

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health

Summary Minutes

Twenty-second Meeting of the
Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health
March 11, 2004

Conference Call Meeting Held at the National Institute for
Occupational Safety and Health
Atlanta, Georgia

Executive Summary

The Twenty-second meeting of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (ABRWH or the Board) was held by telephone conference on March 11, 2004, at 1:00 p.m. All members were in attendance with the exception of Dr. Roy DeHart. Others in attendance included staff of various Federal agencies, as well as members of the public.

* * * * *

Thursday, March 11, 2004

Consideration of Site Profile Review Procedures

The single agenda item was the consideration of the draft site profile review procedures submitted by Sanford Cohen & Associates. **Dr. Paul Ziemer** led the Board through a discussion of the document, following which a motion was made and seconded to approve the procedures, with minor modifications. The motion passed unanimously.

* * * * *

Public Comment Period

Public comment was solicited. Public input included the following:

- Availability of IMBA software to the public.
- Matters just discussed by the Board were not minor.

* * * * *

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

End of Executive Summary

◆ ◆ ◆

Summary Minutes of the Twenty-second Meeting
March 11, 2004

The Twenty-first Meeting of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (ABRWH or the Board) was held at the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (conference call) on March 11, 2004. The meeting was called by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC's) National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), the agency charged with administering the ABRWH. These summary minutes, as well as a verbatim transcript certified by a court reporter, are available on the internet on the NIOSH/Office of Compensation Analysis and Support (OCAS) web site located at www.cdc.gov/niosh/ocas. Those present included the following:

ABRWH Members: Dr. Paul Ziemer, Chair; Dr. Henry Anderson; Dr. Antonio Andrade; Mr. Richard Espinosa; Mr. Michael Gibson; Mr. Mark Griffon; Dr. James Melius; Ms. Wanda Munn; Mr. Leon Owens; Mr. Robert Presley; and Dr. Genevieve Roessler.

Designated Federal Official: Mr. Larry Elliott, Executive Secretary

Federal Agency Attendees:

Department of Health and Human Services:

Ms. Martha DiMuzio, Mr. Russ Henshaw, Ms. Cori Homer, Ms. Liz Homoki-Titus, Mr. Ted Katz; Mr. David Naimon; and Dr. Jim Neton.

Department of Labor:

Ms. Sylvia Dominguez and Mr. Jeffrey Kotsch.

Contractors and Public Attendees: Mr. Hans Behling; Ms. Terry Berry; Dr. Joe Fitzgerald; Mr. Howard Lawson; Dr. John Mauro; Mr. Richard Miller; Ms. Johnnie Rosa; Dr. Dick Toohey;

OPENING REMARKS

Dr. Paul Ziemer, Chairman of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, (ABRWH, or the Board) called the meeting to order, welcoming the attendees.

Dr. Ziemer requested an official roll call of the Board to verify presence on the conference call. All members were in attendance with the exception of Dr. Roy DeHart. **Dr. Ziemer** asked that the attending representatives of various Federal agencies identify themselves, as well as employees of any contractors, and members of the public.

* * * * *

BOARD DISCUSSION AND WORKING SESSION CONSIDERATION OF SITE PROFILE REVIEW PROCEDURES

The sole agenda item was to discuss and consider the site profile review procedures submitted by Sanford Cohen & Associates (SC&A). This first deliverable had been provided at the Board's request so that the Board could establish an agreed-upon approach for conducting the reviews of the site profiles by their contractor.

Dr. Ziemer indicated it was his belief that the Board's primary task in this regard was to provide feedback to SC&A as to the acceptability of the procedures. He noted there could be a variety of outcomes as a result of the Board's deliberations. One would be acceptance of the draft document as provided, with instructions to the contractor to proceed. Another would be acceptance, with minor modifications, and instructions to the contractor to proceed. Or in the event of a need for major modifications, the Board could instruct the contractor to make revisions and return to the Board with an amended procedure.

