

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

convenes

MEETING FIFTY-EIGHT

ADVISORY BOARD ON
RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

VOL. III

DAY THREE

ABRWH BOARD MEETING

The verbatim transcript of the
Meeting of the Advisory Board on Radiation and
Worker Health held at the Crowne Plaza Hotel,
Redondo Beach, California, on Sept. 4, 2008.

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

C O N T E N T S

Sept. 4, 2008

WELCOME AND OPENING COMMENTS	7
DR. PAUL ZIEMER, CHAIR	
MR. TED KATZ, DFO	
SEC PETITION STATUS UPDATES	8
BOARD WORKING TIME:	
DR. PAUL ZIEMER, CHAIR	
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROCEDURES REVIEW	82
WORKGROUP FOR PANTEX	116
TASKING THE CONTRACTOR	122
SELECTION OF TENTH SET OF CASES	151
FUTURE PLANS AND MEETINGS	156
COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	176

TRANSCRIPT LEGEND

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(By Group, in Alphabetical Order)

CHAIR

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

DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL

KATZ, Theodore M., M.P.A.
Program Analyst
National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Atlanta, Georgia

BOARD MEMBERS

BEACH, Josie
Nuclear Chemical Operator
Hanford Reservation
Richland, Washington

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

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

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

1 LOCKEY, James, M.D. (not present)
2 Professor, Department of Environmental Health
3 College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati

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

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

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

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

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANTS

ADAMS, NANCY, NIOSH
BLOCK, SHARON, SEN. KENNEDY
BROEHM, JASON, CDC
DEGARMO, DENISE, SIUE/DOW
HANSON, JOHN, SIUE/DOW
HINNEFELD, STUART, NIOSH
HOWELL, EMILY, HHS
KLEA, BONNIE, PETITIONER
KOTSCH, JEFF, U.S. DOL
LERNER, STEPHEN, DOE
LEWIS, GREG, DOE
MAKHIJANI, ARJUN, SC&A
MCFEE, MATTHEW, ORAU
RAFKY, MICHAEL, HHS
ROBERTSON-DEMERS, KATHY, SC&A
VOLSCH, JOE, SIUE/DOW

P R O C E E D I N G S

(8:30 a.m.)

WELCOME AND OPENING COMMENTS**DR. PAUL ZIEMER, CHAIR****MR. TED KATZ, DFO**

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Good morning, everyone. We're
2 ready to begin the third day of this Advisory
3 Board meeting 58 at Redondo Beach, California.
4 Welcome everyone back.
5 We're going to follow the agenda pretty much as
6 you have it. I -- I do hope that we will be
7 able to streamline a few items because we've
8 had preliminary discussions on a number of the
9 items that will be on our agenda today, so they
10 may go faster than we had originally allowed
11 for. And if that's the case, at least the
12 Chair is shooting for completing this agenda
13 very close to the noon hour.
14 I do want to announce, and it's been announced
15 on the web site, that the -- the procedures
16 workgroup will have a workgroup meeting this
17 afternoon. This is not a last-minute
18 arrangement. It's been on the -- on the
19 schedule for some time. It's been announced on
20 the web site as well, Ms. Munn, chairman.

1 I assume that if we're able to finish close to
2 the noon hour that you will want to start
3 immediately after lunch. Is that correct?

4 **MS. MUNN:** That would be my intent.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. And at the time that we
6 adjourn this meeting we will establish a firm
7 time for the workgroup meeting.

8 The only other announcement this morning is to
9 remind everyone to register their attendance in
10 the registration book in the corridor.

11 **SEC PETITION STATUS UPDATES**

12 We're going to begin with updates on some of
13 the SEC petitions. We had the -- sort of the
14 overview update yesterday by -- by NIOSH, LaVon
15 Rutherford, and we have specific SEC petition
16 issues to deal with today. We're going to
17 begin with Blockson. We -- we do have on the
18 line, I -- I believe, from Senator Kennedy's
19 office, Sharon Block. Let me double-check to
20 see if Sharon is on the line.

21 **MS. BLOCK:** Yes, I am.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Good morning, Sharon.

23 **MS. BLOCK:** Morning.

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** We would be pleased to hear from
25 you this morning if you want to begin for us.

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** (Off microphone) (Unintelligible)
2 Chapman.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** I'm sorry, Chapman. We've got
4 Blockson first here, but I think since Sharon's
5 on the line we'll simply change the order and
6 do the Chapman Valve issues right now, so --
7 and Sharon, you're aware of -- of the
8 discussion that went on yesterday, I believe,
9 relative to Chapman.

10 **MS. BLOCK:** Yes, and I -- and I appreciate the
11 -- the opportunity to -- to be a part of this
12 conversation about Chapman Valve and, you know,
13 appreciate how difficult this petition has been
14 for the Board. But I mean my understanding of
15 where things ended up yesterday was that there
16 was -- there was thought given to forwarding to
17 the Secretary some kind of communication that
18 the Board is deadlocked on this. And you know,
19 I'm -- from Senator Kennedy's point of view,
20 we're just concerned that that may be the
21 functional equivalent of denying the petition
22 and we have, you know, very serious concerns
23 about that 'cause it seems the -- you know, the
24 statute gives the Board the responsibility to
25 make a recommendation one way or the other, and

1 that if -- if the -- the Board is deadlocked,
2 you know, that's six members of the Board, an
3 equal number who would want to grant the
4 petition, and to -- to use that as the
5 functional equivalent of denying it seems to
6 contradict really the spirit of the statute,
7 which was to give the benefit of the doubt to
8 the claimants. And there is this piece of
9 evidence out there, you know, with regard to
10 the Chapman Valve petition, this enriched
11 uranium, that still hasn't been explained and
12 it seems like just too big an obstacle to --
13 again, ignoring it and treating this petition
14 as denied when in fact it has not been denied
15 by the Board. And so, you know, Senator
16 Kennedy certainly has expressed throughout this
17 long process concerns about how long it's
18 taking, and so I think, you know, we would like
19 to see the petition granted. But you know, our
20 -- our biggest concern is about fairness, and
21 certainly wouldn't want concerns about moving
22 the process along to trump treating this
23 petition as fairly as possible because that is
24 what the -- the -- the guiding spirit of
25 enacting this statute was, to treat these

1 people fairly. And so the Senator's office --
2 you know, we stand ready to help in any way we
3 can if there's concerns about getting more
4 information you think we can be helpful, but we
5 are very concerned about anything that would
6 seem to deny the petition when, you know, we
7 think that's really not where the process is
8 right now.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you, Sharon. And just
10 let me make a couple comments. One was that we
11 have not yet made a -- a decision as a Board as
12 to how to proceed. We discussed some of those
13 options that you identified. The option of
14 informing the Secretary of the deadlock was not
15 intended to necessarily be a report to end all
16 activities, but to make sure that there was on
17 the official record some indication to the
18 Secretary of the status, since this has
19 extended over some period of time since the
20 petition evaluation report was completed.
21 Certainly if additional or new evidence comes
22 forward, then this matter can be continued by
23 the workgroup. And in fact we will try to
24 establish today whether there are other paths
25 for the workgroup and the Board to follow on

1 bill. I mean I think one of the issues Sharon
2 was talking about, if -- if we stay with NIOSH,
3 then Chapman Valve is dead. There are no other
4 issues. I mean it's a death warrant, Chapman
5 Valve. And in fact, if you read the
6 information that Congress set out for your
7 procedure, it -- it states (unintelligible) is
8 still no longer -- is now several years since
9 Congress enacted EEOICPA. The primary
10 motivation for this legislation was the need to
11 expeditiously compensate workers and their
12 surviving family members. The statute
13 specifically states that the purpose is to
14 provide timely compensation. It goes on to say
15 that it anticipates that records will not be
16 available, that because of the Secrecy Act of
17 the time it would be a difficult thing. You
18 have to -- you have to err to the benefit of
19 the claimant and -- and you -- you really, I
20 think, need to go back and look at this because
21 if we maintain the status quo, then nothing
22 more will happen on Chapman. I mean right now
23 you certainly have members of the Board that
24 certainly understand that if records are not
25 available that doesn't mean they didn't exist,

1 it's just that we're 60 years later. And they
2 were secret records in the first place. And
3 just by your own nature you stated that you
4 have a difficult time getting any information
5 from the Navy Department and Department of
6 Energy and Department of Defense. We should
7 not be hindered because you -- you
8 unfortunately cannot get the information you
9 need to make a more intelligent decision. But
10 in lieu of that, you could certainly make a
11 decision on the factual evidence that exists,
12 and the only factual evidence that exists is
13 that there was uranium in that building. That
14 is the only factual information you have, and
15 you should make your determination on that.

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

17 **MR. PETERSON:** Thank you very much.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Thank you for those
19 comments.

20 We can proceed, Board members, to discuss now
21 the Chapman Valve situation. I think the
22 chairman of that workgroup, John Poston,
23 indicated a willingness for the workgroup to
24 look into other issues if we could identify
25 what they -- what they would be. The -- the

1 issue of the enriched uranium, I think it was
2 agreed to that there is a sample. The impact
3 of that sample, as far as some of the Board
4 members are concerned, has been noted. I -- I
5 don't know if Dr. Poston has any additional
6 comments as chair, but certainly if you wish to
7 make some, John, at this time, you certainly
8 could do so.

9 **DR. POSTON:** I just want to reiterate what I
10 said yesterday. If the people who have
11 concerns and doubts and so forth will share
12 those with us so that we can investigate those,
13 I'll be happy -- in fact, I have two on my list
14 already. We need to put a plan together as --
15 to move forward and move forward as quickly as
16 we can, but I can't sit here and try to guess
17 what's in people's minds and -- when they -- so
18 if we have a list of things that need to be
19 investigated, let's get it out on the table,
20 let's -- so that we can work with NIOSH and
21 whomever to -- to tr-- do our best to obtain
22 the information and make a decision.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. And Brad?

24 **MR. CLAWSON:** (Off microphone) (Unintelligible)
25 and this -- and this is part of the problem.

1 This is what's (unintelligible) come up. We
2 know we've got (on microphone) the uranium
3 there. We found out about the Dean Street.
4 Yes, we took care of Dean Street but we have
5 not been able to get any information this. And
6 just because we don't have the information out
7 there doesn't mean that the things didn't go on
8 there. This is -- you know, this is one of the
9 things where, in my belief, that we are to err
10 in the side of the claimant. And just because
11 the information isn't there doesn't mean that
12 something didn't go on. And -- and here we're
13 going to be making decisions without all the
14 information. And now to find out where all the
15 information is, I -- I can't. But this is what
16 has also put the Board in this situation to
17 where we're up against -- we're -- we're
18 deadlocked into this because there is
19 sufficient information out there. And my
20 personal opinion is that we should err in the
21 side of the claimants. We do know that we've
22 got the uranium there. Can they explain why it
23 was there? No. Can they explain why it
24 shouldn't have been there? Well, maybe they
25 could, but this is -- this is the whole issue

1 with -- with the problems is we've got too many
2 unanswered questions. Nobody can answer the
3 questions for us. DOE I know has tried. I
4 know that they've looked into the Dean Street
5 facility. We've got people explaining what has
6 come in. Can we factualize that? No, we
7 can't, but we cannot disprove it, either.

8 **DR. POSTON:** But what are those questions?
9 That's what I'm asking. You haven't given me -
10 - except for one, you haven't given me any
11 questions that need to be answered.

12 **MR. CLAWSON:** Okay, tell me --

13 **DR. POSTON:** You said there's too many
14 unanswered questions --

15 **MR. CLAWSON:** But -- no, that -- that --

16 **DR. POSTON:** -- but you haven't provided a
17 list.

18 **MR. CLAWSON:** Okay, here, I'll give you an
19 answer. You tell me everything that went on at
20 Dean Street from the beginning to the end,
21 everything. And if you can give me that,
22 that'll be great, but the problem is, John, is
23 you can't. This is the problem that we're
24 getting into is --

25 **DR. POSTON:** We're not even talking about Dean

1 Street.

2 **MR. CLAWSON:** Chapman Valve. Was Dean Street
3 part of Chapman Valve?

4 **DR. POSTON:** That's a separate question. The
5 committee --

6 **MR. CLAWSON:** Okay, Chapman --

7 **DR. POSTON:** -- agreed to --

8 **MR. CLAWSON:** -- Valve.

9 **DR. POSTON:** -- discount Dean Street
10 completely. We -- it's not part of this
11 consideration.

12 **MR. CLAWSON:** Okay. Then you tell me
13 everything that went on at Chapman Valve, and
14 if you can tell me everything, 100 percent
15 positive, then that's great, but none of us
16 can.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, and of course, Brad --

18 **MR. CLAWSON:** The only --

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- we can't do that for any
20 facility, so --

21 **MR. CLAWSON:** Right, you can't.

22 **DR. POSTON:** That's an impossible thing.

23 **MR. CLAWSON:** That's an impossible task so --

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** That is not a task that Congress
25 has asked, they've asked either to bound or to

1 -- or to go in the direction of the SEC.

2 **DR. POSTON:** I -- I know you're a reasonable
3 person, Brad, and what I'm asking you to do is
4 look at what NIOSH said they were going to do
5 in terms of estimating the doses and tell me
6 that that's not a reasonable approach. It sets
7 a huge upper bound for the potential doses that
8 these folks got. There's no argument about the
9 external doses. We have the data. But the
10 assumptions in terms of the internal dose are
11 so huge that if a person is assigned that dose,
12 plus their external dose, and they're not
13 compensable, they will never be compensable.
14 There's no scenario that you could put together
15 that's going to raise the doses so that those
16 folks will be compensable.

17 **MR. CLAWSON:** So NIOSH's --

18 **DR. POSTON:** NIOSH is saying to you we don't
19 know everything and we can never know
20 everything, but here's a situation that --
21 SC&A, everybody agrees, that this is a huge
22 overestimate of the dose due to internal
23 exposure. And it's a reasonable approach to
24 say okay, if you're compensable under this
25 scenario, then -- then you're compensable. If

1 you're not compensable, there's not much chance
2 that you would ever be compensable under any
3 scenario.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Dr. Roessler?

5 **DR. ROESSLER:** I think, John, to help to
6 clarify what I think the problem is, we have a
7 lot of misconceptions about what this one
8 sample -- what the impact might be if in fact
9 the sample indicated enriched uranium. I -- I
10 was going to suggest that sitting here at the
11 Board meeting this morning is not the place to
12 -- to go over this and clear it all up,
13 although I think John helped a bit. I was
14 going to suggest the workgroup get together
15 again to try and clarify this situation,
16 present it so that everyone understands why
17 people are voting the way they are. And also
18 at that time if we set up a workgroup meeting,
19 then this would be the time for people to bring
20 up the questions that the workgroup could deal
21 with.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Thank you. Dr. -- oh,
23 okay, we have Mark and then Jim and then Brad.

24 **MR. CLAWSON:** Oh, no, I'm --

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, Mark and then Jim.

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** I -- I was going to ask what John
2 had on his list before. I mentioned a few
3 things yesterday, I thought --

4 **DR. POSTON:** Yes.

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- and maybe one of those is on
6 your list, I don't know.

7 **DR. POSTON:** I have the two that you mentioned
8 yesterday, availability of remediation reports
9 --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

11 **DR. POSTON:** -- and the Naval activities in the
12 facility, even though we know that --

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

14 **DR. POSTON:** -- may be (unintelligible).

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** I know that's a difficult one,
16 but at least it's -- it's something we should -
17 -

18 **DR. POSTON:** Yes, I wrote those down --

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- pursue further.

20 **DR. POSTON:** -- and they're on the list.

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** And -- and just to expand on the
22 one with the remediation, I did talk to Jim
23 Neton of NIOSH and -- and we've had these
24 discussions before and the question is to get
25 back to the contractor, and I think maybe Jim -

1 - you've made some attempts to try to get that,
2 but you know, ha-- having done these cleanups,
3 I mean, they -- they have to have done -- I
4 mean I'd be astonished if there was no isotopic
5 data somewhere in the volume of reports when
6 they did this remediation. If they sent waste
7 off that site to a -- a -- a site and it was
8 char-- there was, you know, one enriched sample
9 there, they would have had to at least to a
10 small percentage of assayed samples to
11 demonstrate that they were below the S&M
12 license requirements for the facility they're
13 sending the waste to. So somewhere there's got
14 to be something, and that might say well, here,
15 we sent this many truckloads of soil or debris
16 or whatever out, it was all, you know, less
17 than whatever, and then you may be able to say,
18 you know, yeah, there was a sa-- you know. I
19 mean that -- that's a thread that we haven't
20 pulled and that -- that's one specific -- you
21 know, to get off this debate back and forth,
22 just to get to some specific actions --

23 **DR. POSTON:** No, I agree.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- that's one I recommend.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Jim Neton.

1 **DR. NETON:** Yeah, Mar-- I don't disagree with
2 what Mark is saying, but I -- I would point out
3 that that, in and of itself, may not clear up
4 the issue because we still would not know who
5 produced that contaminated waste that may have
6 had enriched uranium, you know, even if it was
7 identified as still being present. Because
8 remember, the sample was taken I think -- what,
9 1974, some 25 years or more after activities --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** I -- I agree --

11 **DR. NETON:** -- stopped.

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- but it may also say, you know
13 -- some people I think are still not quite
14 convinced that it was a real sample, even
15 though Mr. Folle* seems to suggest that --

16 **DR. NETON:** Yeah, I --

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- it was likely real --

18 **DR. NETON:** -- I have always said it's probably
19 real.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- but -- but if you start seeing
21 waste shipments that -- that show a -- a higher
22 amount of S&-- you know, if there was enriched
23 -- it -- it might add to the picture. I'm not
24 sure it's going to --

25 **DR. NETON:** (Unintelligible)

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- production that was done, I
2 agree.

3 **DR. NETON:** Right.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** And then my -- and then my
5 question about the Naval operations comes into
6 play, and I -- I know that's difficult, but I
7 don't know if -- if you've made any -- if
8 there's any way to make a specific request to
9 DoD or the Navy about a specific facility time
10 frame, you know, that kind of thing.

11 **DR. NETON:** Yeah. We'd certainly be willing to
12 try. I mean --

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

14 **DR. NETON:** -- our success rate has been pretty
15 poor with that --

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** I understand.

17 **DR. NETON:** -- effort, but we could try.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Maybe the Senator's office --

19 **DR. POSTON:** (Off microphone) (Unintelligible)
20 Senator Kennedy's office.

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- can help us.

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, exactly, yeah, yeah.

23 **DR. NETON:** The other thing, I think a contract
24 of some type has to show up, though, because
25 this facility is a covered facility solely

1 because there's a DOE contract in place to
2 machine uranium slugs for the Brookhaven
3 Reactor, and that's what we've reconstructed.
4 So we've done exactly what the covered facility
5 was -- was created for, for that singular
6 contract with the Department of Energy. We saw
7 no other evidence of any DOE contract. So we'd
8 have to find some other contract, whether it
9 was with Department of Defense or maybe some,
10 you know, later date -- a DOE contract.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Dr. Melius.

12 **DR. MELIUS:** I was going to mention perhaps
13 Senator Kennedy can help with the -- the
14 nuclear Navy issue, and then Department of
15 Defense.

16 The second thing I think to look into is
17 whether one can ask DOE to go back and -- and
18 look in more detail for a possible contract,
19 possible records and so forth. Wasn't clear to
20 me from what I've heard about their
21 investigation how -- how thorough it was, and
22 particularly given that -- you know, we have
23 this -- confirm this one sample that maybe we
24 can ask them to -- to re-look at what they've
25 done and see if there's more that they can do

1 to locate records. But I -- I'll leave that up
2 to the workgroup, I -- who is more -- I think
3 more familiar with what's -- what's gone on.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Dr. Poston?

