to be clear on this. So since
7 this motion is deferred until October, no
8 action needs to be taken in terms of sending
9 these transcripts to work group chairs prior
10 to that. But I would offer up that if we've
11 had some work group meetings and will have
12 some more, if there's a general feeling that
13 people would like to sort of start getting a
14 handle on this, of course we can do this
15 without an official motion.

16 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Oh, yes. I just
17 want to formalize the policy, but I think,
18 work group chairs, you certainly want the
19 transcripts of your work group to be correct
20 in that regard. And you may want to go back
21 and if you want to review older ones, I think
22 that would be good. We don't necessarily need

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to go all the way back to the day one on all
2 previous transcripts.

3 MR. KATZ: Well, Dr. Ziemer, and I
4 was really just suggesting that they would
5 send the current ones for the recent meetings
6 to those chairs.

7 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: I think it would
8 be useful to do this, if nobody objects.

9 MS. ADAMS: Dr. Ziemer, this is
10 Nancy Adams. The other issue is if somebody
11 finds something in the transcript in that
12 they're really having trouble with, we can go
13 back to the transcriber and have them
14 re-listen to that part of the transcript to
15 clarify any questions that they may have as
16 well.

17 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes. Yes. And
18 we've done that certainly on occasion already,
19 too, and can do that on any of these work
20 group meetings. Yes, thank you, Nancy. Good
21 point.

22 Okay. Ted, put this on the agenda

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for the October meeting and formalize the
2 policy at that point.

3 MR. KATZ: I'll do so. And I'll
4 also be then sending the transcripts for
5 everything that we received since, you know,
6 maybe a month ago to the work group chairs.

7 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Thank you.

8 Now let me ask if Dr. Melius, by
9 chance, is on the line yet.

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay.
12 Apparently not, but I think we're ready to
13 deal with the Blockson Chemical Radon Model
14 Validation issue.

15 Board members, you may recall that
16 there were questions raised I think primarily
17 by Mark Griffon on stratification of radon;
18 that is, the possibility that radon levels in
19 different parts of the facility might have
20 varied more than the model would predict. And
21 so we were talking about how one would go
22 about validating the model. We asked SC&A to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 give some thought as well to how one might
2 approach validation, not a task to do
3 validation, but to give us some ideas of how
4 one might go about that. And I think Mark has
5 had a chance to think about this further, too.

6 So, Mark, let's start with you on
7 the Blockson Radon Model Validation. Do you
8 have some initial comments? And then I think
9 I will ask John Mauro also to report for SC&A
10 on some ideas that they have had.

11 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, this is Mark
12 Griffon. And I was actually this morning just
13 going over some of John's recommendations, so
14 it would be good to hear from John as well.

15 I mean, at this point I was
16 thinking of looking at a couple thing from our
17 last Board meeting to now. One was, you know,
18 possibilities for validation.

19 And one notion I was thinking of
20 was the other phosphate facilities during this
21 time period. And, you know, the thing I
22 haven't evaluated is the efficacy of a lot of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these options, but I'm just throwing some of
2 these out here as possibilities, other
3 phosphate facilities that would in fact have
4 radon measurement data so that you could test
5 the model sort of. And that's the sticking
6 point, I think, is that if they existed, NIOSH
7 likely would have already brought those
8 forward. So I don't know that those
9 facilities exist that would allow us that.

10 The other possibility is along
11 those lines, and this may be a little more of
12 a stretch, and I think that to some extent
13 NIOSH has used this in their arguments for
14 sort of an upper bound, was whether they could
15 use the Mallinckrodt facility in any way -- in
16 two regards. One is to look at the
17 measurement data, but also the secondary would
18 be, okay, let's use a similar approach that we
19 did for this model being proposed for
20 Blockson. Let's use this model and test it at
21 the Blockson facility.

22 Now there's obviously a lot of,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you know, potential heartache there. Because,
2 you know, I'm not sure that the data needed to
3 model that from source term up exists. I know
4 they have a fair amount of radon measurement
5 data, but I'm not sure on the other end that
6 it would be something that could be achieved,
7 or whether it would, you know, entail such
8 uncertainty that, you know, it would really be
9 a good tool to validate. For example, one
10 thing I'm concerned about there is, you know,
11 I know that over the years Mallinckrodt had
12 several different sources of uranium coming
13 into the plant and so then obviously you have
14 a different source term changing over time.
15 And I'm not sure all that is cleanly defined.

16 But it was during the same time
17 period, so I guess you could argue that
18 similar work practices, similar sorts of
19 ventilation may have existed. And that would
20 be really the usefulness of that site, maybe
21 that they have real measurement data to
22 compare against the model, whereas we don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have that at most of these other sites we're
2 talking about. So that's one thing that I was
3 kicking around.

4 The other items that I have, and
5 these aren't necessarily, what was the title
6 of this session, you know, suggestions for
7 ways to validate, but rather just the ongoing
8 concerns, I guess.