Dr. Ziemer prefaced a discussion of the document by reviewing the format. It was divided into four sections, beginning with an introduction, then proceeding into objectives, the procedural approach, and then the roles, responsibilities, and deliverables. **Dr. Ziemer** opined that the key question for the Board would appear to be: Are there major issues or considerations the contractor has failed to include in the review procedures outlined in this document?

Discussion Points:

■ **Dr. James Neton** noted that in the introduction of the document, "incidents and accidents" were mentioned as being included in the site profiles, and pointed out that they are not targeted for inclusion. **Dr. Ziemer** suggested that **Dr. John Mauro** of SC&A make note of that and modify the

document accordingly.

- **Dr. Neton** was also concerned that in the second paragraph of the same section it indicted the contractor was to "evaluate the approach taken by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) to gauge the adequacy, completeness, and validity of the information used to determine individual eligibility for compensation." **Dr. Neton** felt it important to point out that NIOSH does not perform that role; they perform the dose reconstructions which the Department of Labor uses to determine eligibility for compensation. **Dr. Ziemer** asked that **Dr. Mauro** make that modification to the document, as well.
- **Ms. Wanda Munn** observed that one of the objectives in the second section was the concept of consistency of the site profiles, and wondered if that were completely accurate. **Dr. Ziemer** opined that the intent had been a consistency from site to site where there were commonalities, and called upon **Dr. Mauro** to clarify.
- **Dr. Mauro** acknowledged that there will be differences in various sites, but there will be areas where there should be equivalencies and that was the intention. **Dr. Ziemer** added that it appeared to him that consistency had to do with the type and level and depth of information gathered by one team versus another team which does the dose reconstructions.
- **Dr. Genevieve Roessler** raised a question on the procedural approach section relating to interviews with NIOSH and Oak Ridge Associated Universities (ORAU), and another reference to interviewing site profile authors. She wondered how extensive that plan might be. **Dr. Ziemer** indicated that the process would require his receipt of a request from the contractor to do such an interview. He would then pass the request along to NIOSH or ORAU.
- **Dr. Mauro** added that there was no intention to interview every person who worked on a site profile, but it would be as deemed appropriate. He stressed that they intended to let the site profile review process unfold, and if something developed, it would be probed as they deemed appropriate, in collaboration with the Board.
- **Mr. Mark Griffon** observed that in that same section there is a reference to a review of worst-case dose estimates, noting that the actual phraseology had been to review the outline guidance for general dose estimates, because in some cases the contractor was building a template for doing individual reconstructions. **Dr. Mauro** indicated that was very easily remedied.

In the next section of the document, **Dr. Ziemer** observed that the role and responsibility of the Board as outlined was the contractor's reiteration of what the Board had committed to do; therefore there appeared to be no disagreement with that segment. SC&A is explaining what it will do, which is spelled out in the task order in any event, therefore he noted no problem with that segment.

The role of NIOSH, **Dr. Ziemer** opined, was a matter of the contractor describing what it believes NIOSH is supposed to do, but is not mandating what they do. **Dr. Mauro** agreed with that assessment, and **Dr. Ziemer** then asked **Mr. Larry Elliott** and **Dr. Neton** if they had any disagreement with what had been outlined as NIOSH's role. Both were in agreement that there were no conflicts in that segment.

Moving into the procedures portion, **Dr. Ziemer** cautioned that he did not want the Board to get into a wordsmithing situation, but was looking for red flags, items of concern, or items that Board members may feel were missing from the document.

■ **Mr. Griffon** noted a section on missed dose, and indicated that perhaps if the section were headed as "missed dose or unmonitored dose," that would take care of the matter. But he felt that those were two different things and that it was important to make sure there was a distinction between them. **Dr. Ziemer** asked if **Dr. Mauro** could make note of that. **Dr. Mauro** indicated they had a copy of the procedures before them and were marking it up as the Board commented.