5 **DR. POSTON:** I think I'm going to say what Jim
6 is going to say. At the last working group
7 meeting we actually drafted a letter which was
8 transmitted to DOE to do -- ask them to do
9 exactly that, that we needed more information.
10 We asked them to go back and look. We
11 suggested other search categories and so forth
12 that might uncover some of this, and so far
13 we've received nothing in terms of new
14 discoveries and so forth. So we have asked
15 that. There -- I have no qualms about asking
16 them again.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** John, do you know how long ago
18 that was? Was that prior to Pat Worthington's
19 tenure or --

20 **DR. POSTON:** No, no, no, it was sometime in --

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** And they've -- they've reported
22 back to us, I believe, but maybe we can get an
23 update on -- I'm trying to remember -- the Y-12
24 -- the question was Y-12 shipments back to
25 Chapman, and I'm not sure if -- from the

1 transmittal if that was a sort of a database
2 search or if you went down there physically and
3 pulled records and looked through manifests or
4 -- or what kind of search that was.

5 **MR. LEWIS:** And this is Greg Lewis from DOE. I
6 believe we both searched databases, there were
7 a couple of records collections that were next
8 to the database level and, you know, we
9 actually sent people in to flip through the
10 boxes and the folders, and we were unable to
11 find any further responsive information.

12 **DR. POSTON:** Paul, just to answer your
13 question, that came out of the last working
14 group meeting, which was --

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Recent then.

16 **DR. POSTON:** -- recent, 2008.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you.

18 **DR. POSTON:** I don't remember the date.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Other comments or suggestions for
20 the -- yeah, Brad.

21 **MR. CLAWSON:** And just -- just to speak on
22 that, the reason why we were going in that
23 direction and trying to find more information
24 was because of the claimants explaining and
25 talking about shipments that came back from

1 there, and we have not been able to find that -
2 - they were talking about manifolds and so
3 forth like that, for repairs and processes like
4 that that were coming back from there. It's
5 not unusual -- and -- and this is something
6 that I've said from the very beginning of this
7 program. Between sites -- there's stuff that
8 goes back and forth all the time, and -- and in
9 these earlier years with the secrecy and
10 everything the way it was, I'm sure it'll be
11 hard, but I think there's -- there's also
12 things out there that we haven't uncovered,
13 either.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Dr. Melius, additional comment?

15 **DR. MELIUS:** No, I'm sorry.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, what I'd like to do is
17 formalize this in two parts. One, if the Board
18 believes that the workgroup should pursue these
19 items, as identified, to the extent possible,
20 I'd like to have that on the record in the form
21 of a motion.

22 And then separately I would like to ask the
23 Board to address the issue of notifying the
24 Secretary of the status. Again, I would like
25 to point out that doing that does not preclude

1 us proceeding. It's simply, in my mind, more
2 of a courtesy. But if the Board does not wish
3 to -- to put that on the record at this time,
4 we can delay it.

5 But let me first ask for a motion dealing with
6 the duties of the workgroup. Somebody can
7 create that out of new -- new cloth or
8 something. Dr. Poston?

9 **DR. POSTON:** Mr. Chairman, I move that, based
10 on the in-- requests of the Board to find
11 additional information, that the committee --
12 the workgroup be charged to follow up on those
13 requests.

14 **MR. CLAWSON:** Second it.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** And seconded. Any further
16 discussion?

17 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Who seconded?

18 **MR. CLAWSON:** I did.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** And I think it's fair to say that
20 the pursuit by the workgroup is not necessarily
21 limited to those items. If -- if the workgroup
22 or other Board members have additional paths
23 they think should be pursued, they would be
24 free to feed that back to Dr. Poston and the
25 workgroup so that they can follow that.

1 Any further discussion?

2 (No responses)

3 Okay. All in favor, aye?

4 (Affirmative responses)

5 Opposed, no?

6 (No responses)

7 Abstentions?

8 **MS. MUNN:** (Indicating)

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Motion carries. Abstention, Ms.
10 Munn. Thank you.

11 What is your pleasure on a memo to the
12 Secretary giving the current status of this?
13 We're not obligated to do this. In the absence
14 of the motion, nothing will occur, but if --
15 Dr. Melius?

16 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, I re-- I just -- not sure I
17 see the need for doing that if we're continuing
18 to follow up. I think if we reach a point when
19 our workgroup reports back to us -- I mean
20 let's see what -- what happens at that point in
21 time, but I -- think normally we've -- we've
22 tried to report to the Secretary only when
23 we've ta-- taken an action, final action --

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes.

25 **DR. MELIUS:** -- on something and I think that's

1 -- should continue that -- that practice.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Any others, one way or the other?
3 Josie.

4 **MS. BEACH:** I just have a quick question, not -
5 - being new to the Board. Has this occurred in
6 the past and how was it handled?

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** No, it has not occurred.

8 **MS. BEACH:** Okay, is there any --

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** I mean Chapman Valve, there was an
10 earlier vote that was six-six --

11 **MS. BEACH:** Right, right.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- and then we proceeded and the
13 workgroup pursued some additional things, but
14 we have not had this situation --

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- before.

17 **MS. BEACH:** Okay. Thank you.

18 **MR. CLAWSON:** You know, and I understand what
19 Dr. Melius has said and so forth like that, but
20 you know, I know that there's been a lot of
21 information floating around about this. I --
22 out of respect, do you think that we should
23 send a letter letting him know that we've had
24 this tie vote but we're proceeding on trying to
25 evaluate the issues or problems, or -- I guess

1 I'm kind of looking at if I was up there I'd
2 like to know what was going on, but I -- I know
3 that usually we've only sent (unintelligible).

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, my only concern on this was
5 that the -- the ER from -- the evaluation
6 report from NIOSH was completed quite a while
7 ago, and nothing has come forward to the
8 Secretary. But I think counsel has told us
9 that there's not a need to -- since there's not
10 a time -- there's not a time limit on this
11 Board -- there's a time limit on NIOSH to
12 produce the ER, but we are not on a timetable,
13 so -- Dr. Melius.

14 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, I mean, with all due respect
15 to the Secretary, and there's lots of advisory
16 bo-- I mean there's lots of activity in the
17 Department, and I think -- best to report where
18 we're sort of obligated to report or -- you
19 know, by statute or where we've taken a final
20 action that -- that would make sense and not --
21 that's sort of what -- we're public, we have
22 minutes and so forth, so some-- someone in the
23 Secretary's office is interested, they can find
24 out.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** And of course -- and that's very

1 true.

2 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, yeah.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** And the other thing, I'd simply
4 note that, even if we report, there's no action
5 for the Secretary to take, so it -- it has the
6 same effect as if we don't report. So I --
7 I'm not necessarily pushing hard, but I want to
8 make sure that if the Board feels like we need
9 to -- to keep the secretary informed
10 officially, that we have that opportunity.
11 In the absence of a motion then, that will
12 complete our work today on the Chapman Valve
13 issues and we will proceed with the others.
14 Any -- any further comments on Chapman?

15 (No responses)

16 And Sharon, if you're still on the line then, I
17 think you heard the motion and the workgroup
18 will continue to pursue some lines of inquiry
19 to see if we can perhaps break the deadlock.

20 **MS. BLOCK:** I really appreciate that, as -- as
21 does the Senator. You know, it's obviously
22 important to him and -- and he appreciates all
23 the hard work of everybody on the Board and
24 associated with this process, so thank you.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you. Now I think

1 we're ready to move on to Blockson, and the
2 chair of the workgroup is Ms. Munn. Wanda, are
3 you prepared...

4 **MS. MUNN:** We had a little technical difficulty
5 this morning when we were trying to set this
6 up.

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh, your document's low risk,
8 Wanda. Your document's a risk.

9 (Pause)

10 **UNIDENTIFIED:** We can't hear on the telephone.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, we -- well, we -- nobody's
12 talking. We're -- we have a technological
13 glitch here while we're trying to get the
14 slides ready for Ms. Munn's presentation, so
15 your phone is okay. It's -- I guess it's too
16 early in the morning for the group to engage in
17 small talk while Ms. Munn is setting up so
18 we're just sitting here in stunned silence.
19 We'll be ready to go in just a moment.

20 (Pause)

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** There it is.

22 **MS. MUNN:** Thank you. This group -- workgroup
23 consists of myself, Mike Gibson, Dr. Melius,
24 Dr. Roessler, Brad Clawson is our alternate.
25 We've had two SEC petitions before us. They

1 were qualified in 2006. The technical document
2 that was issued for the site profile had a
3 total revision from the outset. I believe you
4 heard that earlier in this meeting.

5 We had two near-site meetings with workers and
6 the technical contractor, SC&A, reviewed all of
7 the documents that were produced for Blockson
8 Chemical Company -- the site profile, the SEC
9 petitions, the evaluation report. They issued
10 seven findings to us. Those seven findings had
11 to do with the upper bound of the uranium
12 inhalation rate, thorium-232 enrichment ratio,
13 the thorium-230 -- whether or not it was
14 included in the exposure matrix, possible
15 thorium raffinate streams, additional data to
16 support (unintelligible) values, verifying
17 possible exposure from tailings, and trace
18 levels of radium-226 and progeny effects.

19 We had exhaustive work meetings from 2006 to
20 now of the workgroups, of the technical teams
21 and, as I mentioned earlier, with the workers
22 themselves. Several white papers were
23 generated for our permanent record, and each
24 one of those findings that I mentioned earlier
25 was resolved to the satisfaction of both the

1 contractor and NIOSH. The additional details
2 that were raised during our details had been
3 each addressed one at a time.

4 We brought this issue to the Board
5 unsuccessfully in January of '08, this year.
6 There were two additional actions that were
7 requested from members of the Board. There
8 were questions about the validity of the data.
9 There were questions with respect to the radon
10 (electronic interference) --

11 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Ted, I'm sorry to interrupt, but
12 somebody's got (unintelligible).

13 **MR. KATZ:** Okay. People on the phone, please,
14 if you would, mute your phones. If you don't
15 have a mute button please hit star-6.

16 (Electronic interference)

17 **MR. KATZ:** Okay, Wanda.

18 **DR. MELIUS:** Now you know why we put you in
19 that seat.

20 **MS. MUNN:** The workgroup revisited each of the
21 concerns that had been raised (electronic
22 interference) both by the Board and in previous
23 meetings. Then we met again in St. Louis --

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Hold on just a minute, we're
25 getting a lot of background noise from

1 something. Is that some sort of an alarm or...

2 (Pause)

3 **MS. MUNN:** I hope somebody didn't go out the
4 wrong door. I hope it's not a real alarm.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, it's stopped. Thank you.

6 **MS. MUNN:** Back to the top of the page.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** I think we can proceed.

8 **MS. MUNN:** The responsive actions that the
9 workgroup undertook were to revisit the
10 concerns that had been raised by the Board. We
11 met again in St. Louis after the -- during the
12 full Board session for a final resolution on
13 June the 25th of this year. We were
14 unsuccessful in achieving agreement at that
15 time. The workgroup was divided in its
16 response to the three questions that I raised
17 with respect to the review, to the SEC report,
18 and to the site profile. The three questions
19 that I asked were:

20 SC&A identified seven findings of significance
21 in their review of this site. Following
22 detailed technical investigation and
23 interaction with experts and workers, they
24 reported all issues resolved. Do you accept
25 this report? We had four -- all four members

1 present voting yes.

2 The second question I asked:

3 NIOSH has sought information in depth for all
4 activities on this site and has reported they
5 have adequate data to reconstruct or bound
6 radiation dose for Blockson workers. Do you
7 accept this report? Two of the workgroup
8 members present voted yes; two voted no.

9 The third question I asked was:

10 This site profile has been completely
11 rewritten, reviewed and revised at length. Do
12 you accept the current site profile? Two
13 workgroup members voted yes; two workgroup
14 members voted no.

15 I then brought this recommendation to the full
16 Board at the next day's meeting, to accept the
17 NIOSH position. Adequate data exists to
18 reasonably bound with sufficient accuracy any
19 radiation exposure which could have resulted
20 from employment at Blockson Chemical Company
21 during its contract period as an Atomic Weapons
22 Employer.

23 During the Board -- following that
24 recommendation, additional information was
25 requested with respect to radon. The Board

1 requested that the pertinent supporting
2 documents, which had been worked internally by
3 the workgroup, be distributed so that all Board
4 members could review them. The issue was
5 tabled.

6 Since that time, the radon white paper that was
7 produced by SC&A has been distributed to the
8 full Board, further explaining both the
9 contractor's view, which is accepted by the
10 agency, as covering the radon issue. The
11 contractor reports that had been issued
12 previously also covering some of the issues
13 that had been discussed in the workgroup that
14 were not well known to the Board had been
15 distributed to the Board --

16 **MR. KATZ:** Excuse me, Wanda, let me just
17 interrupt a second.

18 People on the line, can you still hear this?

19 (No responses)

20 Is there anyone on the line listening?

21 (No responses)

22 **UNIDENTIFIED:** (Off microphone)

23 (Unintelligible) disconnected, we need to
24 (unintelligible).

25 **MR. KATZ:** Okay, we need to -- sorry, Wanda.

1 **MS. MUNN:** Oh, that's quite all right.

2 **MR. KATZ:** Be just a moment.

3 **MS. MUNN:** That's quite all right.

4 (Pause)

5 This is a morning for enjoying the blessing and
6 curse of electronics.

7 **MR. KATZ:** Okay, just checking. People on the
8 line, can you hear us now? We know you were
9 disconnected.

10 **MS. HOMOKI-TITUS:** I can hear you now, Ted.
11 Thanks.

12 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Yeah, we can hear you.

13 **MR. KATZ:** Okay, great. Wanda, you can
14 proceed.

15 **MS. MUNN:** As I was saying, the chair of the
16 workgroup provided information that had been
17 previously worked inside the workgroup itself,
18 documents that had been produced by both NIOSH
19 and SC&A, with respect to the salient issues
20 that had been raised. Multiple transcripts
21 were released simultaneously regarding the
22 workgroup meetings that had taken place,
23 literally throughout this year. My apologies
24 for that, and my apologies for having mis-
25 stated to the workgroup -- I mean to the -- to

1 the full Board at the June meeting that the
2 transcripts were available to you. I frankly
3 believed that they were and did not know until
4 last week when I went to check one of the
5 transcripts that they had not yet been
6 released. They -- they had been held up in PA
7 review and were all released simultaneously
8 last week, so my apologies again for having
9 inferred that you could have read about this
10 earlier. I didn't realize that that was the
11 case.

12 The conclusion is that the workgroup has
13 nothing further to offer. We are prepared, I
14 believe, to take this item from the table and
15 provide it for the full Board's vote at this
16 time. We do not know of any additional
17 information that we can seek or that we can
18 provide for you. Both the agency and the
19 contractor feel that doses can be adequately
20 bounded for the 123 workers who are involved
21 for the Blockson group, and we will await the
22 Board's further decision on this matter.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Wanda, the -- the radon paper that
24 was -- white paper that was prepared and I
25 think just distributed to the Board this past

1 week, did the workgroup itself evaluate that --
2 that radon paper or what -- what's its status,
3 just --

4 **MS. MUNN:** No, the radon -- the radon paper was
5 a further explanation of material that had
6 already been covered inside the workgroup. We
7 had discussed these matters and all that paper
8 was doing was clarifying information that we
9 had covered previously.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Had been previously discussed.

11 **MS. MUNN:** That's correct.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Let me ask if there's any
13 questions for Wanda on her report. Wanda, I
14 think you are making a motion to remove the
15 item from the table for action?

16 **MS. MUNN:** I am moving that we remove the item
17 from the table for the full Board action.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Is there a second?

19 **DR. POSTON:** Second.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** Did I hear a second? And a
21 second. This is not a debatable motion; we'll
22 vote immediately. The vote is whether to
23 remove the Blockson motion from the table, that
24 motion being the original motion that Wanda
25 described previously, to accept the NIOSH

1 report.

2 All in favor of -- of moving this item from the
3 table, say aye.

4 (Affirmative responses)

5 Opposed?

6 (Negative responses)

7 Okay, let's do a roll call vote.

8 **MR. KATZ:** Right, roll call. So beginning with
9 Ms. Beach?

10 **MS. BEACH:** No.

11 **MR. KATZ:** Mr. Clawson?

12 **MR. CLAWSON:** No.

13 **MR. KATZ:** Mr. Gibson?

14 **MR. GIBSON:** No.

15 **MR. KATZ:** Mr. Griffon?

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** No.

17 **MR. KATZ:** Dr. Melius?

18 **DR. MELIUS:** No.

19 **MR. KATZ:** Ms. Munn?

20 **MS. MUNN:** Yes.

21 **MR. KATZ:** Mr. Presley?

22 **MR. PRESLEY:** Yes.

23 **MR. KATZ:** Dr. Poston?

24 **DR. POSTON:** Yes.

25 **MR. KATZ:** Dr. Roessler?

1 **DR. ROESSLER:** Yes.

2 **MR. KATZ:** Mr. Schofield?

3 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** No.

4 **MR. KATZ:** Dr. Ziemer?

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes. We don't have a majority to
6 remove it from the table. I believe it's --

7 **MR. KATZ:** It is --

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** I was trying to count as we went,
9 there are --

10 **MR. KATZ:** -- five nay-- six nays.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- six nays, so it stays on the
12 table, which means we -- we cannot vote today
13 on the -- on that item. We can, however,
14 discuss the report and --

15 **MR. KATZ:** Dr. Lockey's absent but that won't
16 change the --

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Dr. Lockey doesn't have to vote on
18 this since it's not an item -- tabling and
19 untabling, only those present can vote, so the
20 -- the original motion stays on the table. I -
21 - I do need to get a sense from the Board as to
22 what steps you wish to be taken in the
23 meantime. At some point we will need to remove
24 this from the table and take action. Is there
25 further work that you believe the workgroup or

1 -- or that you, as individuals, need to have --
2 have more time to deliberate on? I must admit
3 that -- personally that, although I read
4 through the radon report, I did not have much
5 time to digest it. I just got it a few days
6 ago, but I don't know if that's what others are
7 concerned about. Let -- let me hear from you
8 so I know where we're -- what the sense of the
9 group is. John, Jim?

10 **DR. POSTON:** Mr. Chairman, I -- I'm sorry, it's
11 not a very constructive comment, but I read the
12 radon report in detail and I've discussed it
13 with colleagues, and I found it tremendously
14 inconsistent. There are lots of statements in
15 there that contradict each other. There are
16 assumptions that are not justified. I found it
17 ex-- totally useless in terms of resolving
18 these issues associated with Blockson. I was
19 hoping that we could remove it from the table
20 so that we could discuss this, but -- so I
21 offer that as a comment as opposed to a
22 discussion of the Blockson SEC.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, what we're removing -- would
24 be removing from the table would be the motion
25 to send the recommendation forward or not.

1 This does not preclude a discussion of the
2 radon report if the Board so wishes.

3 Jam-- James Melius.

4 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, ac-- actually agree with Dr.
5 Poston on -- on some of those points, and my
6 concern -- and I was not at the last meeting,
7 although I read the transcripts of the
8 workgroup meetings as well as the Board
9 meetings, and so I may not have rec-- you know,
10 gotten all the information. Particularly in
11 workgroup meetings, there's occasionally side
12 conversations and so forth, so I don't know all
13 -- necessarily all that went on. But my
14 understanding from reading those is that the
15 information that was presented came to the
16 workgroup at the last minute. They had not
17 seen it before. And then this was then --
18 there was discussion there, and then this was
19 then formulated into a report by SC&A that we
20 all received relatively recently, and I think
21 was -- sort of elaborated on some issues that
22 had come in discussion, but I don't think that
23 the workgroup nor the Board's had adequate time
24 to review that information. Lots of it is
25 confusing and -- and their inconsistent

1 statements, as Dr. Poston has pointed out --
2 and I -- I think this would be better dealt
3 with back in the workgroup and then, you know,
4 based on workgroup review, brought to -- to the
5 -- back to the Board as appropriate.
6 Another concern that is -- find confusing is
7 that -- that some of this report appears to be
8 what would normally be a task done by NIOSH,
9 and I can't tell -- yet it's an SC&A report, so
10 I can't quite tell what -- where we're going.
11 Normally we have a -- a NIOSH report and an
12 SC&A review, and this is an SC&A -- appears to
13 be a review, though some of it was done jointly
14 -- some of the activities reported were done
15 jointly with NIOSH. I'm not even sure where
16 NIOSH stands in terms of this report and how to
17 interpret it and -- not faulting anybody for
18 that, but I think it's all the more reason to
19 bring it back and have some technical
20 discussion, try to understand what -- what the
21 report was trying to do as well as -- as maybe
22 try to resolve these issues, which is what I
23 think we all would like to do.
24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Brad and then Mark, did you have a
25 --

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** I -- I -- same thing, so...