9 The second item I had was concerns
10 about the source term definition for Blockson.

11 And I went back to the site profile and
12 looked up some of this. In the last Board
13 meeting I mentioned the fact that I thought
14 some of the original numbers such as the 6,000
15 tons per week had come from one memo, an AEC
16 memo, or a Blockson to AEC maybe, I forget.
17 And it actually is confirmed that this was a
18 memo that was written and it was a
19 pre-operational memo also which notes the
20 6,000 tons of phosphate rock per week. And
21 then I think it says out of that they would
22 expect or anticipate about 50,000 pounds. I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 forgetting. Anyway, they were projecting some
2 output or amount of product from that amount
3 of phosphate rock coming into the plant, and
4 that number was noted. So they had some sort
5 of uranium recovery efficiency established.
6 And in the site profile, they also have
7 several reports indicating in later years
8 where they actually have production numbers
9 for the uranium, for the output or the
10 product. But nowhere do they mention the
11 input. So you're left to assume that this
12 efficiency was achieved, the original
13 projected efficiency or recovery rate was
14 achieved. And, you know, there's some numbers
15 that sort of lead you to believe that was the
16 case, but there are some gaps. They also note
17 that from, I think it was from 1955 through
18 '62, they don't have any uranium production
19 numbers. So that's one part of my concern
20 about the source term.

21 The other part, I guess, would be
22 these all look like uranium product numbers

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for the AEC, these AEC reports. It's not
2 clear to me. I thought that during this time
3 period they were also doing commercial work.
4 And if both were going on at the same time
5 during the covered period, I believe we have
6 to account for that exposure. And that would
7 potentially be, you know, more throughput
8 coming into the system. And that was not very
9 clear to me reading the site profile. Maybe
10 I'm missing something, or maybe it's not in
11 there, but someone knows the answer to that,
12 as to whether there was other production going
13 on there within the building that would have
14 added to the amount processed per week, or per
15 year, or whatever.

16 MEMBER MUNN: Excuse me, Mark, I
17 don't mean to interrupt you. This is Wanda.
18 I just wanted to be very clear what you mean
19 when you say "production." We know of course
20 that Blockson was fully engaged in its
21 commercial activities to produce a product
22 that was not uranium. When you say

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 "production figures," are you inferring that
2 Blockson was also involved in producing
3 uranium for the commercial market? Is that
4 your inference?

5 MEMBER GRIFFON: Well, I was
6 inferring that any phosphate rock that they're
7 processing you would end up getting residual
8 radon exposures from.

9 MEMBER MUNN: Ah, yes. Okay.

10 MEMBER GRIFFON: So, right.

11 MEMBER MUNN: Okay.

12 MEMBER GRIFFON: So even if it
13 wasn't for the uranium.

14 MEMBER MUNN: Just wanted to
15 verify that.

16 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, yes, yes.
17 All right. And I wasn't clear, you know,
18 again this 6,000 tons per week, I was assuming
19 it was only for the AEC operations and if
20 there was other stuff going on, it would have
21 to be accounted for, I would think.

22 And then the last thing, and this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 maybe perhaps overlaps with John's option 3 in
2 the SC&A paper that John sent out to us. But,
3 you know, I was noting, and I thought I
4 mentioned in the last Board meeting, although
5 I didn't recall finding it in the transcripts,
6 so I must not have mentioned it.

7 But the question of the gradients
8 and, you know, I know at some meeting along
9 the line I've mentioned my concern about the
10 instantaneous mixing, the uniform
11 instantaneous mixing and, you know, I would
12 like to point people back to the original data
13 that we've looked at all the time and one is
14 this Florida study, the FIPR reference. And I
15 think it's useful to notice, you know, if you
16 really believe this was uniform instantaneous
17 mixing, you would expect your results to be
18 the same, or at least very close, you know,
19 wherever you measure within the building.

20 And in fact, that's not the case.
21 You have variations of, I believe, up to a
22 factor of 10 or 20 in measurements throughout

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these different plants, or throughout one
2 plant. And then I was having a little trouble
3 looking at these numbers because I think in
4 some cases they are reporting averages and in
5 some cases it was multiple years, so I wasn't
6 sure if I was comparing, you know,
7 measurements taken on the same day. So that
8 made it a little difficult to make this
9 conclusion, but at least it appears to me
10 that, you know, there's quite a bit of
11 variation from these studies, albeit all these
12 levels, as Jim Neton has pointed out many
13 times, you know, most of these levels are far
14 lower than the proposed model. But I was
15 looking at it from the terms of variation of
16 values.

17 Other interesting things to note
18 in that are that a lot of time the highest
19 levels will appear in the most unlikely
20 places, like the auto repair -- I forget what
21 exactly that area it was called, but, you
22 know, it wasn't at the digester tank or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 something like that. So I guess that that's
2 my last point about the gradients.

3 And then, you know, so I guess the
4 only thing I'd throw out in terms of
5 validation was that first idea, to either
6 similar phosphates plants during the time
7 period, which I don't think exists with
8 measurement data anyway. And then the
9 possibility of Mallinckrodt or other
10 facilities that do have radon measurement data
11 that you could then use as a model and compare
12 measurement data versus model predictions.
13 And I guess I'll leave it there for now.

14 MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda.
15 Before I spoke, Jim, maybe our NIOSH folks are
16 going to address that. I believe we've had
17 quite a discussion about the fact that we
18 don't have any data from other plants that are
19 similar in their type of operation. I thought
20 we had discussed that fairly lengthily, but
21 perhaps I'm incorrect. I'll leave that to Jim
22 and others to address, but I believe we've

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 looked at that. Have we not?

