

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

+ + + + +

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL  
SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION  
AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY,  
MARCH 31, 2010

+ + + + +

The Board convened at 11:00 a.m.  
Eastern Daylight Time via teleconference,  
James Melius, Chairman, presiding.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

JAMES MELIUS, Chairman  
HENRY ANDERSON  
JOSIE BEACH  
BRADLEY P. CLAWSON  
WILLIAM FIELD  
MICHAEL H. GIBSON  
MARK GRIFFON  
RICHARD LEMEN  
JAMES LOCKEY  
WANDA MUNN  
ROBERT PRESLEY  
DAVID RICHARDSON  
GENEVIEVE S. ROESSLER  
PHILLIP SCHOFIELD  
PAUL ZIEMER

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

## ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official  
NANCY ADAMS, NIOSH Contractor  
ISAF AL-NABULSI, DOE  
HANS BEHLING, SC&A  
KATHY BEHLING, SC&A  
TERRIE BARRIE, ANWAG  
ANTOINETTE BONSIGNORE, Petitioner  
LAURIE BREYER, DCAS-ORAU  
ALICIA DRESSMAN, Peace Works  
STUART HINNEFELD, DCAS-ORAU  
EMILY HOWELL, HHS  
LARA HUGHES, DCAS-ORAU  
JEFFREY KOTSCH, DOL  
JENNY LIN, HHS  
ARJUN MAKHIJANI, SC&A  
JOHN MAURO, SC&A  
JIM NETON, DCAS-ORAU  
STEVE OSTROW, SC&A  
KATHLEEN PINCHETTI, Blockson  
LAVON RUTHERFORD, DCAS-ORAU  
LEW WADE, DCAS-ORAU

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

Roll Call	4
Welcome	8
Vote on Westinghouse Electric Corp.	9
Canoga Avenue Facility SEC Petition	10
University of Rochester Atomic Energy Project SEC Petition	26
Chapman Valve and Blockson Chemical SEC Petition	31
Discussion of NIOSH 10-Year Program Review	39
DCAS Facility Record Search Methods	42
SEC Class Definitions Analysis (update)	53
Special Exposure Cohort SEC Petition Status Update	56
Work Groups and Subcommittees Updates	62
New Work Group Assignments	89
Managing Conflicts when Tasking	91
Tasking SC & A	95
Board Correspondence	113
Future Plans/Suggestions for May 2010 Board Meeting	114

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

2 (11:01 a.m.)

3 MR. KATZ: Okay, so let's do roll  
4 call beginning with Board members, Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I'm here.

6 MR. KATZ: Dr. Melius.

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I'm present.

8 MEMBER LEMEN: Dr. Lemen is  
9 present.

10 MR. KATZ: Lemen.

11 MEMBER LOCKEY: Dr. Lockey.

12 MR. KATZ: Lockey.

13 MEMBER MUNN: Wanda Munn.

14 MR. KATZ: Munn.

15 MEMBER CLAWSON: Bradley Clawson.

16 MEMBER ZIEMER: Paul Ziemer.

17 MEMBER PRESLEY: Bob Presley.

18 MEMBER FIELD: Bill Field.

19 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Paul Schofield.

20 MEMBER GIBSON: Mike Gibson.

21 MEMBER RICHARDSON: David

22 Richardson.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Mark Griffon  
2 will be a few minutes late.

3 MR. KATZ: Okay. He called me a  
4 few minutes ago. Okay, so far I have Lemen,  
5 Lockey, Munn, Ziemer, Presley, Field,  
6 Schofield, Gibson, Richardson, and there was  
7 one person that was garbled.

8 MEMBER CLAWSON: That would be  
9 Clawson, and then there's Josie.

10 MEMBER BEACH: This is Josie. We  
11 were trying to talk at the same time.

12 MR. KATZ: Okay, so that's 12.  
13 We're still missing two.

14 MEMBER ROESSLER: This is Gen  
15 Roessler.

16 MR. KATZ: Oh, Gen, great.

17 MS. BURGOS: This is Zaida. We're  
18 trying to get in all of them.

19 MR. KATZ: Yes, we're missing  
20 Henry. Dr. Anderson, are you on?

21 MEMBER ANDERSON: Hello.

22 MR. KATZ: Oh, there you are.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That's Dr. Anderson.

2 MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes.

3 MR. KATZ: Okay. We'll continue  
4 with roll call then beyond the Board, knowing  
5 that Mark will be joining us, so next let's  
6 have the NIOSH ORAU team.

7 MR. HINNEFELD: In Cincinnati,  
8 this is Stu Hinnefeld, Lew Wade, and Jim  
9 Neton.

10 MR. RUTHERFORD: LaVon Rutherford  
11 at Cincinnati, as well.

12 DR. HUGHES: This is Lara Hughes,  
13 also in Cincinnati.

14 MS. BREYER: This is Laurie  
15 Breyer, also in Cincinnati.

16 MR. KATZ: Great, welcome all of  
17 you. Now SC&A.

18 DR. MAURO: John Mauro here, SC&A.  
19 Good morning, everyone.

20 MS. BEHLING: Kathy Behling.

21 DR. BEHLING: Hans Behling.

22 DR. MAKHIJANI: Arjun Makhijani.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: Okay. Then how about  
2 HHS or other federal employees or contractors  
3 to the fed.

4 MS. HOWELL: Emily Howell, HHS.

5 MS. AL-NABULSI: Isaf Al-Nabulsi,  
6 DOE.

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

9 MR. KOTSCH: Jeff Kotsch,  
10 Department of Labor.

11 MS. LIN: This is Jenny with HHS.

12 MR. KATZ: Great. Welcome, all,  
13 and then how about any members of the public  
14 who would like to identify themselves for the  
15 record.

16 MS. BARRIE: This is Terrie Barrie  
17 with ANWAG.

18 MR. KATZ: Welcome, Terrie.

19 MS. BARRIE: Good morning.

20 MS. BONSIGNORE: This is  
21 Antoinette Bonsignore for Linde Ceramics.

22 MR. KATZ: Welcome, Antoinette.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. OSTROW: Ted, this is Steve<sup>^</sup>  
2 Ostrow from SC&A. I think I got in a little  
3 bit late.

4 MR. KATZ: Great, Steve.

5 MS. DRESSMAN: This is Alicia  
6 Dressman.

7 MR. KATZ: I'm sorry. Was there  
8 someone else from the public?

9 MS. DRESSMAN: Yes, Alicia  
10 Dressman from Peace Works PSR-KC.

11 MR. KATZ: Alicia Dressman?

12 MS. DRESSMAN: Yes, D as in David,  
13 R-E-S-S-M-A-N.

14 MR. KATZ: Thank you. Welcome.

15 MS. PINCHETTI: And Kathy  
16 Pinchetti with Blockson.

17 MR. KATZ: Welcome, Kathy. Okay.

18 I think that's good for now, and Mark, I'm  
19 sure, will tell us when he joins us and let  
20 me just say for everybody on the line,  
21 there's a lot of feedback and so on.

22 Everyone who is not speaking, when

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 you're not speaking, please mute your phone  
2 starting now. Use \*6 if you don't have a  
3 mute button and then, to rejoin when you do  
4 have to speak, you just hit \*6 again if you  
5 don't have a mute button.

6 Let me just also remind everyone,  
7 since this is a teleconference, please  
8 identify yourself each time you speak. It  
9 will be hard for the court reporter, who is  
10 Chad, to follow who's speaking without that.

11 Thank you and, Jim, it's your  
12 agenda.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thank  
14 you. Jim Melius speaking, and we have a  
15 fairly long agenda, but I think we can get  
16 through it relatively quickly today. I  
17 believe the first item is we have a vote on  
18 the Westinghouse Electric SEC Petition. Ted,  
19 do you want to provide the follow-up on that?

20 MR. KATZ: Yes, thank you, so Mike  
21 Gibson was absent for a portion of the  
22 meeting where the Board voted otherwise

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 unanimously in support of adding this Class,<sup>1^</sup>  
2 the Westinghouse Electric Corporation. On  
3 February 26, Mike Gibson voted in affirmative  
4 with the rest of the Board. So that's a  
5 unanimous vote and that has gone forward,  
6 that recommendation from the Board, and  
7 that's it. Thank you, Dr. Melius.

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. Okay, and  
9 all the letters to the Secretary have gone  
10 forward actually a couple of weeks ago, I  
11 believe at least, so it's set there.

12 The next item on our agenda is an  
13 update on the Canoga Avenue Facility SEC  
14 Petition. As you may remember, last time we  
15 had sort of postponed any action on that.  
16 There were issues about the Class Definition  
17 when settled, so NIOSH has issued an updated  
18 report on that and I believe that Lara Hughes  
19 should be on to give a short presentation and  
20 an update on that.

21 DR. HUGHES: Yes, I'm here. This  
22 is Lara. As Dr. Melius just stated, NIOSH

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 had, since the February 2010 Board meeting,<sup>11</sup>  
2 issued actually two revisions to the SEC  
3 Evaluation Report. This is SEC Number 151  
4 for the Canoga Avenue Facility.

5 I guess I'm just going to go over  
6 the reasons for the change in the Class  
7 Definition since it's already been presented  
8 to the Board.