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, same comment, okay --
3 basically. Brad?

4 **MR. CLAWSON:** Mine's basically the same
5 comment, too. When I got this and I started to
6 read into it, it was very, very confusing to
7 me. I know that won't surprise a few of you,
8 but I really would have liked the opportunity
9 to be able to have sat down and have some of
10 these questions because it was very -- it was
11 somewhat hard to follow, and I just had a lot
12 of -- lot of questions that were still left
13 unanswered.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Any further comments on
15 that? The -- I -- again, I'm trying to get the
16 sense of the Board on instructing, for example,
17 the workgroup. It appears that there's some
18 concern about the content of the radon report,
19 and perhaps -- let's see, who's on the
20 workgroup again? John, are you on the
21 workgroup?

22 **DR. POSTON:** No, I'm not.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh.

24 **MS. MUNN:** Dr. Melius, Mr. Gibson --

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

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** I was just invited.

2 **MS. MUNN:** -- Gen Roessler.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Well, and also has NIOSH
4 looked at the report and --

5 **DR. NETON:** Yes, we've looked at the report and
6 -- and read it with some interest. I -- I
7 might remind the Board as to exactly my
8 opinion, at least, as to how this transpired
9 was NIOSH has produced a -- a number that we
10 believe was bounding for the radon
11 concentration at Blockson, our 95th percentile
12 number, which there was some opinion expressed
13 by working group members that that was on the
14 low side. And SC&A decided that it would be
15 appropriate, with I think the working group's
16 consent, to -- to see is there some way that we
17 could bound -- could -- see if this was truly
18 in the realm of plausibility and bound, you
19 know, that -- that value. And -- and that's
20 what they've done. Based on first principles,
21 they produced a very simple box model last
22 meeting, and then since then they've elaborated
23 on that and de-- it's blown into sort of a
24 Monte Carlo modeling approach that produced an
25 upper bounded 95th percentile of -- of the

1 values, and that's where they're at with this.
2 Our value falls, obviously, within the realm of
3 plausibility that they produced, albeit at the
4 low end. We would quibble with some of the
5 baseline assumptions that were made there and
6 believe our value is probably closer to -- to
7 reality than what the upper 95th percentile
8 would be. But nonetheless, I think we both
9 agree that there are plausible upper bounds
10 that could be established for Blockson
11 Chemical.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Ms. Munn?

13 **MS. MUNN:** As I stated before, this was not
14 intended to be a stand-alone report. It was
15 intended to be an explanatory statement with
16 respect to discussions that had already taken
17 place, at length, inside the workgroup.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you. Brad, additional
19 comment or you --

20 **MR. CLAWSON:** Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't take my
21 thing down.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Does the -- does the group
23 wish the -- for the workgroup to have further
24 evaluation of this report and -- and -- it
25 appears that it needs to go hand in hand with

1 the NIOSH bounding value and perhaps a
2 determination made as to whether the NIO-- or
3 whether the SC&A analysis is reasonable. I've
4 -- we've heard some statements from several
5 that are concerned about the content of the
6 SC&A report, so --

7 **MS. MUNN:** The workgroup chair would appreciate
8 very clear instructions with respect to what
9 the Board's desire is. Simply going back to
10 meet some more and talk about the same things
11 we've talked about since 2006 would not
12 probably be productive. So very clear
13 instructions, please, exactly what deliverable
14 would be expected from the workgroup.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, I believe the radon issue
16 was the only outstanding issue, was it not?
17 Were there other issues that -- Mark, did you
18 have a comment?

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** I don't know, I was -- I was
20 going to say I -- I mean I -- and I didn't want
21 to repeat comments that were already made, but
22 I agree with John that -- my first read through
23 and, you know, I got -- looked at this fairly
24 recently, on the plane actually, but first read
25 through was -- some questions of some internal

1 con-- inconsistencies. But I also have a lot
2 of detail questions on -- on the model that --
3 that SC&A came up -- and I agree that it was
4 sort of a model to test the distribution posed
5 by NIOSH, but I still had some questions and I
6 even raised that at the last Board meeting as -
7 - you know, when this was going to be
8 redrafted, I said shouldn't this be a NIOSH
9 product. I hope people remember that. I got
10 kind of defeated in that position, but you
11 know, I -- I do think that if some -- if, you
12 know, NIOSH is posing a model and we have
13 questions about it, it's usually up to NIOSH to
14 -- to defend the model and SC&A to comment on -
15 - on the --

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Or critique it.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah. But anyway, not -- outside
18 of that, we have this document in front of us
19 and I have a lot of questions about it. I have
20 questions about the very limited, I would say
21 unusable, Blockson data from 1983, I think it
22 is. I have questions about the modeling
23 approach and the 95th percentile they derive is
24 quite a bit higher than -- than the proposed
25 value of 2. I think the -- in this paper

1 they're saying 60. That's a factor of 30. I
2 think that's -- that's worthy of a discussion,
3 you know, to -- and -- and tha-- but then at
4 the end of the day, SC&A concludes -- I think
5 they say it's -- it's not inconsistent, which I
6 -- I sort of loved that double-negative kind of
7 conclusion, too -- not inconsistent, you know,
8 so it does fall within the range of values that
9 they -- they got in their Monte Carlo analysis.
10 But 2 compared to 60, you know, I -- I think we
11 need some discussion on those, and maybe it is
12 that that -- some of those assumptions were
13 very conservative and -- you know, so I think
14 we just need to -- to look at those more
15 closely and underst-- also understand. I -- at
16 this point I -- I don't see any -- any --
17 certainly there's no commitment from NIOSH to
18 say, you know, we -- we agree and we -- we will
19 consider modifying our approach. You know,
20 that's not on the table. So I think that's
21 what needs to be discussed in the workgroup.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Mike Gibson?

23 **MR. GIBSON:** Dr. Ziemer, I'd raised concerns
24 about things on a more practical level as far
25 as facility design, the changes to equipment

1 and stuff through routine maintenance, and that
2 was looked into. And the answer that was
3 brought back to me was well, there's no record
4 of any major equipment and building
5 modifications and it was -- seemed to be just
6 summarily dismissed from there. But there's a
7 lot of activities that could take place on a
8 day to day basis with maintenance that there
9 may not be record of that could, you know,
10 dramatically change air flow (unintelligible)
11 like that. So you know, I have -- still have
12 some concerns on a more facility level.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Again on the radon issue,
14 specifically, or are you talking --

15 **MR. GIBSON:** No, just in general.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- in general? I see. Thank you.
17 Gen Roessler?

18 **DR. ROESSLER:** I think what Mark is saying, and
19 even what Mike is saying -- I'm a member of the
20 workgroup so I want to be absolutely clear on
21 this -- I think they're saying that the only
22 issue that still remains is the radon issue. I
23 want to make sure -- I would like to have, Mark
24 especially, go on the record and say yes, that
25 what he is discussing is the radon issue, so

1 that if the workgroup gets together again we
2 know what our focus should be, that that would
3 be it, that we'll clarify it, and that we don't
4 have any other items reappear.

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** I'll -- I'll say that's -- that's
6 my issue, but I -- I'm not on the workgroup. I
7 was invited to attend a few of the meetings,
8 but that -- that's the issue I've been focused
9 on. Haven't been a member of the workgroup so
10 don't know if there's other issues out there,
11 but that's -- that's my issue right now.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Dr. Melius?

13 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, I would just, for the
14 record, declare I have one other issue that I
15 would like clarification on. It came up at the
16 last workgroup meeting, which I was not there.
17 For some reason the NIOSH staff was the one
18 that answered, rather than SC&A, which is
19 confusing. So I would like to be able to talk
20 to the NIOSH staff about that. I don't think
21 it will be a big issue, but I would like to get
22 clarification on that.

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

24 **DR. MELIUS:** An issue about the data integrity
25 and the nature and the distribution of the data

1 of the uranium urinary sampling.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. And you are a member of the
3 workgroup.

4 **DR. MELIUS:** I'm a member of the workgroup.

5 **MS. MUNN:** Yes.

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** All right.

7 **DR. MELIUS:** And I have communicat-- I mean
8 there's communication between -- I sent to
9 Wanda before the last meeting with these
10 questions. I think -- I think they were
11 addressed, it just was hard to tell from the
12 transcript and -- exactly what -- you know.

13 **MS. MUNN:** It was the impression of the chair
14 that they were addressed. They were brought up
15 and we discussed them.

16 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, they -- they were and I'm
17 not -- I'm not -- you know, I just would like a
18 clarification.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Ms. Munn, you had some additional
20 comments?

21 **MS. MUNN:** I just wanted to remind Mike Gibson
22 that we did in fact discuss, at the last
23 workgroup meeting, changes that had occurred
24 with respect to the facility itself -- the
25 installation of an exhaust fan at one point,

1 finally, after a number of years, and the
2 addition of some hoods -- but those, the hoods,
3 were not in the area of greatest concern and we
4 had a very mobile workforce. We didn't have
5 people standing in the same place all the time.
6 So when these issues with respect to air
7 transfer were being undertaken, they were being
8 undertaken with the additional information that
9 had come from the workers about, years into
10 their activities, having a fan installed in the
11 facility. Those were a part of the
12 considerations.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you. Mike, did you have
14 additional comment there?

15 **MR. GIBSON:** Yeah, I'll go on the record to say
16 that the radon is not my only issue. And
17 again, yes, we did discuss documented changes
18 to the systems. My concern, again, there is
19 everyday activities that take place with
20 maintenance. There could be motors and blowers
21 that are changed out on fans, and sometimes not
22 a record of that, that could affect the air
23 flow. And I don't think it was adequately
24 addressed other than saying we looked at the
25 records and here's what we found. So it's more

1 of this, as Brad said, the lack of evidence.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, one of the issues will be
3 whether or not the bounding values are
4 sufficient to cover those kind of changes. Jim
5 Neton.

6 **DR. NETON:** Just for -- for your information, I
7 -- my recollection in the Blockson model is
8 that, aside from radon, the other internal
9 exposures were modeled based on uranium
10 bioassay and did not rely on interpretation of
11 air sampling results.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** So actual bioassay values rather
13 than area monitoring values.

14 **DR. NETON:** Correct.

15 **MS. MUNN:** Correct.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you. Jim, additional
17 comment?

18 **DR. MELIUS:** No, I'm sorry.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** I -- what -- what the Chair's
20 looking for is a motion that will specify to
21 the workgroup what their charge would be going
22 forward. This could be made by someone on the
23 workgroup or anyone else who believes that they
24 have a feel for the issues that need to be
25 identified or discussed or evaluated.

1 (No responses)

2 The Chair can make the motion, but usually
3 relies on others to do so. Jim.

4 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, I move that we refer the --
5 the Blockson SEC issue back to the workgroup,
6 instruct them to hold a -- another meeting
7 focusing mainly on the radon issue and the SC&A
8 report on the radon issue, but also to address
9 and clarify some of the other issues that --
10 that have been raised in this meeting.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. You've heard the motion.
12 Is there a second?

13 **MR. CLAWSON:** I'll second it.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** The Chair is cognizant that the
15 second part of the motion is somewhat vague, do
16 we -- some of the other issues, perhaps from
17 the transcript, can be pulled back out. Does
18 any -- do you wish to delineate what they are
19 or --

20 **DR. MELIUS:** Not -- not -- I mean I don't think
21 it's --

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, Josie?

23 **DR. MELIUS:** -- necessary.

24 **MS. BEACH:** Well, I need to understand what
25 surrogate data was used at this site. I don't

1 really have a clear picture of that and I'm
2 wondering if the workgroup could give me an
3 idea there.

4 **MS. MUNN:** We have bioassay data.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** From the site, though, it was --

6 **MS. MUNN:** From the site.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- not surrogate data, was it?

8 **MS. MUNN:** That's correct.

9 **MS. BEACH:** Okay.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** I don't believe any surrogate data
11 is --

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** No, the answer is the radon data
13 was surrogate data, yeah.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, the radon data. Well, Jim --

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Jim may --

16 **DR. NETON:** It's coming back to me now, there -
17 - there are actually two pieces of surrogate
18 data that come to mind.

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh.

20 **DR. NETON:** There's radon data and there's
21 another set of data that we used to bound the
22 inhalation exposures at the calciner -- I think
23 it was the calciner.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Bound -- bound them for uranium?

25 **DR. NETON:** Generation of airborne particulate,

1 which would include -- you know, at the
2 calciner stage, that's where it's not been
3 purified at all so that would be the raw
4 phosphate rock, so whatever the -- the
5 concentration of uranium in equilibrium with
6 the progeny would be considered at that point,
7 and that was a very upper-bounded analysis
8 based on data from I think Idaho or some other
9 faci-- a series of phosphate plants. But at
10 the end of the day we didn't end up using that
11 information because the exposures that we were
12 assigning, based on the bioassay data, were
13 higher than the doses at the calciner, so in
14 reality we're only relying on our dose
15 reconstruction -- at the end of the day, on --

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** On the bioassay.

17 **DR. NETON:** -- on the bioassay -- plus the
18 radon data, which is surrogate data.

19 **MS. BEACH:** Thank you.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Discussion on the motion?
21 Wanda.

22 **MS. MUNN:** The workgroup chair is still fuzzy
23 as far as how --

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Warm and fuzzy or just --

25 **MS. MUNN:** -- many items are --

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- fuzzy?

2 **MS. MUNN:** I think not warm. It's -- it's
3 imperative that this workgroup, if it is going
4 to accomplish anything at all, have absolutely
5 clear data about what is desired so that we can
6 understand what needs to be brought next time.
7 I understand there needs to be focus on the
8 radon issue, you want a report, do you want a
9 paper, do you want clarification from whom
10 about what, we -- you want to address radon,
11 you want to address surrogate data, and -- and
12 Mike, you know, I'm not clear exactly what you
13 want us to address with respect to potential
14 maintenance changes. You're asking for
15 material that we don't have on any site
16 anywhere, so far as I know, and I'm not sure
17 that we can prove a negative in this case -- we
18 haven't been able to in other cases. But if we
19 have specific items that we want addressed, the
20 -- the chair needs to know that because I
21 cannot bring you anything other than what we've
22 already brought unless I have crystal clear
23 direction.

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, let me comment on the
25 latter. I -- think we heard from Jim Neton

1 that -- that that information is not used in
2 any event in the dose reconstructions -- the
3 air flow data. It's bioassay data that is
4 actually used. Is that correct?

5 **DR. NETON:** Well, the -- the air flow -- the
6 radon data relies on air flow.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** No, but --

8 **DR. NETON:** But you would see -- in the SC&A
9 report they -- they've taken a very broad-brush
10 approach and modeled the potential air
11 concentrations from extremely low air exchanges
12 per hour to very high air exchanges per hour
13 and generated a distribution of plausible air
14 sample results. So in some respect that
15 incorporates -- well, any kind of design change
16 that could have occurred at the buil-- in the
17 building, in my opinion.

18 **MS. MUNN:** In the absence --

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Now I think there are members on
20 the workgroup who have identified the, quote,
21 other issues. Jim, you have identified some
22 and Mike -- Mike, are you on the workgroup?
23 Yes.

24 **MS. MUNN:** I have radon. I have surrogate data
25 --

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** Well, the radon is -- is --

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Radon is the sur--

3 **MS. MUNN:** I know, I know, surrogate data is
4 incorporated in the radon issue. Anything
5 else?

6 **DR. MELIUS:** There's the issue of the -- the
7 coworker model for uranium.

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** And -- and I would say, you know,
9 just my opinion, is that you can address Mike's
10 con-- or consider Mike's concern in both those.
11 In other words, is the uranium model bounding
12 of situations for maintenance workers; is the
13 radon model bounding of sit-- you know, I think
14 that's how Mike's comments come into play --

15 **MS. MUNN:** We have --

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- and that's how we've always
17 done that, yeah.

18 **MS. MUNN:** We have addressed that --

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** So I think they --

20 **MS. MUNN:** -- so what you're saying is you want
21 that in some format other than the way we've
22 addressed it in the workgroup.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** I think in the case of --

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** I'm saying consider it in the
25 (unintelligible) --

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- ra-- in the case of --

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- (unintelligible), yeah.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- radon, does the -- does the
4 SC&A model basically do that? I don't know
5 that --

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** I guess it's a -- it's a -- it's
7 that clause, for all members of the class, and
8 maintenance workers would be, you know, part of
9 all members of the class, so you make -- I mean
10 we're reconsidering the uranium model and the
11 radon -- or we're looking again at those two
12 models, and I'm just saying take into account
13 Mike's comment during those discussions, you
14 know. It's nothing new for us, really, but --

15 **MS. MUNN:** We identified very clearly that what
16 -- what buildings were involved. We've
17 identified that people did not stay at one
18 station, that maintenance workers, like other
19 people, came and went --

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

21 **MS. MUNN:** -- so that there were not long-term,
22 continual exposures in one site to anything,
23 either airborne or otherwise. So I am
24 uncertain -- it's unclear to me what further
25 statements we can make, what other

1 clarifications we can make, with respect to
2 individuals who may have occupied that space,
3 and we know that many people walked through it,
4 including maintenance workers. But --

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** I -- I was just trying to give --
6 I was just trying to give you an easy way to
7 roll these into the two action items already on
8 the table. I don't think I'm asking for
9 anything new. I'm asking for when you assess
10 those two options, make sure we've --

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Are they bounding.

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- make sure we express the --
13 you know, if it's the workgroup's opinion that
14 they're bounding for all workers and, as we
15 discussed -- maybe you've already discussed it,
16 but if you would discuss it again in the next
17 workgroup meeting, we considered the -- the --
18 a maintenance type situation and even in --
19 under those situations, you know, with certain
20 assumptions that they might run into elevated
21 concentrations for short periods of time, we
22 still believe its boun-- I mean something like
23 that, some kind of assessment like that, which
24 we -- which we've done on all these situations.

25 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, we have --

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

2 **MS. MUNN:** -- of course, and this plant's --
3 the exposures were never high enough to be of
4 any -- of likely compensable levels for
5 individuals who were only momentarily in and
6 out of the buildings. They never had that
7 level of -- of concern there.

8 But what I have now is focus on the radon
9 issues, include surrogate data, the coworker
10 model from -- for uranium, and maintenance
11 worker assumptions.

12 **MR. GIBSON:** Paul?

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

14 **MR. GIBSON:** Let's just -- let me put it this
15 way. You know, some of this scientific stuff
16 does go over my head. Okay? And maybe some of
17 this engineering stuff is a little below what
18 people understand and evaluate. So when we sit
19 down at the workgroup meetings where I have a
20 concern that I don't feel's been addressed when
21 we've addressed the issues you've raised, I'll
22 bring up where I think maintenance could affect
23 those readings and then they can be addressed
24 there in the bounds of what you've said.