2 DR. NETON: Are you asking me,
3 Wanda? This is Jim.

4 MEMBER MUNN: Yes. Yes, I am
5 asking you.

6 DR. NETON: Yes, we've gone to
7 great lengths to try to find some measurements
8 from the 1950s. And Mark's correct, outside
9 of Mallinckrodt, which was technically not a
10 phosphate production plant, but did some of
11 the processing, we don't have any data. He
12 had provided a number of measurements. The
13 earliest measurements we can find are in the
14 1970s, '80s and we continue to compile
15 measurements at existing facilities where the
16 values are typically a factor of five to an
17 order of magnitude lower than the 95th
18 percentile we're proposing. That's where we
19 are with that.

20 Related to the source term, I
21 think there is some additional data that's not
22 in the site profile we have. Pretty much, at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 least in our opinion, believe the conclusion
2 that the production rate was probably less
3 than 6,000 tons per week based on the uranium
4 production rates. We've got some better data
5 on that that we can provide if necessary.

6 Related to Mark's comment on
7 additional commercial work, I don't think that
8 there was any additional commercial work. In
9 fact, all of the phosphate processing was
10 commercial work. It was merely the uranium
11 that was sort of siphoned off in the other
12 building, building 15, or whatever, as they
13 produced commercial product. So I'm not aware
14 of any additional commercial phosphate that
15 was at the plant that was not covered, that
16 was not used to make uranium.

17 And then the comment on gradients.
18 We've kind of been down that path before. I
19 still, I guess, believe that the main driver
20 outside of the source term -- the main driver
21 in the radon concentrations is the building
22 ventilation rates, of which we have a range of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 values. The lower range of values tends to
2 drive the 95th percentile value, so I would
3 submit that there may be higher concentrations
4 in pockets in that building, but those would
5 be encompassed by the range of ventilation
6 rates that we chose in the model. I guess
7 that's about all I can say right now.

8 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Thanks, Jim.
9 And this is Ziemer again. Let me add one
10 comment.

11 Mark, I don't believe that
12 instantaneous mixing, which a model may
13 assume, implies that there's uniform
14 concentrations throughout a location. You
15 could still have gradients. It's just simply
16 sort of a smoothing process for the model,
17 even if there is a gradient. But that's just
18 a side comment. There are other issues on
19 that smoothing process in terms of people
20 moving around and so on. But I think we need
21 to hear from John Mauro.

22 John, are you prepared to give us

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some comments on the idea of validating the
2 model that we were talking about before, and
3 also stratification?

4 DR. MAURO: Yes, I'd be glad to.
5 At the request of the Board, I did prepare
6 some thoughts, really a think piece dated
7 August 19th. You should have all received a
8 copy of it. It identifies five strategies,
9 strategies 1 through 5, for trying to come at
10 this question of stratification, which I
11 believe it's 1 through 4 strategies, and then
12 strategy No. 5 is model validation, which is
13 really a different subject.

14 I'd like to preface this. It's
15 very easy to lose sight of what we're doing.
16 We're trying to figure out the average annual
17 concentration that people might have
18 experienced inside this building over the
19 course of a year. There's absolutely no doubt
20 from time-to-time and from
21 location-to-location one would expect a
22 considerable variability in the concentration

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of radon in the building in a given location
2 and a given point in time. The question we're
3 trying to ask ourselves is what do we believe
4 to be a claimant-favorable estimate of what
5 the average annual concentration is or was in
6 that building. And of course we both came up
7 with our models and our assumptions.

8 Now, the challenge here was, is it
9 possible that there could have been locations
10 within the building where the average
11 concentration over the course of a year could
12 have been substantially higher than the upper
13 95th percentile average concentration that we
14 calculated for the overall building? Turns
15 out that NIOSH came up with one number, which
16 was about -- for the 95th percentile of that
17 estimate, SC&A earlier came up with its own.
18 Because we used different distributions, it
19 differed by a factor of two.

20 So the question then becomes how
21 do we determine, you know, that stratification
22 could not have resulted in a given location in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the building where the average annual
2 concentration at that location could have been
3 substantially higher than the values that we
4 both independently derived, and ways of coming
5 at the problem. And I'm not going to go into
6 each one of these five areas, but there are
7 ways in which one could sort of create what I
8 would call a weight of evidence. That is, if
9 you were to run down any -- one of them
10 actually is done, mainly. What is the
11 variability of the average annual
12 concentration of radon in residences? And we
13 know that the average annual concentration
14 does vary in a residence by about a factor of
15 two to three, depending on what level in the
16 home you look at. So, for example, in your
17 home, if you take a radon measurement in your
18 basement, over the course of a year you'll get
19 the concentration. If you take it on the
20 first floor or second floor over the course of
21 a year, the concentration will probably be two
22 or three times higher.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 How useful is that information?

2 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Lower on the
3 upper floors.

4 DR. MAURO: On the upper floors.
5 I'm sorry. On the upper floors. And you'll
6 see that you get factors of two or three
7 differences.

8 Now how applicable that is to our
9 situation, one could say, well, in one respect
10 you would expect a lesser degree, because
11 there are floors separating the source of the
12 radon in the basement and then of course then
13 you have the ceiling of the basement and the
14 ceiling of the first floor, et cetera, and
15 you've sort of isolated the source, namely the
16 basement. You know, that's the source of all
17 the radon in homes for all intents and
18 purposes. But anyway, that was one strategy
19 that in effect is done. You know, we know
20 it's about a factor of two or three, that
21 being the difference in the average annual.