9 The main reason for changing the  
10 recommendation stems from NIOSH investigation  
11 into whether or not this recommended Class  
12 that NIOSH recommended in February could be  
13 actually administered, and we have since then  
14 determined that because of some issues with  
15 actual work location and access controls, it  
16 would be very difficult to administer a Class  
17 that would be limited by building.

18 This was also confirmed by a  
19 conference call with the Department of Labor  
20 and the revised NIOSH report also included  
21 statements that were made by the petitioner  
22 during the February Board meeting which were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 found to be in support of the NIOSH decision<sup>10</sup>  
2 to change the Class recommendation.

3 For example, those were that the  
4 access control to this one building with the  
5 nuclear operations was not as strictly  
6 enforced as initially assumed and that  
7 workers -- it was common to move workers from  
8 one division to the other and that there were  
9 some indications that facilities that were  
10 located at this building were accessible to  
11 all workers at the site.

12 In addition, the petitioner also  
13 made a statement that some of the related  
14 work may have taken place in other locations  
15 at the facility than this one single building  
16 and for this reason NIOSH has decided to  
17 change its recommendation on the Class  
18 Definition for this facility.

19 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. Thanks,  
20 Lara. Anybody have any questions about that?

21 MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda, but  
22 it would be helpful to have that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 recommendation read again.

2 DR. HUGHES: Okay. Do you mean  
3 the Class Definition?

4 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

5 DR. HUGHES: Okay.

6 MEMBER MUNN: The decision that is  
7 made -- they made with respect to Class  
8 Definition.

9 DR. HUGHES: Okay. The revised  
10 Class Definition would include all employees  
11 of the Department of Energy, its predecessor  
12 agencies, its contractors and subcontractors  
13 who worked at the Canoga Avenue Facility in  
14 Los Angeles, California, from January 1,  
15 1955, through December 31, 1960, for a number  
16 of workdays aggregating at least 250 workdays  
17 occurring either solely under this employment  
18 or in combination with workdays within the  
19 parameters established for one or more  
20 Classes of employees in the SEC -- got a few  
21 revised NIOSH-proposed Classes.

22 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, yes, that's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 great. That's what I wanted to hear. Thank<sup>1 1</sup>  
2 you.

3 MEMBER GIBSON: Jim, this is Mike.

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, Mike.

5 MEMBER GIBSON: This is the same  
6 contractor that operated the Santa Susana  
7 Field Lab site. Is that correct?

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Correct.

9 MEMBER GIBSON: Okay, and there  
10 was a problem with access controls for  
11 employees, so that would -- at least for me  
12 it brings to mind that they may have a  
13 problem determining who also accessed areas,  
14 Area 4 at Santa Susana. That's not the  
15 question of time. I just want that on the  
16 record.

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: That's correct  
18 and I believe your Santa Susana Work Group is  
19 meeting, at least, sometime early in April.  
20 I don't remember the exact date, but that is  
21 certainly one of the issues that your Work  
22 Group should take up.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think the other one that goes<sup>15</sup>  
2 along with that is that there were issues  
3 about SC&A's proposed review of the Site  
4 Profile for Canoga. Well, it turns out there  
5 isn't a Site Profile but there may be also  
6 Site-Profile issues related to that -- to  
7 that facility in addition to the SEC that  
8 need to be taken up, so I think your Work  
9 Group -- I think, in essence we're referring  
10 to other issues related to Canoga than sort  
11 of this bigger issue of the entire Santa  
12 Susana site to your Work Group for follow-up  
13 and there may very well -- may need to be  
14 some additional changes in terms of Class  
15 Definition but I think they would apply so  
16 the entire facility or facilities rather than  
17 only to Canoga.

18 MEMBER GIBSON: Right. Thanks,  
19 Jim.

20 MEMBER ZIEMER: Dr. Melius, Paul  
21 Ziemer here. Could I follow-up on Mike's  
22 question and perhaps ask Dr. Hughes as well,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 by this new Definition and Mike's comment<sup>16</sup>  
2 with regard to Santa Susana, does that mean  
3 Canoga Avenue was in essence available for  
4 access by anyone who worked at the Santa Anna  
5 -- yes, get the right name here, Santa Anna  
6 Facility?

7 DR. HUGHES: This is Lara Hughes.  
8 They were all employed by the same entity or  
9 the same company, which was North American  
10 Aviation. I have no information as to -- you  
11 know, if any given worker could have gone to  
12 each facility, but it was the same company  
13 that operated the facility and they had a DOE  
14 contract.

15 I think it was quite common that  
16 workers were moved either from the Canoga  
17 Avenue facility or to the De Soto facility to  
18 Area 4 and back. We see this a lot in our  
19 claimant files that people had verified  
20 employment at three or four of these  
21 facilities, actually.

22 So I guess the short answer would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 be yes.

2 MEMBER ZIEMER: If the short  
3 answer is yes, doesn't that automatically  
4 make the Santa Anna facility an SEC Class as  
5 well, if any worker from Santa Anna has  
6 access to this and this is an SEC --

7 MR. HINNEFELD: This is Stu  
8 Hinnefeld in Cincinnati, if I can offer  
9 something here.

10 Santa Susana is an SEC for this  
11 period already in Area 4, the part that we  
12 see the claims from, so if people were moving  
13 between Area 4 and Canoga and back, that's  
14 sort of irrelevant to the discussion.

15 MEMBER ZIEMER: So it becomes a  
16 moot point.

17 MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, the point I  
18 think that Mike's point has to do with at  
19 Santa Susana Area 4 is considered a covered  
20 area for EEOICPA. We didn't make that  
21 distinction and to say only Area 4 is in the  
22 SEC. That's a distinction made in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 coverage and so there are claims from workers<sup>10</sup>  
2 at Santa Susana whose primary assignment was  
3 in the other areas, Areas 1 through 3, that  
4 they were periodically assigned to Area 4,  
5 and I don't see any way for us to deal with  
6 that issue.

7 That seems to me to be a  
8 Department of Labor issue because, if the  
9 person is not verified in being in Area 4,  
10 that claim never gets to us. That apparently  
11 is not verified employment.

12 MEMBER ZIEMER: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: This is Jim  
14 Melius. Isn't there also a De Soto Facility?  
15 Isn't that part of that?

16 MR. HINNEFELD: There are two  
17 other facilities. There are De Soto  
18 Facilities and Downey Facility.

19 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

20 MR. HINNEFELD: And we are  
21 pursuing our investigation of the feasibility  
22 of those as well. That's pretty much

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 complete and we are hopeful that those can be<sup>1^</sup>  
2 -- that there may be something on the agenda  
3 for the May meeting for those two sites.

4 MEMBER GIBSON: Jim, this is Mike.

5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, Mike.

6 MEMBER GIBSON: Could DOL -- I  
7 think Mr. Kotsch is on the line. Could he  
8 maybe kind of give us some comment on this as  
9 far as the people who were supposedly  
10 primarily assigned to other areas of Santa  
11 Susana and how they can determine that, you  
12 know, access controls, and they can't for  
13 other facilities?

14 MR. KATZ: Jeff, do you have any -  
15 - are you prepared to comment on that?

16 MR. KOTSCH: I'm not, excuse me,  
17 Jeff Kotsch, Department of Labor. I'm not  
18 sure. I always say we do all these things on  
19 a case-by-case basis and looking at each site  
20 as far as the employment data or information  
21 goes, and we don't really -- you know, we  
22 obviously won't get into things like access

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 control and things like that. Those are to<sup>o</sup>  
2 be used in the definition of a Class, but I  
3 mean I guess all I'm prepared to say right  
4 now is that, if you're looking at multi-site  
5 people, people at multi-site for Atomics  
6 International, we would have to look at the  
7 employment information we have either  
8 collectively or for each of those facilities.

9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Mike, I would  
10 think that maybe within the work group  
11 meeting you can sort of get caught up with  
12 what NIOSH is doing with the other parts of  
13 this overall complex, and then also start  
14 working on other issues about people moving  
15 in from other parts of the facility that  
16 might not be covered and how that might be  
17 dealt with because I think it's fairly  
18 complicated.

19 If they're not currently part of  
20 the designated facility, then it will require  
21 some -- may require some follow-up by DOL,  
22 but I think if we can get some clarification

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it would be helpful.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thanks,  
3 Jim.

4 MR. KATZ: This is Ted Katz. Can  
5 I just note we just booked the meeting for  
6 the work group for April 20th for Santa  
7 Susana, and I just wanted to note for Jeff or  
8 someone from DOL, you might want to -- if  
9 you'd be willing to listen in on that meeting  
10 by teleconference, it might be helpful at  
11 least for part of the meeting and we can  
12 communicate later about what part of the  
13 meeting would be most helpful for you to  
14 join, but it sounds like it might be helpful.

15 MR. KOTSCH: Ted, this is Jeff  
16 Kotsch. You haven't sent that out yet, but  
17 I'll tentatively put it on our agenda. I may  
18 even try to put one of our facility people on  
19 the phone, too.