25 **MS. MUNN:** Fine.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Let the Chair suggest, Wanda,
2 you've asked what -- what should the nature of
3 the report be from --

4 **MS. MUNN:** Correct.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- the workgroup, it seems to me
6 that what you need to do -- and I'll give this
7 as the broad-brush indicator -- to indicate how
8 you've evaluated the SC&A report, taking into
9 consideration input from both the workgroup and
10 others on, for example, the inconsistencies and
11 so on, and input from -- from NIOSH. And at --
12 and to the extent that we can answer two
13 questions -- one is the bounding of the radon,
14 and then if you can bound it, what's the value?
15 I think, Mark, you had -- you were talking
16 about that. And if -- if it can be bounded,
17 that's one issue that could be agreed upon.
18 The other issue is, is it the right bounding
19 value? And I think there's some give and take.
20 If there's inconsistencies in -- in the SC&A
21 report, then we don't know at this point if
22 their upper value is correct even. That would
23 need to be verified. But -- and -- and perhaps
24 after NIOSH looks at that, too, and has some --
25 some input, we can -- can make some sort of

1 determination on that issue.
2 But I -- I think the nature of your report is
3 simply that you've evaluated the SC&A report,
4 you've addressed whatever inconsistencies are -
5 - have been identified, and then whatever
6 conclusion you can reach in conjunction with
7 our Board members and NIOSH and SC&A on -- on
8 that report, then how it impacts on bottom line
9 for Blockson. So I think it's just a report on
10 what you find. I don't think it's a white
11 paper from the committee. I don't think it's
12 an elaborate thing, but it's what you find
13 relative to that, and then report on the other
14 items that have been identified, that they --
15 they've -- you've looked into them and what the
16 outcome is. And the outcome will be, perhaps,
17 that everyone is agreed or that -- that you've
18 not come to closure. That's -- if you don't
19 come to closure on it, that's a possible
20 outcome. There can be valid disagreements on
21 some of these, but at least you've made a good
22 attempt to address them. So I think that just
23 a normal report on each item that you've
24 identified would be fine.

25 **MS. MUNN:** A verbal report.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, it would be--

2 **MS. MUNN:** Would you like me to produce --

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, from --

4 **MS. MUNN:** -- a written report?

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- the Chair's point of view, it
6 would be useful if there was a workgroup
7 recommendation. If the workgroup's not able to
8 reach a consensus recommendation, then you
9 simply report what you've found. If -- if
10 that's not -- that's the Chair's opinion and,
11 you know --

12 **MR. CLAWSON:** Paul, I -- I'd still -- I'd still
13 like to be able to -- and I know that, Wanda,
14 everything that you've covered in that is the
15 points and issues, but I'd still like to be
16 able to sit down and discuss this whole -- this
17 -- this paper because everything that --

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, that's --

19 **MR. CLAWSON:** -- your action items, yeah.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- that's the starting point.

21 **MR. CLAWSON:** Right.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** That's the starting point for the
23 workgroup.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** And -- and Board members, you have

1 a copy of it, so if you're not on the workgroup
2 and have issues or concerns, you need to feed
3 that back to the workgroup.

4 **MS. MUNN:** The workgroup has had that paper
5 before us for --

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, you had a -- you had the
7 information informally, but the -- the Board
8 did not have it till --

9 **MS. MUNN:** Understand, I'm just saying --

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- just recently. Right? In a
11 formal manner. So the -- the nature of the
12 original motion, which now has been clarified
13 so the sense of the motion has been spelled
14 out, I think. Do you believe it has been,
15 Wanda?

16 **MS. MUNN:** I have the items that were
17 identified as the focus on radon issues; what
18 is the bounding value; is that the right value;
19 the surrogate data; the coworker model for
20 uranium; maintenance worker assumptions that
21 Mike will -- will verify as we approach
22 specific points; and a report on the end result
23 of all those.

24 Additionally, I understand Dr. Melius will be
25 working privately with NIOSH to clarify some

1 other issue?

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, I would -- I would suggest
3 that this not be done privately, that it be
4 done in the for-- in the -- in the framework of
5 the workgroup. Let's -- let's keep it all in
6 the --

7 **DR. MELIUS:** No, I -- and that's what I was
8 intending was -- the NI-- NIOSH technical staff
9 I presume will be at this meeting and we can
10 talk about the issue then.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, let -- let's make sure it's
12 done in the open forum.

13 **MS. MUNN:** They will be aware of your issue.

14 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, they are, I...

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Are -- we you have
16 addition-- okay. Are you ready to vote on the
17 motion?

18 **DR. ROESSLER:** What is the motion?

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** Restate the motion.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** The motion was a charge to the
21 workgroup which, as it was expressed, was to
22 examine the radon question and other issues
23 that had been raised.

24 **DR. MELIUS:** In -- in this meeting.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** In this meeting.

1 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** And -- and then the discussion we
3 had, from my point of view, was to provide the
4 sense of the motion. We have not modified the
5 motion. I said I thought the motion was
6 perhaps a little vague in the second part, so
7 we now have provided a sense of the motion to
8 make it less fuzzy and perhaps warmer. Are you
9 ready to vote?

10 Okay, all in favor of the motion, say aye?

11 (Affirmative responses)

12 All opposed, no?

13 (No responses)

14 Abstentions?

15 (No responses)

16 Okay, motion carries.

17 Before we take the break -- I think we take the
18 break at 10:00 o'clock, we'll just wait ten
19 minutes here -- we can do CANEL very rapidly.
20 We had a motion to defer the vote on the CANEL
21 recommendation for an SEC class. I'm prep--

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** Until today.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- until today. I'm -- I would
24 ask for a motion -- and in fact the effect of
25 that was to table it temporarily. I'm looking

1 for a motion to now consider the CANEL motion -
2 - motion to consider the CANEL motion.

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** To take it off the table or...

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Which is to take it off the table.

5 **DR. MELIUS:** Okay. I move that we take the
6 CANEL motion off the table.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Seconded?

8 **MR. CLAWSON:** Second.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** All in favor, aye?

10 (Affirmative responses)

11 Opposed, no?

12 (No responses)

13 Abstentions?

14 (No responses)

15 Motion carries. The original motion was Ms.
16 Munn's motion to recommend an SEC class as set
17 forth by the NIOSH recommendation. We've asked
18 Dr. Melius to put it into our standard language
19 and, Dr. Melius, if you would read into the
20 record the -- the long version of Ms. Munn's
21 motion.

22 **DR. MELIUS:** This'll be a long friendly
23 amendment -- long-winded.

24 The Board recommends that the following letter
25 be transmitted to the Secretary of Health and

1 Human Services within 21 days. Should the
2 Chair become aware of any issue that, in his
3 judgment, would preclude the transmittal of
4 this letter within that time period, the Board
5 requests that he promptly informs the Board of
6 the delay and the reasons for this delay, and
7 that he immediately works with NIOSH to
8 schedule an emergency meeting of the Board to
9 discuss this issue.

10 The Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker
11 Health has evaluated SEC Petition 00124
12 concerning workers at the Connecticut Aircraft
13 Nuclear Engine Laboratory, parentheses, CANEL,
14 close parentheses, in Middletown, Connecticut
15 under the statutory requirements established by
16 EEOICPA and incorporated into 42 CFR 83.14.
17 The board respectfully recommends Special
18 Exposure Cohort SEC status be accorded to all
19 AWE employees who worked at the CANEL facility
20 in Middletown, Connecticut from January 1st,
21 1958 through December 31st, 1965 for a number
22 of work days aggregating at least 250 work days
23 occurring either solely under this employment
24 or n combination with work days within the
25 parameters established for one or more other

1 classes of employees in -- in the SEC. The
2 Board notes that although NIOSH found that they
3 were unable to completely reconstruct most
4 radiation doses for these employees, they
5 believe that they are able to reconstruct the
6 occupational medical dose during the time
7 period in question.

8 This recommendation is based on the following
9 factors:

10 The CANEL facility was involved in the
11 development of a nuclear reactor for propelling
12 aircraft and on a number of other research and
13 development projects for the AEC.

14 NIOSH found very little pers-- internal
15 personnel monitoring data and no external
16 personnel monitoring data for CANEL workers for
17 the time period in question.

18 NIOSH was unable to locate sufficient
19 information on radiological operations or other
20 workplace monitoring data in order to be able
21 to complete accurate individual dose
22 reconstructions for internal or external
23 exposures at the CANEL facility during the time
24 period in question. The Board concurs with
25 this conclusion.

1 NIOSH determined that health may have been
2 endangered for the workers exposed to radiation
3 at the CANEL facility during the time period in
4 question. The Board concurs with this
5 determination.

6 Enclosed is supporting documentation from the
7 recent Advisory Board meeting held in Redondo
8 Beach, California where this special exposure
9 cohort class was discussed. If any of these
10 items are unavailable at this time, they will
11 follow shortly.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you. Any question on
13 the motion now? Jim?

14 **DR. NETON:** Just -- just a point of
15 clarification. CANEL is a DOE facility, not an
16 AWE facility.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** We -- yes, thank you for reminding
18 us of that. We need to --

19 **DR. MELIUS:** DOE.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- chan-- let's see, I'm looking
21 for the change. It's in the second paragraph.

22 **DR. ROESSLER:** He's got it.

23 **DR. MELIUS:** Second par-- I've got it in my --
24 second paragraph, and then in the first bullet.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, second paragraph, line --

1 one, two, three, four -- five. Correct? It
2 would be status be accorded to all --

3 **DR. MELIUS:** Oh, okay.

4 **MS. MUNN:** Department of Energy employees.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- DOE employees. And then which
6 bullet did you say?

7 **DR. ROESSLER:** First one.

8 **DR. MELIUS:** First one, but actually -- Bob,
9 why don't you clarify it 'cause this is --

10 **MR. PRESLEY:** First bullet's correct, 'cause at
11 the time the AEC was the contractor for this
12 outfit.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Now is the --

14 **DR. NETON:** Normally the phraseology would say
15 DOE and DOE contractors or subcontractors.

16 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, now that -- was -- that was
17 -- I was going to make -- yeah.

18 **DR. NETON:** I'm sorry, yeah, just -- just to
19 make sure that --

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** The first one or both of them?

21 **DR. NETON:** Both. It's very important that
22 they be on -- in there because most people were
23 actually DOE contractors or subcontractors.

24 **DR. MELIUS:** I think -- the wording would be
25 DOE, its predecessor agency and DOE contractors

1 or subcontractors. I apologize.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** That's a friendly amendment. Any
3 other items? I think in your second bullet,
4 and you -- you read it correctly, the time
5 periods; it should be time period.

6 **DR. MELIUS:** Right.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, any other comments or -- on
8 the wording?

9 (No responses)

10 Ready to vote by -- we'll vote actually by roll
11 call vote and we will have to obtain Dr.
12 Lockey's vote on this separately. Okay, roll
13 call vote.

14 **MR. KATZ:** Right, I'll collect Dr. Lockey's
15 vote after this meeting.

16 So Ms. Beach?

17 **MS. BEACH:** Yes.

18 **MR. KATZ:** Mr. Clawson?

19 **MR. CLAWSON:** Yes.

20 **MR. KATZ:** Mr. Gibson?

21 **MR. GIBSON:** Yes.

22 **MR. KATZ:** Mr. Griffon?

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yes.

24 **MR. KATZ:** Dr. Melius?

25 **DR. MELIUS:** Yes.

1 **MR. KATZ:** Ms. Munn?

2 **MS. MUNN:** Aye, yes.

3 **MR. KATZ:** Mr. Presley?

4 **MR. PRESLEY:** Yes.

5 **MR. KATZ:** Dr. Poston?

6 **DR. POSTON:** Yes.

7 **MR. KATZ:** Dr. Roessler?

8 **DR. ROESSLER:** Yes.

9 **MR. KATZ:** Mr. Schofield?

10 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** Yes.

11 **MR. KATZ:** Dr. Ziemer?

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes. So this motion carries in
13 any event. We will still obtain Dr. Lockey's
14 vote, but we will proceed to prepare the
15 documentation to send forward to the Secretary
16 on this facility.

17 Now we're ready to take a recess. I'm going to
18 ask -- we're scheduled for 30 minutes, but
19 we're trying to speed things up a little bit,
20 so let's keep it to 20 minutes and we'll --

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** Before we -- before we adjourn,
22 can you tell us --

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** We're not going to adjourn, we're
24 going --

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- I mean before we --

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- to recess.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- take our break, can you tell
3 us what's coming up on the -- so we can
4 prepare?

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes, we've already done the work
6 committee rep-- workgroup reports, which was
7 the next item, so what we have -- we have Board
8 working issues. We have the tasking of SCA.
9 We've already done the status of the selection
10 of the Board contractor. We need to --
11 establishing a Pantex workgroup --

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** We have to select cases from the
13 10th set.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- and cases for the 10th set, and
15 so --

16 **DR. MELIUS:** The subcommittee.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** Procedures subcommittee.

18 **DR. MELIUS:** Procedures subcommittee.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Procedures subcommittee discussion
20 on --

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** Scope, yeah.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- moving to the -- well, moving
23 from workgroup to subcommittee --

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- status and the document for it.

1 **DR. MELIUS:** Right, and I had asked that two
2 documents be made available to us for this,
3 that somebody was going to --

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes, and I have those.

5 **DR. MELIUS:** Okay, great. Okay, I just wanted
6 to make sure they...

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, so --

8 **DR. MELIUS:** (Off microphone) (Unintelligible)
9 luck getting our (unintelligible).

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- so we will take a 20-minute
11 recess.

12 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from 10:00 a.m.
13 to 10:20 a.m.)

14 **BOARD WORKING TIME:**

15 **SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROCEDURES REVIEW**

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** We're ready to reconvene. We're
17 going into the Board working time now, have a
18 number of items to address. Let's begin with
19 the establishment of a subcommittee on
20 procedures review.

21 What is needed first, if the Board wishes to
22 transfer this from a workgroup to a
23 subcommittee, we need a motion to that effect.
24 And then if the motion passed, we would address
25 the documents that would spell out the

1 responsibilities of such a subcommittee. So
2 I'd like to ask for a motion, if the Board so
3 wishes, to establish a subcommittee on
4 procedures to replace the current working group
5 on procedures.

6 **MR. CLAWSON:** (Off microphone) (Unintelligible)

7 --

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Use your mike.

9 **MR. CLAWSON:** -- make a motion that we -- that
10 we move the working group for procedures to
11 make it a subcommittee.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you. A second?

13 **DR. POSTON:** Second.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** And seconded. Is there discussion
15 on the motion? Dr. Melius? No.

16 **DR. MELIUS:** I'm sorry, that's leftover from
17 Blockson.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** It's out of habit. Ms. Munn, do
19 you wish to speak to this?

20 **MS. MUNN:** I'd like to have one piece of
21 verifying information before we go any further.
22 I'd like to have a very clear outline of the
23 distinction between workgroups and
24 subcommittees with respect to our need for a
25 public notice, the amount of time that's

1 necessary, the need for report to Congress,
2 that kind of -- of information I think is --

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, let me address than, then
4 I'll ask Emily to assist.

5 Number one, a subcommittee -- we're required by
6 law to -- to notice those meetings in the
7 *Federal Register* and they are public meetings.
8 Workgroups, there is no such requirement.
9 However, our practice has been to do the same
10 for workgroups. We do provide *Federal Register*
11 notice. Our work-- or no, we web site notice,
12 I'm sorry, and we do make those available to
13 the public and we do transcripts on those as
14 well. I think *Federal Register* notice is
15 required, is it not, for subcommittee, Emily?
16 Help us on this.

17 **MS. HOWELL:** Yes, that's been our practice.
18 It's a 30-day requirement. However, if you had
19 less than 30 days due to certain reasons -- I
20 know Mark has had this come up a couple of
21 times -- there are procedures you can follow to
22 have an expedited notice for a meeting.
23 Certainly the agency seeks to avoid that. We
24 want to give stakeholders as much time as
25 possible so it is a 30-day notice period. We

1 usually only put working group notices on the
2 web site and we try to also give those two
3 weeks to a month notice as well.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Also I don't believe there's any
5 requirement for -- for reports to Congress, is
6 there, by such a group. You would only report
7 to this Board.

8 **MS. HOWELL:** No, the way that the action letter
9 which Dr. Ziemer passed out yesterday is
10 written, this subcommittee would report to the
11 Board, and any resulting action letters to the
12 Secretary, et cetera, would come from the full
13 Board as opposed to the subcommittee.

14 **MS. MUNN:** Is there a problem with respect to
15 cancellation of notices once they have been
16 posted in the *Federal Register*?

17 **MS. HOWELL:** You mean if a meeting were to be
18 scheduled and then canceled?

19 **MS. MUNN:** Correct.

20 **MS. HOWELL:** I mean we would want to notice
21 that in the *Federal Register* and on the web
22 page, but obviously if you cancel a meeting
23 within the 30-day window, that's okay, too. I
24 mean in this day and age, hopefully most of the
25 stakeholders of the program know to look on the

1 OCAS web site as their first form of
2 information.

3 **MS. MUNN:** Good. Thank you.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Any other questions or discussion
5 before we vote on this motion?

6 (No responses)

7 If not, I'll call for a voice vote. All in
8 favor, aye?

9 (Affirmative responses)

10 Opposed, no?

11 (No responses)

12 Abstentions?

13 (No responses)

14 Motion carries, so we are agreed that we will
15 establish a subcommittee.

16 Now there's two documents that have been
17 distributed for your information. They are to
18 help serve as templates. One is the -- and
19 these -- these concern the existing
20 subcommittee, the dose reconstruction
21 subcommittee. You have a document that says at
22 the top "Information Regarding the Subcommittee
23 for Dose Reconstruction Reviews." This, I
24 believe, is the material that appears on the
25 web site, verbatim.

1 The other document is the package or the
2 document that went forward to the Secretary of
3 Health and Human Services requesting -- because
4 that has to be approved at the Secretarial
5 level, I believe -- requesting the formal
6 establishment of this subcommittee. And that
7 particular document has a discussion on why
8 such a subcommittee is -- is needed, what it
9 will be called, who the members will be and
10 what its functions will be. And what we would
11 need would be a document that's -- as a
12 starting point, a document that is parallel to
13 this one for transmittal to the Secretary.
14 Once the Secretary approved it, then it would
15 exist. It does not exist based on our action
16 just now. Our action is to recommend really to
17 the Secretary that such a subcommittee -- or I
18 guess it's to the Management and Analysis
19 Office, but in any event, the hierarchy of
20 Health and Human Services. And once that's
21 officially established, then an appropriate
22 document for the web site would be prepared.
23 In the Chair's mind, we don't need to do the
24 letter document today. I think we need to
25 focus on the package to HHS management and get

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, let's go back to Discussion,
2 which is --

3 **MS. MUNN:** On the first page, the third
4 paragraph.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Let me actually formalize this
6 first. Let's put the document on the floor as
7 a motion and amend it. So --

8 **MS. MUNN:** That's fine.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- if someone would move the
10 adoption of -- of the document -- well, the
11 document currently doesn't have a title, but
12 it's the -- it's the proposed request to
13 establish a subcommittee for the Advisory
14 Board.

15 **MS. MUNN:** I -- yes --

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Just a motion to adopt --

17 **MS. MUNN:** I move that --

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- that.

19 **MS. MUNN:** -- the draft of a request to
20 establish a subcommittee of the Advisory Board
21 on Radiation and Worker Health be considered
22 for forwarding to the Secretary.

23 **DR. POSTON:** Second.

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Or -- or to Management of HHS, I
25 (unintelligible).

1 **MS. MUNN:** Or to management of HHS.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Second?

3 **DR. POSTON:** Second.

4 **MS. BEACH:** I'll second it.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Seconded. Okay, now it's on the
6 floor and let's talk about amending it then.

7 And --

8 **MS. MUNN:** In the third --

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- my intent here is to proceed
10 with this as -- pretty much as friendly
11 amendments, which means we won't vote on -- on
12 every item, unless it's -- something really
13 controversial appears.