22 But the other strategies are one

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 more of exploring other ways of coming at the
2 problem. And the question becomes, you know,
3 let's say NIOSH or the Board would like to run
4 down some of these others, and, you know,
5 where do they come out? We've seen that
6 average annual concentrations, and if you run
7 down each strategy, you know, vary by a factor
8 of two, a factor of three, I don't know the
9 answer to this, but at least, you know, the
10 sense I'm getting is before moving forward a
11 little bit more confidence, you know, on the
12 stratification issue, you know, how big a
13 difference could there be? Could it be
14 substantial? That's stratification. That was
15 strategies 1 through 4. And, you know, you
16 could certainly read them and you could get an
17 idea of how they would work. They're all very
18 different, by the way, in how they would work.

19 And so in that regard they could
20 be useful because if you actually went down
21 each one and they all came up with about the
22 same answer, that is, well, we're seeing, you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 know, average annual variability's within
2 buildings, different parts of buildings that
3 vary by a factor of two, three, four and they
4 all sort of came around to the same place, it
5 creates a weight of evidence. But it's not
6 going to be proof. It's just going to be
7 another source of -- a basis upon which a
8 decision could be made.

9 And finally, we have the subject I
10 call strategy 5, which is called model
11 validation. This is new information that we
12 were able to obtain from one of our associates
13 who's involved in validating these models, not
14 for the purpose of radon, but for the purpose
15 of Homeland Security. That is, you know, can
16 we predict the behavior of some aerosol inside
17 in a structure mainly from a Homeland Security
18 point of view. So there are models. And in
19 the email I sent you'll see two links that you
20 could go to and find out a little bit more
21 about some of the advanced work that's being
22 done I think under the auspices of Homeland

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Security looking into modeling the behavior of
2 aerosols within buildings and, you know, how
3 they come at the problem. So that would be
4 more along the lines of model validation and
5 what other people are doing in the federal
6 government to try to come to grips with
7 understanding how aerosols behave.

8 So all SC&A really did was try our
9 best to come up with some creative strategies
10 for helping to achieve closure to this
11 problem.

12 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Thank
13 you, John, for those comments. I'll ask for
14 feedback here in a moment. I just wanted to
15 point out in your August 19th paper called,
16 "Strategies for Validating the Blockson Radon
17 Model," in the middle of paragraph 2 you say,
18 "In a related matter the Board expressed
19 concern that stratification was not explicitly
20 taken into consideration in the model." I
21 don't believe the Board took any official
22 action on work stratification. It might be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 more correct to say that some members of the
2 Board expressed concern.

3 DR. MAURO: My apologies. You're
4 absolutely right.

5 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: I don't think we
6 have an official position on stratification,
7 just that the concern was expressed. I wanted
8 to make sure that this doesn't say more than
9 actually occurred.

10 DR. MAURO: Yes, I'd be glad to
11 edit this and reissue it, or is this
12 sufficient --

13 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Well, I just
14 wanted to make sure everybody understands
15 that. I think you did not identify this as an
16 official SC&A deliverable. It's just a think
17 piece for us to think about this issue.

18 DR. MAURO: And that's correct,
19 Paul.

20 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Now, let's get
21 other comments or questions from Board
22 members, if any.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GRIFFON: Paul, this is
2 Mark.

3 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, Mark?

4 MEMBER GRIFFON: I had the mute
5 button on when you called for comments.

6 I guess at this point all I would
7 maybe recommend is there any way that we could
8 -- I don't know if NIOSH has looked at SC&A's
9 thoughts, and I'm not sure that the
10 Mallinckrodt is even a good, you know,
11 candidate, but you know, this idea that I
12 brought up today and whether they could
13 consider these, you know, SC&A options 1
14 through 5 is it, John, or whatever?

15 DR. MAURO: That's correct.
16 Strategies 1 through 5.

17 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, strategies 1
18 through 5. And, I mean, I would like to mull
19 those over a little more as well. And I
20 think, you know, I'm not ready to go much
21 farther with the discussion today. But maybe
22 in the October meeting we can --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, I think we
2 agreed we weren't going to take official
3 action on the Blockson matter today. This was
4 simply going to be input that would give us
5 some ideas to think about prior to our
6 face-to-face meeting. So what you have here
7 is some ideas from our contractor as to how we
8 might think about both model validation and
9 stratification. And this gives both Board
10 members and also NIOSH, if they wish, some
11 opportunities to give thought to what has been
12 suggested, as well as your comments, Mark.
13 And then come to the Board meeting in October
14 prepared hopefully to try to bring closure on
15 the radon issue and then in turn to come to
16 closure on the Blockson issue, on the
17 petition.

18 MEMBER GRIFFON: Well, yes. And I
19 was just going to say, you know, I'm not sure
20 whether NIOSH had had an opportunity to
21 consider any of these strategies and whether
22 any of them make sense. I looked at a few and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 had some reservations about a few of them, but
2 some others seem to have more promise. And I
3 don't know if Jim or others at NIOSH have an
4 opinion on that now or whether we can, you
5 know, maybe ask for them to consider that and
6 maybe give us a report, you know, at the
7 October meeting.

8 MEMBER MUNN: Mark, this is Wanda.
9 Could you clarify for us why you feel that
10 Mallinckrodt is a valid surrogate for
11 potential exploration in regard to this radon
12 exposure?