20 MR. KATZ: Thank you very much.

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Great. Thanks,  
22 Jeff. Any other questions on Canoga Avenue?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 If not, we need a motion to accept or deny<sup>^^</sup>  
2 and I would indicate for those of you that  
3 are not on the Board at least, I did  
4 circulate a draft letter to the Secretary on  
5 this issue, so I think everyone should have  
6 received that, at least the Board members on  
7 Monday, and the NIOSH and other staff people,  
8 but can we have a motion?

9 MEMBER GIBSON: Jim, this is Mike,  
10 so moved.

11 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

12 MEMBER ANDERSON: I'll second it.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thank you. That  
14 was Henry?

15 MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Any  
17 further discussion? If not, Ted, do you want  
18 to do a roll call?

19 MR. KATZ: Sure. Can you hear me?

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

21 MR. KATZ: So, my only question is  
22 do we need to -- or maybe Emily should let us

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 now -- do we need to read in the record first<sup>^^</sup>  
2 or afterwards, whichever?

3 MS. HOWELL: Please, if you could  
4 clarify what the motion is for and read it  
5 into the record.

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Why don't  
7 I read the letter into the record?

8 MEMBER ANDERSON: That's a good  
9 idea.

10 MR. KATZ: Thanks, Jim.

11 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Sorry. Madam  
12 Secretary, the Advisory Board on Radiation  
13 and Worker Health, the Board, has evaluated  
14 SEC Petition 00151 concerning workers at the  
15 Canoga Avenue Facility in Los Angeles,  
16 California, under the statutory requirements  
17 established by EEOICPA, incorporated into 42  
18 CFR 83.13.

19 The Board respectfully recommends  
20 special exposure status be afforded to all  
21 employees of the Department of Energy, its  
22 predecessor agencies and their contractors

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and subcontractors who worked in any area of  
2 the Canoga Avenue facility from January 1,  
3 1955, through December 31, 1960, for a number  
4 of workdays aggregating at least 250 workdays  
5 occurring either solely under this employment  
6 or in combination with workdays within the  
7 parameters established for one or more other  
8 Classes of employees included in the Special  
9 Exposure Cohort.

10 This recommendation is based on  
11 the following factors: (1) the Canoga Avenue  
12 facility was involved in development and  
13 testing of nuclear reactors and related  
14 research; (2) NIOSH found that there was  
15 insufficient monitoring data or information  
16 on radiological operations at this facility  
17 in order to be able to complete accurate  
18 individual dose reconstructions involving  
19 internal radiation exposures for Canoga  
20 Avenue workers during the time period in  
21 question. The Board concurs with this  
22 conclusion; (3) NIOSH determined that health

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 may have been endangered for the workers<sup>25</sup>  
2 exposed to radiation in the facility during  
3 the time period in question. The Board  
4 concurs with this determination.

5 Based on these considerations and  
6 the discussions held at our February 9th  
7 through 11th, 2010 Advisory Board meeting in  
8 Manhattan Beach, California, and March 31st,  
9 2010, Board meeting conference call, the  
10 Board recommends that this Special Exposure  
11 Cohort Petition be granted.

12 Enclosed is documentation from the  
13 Board meetings where this Special Exposure  
14 Cohort Class was discussed. Documentation  
15 includes transcripts from deliberations,  
16 copies of the petition, the NIOSH review  
17 thereof and related materials.

18 If any of these items are  
19 unavailable at this time, they will follow  
20 shortly.

21 MR. KATZ: Thank you, Jim.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Now can you do

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the roll call?

2 MR. KATZ: Yes. Okay, and let me  
3 just note for the record that there are no  
4 Board member conflicts related to this. So,  
5 I'm just going to do this alphabetically.  
6 Dr. Anderson.

7 MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes.

8 MR. KATZ: Ms. Beach.

9 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

10 MR. KATZ: Mr. Clawson.

11 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes.

12 MR. KATZ: Dr. Field.

13 MEMBER FIELD: Yes.

14 MR. KATZ: Mr. Gibson.

15 MEMBER GIBSON: Yes.

16 MR. KATZ: Mr. Griffon.

17 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.

18 MR. KATZ: Dr. Lemen.

19 MEMBER LEMEN: Yes.

20 MR. KATZ: Dr. Lockey.

21 MEMBER LOCKEY: Yes.

22 MR. KATZ: Dr. Melius.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

2 MR. KATZ: Ms. Munn.

3 MEMBER MUNN: Aye.

4 MR. KATZ: Dr. Poston. Okay, Dr.  
5 Poston, are you with us?

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I don't believe  
7 he is, Ted.

8 MR. KATZ: Okay. I recall I  
9 didn't hear him. Mr. Presley.

10 MEMBER PRESLEY: Yes.

11 MR. KATZ: Dr. Richardson.

12 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.

13 MR. KATZ: Dr. Roessler.

14 MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes.

15 MR. KATZ: Mr. Schofield.

16 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes.

17 MR. KATZ: Dr. Ziemer.

18 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.

19 MR. KATZ: Okay. That is  
20 unanimous with Dr. Poston absent and,  
21 according to Board procedures, I will pursue  
22 his vote subsequent to this meeting unless

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 he's joins the meeting today. Dr. Melius.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thank  
3 you. The next item on our agenda is the  
4 University of Rochester Atomic Energy Project  
5 SEC Petition and Dr. Hughes will be giving us  
6 an update on data-capture issues.

7 DR. HUGHES: Okay. This is Lara  
8 Hughes. The SEC was presented to the Board at  
9 the October 2009 Board meeting and since then  
10 NIOSH has pursued actually six different leads  
11 from gathering data capture, well, actually  
12 five because the first one was done by Dr.  
13 Melius who contacted the State Labor Agency of  
14 New York, the state of New York, which did not  
15 believe that to any results or any data are  
16 found.

17 The second location was Hanford.  
18 The site was contacted because there were  
19 indications that the collection of Dr. J.  
20 Newall Stannard was sent there for record-  
21 keeping.

22 The search that was done at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Hanford yielded some search results. However,<sup>^^</sup>  
2 so far Hanford has been unable to actually  
3 locate the boxes that showed up in their  
4 search items.

5           There were record transfer sheets  
6 that indicated these records may have been  
7 transferred somewhere else and NIOSH is  
8 currently following up tracking down these  
9 records and, to give some background  
10 information, Dr. Stannard was I think -- let  
11 me see, Department Chair of the department at  
12 the University of Rochester for many years and  
13 he had a considerable collection of records,  
14 and it is our goal to actually look at these  
15 records to see if any bioassay data, usable  
16 bioassay data is contained in them.

17           The third location we looked at is  
18 Washington State University because there were  
19 indications that Hanford had actually loaned  
20 this collection that we're looking for to  
21 Washington State University, and to date, only  
22 two boxes that seemed part of this collection

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 were located and reviewed and did not contain<sup>^^</sup>  
2 any records that pertained to the University  
3 of Rochester.

4 Follow-up with Washington State  
5 indicated that these records may not have  
6 actually been sent there because of  
7 classification issues.

8 NIOSH has pursued this lead over  
9 the past few months and at the moment it looks  
10 like these records may have been transferred  
11 to the National Archives in Seattle. And this  
12 lead is currently being followed.

13 A fourth site that was  
14 investigated is the University of Tennessee at  
15 Knoxville which has a special collection  
16 library which had part of the -- what is  
17 called the Stannard Collection. At this time  
18 it is not clear if this is a separate  
19 collection or if this part of the initial  
20 number of boxes that we're looking for.

21 His collection consisted of 26  
22 boxes that were reviewed by a NIOSH data-

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 capture team during the week of March 15, and<sup>21</sup>  
2 52 documents were captured that related to the  
3 University of Rochester.

4 None of these records were related  
5 to bioassay data and some very limited source  
6 term information was found.

7 A fifth lead was NIOSH did an  
8 additional search at the Oak Ridge Operations  
9 Office Vault to search for classified or  
10 formerly classified information on the  
11 University of Rochester.

12 This involved the review of 46  
13 boxes of records and the records were found  
14 recording film badge services that were  
15 provided by the University of Rochester but  
16 for other sites. No indication of bioassay  
17 data existed in this collection.

18 And the last location that was  
19 checked is the National Archives and Records  
20 Administration in College Park, Maryland.  
21 This is the data capture that was ongoing  
22 during the time this report was presented to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Board in October 2009.

2           Since then, some data was received  
3 from the College Park facility in November  
4 2009 and an additional data-capture trip has  
5 been completed in February of 2010. During  
6 that search, 33 documents were captured that  
7 pertained to the University of Rochester in  
8 some form, but none are related to monitoring  
9 or source term data of any kind and have been  
10 found not to be relevant for any of the issues  
11 and that concludes my update. Do you have any  
12 questions?

13           CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Anybody have any  
14 questions for Lara?

15           MEMBER MUNN: It sounds like  
16 there's a pretty thorough search going on.

17           CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, but there  
18 are still some -- if I understood you  
19 correctly, some -- you're still waiting back  
20 to hear or to follow-up on some of these.

21           DR. HUGHES: Yes, that's correct,  
22 yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: So I think we<sup>^^</sup>  
2 may have it updated at the May meeting?