14 **MS. MUNN:** In the third paragraph, first
15 sentence, in order to -- in order to get the
16 full sense of it, I'm suggesting that the last
17 few words be amended to read "addressing
18 individual findings that result from such
19 reviews," which would make the entire sentence
20 read "The Subcommittee will be responsible for
21 coordinating all of the detailed work
22 associated with the Board's task of reviewing
23 all the NIOSH procedures developed to enable
24 individual dose reconstructions as directed by
25 the statute, and addressing individual findings

1 that result from such reviews."

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, what? We're going to repeat
3 that again.

4 **MS. MUNN:** Following "statute and," replace the
5 remaining portion of that sentence with the
6 words "addressing individual findings that
7 result from such reviews."

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** And this also includes deleting
9 the rest of this -- the sentence that talks
10 about SECs.

11 **MS. MUNN:** Correct.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Did everybody get that suggested
13 and -- that looks pretty friendly to the Chair.
14 I would like to suggest also, since this refers
15 to NIOSH procedures, and I believe that you are
16 also reviewing what we would call -- no, let me
17 think, are they all NIOSH? Aren't there --

18 **MS. MUNN:** Yes.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- some ORAU --

20 **MS. MUNN:** Yes, there are ORAU, so it would --
21 perhaps NIOSH and NIOSH contractor procedures -
22 - NIOSH and NIOSH --

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** We're not -- you're not reviewing
24 all contractor procedures, are you, because
25 some contractor procedures are internal

1 procedures for how they do certain management
2 things. How did it -- how -- well, wait a
3 minute. If it's -- if the contractor develops
4 it, does -- it still goes to NIOSH for final
5 approval --

6 **MS. MUNN:** Yes.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- if it's used in the program,
8 does it not?

9 **MS. MUNN:** It does.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** So are we okay in -- Emily, can --
11 does NIOSH procedures encompass anything the
12 contractor develops that is finally approved by
13 NIOSH and used in the program?

14 **MS. HOWELL:** Yes, I would say it's implicit in
15 saying NIOSH procedures.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay then, thank you. Did
17 everybody get the proposed friendly amendment?
18 Okay, Josie.

19 **MS. BEACH:** I have a question. In that same
20 paragraph it says the Board is currently
21 reviewing 60 such individual dose
22 reconstructions per year. I'm wondering if
23 that sentence is necessary.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** That was -- that -- what
25 paragraph are you looking at?

1 **MS. BEACH:** The third -- third paragraph.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** I think you're looking at the dose
3 reconstruction document --

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- rather than the --

6 **MS. BEACH:** Oh, I got the wrong one.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- straw man --

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** The one we had yesterday.

9 **MS. BEACH:** Thank you. I have the right one.

10 **MS. MUNN:** Continuing on page 2 under Function,
11 the first paragraph, "This subcommittee will be
12 responsible for reviewing the outcomes of the
13 document production" -- I deleted "and site
14 research" so that it reads "This subcommittee
15 will be responsible for reviewing the outcomes
16 of the document production and related
17 assignments developed by the Board's contractor
18 resulting" -- eliminate "which come" "from
19 their review of all procedures used in the dose
20 reconstruction" -- remove "and the SECs"
21 "processes by NIOSH Office of Compensation
22 Analysis and Support's contractor."
23 Then the second sentence, "The subcommittee may
24 --

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, could you read that again?

1 **MS. MUNN:** Yes. I'll -- I'll read it as it
2 would read --

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

4 **MS. MUNN:** -- with the deletions. "This
5 subcommittee will be responsible for reviewing
6 the outcomes of the document production and
7 related assignments developed by the Board's
8 contractor resulting from their review of all
9 procedures used in the dose reconstruction
10 process by NIOSH's Office of Compensation
11 Analysis and Support's contractor."

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Did everybody get that
13 friendly change?

14 **MS. MUNN:** Then in the next sentence, the very
15 last line, remove "the SEC process," so that
16 the sentence reads "The Subcommittee may
17 develop reports for the Board to advise the
18 Secretary on the scientific validity and
19 appropriateness of the procedures used by
20 NIOSH/OCAS and its contractor for dose
21 reconstruction and related activities."

22 Item one, remove --

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Let me interrupt here, though.
24 Are -- are there not some procedures that you
25 review that in fact would focus on the handling

1 of SECs and not on dose reconstruction?

2 **MS. MUNN:** I don't believe so --

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Are they all --

4 **MS. MUNN:** -- because all of the SECs rely upon
5 dose reconstruction for their completion.

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, so dose reconstruction and
7 related activities --

8 **MS. MUNN:** Correct.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- covers all procedures.

10 **MS. MUNN:** It covers all the procedures that I
11 can recall at this time that we have been
12 dealing with, and the 50 that are proposed that
13 I have scanned still fall under this --

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah --

15 **MS. MUNN:** -- definition (unintelligible) --

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- and I guess in a sense "related
17 activities" is anything related to the program
18 which is the dose reconstruction --

19 **MS. MUNN:** Could be encompassing.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- so broadly we're
21 (unintelligible) --

22 **MS. MUNN:** Could be encompassing.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Gen, did you have some insight on
24 that one?

25 **DR. ROESSLER:** Oh, this is probably just a

1 professor thing, but that sentence doesn't seem
2 to make much sense to me. I think maybe it
3 means the subcommittee may develop reports for
4 the Board which advise the Secretary.

5 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah.

6 **DR. ROESSLER:** That comma there, it's kind of
7 confusing. I'm not sure if the reports are
8 intended to advise the Secretary -- is that
9 what the meaning is?

10 **MS. MUNN:** Yes, it is.

11 **DR. ROESSLER:** Then maybe it should -- take out
12 the comma and -- and the "to" and just put in
13 the word "which".

14 **MS. MUNN:** Okay.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Can't use a "which" there, "which"
16 means the Board -- it's the reports --

17 **DR. ROESSLER:** In order to advise the
18 Secretary?

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** You can say that. I'm a "which" -
20 -

21 **DR. ROESSLER:** Would that -- is that what it
22 means?

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- I'm a "which" hunter.

24 **MS. MUNN:** Yes.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** "Which" is usually used

1 incorrectly, so you're better avoiding it.

2 **DR. ROESSLER:** But that's the meaning then,
3 yeah. So that's --

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Develop reports for the Board that
5 advise the Secretary -- reports that advise?
6 Or reports to advise?

7 **DR. ROESSLER:** Well --

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** I think "to" is still okay, just
9 remove the comma, basically.

10 **MS. MUNN:** I think so. If you simply remove
11 the comma, I think you get the sense of what I
12 interpreted it to be.

13 **DR. ROESSLER:** Yeah, I think --

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Reports to advise the Secretary,
15 okay.

16 **DR. ROESSLER:** Okay.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you. Any questions on that
18 or other changes?

19 (No responses)

20 Okay, please proceed.

21 **MS. MUNN:** Thank you, Dr. Roessler. That isn't
22 just a professor thing.

23 Item number one, remove the word "audit" after
24 "action" -- our contractor for these purposes
25 is not an auditor. They are to serve at the

1 direction of the Board. They audit the dose
2 reconstructions. They do not audit here. They
3 provide findings for us. They review and
4 provide findings at the instruction --

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** You're --

6 **MS. MUNN:** -- of the Board.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- referring to the Board's
8 contractor --

9 **MS. MUNN:** Yes, correct.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- here, as opposed to the NIOSH
11 contractor --

12 **MS. MUNN:** Correct.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- so perhaps we should say the
14 Board's contractor.

15 **MS. MUNN:** Uh-huh.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** I'm a little concerned about the
17 "related to related to" --

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

19 **MS. MUNN:** I am, too.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- and maybe a "concerning" would
21 help -- "procedures related to -- to procedures
22 review concerning dose reconstruction" or
23 "procedures concerning procedures review
24 related to?"

25 **MS. MUNN:** I think the last "related" should be

1 "concerning" -- "related to" instead of -- the
2 last one should be "concerning dose
3 reconstructions as appropriate."

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** So it would say review and
5 recommend -- not recommended, review and
6 recommend for Board action -- recommend the
7 Board's contractor procedures -- recommend
8 what?

9 **MS. MUNN:** To review and recommend for Board
10 action the Board's contractor procedures
11 related to procedure review, including
12 revisions --

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Wouldn't we recommend approval?
14 Recommend for Board action the con-- action,
15 comma, contractor's procedures?

16 **MS. HOWELL:** I'm sorry, I have a question. The
17 procedures are NIOSH contractor procedures, not
18 --

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** No, but this was for -- this --
20 this was lifted from the DR paper, too. It --
21 I think the original intent was that we wanted
22 to look at SC&A's procedures and make sure that
23 they were consistent with what the Board was
24 looking for, as far as that dose reconstruction
25 review for -- for basic, advanced, et cetera.

1 So -- so that was --

2 **MS. HOWELL:** It shou-- shouldn't apply here.

3 **MS. MUNN:** Shouldn't.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Well, they have a procedure for
5 reviewing procedures, I believe. John -- John
6 -- they have procedures that they follow. I
7 think we've looked at them already, but -- so
8 it may be kind of a -- a done issue, but it's a
9 -- they do have a proce--

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** How -- how does SC&A look at --

11 **MS. MUNN:** (Unintelligible) make a change.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- how do they do the procedures
13 review.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** Exactly.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** We actually approved that at the
16 front end.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** I think -- I think we did, at the
18 front end, yes.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** I think we did that as a full
20 Board action --

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** I believe so, yeah.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- not as a (unintelligible) --

23 **MS. HOWELL:** Okay, so --

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

25 **MS. HOWELL:** -- it doesn't need to be here

1 then.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** I don't think the subcommittee has
3 to do that. It was done by the Board -- full
4 Board as --

5 **MS. MUNN:** It was done by the Board originally
6 --

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, so maybe it was --

8 **MS. MUNN:** -- if we assume that there will
9 never be changes in that, then I suppose --

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, if there were --

11 **MS. MUNN:** -- we could ignore the item, but
12 that's --

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- it's a full Board
14 responsibility at that point, is it not?

15 **MS. MUNN:** I would think so.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah. So maybe this one can be
17 dropped.

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

19 **MS. MUNN:** I can see no reason actually why we
20 -- it's absolutely necessary. It's a --
21 unlikely contingency.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

23 **MS. MUNN:** We shall drop it. And under item
24 two, which will now become one, clarify Board
25 intent regarding the technical scope of

1 procedures, period.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** I don't understand.

3 **MS. MUNN:** Huh?

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** What is that? I -- I'm looking -
5 - I'm cross-walking with the other document,
6 too.

7 **MS. MUNN:** Does not --

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** We had clarify Board intent
9 regarding the technical scope of dose
10 reconstruction tasks assigned to the audit
11 contractor. And that was, again, going back to
12 basic versus advanced.

13 **MS. MUNN:** Yes.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** This got lifted into this. Now I
15 don't -- I don't --

16 **MS. MUNN:** That's correct.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** Clarify Board intent regarding
18 technical scope of procedures. I don't know
19 what -- what that means. I don't...

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, see, in the dose
21 reconstruction --

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

23 **MS. MUNN:** We've --

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- case, the Board kind of left it
25 up to the subcommittee to define, for example,

1 what a blind review was.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

3 **MS. MUNN:** Uh-huh.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Or clarify to the -- to the --

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** To the full Board, or to --

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- or -- or to the contractor.

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

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** When you do a blind review, here's
10 what we want done. I'm not sure we have
11 anything analogous --

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** No.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- to that.

14 **MS. MUNN:** Well, not directly analogous, but I
15 read that to interpret the responsibility of
16 the subcommittee to see that any concern that
17 the Board had with respect to the scope or
18 direction of the procedures was followed.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, so if the Board tasked the
20 -- the contractor with reviewing -- I don't
21 know, some particular thing, let's say -- well,
22 let's take the 6000, 6001, and the Board said
23 we want you to focus on Appendix BB and -- or
24 something like that, then it would be up to the
25 subcommittee to make sure that that direction

1 was carried out. Is that the kind of thing
2 you're talking about?

3 **MS. MUNN:** That's the kind of thing. One of --
4 one -- what I had in mind at the time I read
5 this direction was situations where the Board
6 might say do we have a procedure covering this
7 particular type of situation. And if the
8 answer was no, then it would be the
9 responsibility of the subcommittee to see (a)
10 that that procedure was in fact developed and
11 (b), that it was -- that it was properly
12 reviewed --

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

14 **MS. MUNN:** -- by the --

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** But the development part would not
16 be -- involve our contractor.

17 **MS. MUNN:** No, the development would involve
18 NIOSH.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** NIOSH and its contractor.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** I gue-- I guess I'm -- yeah, I'm
21 hung up on the "clarify Board intent," I mean
22 we -- you know, in -- I know it clearly was
23 edited from this old document. I don't know
24 who edited it. It might help if they could
25 clarify the intent.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** No, I think they were trying to
2 find parallel wording, but --

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, yeah, yeah. But I mean
4 when we first wrote that, it was clearly to --
5 to clarify Board intent regarding the technical
6 scope of -- of our tasks in the contract --

7 **MS. MUNN:** The tasks, yes.

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- yeah, and now I don't know
9 what we're -- what the Board's intent is -- I
10 don't understand what it's -- in this sentence
11 I don't understand what our Board intent would
12 be. I'm just trying to un...

13 **MS. MUNN:** We've had several situations where,
14 after procedures have been undertaken, it
15 appeared that they needed fleshing out for some
16 reason. They did not cover adequately
17 situations that we had. I don't recall whether
18 the Board, as a Board, had given any
19 instructions in that regard, but certainly
20 inside the procedures workgroup we've seen
21 numerous cases where new procedures have
22 developed as a result of -- of other
23 functioning procedures not quite meeting the
24 mark in terms of some specific site's
25 requirements.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, and that --

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** I think that falls under your
3 scope items, though. That's just the review of
4 the procedures and whether they met their --
5 you know, but anyway.

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, and the contrary side of
7 that is that there are proce-- we -- we review
8 all procedures. There are some procedures no
9 longer used, or have been replaced by others,
10 and I guess this would give the subcommittee
11 discretion to say don't bother reviewing that
12 since it's not used anymore. In other words,
13 would they have to come back to the full Board
14 or do they have that discretion to clarify
15 intent based on their own judgment of what --
16 what their charge is. I -- I'm trying to see
17 if there is a parallel to --

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I -- I see it is a bit
19 confusing, but I don't object to what Wanda --
20 you know, if that's the intent, that's fine.
21 I'm not going to harp on it anymore.

22 **MS. MUNN:** It appears to me to be --

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** But it's the technical --

24 **MS. MUNN:** -- a very broad brush.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- scope of the procedures review,

1 not of the procedures.

2 **MS. MUNN:** Correct.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** So what you would still need in
4 here would be the word "procedures" -- you
5 would need the addition of "review" -- right?

6 **MS. MUNN:** Review.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** May-- maybe we can leave that in
8 for now. It's -- it's somewhat vague as to
9 what it means, but "Clarify Board intent
10 regarding the technical scope of procedures
11 review."

12 **MS. MUNN:** "Of procedure reviews."

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Maybe as necessary or something.
14 I don't think it's normally necessary, but --
15 what do you think about adding the words "as
16 necessary"? Maybe that's redundant.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, that's -- that's fine.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Huh?

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** That's fine the way -- as --
20 Wanda's interpretation, that's -- that's fine.

21 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah. Under item -- currently
22 number --

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** And then you would delete the rest
24 of the sentence.

25 **MS. MUNN:** I would delete the rest of the

1 sentence.

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

3 **MS. MUNN:** "And SEC tasks assigned to the audit
4 contractor" come out.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Proceed.

6 **MS. MUNN:** Item three was left intact.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Which is now item two?

8 **MS. MUNN:** Yes. Item four, now item three,
9 "Prepare documents" -- insert "or provide
10 periodic verbal reports" -- "concerning the
11 preparation of procedures" -- mark out "for
12 submission" -- "to the Board."

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** So it would say "Prepare documents
14 or provide oral" --

15 **MS. MUNN:** Periodic --

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- "periodic oral" --

17 **MS. MUNN:** -- verbal reports. Oral is fine,
18 whichever.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- "oral reports" --

20 **MS. MUNN:** Concerning the preparation of
21 procedures to the Board.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** How about putting the "to the
23 Board" after "reports"? It's not procedures to
24 the Board, it's --

25 **MS. MUNN:** Fine. Uh-huh.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- reports to the Board. Right?

2 **MS. MUNN:** Uh-huh, fine.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** So it would say "Prepare documents
4 or provide periodic oral reports to the Board"
5 --

6 **MS. MUNN:** Concerning --

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- "concerning the preparation of
8 procedures."

9 **MS. MUNN:** Correct. Perhaps "concerning the
10 status of procedures" would be a better word --

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** That --

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

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- that would probably be better
14 because it would cover preparation, it would
15 cover modification, it would --

16 **MS. MUNN:** Yes.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- cover a --

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** Can you read that whole thing
19 again, Wanda?

20 **MS. MUNN:** "Prepare documents or provide
21 periodic verbal reports to the Board concerning
22 the status of procedures."

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** That's better, rather than
25 preparation of, yeah.

1 **MS. HOWELL:** Can I go back a second to the new
2 number two and ask for clarification of what is
3 meant by "taking into consideration conflict of
4 interest matters?" Was that lifted from the
5 dose reconstruction language?

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** I believe it was --

7 **MS. HOWELL:** Then I would suggest it be struck
8 here --

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

10 **MS. HOWELL:** -- 'cause there wouldn't be any.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** I'm not sure, I -- I was thinking
12 the same thing at -- at first, but then I think
13 there are some site-specific procedures, so I
14 don't know if -- if we should just leave it in
15 --

16 **MS. HOWELL:** Well, I guess my -- I mean I'm not
17 sure --

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

19 **MS. HOWELL:** -- that it would be necessary to.
20 In the dose reconstruction situation, the full
21 Board --

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

23 **MS. HOWELL:** Thank you -- the full Board is
24 looking at those individual dose
25 reconstructions, and so I think that was the

1 reason for leaving it in there. Certainly with
2 the help of staff, such as myself, any Board
3 member that was looking at a procedure for a
4 site that they were specifically conflicted at
5 would have -- fully be aware of that and step
6 away from the table. It's up to the Board. I
7 just wanted to bring that up.

8 **MS. MUNN:** It's probably redundant in this
9 case.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** As long as it says "consistent
11 with Board policies," it inherently includes
12 the issue of conflict of interest, in any
13 event. So we can probably -- probably delete
14 that phrase.

15 **MS. MUNN:** Policies, period.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes. Thank you.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** Going back to the one that Wanda
18 just read, at the end of that sentence can you
19 say procedures review?

20 **MS. MUNN:** Certainly.

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, instead of just procedures.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes. Right, thank you.

23 **MS. MUNN:** And item five, the only thing I did
24 was remove the "s" from "prepare" on the end of
25 the first line.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** And prepare responses, is that --

2 **MS. MUNN:** Correct.

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

4 **MS. MUNN:** Item six, "Review findings of the
5 Board's" -- eliminate -- delete "audit" --

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

7 **MS. MUNN:** -- "contractor regarding procedure
8 reviews, assure that these findings are
9 considered by NIOSH, and oversee the
10 development and closing of a resolution
11 database" -- rather than matrix. We have
12 evolved from the matrix stage.

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

14 **MS. HOWELL:** I had another question. It was my
15 understanding -- I'm not sure, does the
16 database ever close now? I mean I know
17 individual items may, but other items perhaps
18 may not. I just wanted clarification.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, the clo-- closing of items
20 in the database is what Emily is asking.

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

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** We're not closing the database.
23 This says oversee the closure of the database.
24 I think we're saying the closure of items or
25 findings --

1 didn't know if you -- I'm not sure how much it
2 matters what is in this contract --

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Why don't we just leave it on an
4 as-needed basis and --

5 **MS. HOWELL:** Or -- or even eight or nine times
6 a year. I mean I -- certainly there's certain
7 months where it might not happen.