13 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.

14 MEMBER MUNN: It's not clear to me
15 from what you've said why you would feel that
16 that, in my mind, unrelated --

17 MEMBER GRIFFON: No, I know --

18 MEMBER MUNN: -- facility would
19 have any bearing on what transpired at this
20 phosphate plant.

21 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, and that's
22 exactly why I hesitated to even bring it up.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 It is not, and I never used the word
2 "surrogate" --

3 MEMBER MUNN: No, that was my
4 word.

5 MEMBER GRIFFON: -- and shouldn't
6 have. If I implied that, I misspoke.

7 MEMBER MUNN: All I was saying is
8 that this is one example where you have a
9 fairly robust set of monitoring data and
10 potentially -- and this is a big if, you know,
11 you have source term information and you could
12 compare actual measured data with what this
13 model that was created for the Blockson site,
14 you know, you could put in your parameters for
15 Mallinckrodt using the same Monte Carlo
16 modeling approach and see what you got and
17 compare it with the actual results that you
18 have over time. So that was the only
19 usefulness, utility it would have, I guess,
20 not as a surrogate model. And we've heard Jim
21 argue this many times, and I don't disagree
22 with this, the ore used there, you know, had

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 much greater radium content and therefore much
2 higher radon levels. So it would at least
3 say, okay, we took this model and it does
4 work, you know, reasonably well at
5 Mallinckrodt and, you know, therefore we
6 expect it would also work. So the reason was
7 more to test this model rather than to use it
8 as a surrogate.

9 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: One concern,
10 Mark -- this is Ziemer again. One concern I
11 would have about doing that is that unless we
12 agreed in advance that it was sort of a
13 reasonable, and I'll use the word "surrogate"
14 here -- if you found that they did agree, then
15 it seems to me if I was NIOSH, I'd say, well,
16 that sort of bolsters our case. But if you
17 found that they don't agree, the main thing
18 that's going to happen is they're going to
19 point out why it isn't a good surrogate, why
20 the source terms, not in terms of a model, but
21 how it's generated and how it's distributed
22 and so on, why it's not a good surrogate.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GRIFFON: Well, we already
2 know that it's not. I mean, I would argue I
3 know it's not a good surrogate set of data.

4 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

5 MEMBER GRIFFON: But I mean, I can
6 think of several concerns about using this
7 approach. I'm just throwing it out there as a
8 possibility.

9 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, but once
10 you get the answer --

11 MEMBER GRIFFON: But one thing is
12 that if you have, you know, so much
13 uncertainty on your source term and your other
14 parameters that you're entering into this --
15 you know, but the one thing I guess I'd be
16 most concerned about was the source term
17 because arguably we have a fair amount of
18 uncertainty in the Blockson model, you know,
19 the existing model that we're assessing. The
20 one sort of constant or the one, you know,
21 pretty hard piece of data, at least that NIOSH
22 has presented, is the source term information.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Well, would you
2 be interested in the degree of variation of
3 radon levels at particular locations for given
4 source terms? In other words, how it varies
5 in time and space per unit source term or --

6 MEMBER GRIFFON: Well, I guess I
7 would look -- honestly, Paul, I haven't
8 thought this completely through, but I would
9 consider it in terms of, you know, we're
10 saying, or NIOSH is saying, that this current
11 approach, the 95th percentile will bound, you
12 know, all workers for, you know, all these
13 years. And we do see some variation in
14 sampling throughout the plant. We have
15 variation in Mallinckrodt, too, but if this
16 model also -- you know, the one used at
17 Mallinckrodt ends up being a -- you know, the
18 95th ends up bounding all potential workers in
19 that sort of situation, then I would say that
20 it correctly predicts, you know, or is
21 consistent with the measured data, that data
22 that we have.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

2 MEMBER GRIFFON: So that's sort of
3 the utility.

4 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

5 MEMBER GRIFFON: Is it a correct
6 predictor or actual concentrations, actual
7 exposure levels in the plant, not to be a
8 surrogate set of data.

9 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

10 DR. MAURO: This is John Mauro.
11 I'd like to -- if you don't mind, I think the
12 big question is it's not the absolute value.
13 Whether you work with data collected from
14 Florida phosphate buildings, you work with
15 data on radon measurements in any other
16 buildings, including Mallinckrodt, it's not
17 the absolute value that is of great interest
18 here. It is the variability of the average
19 annual value in different locations in the
20 same building. See, in the end the real
21 question is, does radon or any other aerosol
22 behave in a way where the average annual

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 concentration in one location in the building
2 is going to be substantially different than
3 the average annual concentration in another
4 location in that building, especially if the
5 buildings don't have any, you know, partitions
6 that are isolating one part of the building
7 from the other where, you know, the source is
8 isolated from one location.

9 So in my mind the big question is,
10 is the variability in the average annual
11 concentration large or small in a given
12 structure, not the absolute values themselves.

13 And that was really one of the themes that
14 rang true, the strategies we identified, not
15 to try to find an absolute value of what the
16 upper bound or average annual value would be,
17 but more along the lines of how variable is
18 the average annual value within a given
19 building.