3 DR. HUGHES: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, okay.  
5 Thanks. Next item on our agenda is the  
6 Chapman Valve and Blockson Chemical SEC  
7 Petitions. This item is on our agenda mainly  
8 for the new members of the Board and you were  
9 given lots of information to read about our  
10 review and deliberations on these two sites  
11 and I think this is if they had any additional  
12 technical questions about any of the materials  
13 they received or that -- not intending to have  
14 any sort of votes of follow-up on the --

15 Whoever is talking on the phone,  
16 could you please mute your phone because --  
17 anyway.

18 I guess for the new Board members,  
19 do you have any questions on those two sites  
20 or the information on those two sites?

21 MEMBER ANDERSON: No, I don't.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. David, do

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you at this time, David Richardson?

2 MEMBER RICHARDSON: I have -- I  
3 guess I do have one question. It's about --  
4 there was a presentation last time about  
5 Blockson, and so, are we asking questions  
6 about both of these?

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, either one,  
8 I think.

9 MEMBER RICHARDSON: So Blockson,  
10 regarding Blockson, I'm wondering if -- I  
11 still have a sense of the variance in the  
12 estimates that are being assigned.

13 For example, what's the difference  
14 between -- everybody's getting -- at the  
15 facility is getting an assigned dose, right?  
16 It's not broken out by job title or area or  
17 anything like that at Blockson, correct?

18 DR. NETON: Correct. Dr.  
19 Richardson, this is Jim Neton. Are you  
20 talking about the radon exposure?

21 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes, about the  
22 radon exposure.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. NETON: Everyone at Blockson<sup>25</sup>  
2 Chemical would receive the exact same radon  
3 exposure which is the 95th percentile of the  
4 distribution of activities generated by the  
5 probabilistic model.

6 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Right, and so  
7 can you tell me what the mean of that is and  
8 what the 95th percentile is?

9 DR. NETON: The 95th percentile is  
10 17.6 picocuries per liter and I don't recall  
11 the mean. It was -- hang on here. I think  
12 the geometric mean was 4.2 picocuries per  
13 liter, yes, with a 92nd percentile of 17.6.

14 If you generate the geometric  
15 standard deviation of that distribution, it  
16 equates a GSD of 2.9.

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Is that helpful,  
18 David?

19 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes, that's  
20 helpful. Is it possible for you to create a -  
21 - I could do it, but if you have a picture of  
22 the distribution.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. NETON: Actually there's a  
2 picture that I was provided in one of the  
3 reports to the Board. I think it was one of  
4 the last reports that was provided in the  
5 database that was sent and it was generated on  
6 September 25, 2009 and that's where we compare  
7 the so-called Polish study data to the  
8 Blockson model, and there are two lines on a  
9 graph of Figure 1, the only figure in that  
10 22-page paper, and it does show a diagram that  
11 shows the distribution.

12 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Do you have  
13 the name of that document?

14 DR. NETON: The title is  
15 Evaluation of Blockson Chemical Radon Model  
16 Dated September 25, 2009.

17 If you go into the data files in -

18 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Blockson docs,  
19 SC&A and NIOSH.

20 DR. NETON: Right, and there's an  
21 Excel spreadsheet. If you click on that Excel  
22 spreadsheet, it will give you a chronological

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 listing of all of the documents, and it's one<sup>27</sup>  
2 of the latter documents in that database. I  
3 don't recall exactly -

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: David, I've got  
5 the document here, and I'll forward it to you.

6 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: The email, I  
8 just happened to be able to pull it up  
9 quickly, so - from what I originally received  
10 it.

11 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: That would be  
13 helpful.

14 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Thanks.

15 MS. PINCHETTI: This is Kathy  
16 Pinchetti. I think that that was the whole  
17 question that's been going - that's been  
18 debated for the past couple of years is what  
19 we're basing that model on and if the Board<sup>27</sup>  
20 even agrees that you're using the right  
21 information.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, maybe,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Kathy, you're the petitioner, correct?

2 MS. PINCHETTI: Right, yes.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, that's  
4 right. That's what I thought. Today we're  
5 not really going to be sort of debating or  
6 discussing the - trying to reach a decision on  
7 this. This is simply just to try to make sure  
8 that the new Board members who just recently  
9 joined the Board really at the last meeting  
10 have adequate information so that when we do  
11 discuss this which will be at the May Board  
12 meeting, they're ready and prepared to  
13 participate as we try to reach some closure on  
14 this.

15 MS. PINCHETTI: Okay, but the  
16 information that they're getting is that this  
17 has been an issue for quite awhile?

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, they had a  
19 full briefing at the last meeting and were  
20 given a lot of the background documents. It's  
21 just that it's a lot of documents, a lot of  
22 information and just to sort through, so we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just put this on the agenda this time in order<sup>^^</sup>  
2 to make sure if they had further questions  
3 before the meeting or needed additional  
4 documentation that they would have a chance to  
5 bring it up now.

6 MS. PINCHETTI: Okay, thanks.

7 MEMBER LEMEN: This is Richard  
8 Lemen. I don't have any need for more  
9 information.

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And Bill Field.  
11 Bill, are you on the line?

12 MEMBER FIELD: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. I just -  
14 if you had any additional questions on either  
15 Chapman or Blockson.

16 MEMBER FIELD: Yes, my question is  
17 focused on Chapman Valve.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

19 MEMBER FIELD: And I just wanted  
20 to know is there any - has there been any  
21 updates on sources of exposure that we sort of  
22 discussed at the last full meeting or is that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pretty much how things pretty much still  
2 stand?

3 DR. NETON: There is no new  
4 information to offer on other potential  
5 sources of exposures outside the activity that  
6 originally maybe covered the employees in the  
7 first place which is the sheeting -

8 COURT REPORTER: Hi, I'm sorry.  
9 This is the court reporter. Who is speaking -  
10 identify themselves.

11 DR. NETON: I'm sorry. This is  
12 Jim Neton. Outside of the machining of sludge  
13 from the Brookhaven Research Reactor, there is  
14 no other information that we have been able to  
15 find that indicates any other activities  
16 occurred there that were AEC related.

17 MEMBER FIELD: And, Jim, I just  
18 wanted to verify. The claimants for this  
19 site, does this pretty much agree with what  
20 they report as well?

21 DR. NETON: Yes, we - yes.

22 MEMBER FIELD: Okay. That's all I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 had.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any other  
3 questions or comments on either of those sites  
4 from the new members? Okay. If not, thank  
5 you, and we'll be discussing these at our next  
6 meeting.

7 The next item on our agenda is the  
8 discussion of the NIOSH ten-year program  
9 review, and this was on our agenda. We had a  
10 presentation at the beginning of the meeting  
11 on our last Board meeting. We really didn't  
12 have much time for discussion, and we just  
13 want a chance - if anybody had any follow-up  
14 questions or comments or suggestions for that  
15 review to give you an opportunity to say so.

16 I will indicate that when the  
17 Outreach Working Group met recently, they were  
18 briefed by the NIOSH staff that are involved  
19 in the outreach portions of this review to try  
20 to coordinate and comment on that, so I think  
21 - I know, Mike Gibson, if you have any  
22 comments on that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MEMBER GIBSON:       No additional  
2                   comments, Jim. We're going to work with them  
3                   and see how we can coordinate our efforts.

4                   CHAIRMAN MELIUS:       Anybody else  
5                   have any comments. I don't know if Lew Wade's  
6                   on the phone.

7                   DR. WADE:    Yes, I am, Jim.

8                   CHAIRMAN MELIUS:       Okay, Lew, do  
9                   you want to give us an update on where things  
10                  are?

11                  DR. WADE:        Just work is  
12                  proceeding. In fact, I'm here in Cincinnati  
13                  to meet with a team that's looking at the  
14                  science issues, so work is proceeding.

15                  I would like before the next Board  
16                  meeting in May to have completed the Phase 1  
17                  report on the individual dose reconstruction  
18                  review and have that available to the Board,  
19                  and I would present that at the meeting not  
20                  only to focus on some of those issues but to  
21                  give you an idea of the form that this Phase 1  
22                  review will take.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           As you recall, the Phase 1 review<sup>12</sup>  
2           is intended to be data driven assessment of  
3           program activities. We would assemble those  
4           five reports, individual DR, SEC, science  
5           issues, timing issues, and customer service  
6           issues. Once those Phase 1 reports were  
7           completed and reviewed by the Board, then John  
8           Howard would assemble a team that would take  
9           those and use those to trigger analysis of  
10          potential program improvements.

11           So I'd commit now to have one of  
12          those Phase 1 reports, the one on individual  
13          dose reconstructions, available to the Board  
14          to review and comment upon when you meet in  
15          May.

16                   CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. Thanks,  
17          Lew. Anybody have questions for Lew or  
18          comments on the review?

19           Okay. If not, we'll move to the  
20          next item on our agenda which is the Facility  
21          Record Research Methods that DCAS uses. LaVon  
22          Rutherford.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, this is  
2 LaVon Rutherford, and can everyone hear me?

3 At the February Board meeting - I  
4 was making sure I had my mute off - at the  
5 February Board meeting, the Advisory Board  
6 asked that I provide some detail to the  
7 Advisory Board concerning our efforts, DCAS's  
8 facility records search methods. I will  
9 briefly discuss our standard data search  
10 method and provide some detail as to how our  
11 SEC data captures our focus.