■ **Dr. Ziemer** raised a question in that same section on distinguishing between what the "site" did and what the "site profilers" did. **Dr. Mauro** indicated that he understood exactly what **Dr. Ziemer** was referring to, noting there was in fact a need for editing some of the questions so they are placed in the proper context.

■ **Dr. Antonio Andrade** wanted to go to an earlier portion of that section, specifically referring to assignment of site profile reviewers, which called for operational experts led by a designated team member. He questioned who the operational experts were and whether the team leader was one of the health physicists.

■ **Mr. Joe Fitzgerald** of SC&A indicated the team leader would be one of two or three health physicists on a team. He noted that the reference to experts was in the event there may be some specialist issues particular to a site profile where the contractor would need to draw upon somebody from the SC&A team who may have expertise. This would not necessarily be a member of the site profile team. The involvement would be very intermittent, but would be valuable to ensure the proper evaluation of the issue.

■ **Dr. Andrade** inquired if those people would be among the ones specified in the contract, and **Mr. Fitzgerald** assured him they would.

Since the procedures consisted of a variety of questions the contractor would be asking in its review of the site profiles, discussion was held regarding exactly what would happen to the answers to those questions once they were determined.

Dr. Ziemer observed that the Board understood the questions didn't stand by themselves and that it wasn't a matter of having a list of answers to a list of questions, but that the contractor is going to take the information and develop it into an evaluation. However, in some cases the document states more specifically what will be done with the information.

Adding that the Board neither expected nor asked to have everything detailed at this point, **Dr. Ziemer** commented that for SC&A's purposes they may want to clarify those issues, pointing out that there is some fuzziness in the language.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the site profile review procedure as submitted, with the understanding that the minor items discussed would be taken into consideration by the contractor as they proceed with the process.

Dr. Ziemer called for discussion on the motion, noting that he wanted to raise one other issue before the vote, which was probably his only red flag item. In the procedures section under the subheading of Dosimetric Technical Basis and the sub-subheading of occupational environmental dose, there was a section on chemical data. He pointed out that the contractor is proposing as a part of this review to examine chemical exposure issues, which is not being done. **Dr. Ziemer** queried whether that section is not beyond the scope of the task, and called for input from the Board and NIOSH.

Mr. Elliott indicated that indeed that section was beyond the scope of both the task and the contract which had been awarded.

After some discussion, it was agreed by the mover and the seconder of the motion that, as a friendly amendment, the motion include removal of the paragraph on chemical data as being beyond the scope of the review process. **Dr. Ziemer** asked for a roll call vote.

The motion to accept the site profile review procedure, with all discussed modifications, was passed unanimously.

Dr. Ziemer announced the Board was pleased to instruct SC&A to proceed.

Attention was called to the fact that the Board members had received in their packets documentation related to Task Two, which was a deliverable under the contract. This material was provided simply as an indication that it had in fact been received, and required no action.

* * * * *

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Ms. Johnnie Rosa

Ms. Rosa raised again the issue of making IMBA software available to the general public.

She particularly wanted the Board to know that the issues discussed today were not minor items, that denial of claims was a major item.

Dr. Ziemer thanked **Ms. Rosa** for her comments, and noted that the issue of the IMBA software is being researched, and that NIOSH did not control its availability. **Mr. Elliott** added that NIOSH was looking into making IMBA available through a help desk or look-up tables. He also pointed out to **Ms. Rosa** that models which appear in the IMBA software are international consensus models which have been published, are accessible and are of public domain.

Ms. Rosa indicated she was going to address the issue all the way to the President. **Dr. Ziemer** expressed his agreement with that approach, noting it was the route which probably would be most effective for her at this point.

* * * * *

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

End of Summary Minutes

◆◆◆◆◆

I hereby confirm that these Summary Minutes
are accurate to the best of my knowledge.



Paul L. Ziemer, Ph.D., Chair



Date