20 MEMBER GRIFFON: And, John, along
21 those lines, just to go back to my
22 Mallinckrodt, you know, case here, I mean,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's sort of what I was considering, too,
2 not the absolute values, because I believe
3 that the Mallinckrodt values, you know, it's a
4 much more concentrated or with regard to
5 radium and higher radon levels than we would
6 expect at any of these phosphate facilities.
7 But you have a lot more data. So you can look
8 at that variability a little better. And you
9 can test it because what I've heard anyway is
10 that, you know, yes, there is some
11 variability, there are some gradients in the
12 Blockson plant. You know, we don't doubt
13 that. However, using the 95th on this model
14 would account for that, would cover that. And
15 that's I think what I was thinking when I
16 mentioned this is that that could be tested in
17 the case of Mallinckrodt possibly. I think
18 there's a lot of potential pitfalls with
19 regard to defining the source term, as I said.
20 But, you know, that may be a test case where
21 you have a -- it's one of the few places where
22 we have a lot of measurement data that seemed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to be -- that we could possibly use for
2 validation purposes. That's all I was saying.

3 MEMBER MUNN: Even if one
4 validated the model, however, you still have
5 the issue of stratification that you expressed
6 concern with. It's hard to imagine how a
7 structure like Mallinckrodt could be in any
8 way relative to the kind of structure, and
9 lack of structure in many cases, that existed
10 at the Blockson plant. Would resolving the
11 source term and 95th percentile issue -- in
12 other words, would validating the model in
13 your mind eliminate your stratification
14 concerns? Or are we still talking about two
15 different concerns?

16 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, I don't --
17 no, no, no. You know, the Mallinckrodt
18 facility, I think you're probably right, is
19 not just one open, you know -- in my mind, I
20 don't remember what the Mallinckrodt facility
21 looked like, but I'm guessing that it was not
22 this real big high bay facility such as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Blockson, you know?

2 MEMBER MUNN: It was not much --

3 MEMBER GRIFFON: And it might have
4 been multiple rooms. So, you know, NIOSH may
5 look at this quickly and say, you know what,
6 it's not a good test case and here's the
7 reason. That's all I was saying. But at
8 least consider this or other places where you
9 have a reasonable set of radon data and a
10 reasonable understanding of the source term.
11 I was trying to say, you know, it may --
12 forsake of looking at the model and
13 considering whether it adequately addressed
14 variations or gradients, you know, within real
15 life data, we may be able to look outside the
16 phosphate, you know what I mean? That's all I
17 was saying, that there may be other possible
18 sources of data that can be considered. Not
19 to be surrogate measures, but rather just to
20 test. And if they did find that right set,
21 and maybe Mallinckrodt's not the right set,
22 but then I think that would satisfy my concern

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about the gradients, you know, that we know
2 they exist, but clearly this Monte Carlo
3 approach in this model by using the 95th will
4 bound those. You know, so I would say yes,
5 that would address both concerns.

6 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Further
7 comments or questions?

8 Jim Neton, do you have any
9 comments at this point?

10 DR. NETON: Well, no, I've been
11 listening very attentively to the discussion,
12 and I really don't have any input at this
13 point other than, you know, if I hear
14 something definitive that the Board would like
15 us to do that would help resolve this issue,
16 we'd be happy to consider it.

17 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: I think the only
18 thing we really have before us today are the
19 ideas brought up by SC&A, and we can get some
20 feedback from the Board. I suspect there
21 would be some desire on the Board members'
22 part to at least have NIOSH's sort of reaction

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to those as to whether you feel any of those
2 are worth pursuing, or to the contrary.

3 Board members, any other --

4 MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda again.

5 We have had this information from SC&A, this
6 commentary on validating the model and the
7 stratification issues. We've had it for
8 several weeks now. I haven't heard anyone ask
9 NIOSH specifically whether they've had
10 adequate opportunity to review those and
11 whether they have any comment. I'd like to
12 know if they have already.

13 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Well, number
14 one, I don't think at this point -- it's not
15 an official -- John described it as a thought
16 piece. It's not an official deliverable from
17 SC&A. And I don't believe that NIOSH would
18 automatically respond to that. Would you,
19 Jim?

20 DR. NETON: No, that's correct. I
21 mean, we certainly have gone through it and
22 thought about some of it, but we're not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 automatically going to respond to what John
2 termed as a thought paper, I guess. Again,
3 we'd be happy to hear what the Board's
4 opinions are on these and would adopt or
5 consider any approaches that might be
6 beneficial.

7 MEMBER MUNN: All right. Thank
8 you, Jim. I didn't anticipate any formal
9 response. I had just thought perhaps you
10 might have some thoughts.

11 DR. NETON: You know, I could
12 comment briefly. You know, I have some of the
13 concerns that Mark raised about some of the
14 issues, and they're all related to
15 stratification. So, I mean, I don't know that
16 any of these -- my general thought is that all
17 of these approaches in themselves require
18 certain assumptions. They're also subject to
19 certain validation requirements. And so I
20 don't know if we're going to go down sort of
21 this infinite regression pathway where, you
22 know, we produce an analysis that has certain

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 inherent assumptions again that says well that
2 supports our model. Well, how valid are those
3 assumptions? You know, you keep kind of going
4 on and on down this path. So I'm not sure
5 that this would provide the weight of the
6 evidence that the Board is looking for.

7 MEMBER MUNN: Thank you, Jim.

8 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Other comments
9 from other Board members?