12 In general, I can say that the  
13 locations we've searched for records have  
14 changed over time. Based on our lessons  
15 learned from previous data captures and  
16 information we have uncovered from some of the  
17 large database searches that we've done, we've  
18 increased the standard location that we search  
19 for information.

20 The level of effort required or  
21 necessary for a data capture in support of a  
22 Site Profile or an SEC evaluation depends

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 largely on how much data and information we've<sup>^r</sup>  
2 already retrieved.

3           There's been considerable effort  
4 up to this point in large, early-on data  
5 captures that were done in development of Site  
6 Profiles in early evaluation, so there's been  
7 a lot of data captured for different  
8 facilities, so the level of effort required  
9 for these data captures is very much dependent  
10 on how much information we have.

11           A little bit about our standard  
12 data search, obviously searching for records  
13 to support dose reconstruction for a DOE site  
14 is typically much easier than searching for  
15 records for an AWE that may no longer exist.

16           For DOE facilities, our records  
17 search is focused at the site if it's still in  
18 existence. If not in existence, we focus our  
19 efforts at the Federal records centers where  
20 the records would typically be transferred,  
21 also at the Legacy Management sites.

22           For AWEs we start out by tracing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the facility history and ownership. You know,<sup>16</sup>  
2 did the owners change over time? If you  
3 remember from my United Nuclear presentation  
4 at the February Board meeting, our ownership  
5 changed - ownership at that site changed three  
6 or four different times over the period of  
7 operation.

8 Then we request information from  
9 each of those former owners and any current  
10 owner. A lot of times the specific facility  
11 records are transferred along with the  
12 ownership, so we may get a current owner  
13 that's operating the facility today may  
14 actually have information from a previous  
15 owner that was transferred to them when  
16 ownership was transferred.

17 Then we'll move onto state  
18 regulatory agencies that may have had some  
19 jurisdiction over the site. For example,  
20 United Nuclear, again, this is the one I  
21 presented at the last February - at the  
22 February Board meeting.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           We requested information from the<sup>17</sup>  
2 Missouri Department of Natural Resources, and  
3 we received five documents, so we do look at  
4 those state regulatory agencies. I know there  
5 were questions with the University of  
6 Rochester on whether we'd actually done that  
7 through New York, but we do typically look  
8 through those, and those are included in our  
9 data capture synopsis.

10           The National Archives and Records  
11 Administration or the Federal Record Centers,  
12 we do go to the Federal Records Centers'  
13 holdings for data on facilities.

14           The Office of Scientific and  
15 Technical Information, OSTI, in addition to  
16 the internet searches we will do through OSTI,  
17 we also go to the site, OSTI, and request any  
18 documentation or information from sites in  
19 their classified holdings and such, stuff  
20 that's not available via the internet.

21           We've got a DOE grand junction  
22 office, FUSRAP holdings. We review

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information from them as well.

2 Internet searches, one of our  
3 early lessons learned in the - not only mainly  
4 from an SEC perspective because that's where I  
5 felt it the most, one of the early lessons  
6 learned was standard Google search can be very  
7 helpful.

8 We have 136 key words that are  
9 standard words that are used in our internet  
10 searches. We add to that based on the site  
11 specifics associated with the evaluation or  
12 the Site Profile development and so on.

13 For example, again, from the  
14 United Nuclear evaluation, this is mine, so I  
15 know this. For example, again, in that United  
16 Nuclear evaluation, our Google search, we  
17 ended up retrieving 17 documents that we did  
18 not have prior to doing that search.

19 Also there are 11 databases that  
20 are searched. These are databases that  
21 contain site databases, they're DOE databases,  
22 DOE Comprehensive Epidemiologic Data Resource

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 CDER database, and these are researched for  
2 every one of these. It's not just - we don't  
3 just look at these and say, hey, I don't  
4 really think I need to search that. We search  
5 these.

6 DOE Hanford Declassified Document  
7 Retrieval System, the DDRS, DOE Legacy  
8 Management Considered Sites, National Academy  
9 Press', National Nuclear Security  
10 Administration, the NNSA, NRC ADAMS database  
11 which is the Agency-wide Document Access and  
12 Management System.

13 OSTI, we have three databases that  
14 are searched through their Energy Citations,  
15 Information Bridge, and OpenNet, and then  
16 Washington State University has a database for  
17 U.S. transuranium and uranium registries.

18 As we research a site, we will add  
19 additional keywords or search additional  
20 resources. For example, again back on United  
21 Nuclear we actually ended up - we got a hit  
22 that the Cincinnati Public Library may have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information on United Nuclear - free  
2 documentation from the Cincinnati Public  
3 Library from - so as we're searching and  
4 looking at information, we add in when we have  
5 a hit or when we have an idea that another  
6 source may be available.

7 Also, as we found with the  
8 University of Rochester research, searching  
9 key individual names may provide additional  
10 information, and that's one place where we  
11 failed somewhat with the University of  
12 Rochester recognizing that the data actually -  
13 the information could actually be stored in  
14 these databases by specific names of  
15 individuals that had a lot of responsibilities  
16 at these sites.

17 For SEC Petition Evaluations,  
18 during the early phase of our evaluation, and  
19 I'm going to kind of go back a little bit  
20 here, in our early phase of an evaluation, we  
21 define our potential SEC issues.

22 These issues are derived from the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 issues identified by the petitioner, issues<sup>51</sup>  
2 that may have been brought up or identified by  
3 SC&A during a Site Profile review, issues that  
4 may have been brought up by DCAS or our  
5 contractor staff, and issues that we have  
6 dealt with with other sites that may have been  
7 an issue for that - for the site we're  
8 evaluating.

9 For example, we may have a new SEC  
10 Petition that we know thorium operations  
11 occurred. Obviously we have had issues with  
12 thorium in the past. Even if that was not  
13 identified by the petitioner, we would have  
14 looked at that as a potential issue that we  
15 need to evaluate.

16 Once we define our issues, we  
17 identify a path forward for resolving the  
18 issue. Resolution of an issue may require  
19 additional data capture.

20 In this case, the data captures  
21 are focused on looking for specific  
22 information to resolve an issue. When we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 complete our data capture efforts in support  
2 of an SEC evaluation, we put together a data  
3 capture synopsis.

4 As everyone has seen, at the back  
5 of the evaluations there's always attached a  
6 data capture synopsis. The synopsis  
7 identifies the locations where records were  
8 searched. It also provides a brief  
9 description of what - of the types of records  
10 that we found during that search and how many  
11 total number of documents as well as the date  
12 that it actually occurred.

13 So those are the things that we do  
14 in addition that are specific to SEC. That's  
15 what I have for the - pretty much all I have  
16 on the issues. Are there specific questions,  
17 or things that I didn't address?

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Anybody have  
19 questions for LaVon? I would have sort of a  
20 comment. One is that I mean I don't  
21 necessarily view like the University of  
22 Rochester as your failure as much as - or that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 somebody did something wrong or whatever. I  
2 just think it points out that how complicated  
3 and difficult it is and how it can - it is  
4 sort of following back on a trail.

5 I guess my question is that to me  
6 or maybe it's a comment, more of a comment, is  
7 that as you are working on a site or  
8 evaluating a site you're going to discover new  
9 information or new potential leads so that the  
10 attempt to identify documents in the data  
11 capture sort of needs to be an ongoing effort.

12 I assume that it is. It's not - obviously  
13 you do it at the beginning, but it's also  
14 something that you would do if you go along in  
15 the development of a Site Profile or an SEC  
16 evaluation or later following up on a site.

17 MR. RUTHERFORD: And I think that  
18 adds an excellent point in that one of the big  
19 problems or the problems or issues that we  
20 deal with in balancing the - meeting the 180-  
21 day SEC evaluation, we can go down and be  
22 evaluating information and you can recover 400

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 documents, and in that process of reviewing<sup>51</sup>  
2 that 400 documents you find out that - a  
3 potential resource of information late in the  
4 game of evaluation that you need to go recover  
5 that information, and so it's our  
6 responsibility to bring that up to the DCAS  
7 director and make him aware of that that, you  
8 know, there's potentially information here  
9 that may help us resolve an issue or may  
10 actually identify a new issue that may force  
11 us to have to delay completion of our  
12 evaluation, and that is something that we  
13 struggle and deal with all the time.

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Anybody else  
15 have any questions or comments for LaVon?

16 MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer. I  
17 have a comment.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Go ahead, Paul.

19 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, well, I just  
20 wanted to sort of compliment LaVon and the  
21 staff there for their efforts on data  
22 captures. I know it's a tremendous job.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           To some extent they've had to  
2 learn as they've gone forward as well, and I  
3 know we all have frustrations from time to  
4 time when we feel in some cases like they  
5 haven't really addressed all the potential  
6 resources.

7           Sometimes that's kind of quirk as  
8 it was in the case of Rochester that we happen  
9 to know of some possible leads that they  
10 hadn't thought of, but I think in general we  
11 should be appreciative of the vast effort that  
12 the agency has made to uncover these  
13 documents.