8 **MS. MUNN:** Our experience --

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** You think we need a number?

10 **MS. MUNN:** Our experience for the last two
11 years has been that it's almost impossible to
12 let a month go by without meeting this group.
13 There's so much activity that's still going on
14 with respect to development of new procedures
15 and to closing of the numerous individual
16 findings that attach to -- as the letter
17 starts, we're reviewing 295 findings, and
18 that's -- that's a lot of material.

19 **MS. HOWELL:** I mean I don't think anyone's
20 going to hold you to what's in this document,
21 but if you wanted to use a more -- slightly
22 more nebulous word, such as "several," that's
23 all I was going to suggest.

24 **MS. MUNN:** I don't think it's going to reduce
25 the number of meetings, but -- which have been

1 about 12 a year, but that's -- that's up to the
2 Board. I have no strong feeling.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** What is the intent of this
4 particular requirement? To allow the agency to
5 estimate what it might cost to --

6 **MS. HOWELL:** (Off microphone) (Unintelligible)

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** So if you were to say twice a year
8 and they ended up meeting 12 times a year --

9 **MS. HOWELL:** That might be a problem.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- that might be a problem.

11 **MS. HOWELL:** So I mean I -- I think it's fine,
12 probab-- better probably to overestimate --

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

14 **MS. HOWELL:** -- than underestimate.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, let's leave it at 12. Thank
16 you. Any other comments or suggestions here?

17 (No responses)

18 If not, we'll call for a vote on the document,
19 as amended. We'll -- I think we can do this by
20 voice -- voice vote.

21 All in favor, aye?

22 (Affirmative responses)

23 Opposed, no?

24 (No responses)

25 Any abstentions?

1 (No responses)

2 Motion carries. Thank you very much. This
3 action does not require us to get Dr. Lockey's
4 vote, I do not believe, because it doesn't
5 really go to the Secretary. It goes to the
6 management group, so...

7 **WORKGROUP FOR PANTEX**

8 Next on my schedule here is the establishment
9 of a workgroup for Pantex.

10 (Pause)

11 I'm looking for my own notes -- here they are.
12 Okay. The Chair would like to suggest the
13 following individuals -- or ask the following
14 individuals to serve as the workgroup for
15 Pantex. I'm -- I'm going to name five
16 individuals plus an alternate -- it's a little
17 larger than normal, but I think this would be
18 perhaps helpful -- Poston, Presley, Griffon,
19 Schofield, Clawson, and alternate Beach. Would
20 all of you agree to serve on that group?

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

22 **UNIDENTIFIED:** (Off microphone) Would you
23 repeat (unintelligible)?

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Poston, Presley, Griffon,
25 Schofield, Clawson and Beach.

1 **UNIDENTIFIED:** (Off microphone) Beach is
2 (unintelligible) alternate?

3 **UNIDENTIFIED:** Yes.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right. I'm -- I'm looking to see
5 who has more -- and less -- duties to see about
6 naming a chair.

7 **MR. CLAWSON:** Paul, I'll -- I'll volunteer, if
8 you want. I've only got one.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, Clawson has volunteered to
10 chair, and that's -- that will be fine. And
11 this does not require Board action. The Chair
12 is authorized to appoint the workgroup members.

13 **MS. MUNN:** Mr. Schofield has a question here.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, Phillip.

15 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** (Off microphone) I would like
16 to propose we also (unintelligible) workgroup
17 for the Idaho National Engineering Lab
18 (unintelligible).

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, let me -- let me look at
20 this -- I'm looking at other items so you can
21 get -- get them all within an overall
22 framework.

23 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Could I ask everybody to
24 use your mikes real close to you as we get more
25 conversational?

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** I'm looking to see if there's any
2 other workgroups that need to be appointed
3 right now, in addition to the INEL.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** The only thing, Paul, I -- I had
5 mentioned yesterday the Board could consider
6 adding the task of the SEC review to the SRS
7 workgroup, the Savannah River. That's not a --

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, that's -- that's a --

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- not a new workgroup but --

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- the tasking issue --

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- especially with our contractor.

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah. I -- I think that will be
15 fine. Let's go ahead with -- is there any
16 objection to setting up the INEL workgroup?
17 Okay.

18 I think I will ask on this one for volunteers.

19 Okay, we've got Phil, we've got Josie -- who

20 else? We've got Melius, we've got Roessler,

21 we've got Munn. Okay, that's five people. We

22 can do that as four plus a -- four plus a -- an
23 alternate. Anyone prefer to be the alternate?

24 Phil, are you --

25 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** I was going to say

1 (unintelligible) --

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** You're volunteering to be chair?

3 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** To be chair.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** That'll be fine. Anyone prefer to
5 be the alternate, as opposed to the full --

6 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, I --

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- Wanda, as alternate. Thank
8 you.

9 For the record, the INEL workgroup will consist
10 of Phil Schofield, Josie Beach, Jim Melius, Gen
11 Roessler, and Wanda Munn as alternate, with
12 Phil Schofield serving as chair.

13 **MR. CLAWSON:** Dr. Ziemer, I'd just like to make
14 a little editorial change. It is now -- since
15 this time has changed names, now it's just INL.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes.

17 **MS. MUNN:** We can't keep track.

18 **DR. MELIUS:** How do you pronounce that IN-L?

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** I know.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** It's pronounced INEL. Okay, Idaho
21 National Laboratory. Does that mean they've
22 stopped engineering there or...

23 **MR. CLAWSON:** (Off microphone) Well,
24 (unintelligible).

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Who knows? Josie.

1 **MS. BEACH:** Paul, we heard from John yesterday
2 saying that he -- that SC&A would like to
3 revisit the site profile review. Is that
4 something we need to task as a
5 (unintelligible)?

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** We would -- we would have to task
7 that if we want them to revisit, and we're
8 going to do tasking here in just a moment, so -
9 - I'm looking to see where we are, item-wise.
10 Let me take care of a couple of quick items.
11 First of all, a meeting or two ago a number of
12 the Board members, particularly those who were
13 not with us in the early days, asked about a
14 policy dealing with Congressional visits,
15 particularly where Congressional offices asked
16 -- have asked our contractor to brief them, and
17 we've -- we indicated the fact that there was a
18 Board policy that we would attempt to ask that
19 a Board member be present, but that we
20 recognize that we could not insist on that in
21 the Congressional offices. And individuals
22 asked where that -- where that Board policy
23 existed. I have gone back and identified in
24 the minutes where that action by the Board took
25 place, and I want to identify that to --

1 particularly to the newer members of the Board,
2 and also tell you that I'm -- I can give you,
3 on flash drive or however you want it, or e-
4 mail it to you, those particular items. So let
5 me identify for the record where they appear.
6 Just a moment.

7 (Pause)

8 Well, they appear on my flash drive, which
9 isn't plugged in. Hold on.

10 Okay -- they appear in the transcripts of
11 August 25th, 2005 and August 26th, 2005. And
12 again, I have those pages in the transcripts
13 where the discussion and the action took place.
14 So those members who want that, I'll give you
15 the flash drive when the meeting's adjourned
16 and you can copy that and take it with you.

17 **MS. BEACH:** Can you just e-mail it to us?

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Or I -- if you ask me. Shall I
19 just e-mail it to the whole Board?

20 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah.

21 **MS. BEACH:** Yeah.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** I'll just do that, and e-mail it
23 everyone and you'll have that -- even for the
24 older members -- to update your records.

25 **DR. MELIUS:** Refresh our memories.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Refresh your memories of what you
2 did in the olden days.

3 **DR. MELIUS:** I remember back when.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** In days of yore. Okay, so I just
5 want to get that in the record and make sure
6 that we had a follow-up because I -- I know
7 several of you requested that earlier.

8 **TASKING THE CONTRACTOR**

9 Now let's talk about tasking our contractor.
10 We have the issue of closing out various items
11 that John discussed with us. We also had the
12 sort of proposal for how the contractor might
13 handle newer tasks going forward, based on the
14 use of carry-forward money, between now and
15 December.

16 John Mauro had suggested that the contractor
17 might begin to address some new site profiles,
18 in terms of what he called paper studies, for
19 Brookhaven, the Kansas City Plant, and Lawrence
20 Berkeley.

21 He also indicated that they might be tasked to
22 address some particular SECs and here --
23 Savannah River construction workers, Pantex,
24 Santa Susana and Los Alamos post-'75. And then
25 we also have the issue of INEL, as well, that

1 we can consider.

2 John Mauro, were there other items that I --
3 oh, yes. Well, we have -- we do have the dose
4 reconstructions also. You've already been
5 tasked, I think, to complete those dose
6 reconstructions.

7 **DR. MAURO:** We haven't received the CDs.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** But you have not received --

9 **DR. MAURO:** We haven't -- that's right.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** But that tasking has been done.

11 **DR. MAURO:** That's correct.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** And in a moment we're going to
13 select the last 20 cases. And incidentally, we
14 -- I indicated to the Board yesterday that the
15 teaming for the ninth set of cases would be
16 done -- that actually has been done already,
17 and John Mauro and I have compared notes and
18 they do have the teaming for the cases -- well
19 the ninth set, which is cases 160 to 80, I
20 guess, or --

21 **DR. MAURO:** And that -- it's 40 cases -- 40 --
22 nin--

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** It's 40 cases. I don't know the
24 numbers, but --

25 **DR. MAURO:** Yeah 40 cases. I don't recall the

1 numbers there.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, right.

3 **DR. MAURO:** But the --

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** In any event, the ninth set has
5 been tasked and the teams have been identified,
6 so that's work to be done.

7 **DR. MAURO:** There is one other item that I
8 discussed in fact with Larry Elliott related to
9 proced-- procedures. Apparently there are a
10 couple of procedures that are -- are new and
11 perhaps important that may want to be
12 addressed. Specifically --

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Actually the -- the new NIOSH
14 procedure IG-004 is the surrogate data
15 procedure, and that could be tasked as well.

16 **MS. MUNN:** And --

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Comments -- Wanda?

18 **MS. MUNN:** -- and 003?

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** What was 00--

20 **MS. MUNN:** Related, I believe.

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, I didn't jot -- what was
22 003? I didn't jot --

23 **MS. MUNN:** I think it's related, isn't it?

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, Larry mentioned another one
25 that --

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Stu, can you help us, what was
2 003?

3 **MR. HINNEFELD:** 003 is a description of what
4 doses are included in the dose reconstructions
5 for the -- for the program.

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** Is that simply definitions, or is
7 it procedures, or --

8 **MR. HINNEFELD:** Well, it -- it's essentially --
9 it's a guidance, IG documents are guidance
10 documents, or Implementation Guides.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** So those are the -- those are the
12 items that we can consider, and I think we can
13 do this in form -- in the form of a motion
14 where we move to task the contractor to do
15 specific things.

16 Michael?

17 **MR. GIBSON:** The workgroup on Santa Susana
18 still has a request for the --

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you.

20 **MR. GIBSON:** -- review of the SEC petition.

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** So -- so tasking on Santa Susana
22 SEC would be another possible -- thank you --
23 and I have that jotted down. I forgot to
24 mention it. Thank you for reminding me.

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** Did you mention Pantex

1 (unintelligible) --

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** (Unintelligible)

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- I'm sorry, I was reading the
4 cases.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

6 **MS. MUNN:** What, doing your work?

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Actually for SECs we would --
8 possible ones, Pantex, Santa Susana -- I
9 thought it was on the list that I mentioned
10 earlier, but -- and then Savannah River and Los
11 Alamos, and now INEL -- INL, thank you.
12 So the Chair's looking for a motion to ta-- for
13 tasking of our -- of our contractor. And --
14 and in the framework that the money that's
15 being used for all of this currently is
16 closeout money which originally was earmarked
17 for closing out issues on site profiles and
18 dose reconstructions and some SEC issues.

19 **MS. MUNN:** Mr. Chairman, could you please read
20 that list again of tasks? If you read the list
21 I'll be happy to make the motion.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Actually -- actually, as I think
23 about it, I think what I will suggest is that
24 we divide this. Let's do a motion relating to
25 SEC work. We'll do a motion relating to site

1 profile work, and a motion relating to
2 procedures review work, so that we don't
3 intermingle them and get them clear.

4 Let's begin with SEC work. It's been suggested
5 that we task the contractor to assist with SEC
6 reviews for Savannah River construction
7 workers, Pantex, Santa Susana, Los Alamos and
8 INEL. Now keep in mind --

9 **UNIDENTIFIED:** (Off microphone) INL.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** INL -- keep in mind that there is
11 some other SEC work going on that's already
12 been tasked. That is the -- the Blockson and
13 the -- the valve work.

14 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, Chapman --

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Chapman Valve.

16 **MS. MUNN:** Uh-huh.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** So -- but those are already tasked
18 so we don't need to retask any of that. That
19 carries forward. Brad?

20 **MR. CLAWSON:** Mr. -- the INL is -- has not yet
21 got an SEC, but --

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** There is no SEC work associated
23 with INL, okay, just a site profile.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

25 **MR. CLAWSON:** At this time.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right. So our priorities would
2 be, I would say, to address the others even
3 though we established a workgroup for this. So
4 the Chair's looking for a motion. You need
5 help with this motion?

6 **MS. MUNN:** Before -- before making the motion,
7 however, there is some concern about the
8 quantity of effort that would be involved in
9 this many SECs. These are major items, and can
10 be envisioned as requiring a significant amount
11 of time and effort on the part of anyone who
12 wished to address them.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, let me point out that we
14 have before us a petition from Santa Susana so
15 we have to deal with that, in any event. We
16 have a petition before us from Pantex, so we
17 have to deal with that one. Where -- let's
18 see, where are we on Savannah River
19 construction --

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** Is the ER report complete on
21 Savannah River -- not quite complete, right?
22 Is that --

23 **DR. MELIUS:** But -- but it'll be complete
24 before the next meeting, and we're going to be
25 in --

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

2 **DR. MELIUS:** -- down there. It'd be helpful, I
3 think, to...

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** So if -- if we -- if we need any
5 assistance from the contractor on these three
6 which are before us, in principle we can only
7 guarantee the availability of the contractor
8 for the next two or three months, in any event.
9 So I simply point that out.

10 **MS. MUNN:** They -- they've indicated that their
11 expenditures were roughly on the order of
12 \$200,000 per month in recent history, but I
13 don't think their recent history has included
14 this level of effort with respect to SECs. Am
15 I incorrect?

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, maybe John can speak to
17 this, but I -- I think it's fair to say -- let
18 -- let's say that the contractor -- let say
19 that there's a different contractor after
20 January 1 or whenever it occurs or -- or
21 sooner, it's not obvious to me that we would be
22 able to close out all of the site profiles in
23 any event under a continuing effort.

24 **DR. MAURO:** To be responsive to issues, Wanda
25 is correct that there is a certain workload

1 that we can handle. We've been operating at
2 about \$300,000 to \$350,000 a month --

3 **MS. MUNN:** Ooh.

4 **DR. MAURO:** -- and basically at -- that work
5 generally consisted of efforts where at least
6 three site profiles and perhaps three SEC
7 petitions were moving through the system, 60
8 dose reconstructions -- reviews, a dozen
9 procedures, in addition to closeout process.
10 So the scope of work that you are entertaining
11 at this time is very compatible with what we've
12 been doing for the last five years. So -- now
13 the real important question, I believe, and --
14 I think is that we need to design the work,
15 whatever is given to us, in a manner that has a
16 break point that will allow the baton to be
17 handed off to the next contractor readily.
18 That's why in my little e-mail I mentioned the
19 word "paper studies." I think a lot can be
20 done with paper studies in terms of setting the
21 table for what some of the more important
22 issues might be, deliver those reports. So I
23 do not believe we're going to be able -- if we
24 -- if we are authorized to do, whether it's a
25 site profile review or a -- an SEC re-- focused

1 review, in -- in --

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** They will be paper studies.

3 **DR. MAURO:** They will be paper studies, and I
4 think it would be probably important that how -
5 - whatever you folks decide to task us with, I
6 will take it upon myself to very shortly
7 prepare what I would call a closeout plan.
8 That is, in anticipation that by a certain
9 date, SC&A may no longer be available, I think
10 we owe an -- have an obligation to let you know
11 how we're going to close out all of the active
12 items that are before us in a form that there's
13 clear boundaries so that the -- the baton can
14 be passed cleanly. Of course, hopefully that
15 will be back to us. But if it's not, it will -
16 - we hope to put you in a position that it can
17 be passed on pretty easily. But that's
18 something that I think that perhaps I can work
19 on. I left you with the idea of a paper study
20 to give you a concept. But it -- how that
21 actually will -- will be realized and what
22 we'll actually do, I think it will depend on
23 the ones that you ask -- to task us to do, and
24 then we'll design something and lay it out for
25 your consideration.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Dr. Melius, a comment, and
2 then --

3 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, just --

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- Mr. Presley.

5 **DR. MELIUS:** -- just to follow up on that, I
6 think we've -- first of all, we have a lot of
7 work that we're behind in, and I think these
8 are imp-- important SECs and I think we -- we
9 need to forward -- I think, as John has stated,
10 he -- I think he can manage it in a way that
11 could take into account the possibility that
12 there need-- may need to be a transition to a -
13 - a different contractor. I also think we --
14 we've tended to not assign SC&A maybe as much
15 work as -- as they could handle -- time, and
16 that's -- also tends to slow down the overall
17 process of dealing with -- with SECs and so I -
18 - I think that, given the priority, the -- the
19 need to address these particular sites, I -- I
20 think what's being proposed is reasonable and I
21 think can be managed within the scope of the
22 current contract, and I -- I think we need to
23 do it if we're going to keep this process
24 moving along and not have the, you know,
25 petitioners waiting for -- significantly longer

1 than they -- they will have to wait anyway
2 through the process, so...

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you. Mr. Presley?

4 **MR. PRESLEY:** I'd like to recommend Santa
5 Susana, Savannah River and Pantex, in that
6 order. John, SC&A has already been working on
7 those and those -- there's two there that are
8 quite big. They have done a tremendous amount
9 of work on both of those. With the possibility
10 of Savannah River coming up in November, it
11 would probably be a good idea to make it
12 second, and then we can get Santa Susana
13 working. Tho-- that's my recommendation.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Is this a motion that you're
15 making to task --

16 **MR. PRESLEY:** I will make that in the form of a
17 motion.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- to task SC&A --

19 **MR. PRESLEY:** SC&A.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- to assist in the SEC review
21 process for those three sites. The order you
22 gave them in was Santa Susana, Savannah and
23 Pantex.

24 Second to the motion?

25 **MR. GIBSON:** Second.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Mike, and -- seconded.

2 Discussion?

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I -- I guess -- the only
4 question I would have was -- is stating in
5 order. I mean I think they might run in
6 parallel, depending on their staffing, so --
7 but otherwise I agree with -- am in support of
8 the motion, but I -- I don't know, I -- the
9 priorities might be right, Bob, but I don't --
10 I think they might want to be able to work in
11 parallel. I don't think we want to --

12 **MR. PRESLEY:** (Off microphone) I'm sure they
13 (unintelligible) --

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- sort of dictate an order for
15 the contractor.

16 **MR. PRESLEY:** -- (unintelligible) those need to
17 be --

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, I don't -- I don't think
20 you're suggesting they necessarily do --

21 **MR. PRESLEY:** No.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- everything sequentially --

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- but sort of prioritize --

25 **MR. PRESLEY:** Right.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- them sort of conceptually.
2 Josie?

3 **MS. BEACH:** I would like to add INL to that
4 list, also. I think that's going to be a real
5 quick review for SC&A. I'm not sure, but --

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** This is just SECs.