10 MEMBER GRIFFON: I mean, other
11 than I would ask if before the next meeting if
12 Jim could possibly give some thought to the
13 Mallinckrodt or other data sets, you know,
14 that I just discussed, whether the utility of
15 using that - - those to sort of test the
16 model.

17 And then, Jim, I would also take
18 you up on your offer. If you can provide; I'm
19 sure they're in the site research database,
20 but those other references regarding the
21 source term. You mentioned that there was
22 other references.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. NETON: Right, Tom Tomes I
2 don't think is on the call, but he's since
3 found a number of other documents on that.

4 MEMBER GRIFFON: Okay. If you can
5 just, you know -

6 DR. NETON: Yes, we could
7 certainly do that.

8 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, that would
9 be great.

10 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. So the
11 action will be, number one, that NIOSH will
12 provide the additional documentation, provide
13 that to Mark particularly to look at and maybe
14 copy the rest of us on that information as
15 well. And I haven't heard from the Board any
16 sort of overwhelming desire to have NIOSH
17 respond to the SC&A ideas.

18 Board members, would you like
19 NIOSH to at least give a preliminary critique
20 of whether they believe any of these things
21 are worth following up? Not that they would
22 actually do it, but they obviously have looked

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at them. Do you want them to give their
2 thoughts on these at the October meeting?

3 MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. My
4 initial thought is it should not be necessary
5 as long as we're meeting the desires that Mark
6 has expressed and that Dr. Melius has
7 expressed in the past. If their desires for
8 further instruction and further examination
9 have been met then there does not appear to be
10 any reason to request specific response to all
11 of these issues. I would request that the
12 information would be sent to at least the work
13 group members at the same time, even though
14 the work group has not been functioning in
15 recent months.

16 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes. And I
17 suggest that we send it to the whole Board
18 because the issue has moved up from the work
19 group level to the Board level in any event.

20 MEMBER MUNN: Correct.

21 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: So, we're
22 considering this as a full Board at this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 point. So I think it's appropriate that only
2 the work group be informed but others as well.

3 MEMBER GRIFFON: Paul, this is
4 Mark.

5 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, Mark?

6 MEMBER GRIFFON: I have a slightly
7 different view on that than Wanda, especially
8 option 3. My concern is that I may have -

9 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: You're talking
10 about strategy 3?

11 MEMBER GRIFFON: I'm sorry,
12 strategy 3, yes. See, that one to me sort of
13 possibly dovetails with the whole notion of
14 Mallinckrodt data, really looking at the
15 variability and how the model accounts for
16 that variation. But I think it was actually
17 slightly different than that. And I must say
18 that, you know, a couple of the strategies I
19 felt, as Jim just said, that, you know, we
20 would be going down a possible path to
21 recreate some of those theoretical thought
22 pieces there that we'd almost be questioning,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 whether, you know, our assumptions on those
2 were erroneous. But option 3 stood out a
3 little to me that it might have some merit.
4 But I would like to maybe have NIOSH at least
5 -- I don't know that I'm looking -- you know,
6 my thought is I don't need a written
7 assessment of these strategies, but rather
8 just, you know, maybe be prepared to give us a
9 quick response on the strategies laid out by
10 SC&A and maybe pay particular attention to
11 number 3. That would be my hope.

12 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Other Board
13 members?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: I mean, at this
16 point I think I certainly would support Mark
17 in that.

18 Jim Neton, if NIOSH is able to
19 give a -- we're not asking in-depth studies,
20 but give their sort of reaction to these
21 ideas, and particularly focus on the third
22 strategy as to whether that is something that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would be of any help or doable.

2 DR. NETON: Yes, this is Jim. I
3 have to admit of all the strategies, three was
4 something which I think we kind of
5 communicated a little differently to the Board
6 in previous discussions. And that was the
7 fact that, you know, we don't have -- clearly
8 strategy 3 calls for finding data that was
9 contemporary. We don't have that. But we
10 have a lot of data that was taken in phosphate
11 plants at a later date, and we do have
12 distributions available. And on top of that,
13 I think it's as important to look not only at
14 the variability but the relative magnitude of
15 the values. If one consistently sees values
16 that are approaching an order of magnitude
17 lower than what we're assigning at Blockson,
18 even though it's in a different time frame,
19 one has to wonder then could the ventilation
20 rates, which is driving most of this, have
21 been more than an order of magnitude greater
22 to account for those differences? That's sort

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of where I feel a weight of the evidence
2 argument starts to make sense.

3 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes.

4 MEMBER GRIFFON: And, Jim, maybe
5 if you could -- yes, I mean --

6 DR. NETON: I'd be happy to put
7 something together like that.

8 MEMBER GRIFFON: That would be
9 good.

10 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: I think that
11 would be helpful.

12 MEMBER GRIFFON: -- interested in
13 looking at that both ways.

14 DR. NETON: That I think we've
15 already tried to communicate. Maybe it's not
16 been, you know, succinct in a single document,
17 but that sort of argument. In addition to the
18 fact that Mallinckrodt may not be a good
19 surrogate, but given the source term was maybe
20 1,000 times more concentrated radium, you
21 know, I think that the model would probably
22 over predict the radon concentration in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Mallinckrodt by a considerable margin. You
2 know, that's something I think that we talked
3 about.

4 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, and that
5 would be supportive, right.