14           MEMBER MUNN: I certainly agree  
15 with that. This is Wanda. There's no way  
16 we're ever going to be able to have perfect  
17 information, but it appears from the view of  
18 the person outside of the process that the  
19 number of sources that have been identified  
20 and have been followed up despite the numerous  
21 tangents that are required once we really get  
22 into a data set has been exemplary.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   CHAIRMAN MELIUS:       Thank you,  
2                   Wanda.   Anybody else have comments?   If not,  
3                   LaVon,   you're   still   on   for   SEC   Class  
4                   Definition analysis update.

5                   MR. RUTHERFORD:   All right.   I'll  
6                   jump   into   that   now.   As   we   mentioned   -  
7                   actually as I had presented at the February  
8                   meeting, we have completed an assessment that  
9                   looked at how Class Definitions have changed  
10                  over time.   At that meeting, I also mentioned  
11                  based on that assessment we do recognize we  
12                  have changed how we define Classes and because  
13                  of that, we are going to review each Class  
14                  Definition - and ensuring Class Definitions  
15                  are properly defined.

16                  Unfortunately we have not started  
17                  our   full-scale   review   of   the   Class  
18                  Definitions, and that's because due to  
19                  resources being used to support meeting our  
20                  June 1, 2010, date, we have been unable to  
21                  fully start this process.

22                  However, we will be presenting an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 83.14 at the May Advisory Board meeting. That  
2 is part of this process. We will be proposing  
3 a Class for Los Alamos National Lab that will  
4 remove the current restrictions associated  
5 with technical areas, and it will become all  
6 employees, and that is based on a review of  
7 how we define that Class and the  
8 implementation of that Class and where we  
9 would define it today.

10 We anticipate our full-scale  
11 review will begin shortly after June 1, and  
12 our schedule for completing our review and the  
13 current status will be presented to the  
14 Advisory Board at the August 2010 meeting, and  
15 that's what I have on the SEC Class Definition  
16 analysis.

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thanks, LaVon.  
18 Any comments or questions? I actually have a  
19 comment to start off.

20 I think one of the things we'd be  
21 looking for, I think we talked about this at  
22 the last meeting, is also how this Class

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Definition issue is coordinated with the<sup>50</sup>  
2 Department of Labor.

3 I believe we asked the Department  
4 of Labor to make a presentation at our May  
5 meeting on sort of - from their side the Class  
6 Definition issues and how we make them more  
7 workable for them, and I believe the  
8 Department of Energy also would like to be  
9 involved in that discussion, so I assume we're  
10 going ahead with that for the May meeting?

11 MR. KOTSCH: This is Jeff Kotsch  
12 of Labor. Yes, we're planning on it.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, good,  
14 because I think it would be helpful. I think  
15 it would also feed into this sort of  
16 retrospective review that NIOSH is doing or is  
17 about to start in June.

18 Anybody else have any questions or  
19 comments? Okay if not, the next issue - let's  
20 see. Who is this? LaVon again, petition  
21 status update.

22 MR. RUTHERFORD: All right. I'll

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 give it so that I give everyone a little<sup>er</sup>  
2 update on what we plan to present at the May  
3 meeting, new sites, and also have some updates  
4 for some questions that were brought up at the  
5 February Board meeting.

6 83.14s that we plan on - and Stu  
7 kind of stole my thunder a little bit - we  
8 plan on presenting De Soto, Downey, BWXT, and  
9 Los Alamos National Lab. The Los Alamos  
10 National Lab, 83.14, is the one I just  
11 mentioned briefly, and then De Soto and Downey  
12 are both 83.14s and BWXT.

13 As for 83.13s, we are currently  
14 planning to present the St. Louis Airport  
15 storage site. Hooker Electrochemical, we are  
16 working on an internal issue with that one,  
17 but right now we are scheduling to present  
18 that one.

19 Weldon Springs will be presented  
20 at this Board meeting as well, and potentially  
21 we would be presenting a revision to the Mound  
22 Evaluation Report. That is dependent on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 whether the Work Group can get together and  
2 feels ready for us to make that presentation.

3 Also at the February Board  
4 meeting, I had a couple of action items that  
5 were given to me, and Ted was - thanks to Ted  
6 he reminded me on a couple of them because I  
7 had actually missed them.

8 One of them, we had held - the  
9 Board had held up action on Hangar 481 until  
10 the FOIA request had been received by the  
11 petitioner and it had given time to review  
12 that information, and I was asked to give a  
13 status on that.

14 The non-DOE records have been sent  
15 to the petitioner's representative, and NOISH  
16 has sent the DOE records to the DOE FOIA  
17 office for review and clearance.

18 Unfortunately I can't give you a  
19 good estimate when DOE records will be  
20 released by the FOIA office at this time. As  
21 soon as we are aware that they have been  
22 released, we will notify the Board.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   Also United Nuclear Core, the  
2 Board had requested a copy of the letter the  
3 petitioners sent to Larry Elliot concerning  
4 Westinghouse withholding data and the DCAS  
5 response.

6                   That was actually an email to  
7 Larry. It was a lengthy email. The email and  
8 the response are in the Advisory Board's  
9 folder for United Nuclear entitled Email - and  
10 the title for that file is Email from  
11 Petitioner to Larry Elliot.

12                   There were a couple of issues  
13 brought up with United Nuclear that I could  
14 address with the TBD 6001 work group, but  
15 since it was brought up during the full Board  
16 meeting, I figure I'll respond to them now  
17 somewhat, and I'm sure it will get into more  
18 detail when we get into the Work Group.

19                   A question was raised by the  
20 Advisory Board concerning Table 6-2 of the  
21 report. Table 6-2 provides an indication of  
22 how much data is available, film badge data

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for the given years.

2 The Board asked if we could  
3 provide an update as to the number of film  
4 badge results for the 1958 through 1960  
5 period. That had a note of - an x note that  
6 indicated that data exists, but the specific  
7 number of samples collected or individuals  
8 monitored was not available.

9 As I looked at that a little  
10 closer, I realized our note is somewhat  
11 misleading. It is true that the data exists,  
12 but it exists in a summary report or client  
13 inspection report.

14 The report indicates everyone was  
15 badged and the records maintained - are  
16 maintained for each individual. The report  
17 also indicates that average and maximum  
18 readings, however, at this time we have not  
19 received the individual data for the '58  
20 through 1960 period film badge data, so I  
21 wanted to clarify that.

22 Also Dr. Fields mentioned he would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 like to see the document that discusses how<sup>62</sup>  
2 they were controlling airborne levels for  
3 thorium, and I have placed that document in  
4 the Board's folders. It was actually in there  
5 already, but it's identified as SRDB number  
6 62430.

7 The last item is the United  
8 Nuclear schedule. I'd indicated that we were  
9 revising the Appendix associated with United  
10 Nuclear. We are revising that Appendix right  
11 now.

12 Our current schedule is that  
13 Appendix will not be approved and released  
14 until early July. We are working to pull that  
15 schedule back a little bit, but I want to give  
16 you that schedule now.

17 As soon as that Appendix is  
18 approved and released, I will notify the TBD  
19 6001 work group and let them know.

20 That's all I have.

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. That was  
22 a lot. Questions for LaVon. I think after

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you told us a number of petitions - Evaluation  
2 Reports you were going to present in Niagara  
3 Falls, I think everyone's afraid to ask  
4 questions. Afraid we were going to be there  
5 for a month.

6 MR. KATZ: Jim.

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

8 MR. KATZ: It's Ted Katz. I just  
9 want to - one other thing that was in the  
10 transcripts, so I just would like to remind  
11 all of the Board members related to Hangar 481  
12 is that since we were not at this point at  
13 least setting up a work group for that, I  
14 think Dr. Melius had asked that all the Board  
15 members consider the material we have and to  
16 raise questions with DCAS as they might have  
17 them to prepare for a discussion related to  
18 Hangar 481, so I just want to remind you all  
19 that that's on all of your plates to consider  
20 what outstanding issues you might have. Thank  
21 you.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, thanks.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 Any other comments? If not, the next item on  
2 our agenda is update from Work Groups and  
3 Subcommittees, and I'm going to start by  
4 calling on the Subcommittees and Work Group  
5 Chairs for - the Chairs of the Work Group and  
6 Subcommittees that have met since our last  
7 meeting and then open it up if anybody else  
8 has any updates rather than try to go through  
9 a long list.

10 Mark, the Dose Reconstruction  
11 Review Subcommittee I believe met?

12 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, yes.  
13 Thanks, Jim. This is Mark Griffon. We did  
14 have a meeting, and we continued on our  
15 regular review of the findings, and we  
16 actually completed the sixth set of cases and  
17 nearly completed the seventh set of cases, and  
18 these are a reminder these are like groups of  
19 20 cases that we're reviewing.

20 We are well into the eighth set of  
21 cases. This is in the comment resolution  
22 process of the review. It should be noted

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that the - I believe SC&A is working currently<sup>^^</sup>  
2 on the 12th set of cases, so along those  
3 lines, I guess the few things that came up at  
4 our meeting is first of all I believe SC&A is  
5 ready for an additional set of cases to be  
6 assigned, and we'd have to go through our  
7 normal process to do that where we ask NIOSH  
8 to generate a list of the available cases for  
9 review.

10 Then usually what we've done is  
11 had the Subcommittee take an initial look at  
12 the list and come back with a recommended list  
13 to the full Board, and then the full Board  
14 votes on tasking SC&A to do the review.