7 **MS. BEACH:** Just -- oh, just SECs? Okay. I
8 retract that.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Just SECs. Any -- any other
10 comment? So we would be tasking for these --
11 assistance on these three SECs. Okay, are you
12 ready to vote then?

13 All in favor, aye?

14 (Affirmative responses)

15 Opposed?

16 (No responses)

17 And abstentions?

18 (No responses)

19 Motion carries, so that tasking is approved and
20 can get underway, and we -- we now have --
21 there are workgroups for each of these.

22 Actually -- I'm trying to remember -- is
23 Savannah River workgroup a site profile review
24 --

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right now it's a site profile

1 review. I was asking that the Board let -- if
2 -- if it's --

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Can we take --

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- the Board's wish --

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- it by consent --

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- that we'll ask the Savannah
8 River workgroup to -- to focus on site profile
9 iss-- or SEC issues? Any objection?

10 (No responses)

11 No objection. John?

12 **DR. MAURO:** I'd just like to point out,
13 especially in the case of Pantex, our
14 classifications for our Q-cleared people will
15 end mid-October. I'd just like to -- any
16 assistance we can get in having those renewed -
17 - I'm not sure exactly the process, but it's --
18 it's essential that our Q-cleared people con--
19 continue to have their clearances active as we
20 move into this phase of work and --

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** Would you -- Emily, I don't know
22 if you can help John on this or -- who -- who
23 can assist him, or can -- maybe Ted can.

24 **MR. KATZ:** I think this is already in the
25 works, but --

1 **DR. MAURO:** It is? Thank you.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Ted, could you follow up
3 and make sure that --

4 **MR. KATZ:** I will follow up.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- they have the ability to -- to
6 continue to assist through the -- the interim
7 period.

8 Let's do tasking for procedures review. Is --
9 are there any motions to add procedures review
10 tasks for our contractor? There had been a
11 suggestion that they consider --

12 **MS. MUNN:** We had --

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- IG-003 and 4. Does the Board
14 wish to have that tasked?

15 **MS. MUNN:** Yes. I can't remember whether we
16 put --

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** I mean they -- the other
18 procedures --

19 **MS. MUNN:** -- 70 --

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- are already tasked and we're
21 well into the other procedures. Right?

22 **DR. MAURO:** Oh, yes, we have --

23 **MS. MUNN:** Yes, you have --

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** You've delivered your reports.

25 **MS. MUNN:** But we had -- we had talked -- do

1 you have 70 already?

2 **DR. MAURO:** Oh, the -- the total number?

3 **MS. MUNN:** No, no, no --

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** No, TIB-70 --

5 **MS. MUNN:** -- no, I meant OTIB --

6 **DR. MAURO:** Oh, oh, oh, I'm sorry --

7 **MS. MUNN:** -- OTIB --

8 **DR. MAURO:** -- OTIB-70, yes, we -- in fact,
9 that was completed and delivered.

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

11 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, that's --

12 **DR. MAURO:** It's been delivered.

13 **MS. MUNN:** -- that's done.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

15 **DR. MAURO:** Yeah, and 66 is completed and will
16 be delivered very shortly, so we're fair-- you
17 know, we're just about done with all our
18 reviews. I bring it up only that I -- I know
19 that now that there are some important new ones
20 that have come out that we have not been
21 tasked, but no -- yes, we -- we were tasked and
22 we've completed our work on OTIB-70 and -- and
23 als-- and we're about to deliver OTIB-66.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** John, there are other important
25 new ones other than IG--

1 **DR. MAURO:** The on-- no, the one that I -- I
2 only became aware of --

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

4 **DR. MAURO:** -- during this meeting was the
5 surrogate one. That seems to be a fairly
6 important procedure.

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, okay.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

9 **MS. MUNN:** We -- we -- the workgroup has a list
10 of items which are proposed that are on the
11 horizon, some of which are in the process of
12 being signed off right now. And until we have
13 an opportunity as a workgroup to consider this
14 proposed list, I'd be hesitant to add anything
15 more at this juncture. Perhaps if there's need
16 to do that, we might be able to poll the Board
17 --

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Is 04 --

19 **MS. MUNN:** -- electronically.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- on the list? IG-004? 'Cause
21 that one now, I understand, is completed.

22 **MS. MUNN:** I believe it's out.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes, it's out, that's --

24 **MS. MUNN:** So it's not on the proposed list.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

1 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, I think it's out. And --

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** But has not yet been reviewed.

3 **MS. MUNN:** No, it has not been reviewed.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** That's the surrogate data.

5 **MS. MUNN:** We've -- we've already specified
6 we're going to ask for that. Right?

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, no, that's what I'm asking
8 right now. That's what I'm asking if -- if we
9 wish to task 03 and 04, now's the time to do
10 it.

11 **MS. MUNN:** I would move that we task our
12 contractor with review of OTIB-003 and 004.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Is there a second?

14 **MS. BEACH:** Second.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Discussion? Jim.

16 **DR. MELIUS:** I still haven't seen the surrogate
17 data one, but it seems that we have the
18 potential for duplication. It -- be helpful to
19 see what's -- what makes sense in terms of how
20 -- how to review it and the -- and what -- it
21 may be perfectly appropriate for the procedures
22 workgroup, it -- it may not. I just don't want
23 to...

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Now I'm wondering if this -- your
25 workgroup should maybe also take a look at it

1 from your point of view. I don't want to
2 duplicate everything, but --

3 **MR. HINNEFELD:** I just want to comment, these
4 are IG-3 and 4, not -- not OTIB-3 and 4.

5 **MS. MUNN:** Oh, sorry.

6 **MR. HINNEFELD:** IG-3 and 4.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** No, IG -- didn't I say IG?

8 **MS. MUNN:** I'm sorry, yeah, it is.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** IG-004 and 003.

10 **MS. MUNN:** Uh-huh.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

12 **DR. MELIUS:** That's fine, too, but I think --
13 without having seen it and -- last I knew, the
14 link -- Mark had tried the link and it wasn't
15 working.

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** I -- yeah, it might be now,
17 but...

18 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, but...

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, let's -- let's get the
20 tasking done. At least they can take --

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- a look at it.

23 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah.

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** And then we can take it from
25 there.

1 **DR. MELIUS:** Right.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah. Okay, let's see -- other
3 comments?

4 (No responses)

5 Okay, we'll vote on this motion to task for
6 procedures review for those two documents.

7 All in favor, aye?

8 (Affirmative responses)

9 Opposed, no?

10 (No responses)

11 Abstentions?

12 (No responses)

13 Motion carries. Okay, now let's focus on site
14 profile reviews. Do you want to task any
15 additional site profile work at this time?

16 John had suggested paper studies on several.
17 Josie?

18 **MS. BEACH:** I'd like to propose that they look
19 at INL.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** This would be the revised, right?

21 **MS. BEACH:** Revised, correct.

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

23 **MS. BEACH:** Just a review.

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Only, or --

25 **MS. BEACH:** Well, John indicated they wanted to

1 go back and look at -- at that document because
2 it was -- it's been two years since they've put
3 it out, so...

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** They have an initial review that
5 was done on the first site profile but the re--
6 yeah.

7 **DR. MAURO:** That would not be a new one. We --
8 we have been authorized to review INL. I only
9 brought that up because of the amount of time
10 that's passed. If -- since the workgroup has
11 formed for INL, all I would suggest is that
12 perhaps one of the first things that that
13 workgroup may want to do is let's go back, take
14 a look at that, read it -- read it over to see
15 if there are any new issues that we'd like to
16 add, maybe some issues to remove in light of
17 the amount of time that had passed, so I -- I
18 see that as within the scope of our current
19 mandate.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

21 **MS. BEACH:** So we don't need to...

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, I think that discussion was
23 based on the idea that if there was an INL SEC
24 petition, that the next step would be to look
25 at what was there in the document, before you

1 even picked out SEC issues, to see how up to
2 date the site profile was anyway, was -- that
3 was what you were talking about originally.

4 **DR. MAURO:** I have to say, I -- when I was
5 thinking -- I don't see this as an SEC -- in
6 other words, I'm -- I don't --

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** There's not an SEC --

8 **DR. MAURO:** -- believe there is an SEC --

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- no, no, no --

10 **MS. BEACH:** No, no, no.

11 **DR. MAURO:** -- this is purely -- this is purely
12 a -- a workgroup forming to let's take a look
13 at INL, and the only new twist to this is,
14 unlike the others where there was a relatively
15 short period of time between when we produced
16 our report and then when we moved forward with
17 the workgroup, in this case we have quite a bit
18 of lapse of time. And all I was suggesting is
19 probably a good idea, once we start the
20 workgroup, that one of the first things that I
21 know I'd like to do is read it again cover to
22 cover and perhaps put together perhaps some
23 type of supplemental material that would
24 accompany maybe a revised matrix that would add
25 some items, perhaps -- and a rationale, and

1 perhaps suggest deleting some items as being a
2 good way to kick off the closeout process for
3 the INL site profile process.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** And actually, see, INEL really was
5 tasked earlier, much earlier, does not
6 technically require new tasking, but if -- if
7 it's the sense of the Board, since it's sat for
8 so long, I think the workgroup could exercise a
9 prerogative and ask for assistance in doing
10 what John just described, and that would get
11 you underway. But we need to be cognizant that
12 that work is going on in the framework of any
13 other tasking that we might add. Because
14 otherwise that's sitting on the shelf, so now
15 that sort of reactivates an old task that was
16 assigned. So we -- we don't need to
17 specifically, since we've approved the
18 workgroup, I think you -- Phil, you can get
19 underway and ask them to help in that regard.
20 But now I ask, do you wish to task any
21 additional site profile work -- in the -- in
22 the framework that we have tasked these SEC
23 activities, site -- or procedures review
24 activities. You know what's ongoing also. Do
25 you wish to add any new site profile work done?

1 Because in the absence of a motion, I'm going
2 to interpret that as meaning that the Board
3 does not wish to add any site profile tasks at
4 the present time, which means we'll focus on
5 the things we've identified, plus any other
6 closeout activities that are underway. And
7 again I --

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Can -- can I just ask as a re--

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- we're kind of focused on the
10 next three months because --

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- and at which point we'll know
13 where we stand with respect to continuing or a
14 new contractor.

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Can -- can I just ask as a
16 refresher -- I think John mentioned a few sites
17 in his presentation. Can maybe we discuss tho-
18 - or John, can you te-- remind me what those
19 were?

20 **DR. MAURO:** Yes, Brookhaven was identified as a
21 site profile that might benefit -- especially
22 since there is an upcoming SEC, and we thought
23 by moving forward on the site profile review,
24 we'd be -- and put together a paper study, we'd
25 -- would put the Board in a position to be

1 well-poised to begin -- when that SEC
2 evaluation report is ready, you'll be in a --
3 well-positioned to do that. That was the
4 reason we brought Brookhaven up as a -- as a
5 possibility.

6 We also mentioned Kansas City as a site
7 profile, simply because it's the only remaining
8 weapons site that we have not performed a site
9 profile review on.

10 And the last one we mentioned was Lawrence
11 Berkeley in terms of, I guess -- these are the
12 three that we felt might benefit from a site
13 profile paper study.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** What is the status of the
15 Brookhaven -- I think -- is LaVon still here?

16 **MR. KATZ:** No, he's not.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** Stu can --

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** I'm trying to remember what he
19 told us on that one.

20 **MS. BEACH:** Paul, he said it was -- could be up
21 for review in December. I believe that was one
22 that was going to be ready.

23 **MR. HINNEFELD:** Yeah, I -- I believe that's one
24 that will be prepared, we think fairly shor--
25 you know, quite shortly before the next

1 meeting. So whether there would be enough time
2 for interpretation of it and have it on the
3 agenda would be questionable, but that's the
4 approximate time schedule.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** I think we could probably delay
6 tasking that since it's not going to be
7 available in any event till after what will be
8 the sort of drop-dead date on the contractor
9 selection, would be my --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** No -- well, the SEC won't be
11 available. Right? Is that what we're saying?
12 I mean the site profile is out, yeah. Yeah.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** The site profile is available.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** I'm looking now to see what other
16 items we have before us.

17 **MR. KATZ:** (Off microphone) (Unintelligible)

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Huh?

19 **MR. KATZ:** Future plans?

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, before we do future plans --

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** So -- so are we not -- we -- we
22 are not --

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Unless you're making a motion.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** (Off microphone) No, I'm just
25 asking (unintelligible) Jim's (unintelligible).

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** We'll wait on those.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Just for the record, I want to
4 call attention to the fact that we got a letter
5 this summer -- actually late July -- from
6 Senator Schumer, Senator Clinton and
7 Congresswoman Slaughter concerning the Linde
8 plant in New York state. That letter raised a
9 lot of questions about procedures that occurred
10 between the petitioner and how various actions
11 were handled. It was addressed to me, but
12 again, I cannot reply to these Congressional
13 letters without Board approval. But most of
14 the questions dealt with how various things
15 were handled by NIOSH, so Larry Elliott did
16 provide an extensive reply to those three
17 individuals in a letter dated August 21st.
18 Now what I would like to do right -- I was
19 uncertain as to the distribution of the
20 original letter. Do -- do any of you recall
21 whether you were copied on the original letter
22 or not?

23 **DR. MELIUS:** The July letter?

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes.

25 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, we were copied on it, but

1 the -- not on the res-- not on Larry's
2 response.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. I wasn't sure what the
4 distribution was, so number one, I will make
5 sure that Larry's response is distributed to
6 all the Board members.

7 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** I believe that he has answered the
9 questions that were raised, and Larry un-- is
10 Larry here? I don't know if -- I don't know if
11 he's heard back or if we know that -- whether
12 or not the individuals were okay with his
13 response. In any event, I do want to respond
14 to the letter, but let me first distribute
15 Larry's response, and then I'm going to ask the
16 Board members for input. I will -- I will
17 prepare a draft for our next call meeting so
18 that I can at least say thank you for the
19 letter. NIOSH has, we think, responded to your
20 questions, but if there's additional issues, we
21 would be glad to address them. I want to make
22 sure all the Board members have both the
23 Congressional letter as well as the response,
24 so we'll make sure that's distributed. And I
25 just wanted to get that on the record here

1 today.

2 SELECTION OF TENTH SET OF CASES

3 Okay, I think we're -- we're at the point of
4 selecting the -- Mark, the cases for the next -
5 - it's the tenth set of reviews. All of you
6 should receive -- have received a copy -- I'm
7 not sure if this is --

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** This can't be distributed.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** This is -- cannot be distributed.

10 It has confidential information so there are
11 not copies for the public on this, but it's the
12 identification of the last set of cases. Mark,
13 describe what we have and what we need to do.

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, we have -- NIOSH -- Stu
15 Hinnefeld -- this is our iterative -- our
16 second step in our iteration process where we
17 pre-selected a number of cases and we asked for
18 more information on those so that we could
19 determine -- if you remember, the last few
20 columns in our criteria here better define what
21 kind of case we're going to see when we
22 actually do the review and -- and -- 'cause
23 sometimes, just for people that haven't been
24 through this, sometimes -- when we first do a
25 selection, the criteria -- it might suggest

1 that there was a best-estimate approach used in
2 the dose reconstruction. But when you pull the
3 file and look at the details, it actually was
4 often a site-wide model or something like that.
5 So we thought to better understand what we're
6 actually going to be reviewing, we wanted more
7 information. So in this second step -- we sort
8 of pre-select, and in a second step NIOSH comes
9 back and -- and gives us more information on
10 the cases.

11 We had a lot more cases when we started. A
12 number of them I understand are either -- are
13 not available really for our review now.
14 Either they're -- I think in most cases they're
15 under PER review, so they were pulled out
16 because they're already being reworked by
17 NIOSH. So our list is down to 22 already on
18 this one paper, front and back, that you have.
19 Out of that we -- we would like to get 20, and
20 I -- I have a couple that I would -- I would --
21 at least my personal preference is to drop
22 those two cases that I think we might consider
23 dropping, and the rest would probably be reason
24 -- would be reasonable for our tenth set, if
25 you want to hear those now or if people --

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, let me suggest that -- that
2 you tell us the cases you are recommending be
3 dropped and let's see if there's any objection
4 or if others believe there are other cases that
5 are more worthy of being dropped. How do I
6 describe that?

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** All right -- one, two, three --
8 the sixth case down, I believe, number 152 --
9 the last three digits are 1-5-2 in the ID.
10 It's a lung case, Materials (sic) and Controls
11 Corp., and I'm not going to say anything more,
12 but the reason I would propose to drop that one
13 is because it -- it really is not going to --
14 usually when we pick these smaller sites, the
15 intent is not to only review a case but also
16 we're almost doing a mini-site profile review,
17 if you will. And in this case, they used -- it
18 wasn't based on any information from the site.
19 I talked to Stu a little about this earlier and
20 the doses for internal were based on MDAs from
21 another site, so I'm not sure that really would
22 get at what we wanted to do with a review of a
23 -- a DR from that site. So that's one. And
24 it's also a compensable one, you know, so those
25 two factors.

1 The other one is number 402, Jessop Steel. And
2 again, this is -- this was not a site profile
3 model for the site or a matrix for the site.
4 It was a -- a TIB-4 reconstruction. We've had
5 many of the TIB-4 recons-- you know, cases.
6 I'm not sure this would add a -- you know.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** And it was compensable.

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, and compensable, right.
9 So those two I -- I thought, out of the 22, can
10 probably be dropped off and then we would have
11 20 still for -- for the tenth set.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Well, those are Mark's
13 recommendations for reducing this set to 20.
14 Are there other cases that any of you have
15 identified that you believe should not be
16 considered?

17 **MR. CLAWSON:** Could -- could you run over the
18 numbers again, just to make sure? I thought I
19 had one or two.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** Last three --

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** I thought number --

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- last three numbers --

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- 152 -- number 152, Metals and
24 Controls it is, and number 402, which is Jessop
25 Steel. And I -- I would say the other 20 would

1 be available for SC&A's review.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Then I'll ask if there are others
3 that anyone believes should be deleted.

4 (No responses)

5 If not, I'll ask for a motion to accept the 20
6 cases that remain.

7 **MS. MUNN:** So moved.

8 **MR. PRESLEY:** Second.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Seconded. Any further discussion?
10 All in favor, aye?

11 (Affirmative responses)

12 Opposed?

13 (No responses)

14 Carried, thank you. No abstentions?

15 (No responses)

16 No abstentions.

17 **MR. HINNEFELD:** Paul, if I can have just one
18 point of clarification. These -- it's been a
19 while since these have been looked at for post-
20 closure activity, like the PER or being
21 returned for some other reason. If any of
22 these should fall off, can I just add those two
23 back in to get back to 20? I mean if one or
24 two drop off, and I would suspect you would
25 want the Jessop Steel case to be added in last,

1 would that be acceptable to the Board.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** I sup-- I suppose. Everybody's
3 looking at me.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, I think it's -- we're
5 looking for your recommendation. I -- I think
6 you've sort of convinced us that we don't gain
7 any information --

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

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- from these two, so it's sort of
10 a question of would we just do them to get 20
11 cases, or are there some other cases that got
12 deleted earlier?

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I would just say leave them
14 off. If we're a little short of the 20 --

15 **MR. HINNEFELD:** All right.

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- we'll pick it up later or
17 whatever, you know.

18 **MR. HINNEFELD:** All right.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you. Question -- no. Okay.

20 **FUTURE PLANS AND MEETINGS**

21 I think we may be ready to look at our schedule
22 going forward. We have scheduled a meeting --
23 okay, these -- these are face-to-face meetings
24 now, not the phone call meetings. December 16
25 through 18 meeting has been confirmed for

1 Augusta, Georgia, which is near the Savannah
2 River Site. I don't know if we know the hotel
3 yet, but somewhere in Augusta.

4 **UNIDENTIFIED:** (Off microphone)

5 (Unintelligible)

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

7 **DR. ROESSLER:** What -- will that start in the
8 morning of the 16th?