6 DR. NETON: ORAU, and I had
7 mentioned this before, had done a study where
8 they took and did a time-weighted -- I know
9 there's a lot of objection to time weighted
10 studies, but at a time-weighted average
11 exposure to workers at Mallinckrodt between --
12 the very early years, up to 1956, I believe,
13 and the values were not that different than
14 the 95th percentile we're using at Blockson.
15 That, again, to me is sort of a weight of the
16 evidence argument that says, you know, this is
17 a source term much more concentrated and these
18 workers are not receiving time weight
19 exposures approaching -- or very close to, it
20 may be a factor of two, but in the same
21 ballpark, let's say, as what we're assigning
22 it at Blockson.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So we could put some of that
2 together, you know, maybe in one place.

3 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Thank you, Jim.

4 Board members, is that agreeable?

5 Any objections to that as a pass forward? We
6 have two things that NIOSH would do. One is
7 to provide those references that you referred
8 to earlier. And then the other would be to
9 look more closely at strategy 3 and whether or
10 not that can be utilized for addressing the
11 issue of -- well, mainly the stratification
12 issue, but to some extent has some validation
13 implications as well.

14 Is that agreeable with everyone?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: I hear no
17 objections.

18 Mark, does that --

19 MEMBER GRIFFON: That sounds fine.

20 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Sounds
21 reasonable.

22 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. We'll

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 proceed on that basis then and have a report.

2 And, Ted, if you'll put this on
3 the agenda for the October meeting as well.

4 MR. KATZ: Absolutely, Dr. Ziemer.

5 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay.

6 MEMBER GRIFFON: Can I ask one
7 more thing before we get off the topic?

8 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: You bet.

9 MEMBER GRIFFON: This is to Jim
10 Neton really. If I have questions on the
11 actual crystal ball model, is there anyone I
12 can turn to at NIOSH, or should I go through
13 you, Jim? I'll certainly cc everyone, but --

14 DR. NETON: You can start with me.

15 MEMBER GRIFFON: Okay.

16 DR. NETON: I should be able to
17 answer it. If I can't, I'll track down who
18 can.

19 MEMBER GRIFFON: Okay. Okay. All
20 right. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. I think
22 we're set on that then. Are we?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Ted, you have some final issues
2 with respect to agenda?

3 MR. KATZ: Yes, Dr. Ziemer, just
4 one, I think, which is I just would like to
5 try to confirm, although we're missing a
6 couple of Board members, but I know it from
7 one at least, who is interested for the
8 Brookhaven, to actually see the facility since
9 we have that SEC coming up and so on. And let
10 me just run through, to make this quick, the
11 people I think have said yes, but I could be
12 wrong on one of these. And then just open it
13 up for someone to correct me on the people I
14 think have said yes, and also to add in for
15 others that may want to do it but haven't said
16 so.

17 So I believe I have Gen Roessler,
18 Josie Beach, Phil Schofield, Bob, Brad, Wanda
19 and Mark have said yes, I think. Is that
20 correct?

21 MEMBER PRESLEY: This is Bob
22 Presley --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GRIFFON: No, Ted, I can't
2 do it.

3 MR. KATZ: Okay. Not Mark.
4 Sorry. That's right.

5 MEMBER GRIFFON: That's right, not
6 Mark.

7 MEMBER PRESLEY: Hey Ted?

8 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Yes, and this is
9 Ziemer. I indicated to you I have visited
10 Brookhaven a number of times in the past, so I
11 probably won't go.

12 MR. KATZ: Right.

13 MEMBER CLAWSON: This is Brad.
14 That is correct for me.

15 MR. KATZ: Okay. Mike, are you
16 with us on this call?

17 MEMBER GIBSON: Yes, I'm here.

18 MR. KATZ: This tour which would
19 probably be the Monday afternoon before the
20 Board meeting, is this something you're
21 thinking you might attend or -

22 MEMBER GIBSON: I don't think I'll

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be available.

2 MR. KATZ: Okay. Okay. And I
3 have no other takers then, I believe.

4 MEMBER PRESLEY: Hey, Ted?

5 MR. KATZ: Yes?

6 MEMBER PRESLEY: You might ask the
7 staff.

8 MR. KATZ: No, no, no. That's a
9 separate thing. I just wanted to get the
10 Board here on this call, but absolutely I've
11 opened it. The option is there for the staff
12 to attend, too. And I've already heard from
13 SC&A. I haven't yet heard from OCAS.

14 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. And, Ted,
15 any other information needed for the Board
16 meeting agenda for October?

17 MR. KATZ: I think we're good, but
18 I will certainly be sending out a draft so
19 that you can see what's there and can comment,
20 if necessary. And I'll be doing that fairly
21 soon.

22 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Thank you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 very much.

2 MEMBER PRESLEY: There's no
3 problem with us coming in early on our rooms,
4 right?

5 MR. KATZ: There will not be.
6 There may be a problem right this moment, but
7 that will certainly be an option. Otherwise,
8 it of course wouldn't work for particularly
9 folks coming from parts west.

10 MEMBER PRESLEY: Yes, because I'm
11 coming in on Sunday.

12 MR. KATZ: Right.

13 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: Okay. Thank
14 you. I believe that concludes our agenda for
15 today. Does anyone else have any additional
16 items they want to raise to us?

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN ZIEMER: If not, then I
19 will declare the meeting adjourned. Thank you
20 all very much.

21 (Whereupon, the above-entitled
22 matter went off the record at 1:22 p.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701