15 Jim, if you remember that process  
16 I assume we would do the same for the next set  
17 of cases?

18 DR. NETON: Correct.

19 MEMBER ANDERSON: When do you  
20 expect to have that recommendation?

21 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, this is Mark  
22 Griffon again. I think that I have to work

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 through how we would do that with Stu.  
2 Usually it's a problem of logistics here, but  
3 we'd like to have - the Subcommittee has to  
4 meet and then the Board has to meet, so it's  
5 kind of a two-step process.

6 I don't want to let it delay too  
7 much farther, but I guess we would have to  
8 have another meeting of the Subcommittee  
9 before we could bring it to a full Board  
10 meeting.

11 It could be a phone call Board  
12 meeting though, so that might help us at least  
13 expedite it a little bit.

14 MEMBER ANDERSON: You mean a phone  
15 call Subcommittee meeting, Mark?

16 MEMBER GRIFFON: Well, yes, or we  
17 could have a phone call Subcommittee meeting  
18 before the May meeting. That may be a  
19 possibility too.

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, though  
21 either one you'd end up with - yes, you're  
22 right. We could do it at whatever the fall

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meeting is after the May meeting.

2 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, who's  
3 speaking?

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: This is - I'm  
5 sorry. This is Jim Melius. By the way, that  
6 was Henry Anderson who asked the question  
7 before of Mark.

8 MEMBER ANDERSON: I'm sorry. I  
9 should have mentioned -

10 MEMBER GRIFFON: So I'll work with  
11 NIOSH and if timing allows it, we could try to  
12 get a phone call Dose Reconstruction  
13 Subcommittee meeting in prior to our Niagara  
14 meeting, and that way we could be in the  
15 position to select the cases for SC&A at the  
16 next full meeting in May.

17 That would be ideal. I'm just not  
18 sure if NIOSH has the time to - you know we  
19 have a couple of steps that NIOSH has to do  
20 here, selecting the cases and not only  
21 selecting but also determining whether we have  
22 different parameters with which we do our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 selection on, so they have to put together a  
2 matrix for us, and I will work with Stu via  
3 email or Brent, I'm not sure who, I guess both  
4 of you at this point would be involved from  
5 NIOSH, and we'll do the best we can.

6 If we can bring it to the next  
7 Board meeting, we will try to do that.

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Mark, this is  
9 Jim again. I think if you're going to do  
10 that, you probably need to decide relatively  
11 quickly with NIOSH because if you are going to  
12 do a Subcommittee meeting, you need to  
13 announce it -

14 MEMBER GRIFFON: Right, right,  
15 right, you, it's got to happen real soon.

16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Just as another  
17 follow-up, the step after the cases are chosen  
18 is the Board Chair then assigns people to  
19 review the cases, so there's a previous - I  
20 can't remember the number on it that Ted just  
21 provided to me earlier this week for  
22 assignment - and so I will be making

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 assignments to people.

2 What my plan was, was to - it's a  
3 relatively long list, and I will continue to  
4 have two members of the Board assigned to each  
5 case. I will probably change the pairings  
6 again so that the new Board members are paired  
7 up with someone who's more experienced at  
8 least having gone through the process before  
9 because I think that will be helpful.

10 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, and, Jim,  
11 this is Mark Griffon again. Jim, that was the  
12 other item that came up at our meeting was  
13 that the 12th set done and they were ready to  
14 do the - so I believe that's the 12th set that  
15 you're referring to.

16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, sounds  
17 right, and I think you reminded Ted who then  
18 sent it to me.

19 MEMBER GIBSON: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: We're underway,  
21 and I'll try to do that by the end of the  
22 week.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MEMBER GRIFFON:       That's fine,<sup>71</sup>  
2       that's fine, and the only other think I had to  
3       report for the Dose Reconstruction  
4       Subcommittee was we continued our work on the  
5       follow-up on the first hundred cases just to  
6       remind everyone, especially new Board members,  
7       we submitted a report on the first hundred  
8       cases that the Board reviewed to the  
9       Secretary, but then there was a request from  
10      the full Board that we do a follow-up I guess  
11      more specifically, so what do these particular  
12      findings mean, are there areas where we can  
13      recommend that NIOSH needs to focus or  
14      improve, issues like that.

15                   What we've done at this point on  
16      the Subcommittee is we put together a draft  
17      letter outlining the primary issues sort of  
18      under three primary headers of the issues we  
19      found in these first hundred cases and what,  
20      if any, recommendations we as a Subcommittee  
21      feel NIOSH may take away from the first  
22      hundred case review, and we are in a position

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 now to bring that draft to the full Board in<sup>70</sup>  
2 May, and I would like to - I have the draft  
3 ready.

4 I was going to distribute it to  
5 all Board members in preparation for the  
6 upcoming meeting so that we can discuss it at  
7 whatever time you would like to discuss it,  
8 Jim, and then move forward on that.

9 The only other - the report is a  
10 preliminary report because we've asked SC&A to  
11 do some follow-up on quality assurance and  
12 quality control findings. That's one of our  
13 primary headers in this report, and they're in  
14 the process - they've actually at the last  
15 meeting selected cases and they're going to go  
16 back with NIOSH. It's sort of a dual process,  
17 NIOSH and SC&A working on this to determine  
18 why exactly some of these quality assurance  
19 errors occurred and to what extent, you know,  
20 if there's any trend or any change that has to  
21 be - that should be recommended from the NIOSH  
22 reconstruction standpoint.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)



1           So that is - so this report is<sup>72</sup>  
2     sort of preliminary, but it will give you a  
3     sense of what we have found to this point and  
4     we can at least get all Board members' input,  
5     so I'd like to present that at the May  
6     meeting.

7           CHAIRMAN MELIUS:     Okay.     Thanks,  
8     Mark.     Anybody have any questions for Mark?  
9     Okay, if not, Wanda, do you want to update us  
10    on the Procedures Work Group?

11           MEMBER MUNN:     Yes, I certainly do.  
12    We had a significant action item list at this  
13    meeting since we had not met face to face  
14    since last November, and things do have a  
15    tendency to pile up.

16           During that hiatus, we had all  
17    been very concerned over the importance of the  
18    PERs, reviews which had never been really  
19    discussed at any great length with respect to  
20    what the process was going to be.

21           It seemed to most of us on the  
22    Subcommittee, I believe, that the process

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 addressing PERs are almost by definition<sup>74</sup>  
2 different than addressing our review  
3 procedures rather than projects.

4 As a result, we spent a  
5 significant amount of our discussion time  
6 during that meeting working on that precise  
7 item. It was - I had hoped that I would be  
8 able to bring to you in written form at this  
9 meeting our expectation, our at least proposal  
10 for how to proceed. That suggested rough  
11 proposal has gone out to the Subcommittee  
12 itself, and we have worked on it.

13 But this meeting only occurred  
14 last week, and the Subcommittee Chair seemed  
15 to have overestimated her physical ability to  
16 achieve some of these things in the period of  
17 time left to us.

18 The Subcommittee members do have  
19 suggestions, and I received one or two  
20 comments back which I think would be wise for  
21 us to perhaps pursue in a Subcommittee  
22 teleconference to get a little more agreement

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on precisely what the details might be in <sup>75</sup>one  
2 or two of these things, but let me read to you  
3 if you would the information that we sent to  
4 the Subcommittee to cover approximately what  
5 our discussions were distilled down to become  
6 during our meeting.

7 We have anticipated that at least  
8 on an annual basis and more often than that if  
9 necessary that our Board contractor, SC&A,  
10 will present to the Board a chart that shows  
11 the entire universe of PERs that are available  
12 up to that date.

13 Whatever has been looked at at  
14 that time will be before us to make the  
15 choices. That chart will agree an assessment  
16 that SC&A will make regarding the complexity  
17 of any reviews that they might do, the number  
18 of potential dose reconstructions that might  
19 be involved, and a rough estimate of the costs  
20 that might be necessary to do that review.

21 Now recognize that these cost  
22 estimates would be very rough simply because

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 until the review is done and findings are<sup>76</sup>  
2 placed before us, it's almost impossible to  
3 make any degree of certainty with respect to  
4 the number of issues that need to be viewed  
5 under an even stronger microscope than what we  
6 would have looked at to that point.

7 The chart is going to be arranged  
8 in the descending order of importance as  
9 perceived by the contractor rather than by the  
10 number, the category, or any other criteria.

11 If the Board's going to make a  
12 decision, we would request the Board to decide  
13 on two factors looking at that, at that full  
14 number of the PERs.

15 We will ask the Board to choose  
16 the number of reviews that are going to be  
17 done in the foreseeable future and secondly,  
18 which of those PER items that are listed will  
19 be chosen.

20 That document or documents that  
21 are chosen will then be reviewed and findings  
22 will be delivered by SC&A in the usual manner

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just as we have done with respect to  
2 procedures in the past.

3 The Procedures Subcommittee will  
4 perform their standard process on those  
5 findings including populating the database,  
6 proceeding with the resolution of the issues  
7 as we have always done.

8 When we complete the resolution of  
9 those findings, then SC&A will present the  
10 Dose Reconstruction Subcommittee with a list  
11 of applicable dose reconstructions that might  
12 be available under that PER, the assessment of  
13 the number and dose reconstructions which  
14 should be reviewed in their view and the  
15 criteria that were used as the basis for that  
16 assessment.