9 **MS. MUNN:** Yep.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, we've not established the
11 agenda yet.

12 **DR. ROESSLER:** Okay.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** It's on a Tuesday. Yeah, comment,
14 Jim?

15 **DR. MELIUS:** Just can -- can I make a request
16 that we try to establish the agenda a little
17 farther ahead of time, at least as to whether
18 there's going to be subcommittee meetings and
19 so forth 'cause those of us that aren't on the
20 subcommittees don't need to be there and -- and
21 --

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

23 **DR. MELIUS:** -- it's just helpful 'cause we
24 have to make plane reservations and travel
25 plans and that's becoming more difficult --

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** More problematical, right.

2 **DR. MELIUS:** -- yeah, and so having -- so we --
3 you sent out the notices and the hotel and
4 everything, but we'd have no idea how long the
5 meeting's going to --

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

7 **DR. MELIUS:** -- last so how many hotel nights
8 and how many other reservations, so...

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, normally we've been starting
10 -- well, I guess that --

11 **DR. MELIUS:** No, there is no normal.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- there isn't a normal, and this
13 -- and this meeting was not normal 'cause we
14 had the holiday, which caused some changes in
15 how we did the travel.

16 **MR. KATZ:** Jim, but -- so part of that is
17 really you're tasking yourselves because the
18 workgroup meetings and subcommittee, of course,
19 you guys are in charge of sort of leading the
20 scheduling for those. Right?

21 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, but --

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** But even there, that's -- that
23 remains -- once the main schedule's
24 established, workgroup folks can work around
25 that if necessary.

1 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, we have a sense of how --
2 how many -- you know, where we are, I think it
3 could be --

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** So if we're going to start mid-day
5 on -- on the Tuesday, then workgroups can
6 schedule that morning, for example, but I think
7 your point is well-taken. The earlier we know
8 the agenda, the better it will be.

9 Then moving forward to 2009, we're blocked off
10 for February 17th through 19th, and that will
11 either be Santa Fe or Albuquerque, in the Los
12 Alamos area. February 17 through 19, near
13 Albuquerque or Santa Fe.

14 Then we are scheduled for May 12 through 14,
15 meeting location to be determined, and I think
16 Ted would like to talk about that now. And
17 also July 27 through 29, meeting date (sic) to
18 be determined.

19 **MR. KATZ:** So I just wanted to raise, for --
20 trying to think about locations for these next
21 two meetings, and maybe someone from OCAS will
22 have to help out on these points, but -- but
23 normally I think you try to coincide with a SEC
24 evaluation and particularly if it can be a big
25 site, but not necessarily. So I just -- I just

1 made a list of the SEC evaluations that are
2 sort of in the works and sort of in a phase
3 where, you know, they -- they might be germane
4 for those locations, although the far out one,
5 of course, it's hard to say. But I just wanted
6 to raise these and you -- some of you will know
7 better, perhaps, in terms of timing.

8 But Feeds Material Production Center, Hanford
9 Part 2 -- that's the 1947 to '90, NTS, Mound,
10 Texas City, Santa Susana -- of course we're
11 here now, but -- Pantex, LANL -- of course
12 we're already going to Albuquerque or the other
13 location, Santa Fe -- and -- and Linde, which
14 is-- isn't a large one, but -- so those are the
15 -- those are the SEC sort of germane sites.

16 **DR. MELIUS:** How ab-- how about Pantex?

17 **DR. ROESSLER:** Yeah, we've talked about Pantex
18 for a long time.

19 **MR. PRESLEY:** Might be a good time to go to
20 Pantex.

21 **MR. KATZ:** All right, that's -- so Pantex -- I
22 didn't realize the scale of that is why I
23 didn't include that on this list.

24 **DR. MELIUS:** And we've never been there, that's
25 --

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Amarillo, May possibly.

2 **DR. ROESSLER:** Only 100 degrees then.

3 **MS. MUNN:** No, is -- we just -- we've just
4 missed the bluebonnets, that's not that bad.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Any objection to considering the
6 Amarillo area for May?

7 **MS. MUNN:** No, good deal.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** We've talked about going there a
9 number of occasions. We've avoided it as long
10 as possible, it appears, but --

11 **MS. MUNN:** Despite my insistence.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** John?

13 **DR. POSTON:** I would urge that we consider
14 Albuquerque and not Santa Fe. The
15 transportation to Santa Fe is unbelievable.
16 It's an hour and a half away from the closest
17 airport, means everybody's going to have to
18 rent a car. It's just a expense that we don't
19 need, and the hotels are cheaper in Albuquerque
20 anyway.

21 **MS. MUNN:** They are.

22 **MR. PRESLEY:** I agree to that.

23 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** (Off microphone)

24 (Unintelligible) --

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yes, Phillip?

1 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** -- there are a couple of
2 reasons (unintelligible) Albuquerque is the
3 fact that February in Santa Fe can
4 (unintelligible) and a lot of retirees
5 (unintelligible) outskirts of Albuquerque, and
6 there's a number of people (unintelligible)
7 Sandia National Labs in Albuquerque that's
8 starting to become interested in the program.
9 (Unintelligible) already been (unintelligible)
10 Sandia (unintelligible) Albuquerque.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Okay, Nancy, did you have a
12 comment? We're -- we're focusing on --

13 **MS. ADAMS:** Zaida has already made
14 arrangements, and it is Albuquerque and it is
15 the Marriott in Albuquerque.

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

17 **MS. ADAMS:** Oh, Doubletree? Excuse me,
18 Doubletree in Albuquerque.

19 **MR. PRESLEY:** (Off microphone) Is that in
20 (unintelligible), the one with
21 (unintelligible)?

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, thank you for that input, so
23 we're all set on that. Any -- any early
24 thoughts on July of '09?

25 **DR. POSTON:** College Station.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Dr. Poston suggested College
2 Station. That's nearly as hard to get to as
3 Santa Fe -- actually it isn't difficult.

4 **DR. MELIUS:** Amarillo, we ta...

5 **DR. POSTON:** That's closer to Texas City.

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** Any thoughts on July of '09?

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** Probably too far out, but Fernald
8 is moving along.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, that would put us back in
10 Cincinnati, I guess. Right? It's a
11 possibility.

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** And you have Mound -- you also
13 have Mound is there, you know, so -- may be a
14 good reason for Cincinnati, yeah, Fernald and
15 Mound.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Kind of keep that on reserve, but
17 others could come up. What other -- I'm trying
18 to think of other sites -- we've not done
19 anything near Brookhaven, I don't think, too
20 close to there. We've been to the Hanford area
21 twice, maybe -- maybe three times. Idaho in
22 July's not a bad site.

23 **MR. CLAWSON:** No, it isn't.

24 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** We want to go there in the
25 winter.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, there are several
2 possibilities. Ted, how much more specific do
3 we need to be for July? We've got some ideas
4 here.

5 **MR. KATZ:** Well, just -- just because summer is
6 very difficult for scheduling, so it really
7 would be good to have a --

8 **MS. MUNN:** Why not INL?

9 **MR. KATZ:** -- a candidate.

10 **MS. MUNN:** INL would be a good candidate, from
11 my perspective.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** The airport will be open again,
13 Brad, and -- far as you know?

14 **MR. CLAWSON:** Far as I know.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** No, this is not a joke, they were
16 shut down --

17 **MR. CLAWSON:** We are shut down through next
18 month, so -- yes, it will be.

19 **DR. MELIUS:** How -- how many flights a day?

20 **MR. CLAWSON:** (Off microphone) (Unintelligible)
21 is it.

22 **MR. KATZ:** So do we have that as a first choice
23 then, INL for July? And do we have a second in
24 case, for some reason, that's a bust?

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Let me ask this question. Is

1 there another location besides -- well, what
2 other towns in Idaho might be -- are there
3 other towns in Idaho?

4 **MS. MUNN:** Idaho Falls, surely you joke.

5 **MR. CLAWSON:** There's a couple of little towns,
6 but they don't have airports.

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** No, I'm -- is Pocatello too far or
8 is --

9 **MR. CLAWSON:** Oh, yeah, Pocatello's too far,
10 plus Idaho Falls is the best.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Idaho Falls would be the best.

12 **DR. POSTON:** Sun Valley.

13 **MR. CLAWSON:** What?

14 **DR. POSTON:** Sun Valley?

15 **UNIDENTIFIED:** I kind of like Sun Valley.

16 **MR. PRESLEY:** We've talked about going to
17 Brookhaven, in that area.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, I -- I mentioned Brookhaven
19 earlier and basically -- and Jim, help us out
20 here, would we go out in Long Island somewhere
21 or would we --

22 **DR. MELIUS:** It's Long -- you'd have to stay
23 out on Long Island but by the LaGuardia or JFK
24 are the -- the airports, but -- get a little
25 taste of New York -- Long Island traffic, which

1 is...

2 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah.

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, there is a little Is--
4 Islip airport, isn't it, but --

5 **DR. MELIUS:** Islip doesn't --

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** No, I think you'd fly into the
7 main airports and then have to go out --

8 **DR. MELIUS:** But it would require rental cars
9 for most people. Brookhaven's quite a ways
10 out.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** Couple of hours, yeah.

12 **DR. MELIUS:** And if you want to get people to
13 come out -- people living -- you know, you'd
14 want people from -- they don't travel -- like
15 to travel in their traffic, either, so you'd
16 want to be -- something out near Brookhaven.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

18 **MS. BEACH:** Well, and Ted, don't forget to add
19 to the list Cincinnati for the -- for Mound and
20 Fernald.

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, he's got that on his --

22 **MS. BEACH:** You've got that?

23 **MR. KATZ:** Yeah, but I --

24 **MS. BEACH:** For July?

25 **MR. KATZ:** -- I don't have -- well, I thought

1 we were going for Idaho Falls for July. I
2 thought that's what you just --

3 **MS. BEACH:** I thought you asked for some
4 backup, so --

5 **MR. KATZ:** Oh, okay, right, so -- and backup is
6 Cincinnati for Mound?

7 **MS. BEACH:** I thought we heard Brookhaven and
8 then Cincinnati for Mound and Fernald.

9 **DR. MELIUS:** And I would keep Hanford on the
10 list, I -- in the sense that -- depending where
11 we are with data and so forth, there'll be more
12 issues out there and I -- I know the groups out
13 there are interested in having us come back
14 out, in addition to visiting our two Board
15 members.

16 **MR. CLAWSON:** I -- and in Idaho I would love to
17 have you come to Idaho Falls, but -- but also,
18 too, I think that we ought to be hitting at the
19 ones that have got the SECs out there right
20 now. That's -- that's my -- that would just be
21 my suggestion. You know, we've got Brookhaven,
22 we've got Hanford, everything else like that.
23 Idaho does not have one at this time, so --

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** We might want to wait --

25 **MR. CLAWSON:** I -- I would suggest that. I'd -

1 - I'd prefer probably in the December time
2 frame for that.

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** I'm just -- the only reason I'm
4 back on Cincinnati is I think Fernald and Mound
5 should be by then far along, you know, with the
6 SEC process. If they're not, we -- we've got
7 some explaining to do. I mean, you know,
8 they've been out there for a while, so...

9 **MR. KATZ:** So is that our first priority?

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** I -- I feel that way, I'm -- you
11 know.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Certainly Idaho's not going to be
13 ready. We don't have a petition yet even.

14 **MR. CLAWSON:** Right, that's -- that's why I say
15 I would focus more (unintelligible).

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Once the petition comes, then we
17 have another 180 days, which is six months.

18 **MR. PRESLEY:** Cincinnati seems to be easy for
19 all of us to get to.

20 **MR. KATZ:** Okay. So just to clarify, May, was
21 that Amarillo?

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** May, Amarillo then, and first
23 choice for July then would be Cincinnati.
24 Okay, thank you. That's helpful.

25 **MR. KATZ:** Thank you.

1 **DR. ZIEMER:** I'd like to ask now if there's any
2 other business to come before this assembly
3 today. Any -- anything that the Chair has
4 overlooked or anything that any member wishes
5 to bring up? Mr. Katz, do you have any items
6 for us?

7 **MR. KATZ:** No, nothing left, thank you, Dr.
8 Ziemer.

9 **MS. MUNN:** Before we close out, as long as
10 we're all here at the table, it would be
11 helpful for the chair of the Blockson group if
12 we could identify a date to meet next time, in
13 the very near future.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, Blockson workgroup, can you
15 -- do you have some dates to suggest, Wanda,
16 and let them respond to that?

17 **MS. MUNN:** I would like very much to be looking
18 at an October date, possibly --

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** And Ted, there had been some
20 discussion on how soon in October we could meet
21 due to issues on continuing resolution. What's
22 the earliest date in October that --

23 **MR. KATZ:** I mean I think I would push the 1st
24 out, but really we could --

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** First week or --

1 **MR. KATZ:** -- we could meet the first week,
2 still, you know --

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** That's difficult after the --

4 **MR. KATZ:** It's -- the first week is a little
5 more difficult, just because we have to get
6 administrative people at other parts of the
7 agency to press some buttons, but -- but it can
8 be done the first week of October if it need
9 be.

10 **MS. MUNN:** My suggestion would be October --
11 the week of October 12th.

12 **DR. ROESSLER:** Sounds good to me.

13 **MS. MUNN:** Is it possible either -- perhaps a
14 Tuesday meeting, Tuesday the 14th of October?

15 **DR. ROESSLER:** In Cincinnati?

16 **MS. MUNN:** Cincinnati, face-to-face?

17 **MS. HOMOKI-TITUS:** Could we just ask that that
18 meeting start late enough for us to fly in that
19 morning, since the 13th is a federal holiday?

20 **MS. MUNN:** How about Wednesday the 14th -- I
21 mean the 15th? Is that acceptable to everyone,
22 full day Wednesday? NIOSH, SCA, will that give
23 us time to pull together what we need to have?

24 **DR. MAURO:** That's fine for us.

25 **MS. MUNN:** All right. Jim?

1 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah.

2 **MS. MUNN:** Okay.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, it looks like Wednesday the
4 15th.

5 **MS. MUNN:** Wednesday the 15th, face-to-face in
6 Cincinnati, Blockson.

7 **DR. ROESSLER:** Starting early?

8 **MS. MUNN:** Starting early --

9 **MR. KATZ:** What -- tell -- tell me how long?

10 **MS. MUNN:** Starting 9:30.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Mr. Presley?

12 **MR. PRESLEY:** Josie has a meeting on Mound the
13 27th --

14 **MS. BEACH:** Suggested meeting at this point.

15 **MR. PRESLEY:** That's a suggested meeting. Brad
16 and I have been talking about Fernald and NTS.
17 Since there are three of us that are on Mound,
18 Fernald and NTS, I would like to propose that
19 we have Fernald the 28th and NTS on the 29th.
20 I reali-- of October. I realize that's three
21 straight days, but that -- if we do that, then
22 that's going to cost the federal government a
23 whole lot less, if we can schedule it that way,
24 if John and NIOSH can accommodate those dates.

25 **MR. STAUDT:** Excuse me, Ted?

1 **MR. KATZ:** Yes.

2 **MR. STAUDT:** Dave Staudt, I'm going to need
3 some -- some people's time in October, probably
4 the week of the 20th. I don't know if you've
5 had an opportunity to discuss that, but that
6 could -- that -- and that could play into your
7 plans there.

8 **MR. KATZ:** Right, no, I -- I have to discuss
9 that individually with Board members, yes, that
10 --

11 **MR. STAUDT:** Okay, I just wanted -- that --
12 that may have some impact.

13 **MR. KATZ:** Thanks, that -- thanks for reminding
14 us, David.

15 **MR. PRESLEY:** Can we put those dates as
16 tentative dates so that the Board members can
17 be thinking about that? Is that all right,
18 Brad?

19 **MR. CLAWSON:** Yes, I've -- I've sent out e-
20 mails to the Fernald workgroup, Josie has, and
21 I believe Bob's sending one out, too, so just
22 to try to be able to do that, and also, Ted, I
23 -- I've -- the only thing with the Blockson is
24 you've asked me to keep those two weeks open --

25 **MR. KATZ:** Yes, right, that's what David was

1 just --

2 **MR. CLAWSON:** Right, I just -- that's the only
3 thing that'd be a problem with hers.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Phil?

5 **MR. SCHOFIELD:** (Off microphone)
6 (Unintelligible)

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Thank you for the suggestion.

8 **MR. CLAWSON:** If I could make a suggestion to
9 Wanda, if -- according to what I've talked with
10 Ted, if -- if we (unintelligible) up the
11 Blockson one for -- on the tail end of NTS, I
12 know that'd be four days, but that'd -- that'd
13 open us -- open it up to us.

14 **MS. MUNN:** I'm not going to be able to attend
15 the NTS. I'm having surgery that week and --

16 **MR. CLAWSON:** Oh --

17 **MS. MUNN:** -- I won't be doing anything the
18 last week in October.

19 **MR. CLAWSON:** So where's your dedica-- can't
20 you call from anesthesia?

21 **MS. MUNN:** No, they're really touchy about
22 that.

23 **MR. CLAWSON:** You called from the beach, so --

24 **MS. MUNN:** Once.

25 **MR. KATZ:** So Wanda, can you just reiterate for

1 me, what -- what are the dates we're talking
2 about tentatively now and which workgroups?

3 **MS. MUNN:** The -- the other workgroups were --
4 were on the 27th, 28th and 29th.

5 **MR. KATZ:** But which workgroups 27th, 28th,
6 29th?

7 **MS. MUNN:** They were Fernald --

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Mound is 27th.

9 **MR. KATZ:** Oh --

10 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah.

11 **MR. PRESLEY:** Mound is the 27th.

12 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah. Mound, Fernald --

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Fernald the 28th, NTS the 29th.

14 **MS. MUNN:** NTS.

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** And Wanda, your workgroup?

16 **MS. MUNN:** My Blockson workgroup was the 15th.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** The 15th.

18 **MR. KATZ:** Right.

19 **MS. MUNN:** Two weeks prior to the --

20 **MR. KATZ:** Right, I've -- I've got that one,
21 thanks.

22 **MS. BEACH:** And I'll add for Mound I'm just
23 waiting for confirmation from Brant if NIOSH'll
24 be ready for that meeting.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. So we can schedule it now

1 and cancel if we need to.

2 **MR. PRESLEY:** Yeah.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Thank you very much. Any
4 other items to come before us today?

5 **MR. PRESLEY:** Do we need to give these back to
6 Stu? Stu, do you need these back?

7 **MR. HINNEFELD:** I can collect them or you can
8 throw them away.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** What -- what are -- you're asking
10 about the -- the list?

11 **MS. HOWELL:** (Off microphone) (Unintelligible)

12 **MR. PRESLEY:** That's what I was going to say, I
13 think Emily wants those.

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** The list of cases, which has some
15 confidential material in it, just turn that
16 back to Stu here before you leave.

17 Ladies and gentlemen, I think that completes
18 our business for this week. I thank you all
19 for your hard work and your dedication to this
20 effort. We stand adjourned.

21 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 12:05
22 p.m.)

23

1

**CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER
STATE OF GEORGIA
COUNTY OF FULTON**

I, Steven Ray Green, Certified Merit Court Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported the above and foregoing on the day of Sept. 4, 2008; and it is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony captioned herein.

I further certify that I am neither kin nor counsel to any of the parties herein, nor have any interest in the cause named herein.

WITNESS my hand and official seal this the 4th day of Oct., 2008.

**STEVEN RAY GREEN, CCR, CVR-CM, PNSC
CERTIFIED MERIT COURT REPORTER
CERTIFICATE NUMBER: A-2102**

I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge, the Transcript of the September 4, 2008 Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health Meeting held at Redondo Beach, CA, is accurate and complete.

October 13, 2008

Paul L. Ziemer, Ph.D.

Chair, Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health