17 We would anticipate that those  
18 criteria would be different in many cases from  
19 the criteria that we would use when we are  
20 looking at procedures since the goal of  
21 procedure review is slightly different than  
22 the goal of Project Evaluation Review.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   Clearly there would be no surprise<sup>70</sup>  
2 if the criteria would be different and would  
3 as a matter of fact possibly be different from  
4 case to case depending upon the type of  
5 project that was under review at the time.

6                   When that number of dose  
7 reconstructions has been identified, then at  
8 this juncture we would suggest that this  
9 entire process move into the Dose  
10 Reconstruction Subcommittee's purview where  
11 that Subcommittee will make the determination  
12 as to whether the criteria and recommended  
13 numbers are acceptable or whether they should  
14 be changed, and that Subcommittee will follow  
15 their usual method for selecting cases for  
16 review.

17                   That DR review would then be  
18 maintained as a separate grouping identified  
19 clearly as PER cases and not incorporated into  
20 the body of review that has been done from the  
21 usual dose reconstruction process.

22                   One of the items that we have not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 cleared completely at this juncture and may<sup>70</sup>  
2 require a little more conversation is that -  
3 the Procedures Subcommittee is what transpires  
4 at the conclusion of this particular activity  
5 when the DR review is complete.

6 Then the report of completion  
7 including the results of all the work done  
8 will be put together by the Dose Review  
9 Subcommittee and transmitted to Procedures  
10 Subcommittee including all of that into the  
11 archive database that we have built over the  
12 past five years to track our actions.

13 We are very interested in making  
14 sure that this archive does not become simply  
15 a document hidden under layers of other  
16 documentation somewhere, and how we might make  
17 that available.

18 What format it needs to take has  
19 not been adequately covered by our discussions  
20 today. We anticipate doing that and hopefully  
21 will have a more complete report available to  
22 you. My intention is to try to get our

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 expectations to the full Board prior to the<sup>^^</sup>  
2 upcoming meeting in New York so that you will  
3 have an opportunity to look at it yourself.

4 This is of course a slightly more  
5 complex process than we have undertaken in the  
6 past and probably will require more than one  
7 review at our internal process before we come  
8 to a smooth operation of this activity.

9 In addition to that process was we  
10 were working through out action list we  
11 encountered one other electronic issue with  
12 the database. We thought we had worked all  
13 those out pretty well, but we have one case  
14 where we may be limited in the number of  
15 direct electronic connections we could make to  
16 other White Papers and supplementary files  
17 that are helpful to us when we're doing our  
18 usual Procedures Subcommittee work.

19 We're going to attempt to resolve  
20 that in the future so that we do not have a  
21 situation where it is difficult for anyone who  
22 works with the database to either find or to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 easily get to any electronic White Paper or  
2 other pertinent information that we hope will  
3 be part and parcel of the final database.

4 I'm sorry that's such a long-  
5 winded report, but there are a lot of details  
6 in what we're trying to do.

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thank you,  
8 Wanda. One question. I understood that the  
9 procedure for - the review procedure was  
10 accepted by the Subcommittee, but you're  
11 saying you're not ready yet. Is that -

12 MEMBER MUNN: We have not  
13 addressed that fully. We have tentatively  
14 accepted it, but it has - we're working in a  
15 process where SC&A has actually done one such  
16 straw man for us.

17 In doing that there are four  
18 specific items that they have suggested that  
19 they perform, and they performed the first  
20 three of those on their straw man. The  
21 fourth part of their recommendation is the  
22 review of - data review of dose reconstruction

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reviews themselves.

2 This has not yet been done because  
3 we have not worked through this process that I  
4 have just suggested we address in the choice  
5 of dose - of claimant files to be reviewed,  
6 and that would have been Item 4 on the straw  
7 man that SC&A has presented to us.

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. I guess  
9 my question is I - reading through this, the  
10 material - SC&A actually proposed prior to the  
11 February Board meeting that they sort of  
12 divide the PER reviews into two phases, a  
13 Phase 1 and then a Phase 2 that would involve  
14 the individual dose reconstruction reviews and  
15 the recommendation on that because that would  
16 essentially have to follow some of the  
17 findings from the initial review.

18 MEMBER MUNN: Correct

19 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: So I guess my  
20 question is does the Subcommittee feel they're  
21 ready to let SC&A start on the Phase 1 PER  
22 reviews or would you rather wait until you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sort of fleshed out the procedure some more?

2 MEMBER MUNN: Unless I am mistaking  
3 the intent of the conversations that we had  
4 during our deliberations, I believe it was the  
5 feeling of the Subcommittee that we would like  
6 to work this existing straw man through to see  
7 at least how the choice of DRs is going to  
8 play out, how many we are going to require for  
9 any given PER and what the criteria are going  
10 to be to select which of the potential doses  
11 underneath that PER would be most - of most  
12 interest and be the most directly serving the  
13 person that we're trying to have perform these  
14 PERs to begin with.

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. That - I  
16 understand that then. Does anybody else have  
17 any questions?

18 MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer.  
19 Can I address an issue too?

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Sure.

21 MEMBER ZIEMER: Related to this -  
22 I think in the agenda there was a suggestion

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that perhaps we could do some tasking of SC&A<sup>21</sup>  
2 on the PER issue. One of the sort of carry-  
3 over questions, and it's not clear to me that  
4 this has been resolved yet, is how the Board  
5 actually goes about making the selection of  
6 those PERs with respect to conflicts of  
7 interest.

8 For example, on the list that I  
9 think we all got, which is the SC&A list of  
10 all of the Program Evaluation Reports, and  
11 it's sorted by numbers of cases affected. It's  
12 assorted by how complex the selection criteria  
13 and the science issues are.

14 On that list, we have for example  
15 the highly insoluble plutonium issue. We have  
16 a Hanford TBD. We have construction trades.  
17 We have dosimetry records from Argonne. We  
18 have Los Alamos Lab.

19 There were questions on how one-  
20 how the Board would do the tasking with  
21 respect to conflicts of interest. Has that  
22 been resolved yet?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I think Ted's<sup>25</sup>  
2 going to speak to that a little bit. Actually  
3 It's the - a little bit farther down the  
4 agenda in terms of some of this, but you're  
5 right.

6 MEMBER ZIEMER: Really sort of  
7 that issue coupled with whether or not the  
8 Subcommittee feels that the review approach is  
9 fully in place.

10 We have the SC&A - I think  
11 everybody got the SC&A document on how they  
12 propose to review the PERs, right?

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

14 MEMBER MUNN: I think so.

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: That was  
16 circulated to everybody, and then I circulated  
17 documents basically proposing - took the first  
18 four Phase 1 - first four on the list that had  
19 a - John Mauro had already done a cost  
20 estimate on. The first one, O-  
21 12, the plutonium suppress, they - it's mostly  
22 a dose reconstruction - individual dose

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reconstruction review issue, so I'm just  
2 trying to see if we - the Subcommittee was  
3 ready. I wanted us to be ready to do some  
4 tasking. I think what Wanda is saying is the  
5 Subcommittee is not ready in terms of the  
6 procedure and then secondly there are some  
7 issues resolved - learning how do we do the  
8 tasking, though I think this really applies to  
9 a lot of other assignments also.

10 MEMBER MUNN: The Subcommittee is  
11 very close, Jim.

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: That's fine.

13 MEMBER MUNN: I don't think we  
14 have any major problems here. It's just a  
15 matter of working through the minutiae and  
16 trying to make sure that we don't have to  
17 second guess ourselves too much once we get  
18 underway.

19 I think the general consensus  
20 among the Subcommittee members was that the  
21 addition of our new Board members will be very  
22 helpful to us in addressing our concerns that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we always have with respect to conflict<sup>27</sup>  
2 methods.

3           There certainly will almost always  
4 be - we couldn't imagine a situation where  
5 there would not be an adequate number of  
6 unconflicted Board members available at the  
7 decision-making point to be able to make these  
8 decisions.

9           Further, the mere fact that we're  
10 talking about a program review rather than an  
11 internal procedure makes the conflict of  
12 interest issue not quite the same, so this, we  
13 felt, was an issue that the Board itself was  
14 going to have to decide.

15           We don't, as a Subcommittee of the  
16 Board, then decide what the Board will and  
17 will not do, which in effect is a conflict of  
18 interest.

19           CHAIRMAN MELIUS:       I appreciate  
20 that.       Anybody else have comments or  
21 questions?   So I think what we'll - I think  
22 later on in the agenda we'll talk about the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conflict issue, but I think we'll be ready to<sup>^^</sup>  
2 proceed hopefully by the May meeting to move  
3 forward on this.

4 At least we'll see when the  
5 Subcommittee is ready.

6 MEMBER MUNN: We will - the  
7 Subcommittee will meet by telephone prior to  
8 that time, and we will hopefully have written  
9 some material.

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thank  
11 you. Okay. The other Work Group that met  
12 since the last meeting was the Worker Outreach  
13 Work Group. Mike Gibson, do you want to give  
14 us an update?

15 MEMBER GIBSON: Yes, Jim, we met.  
16 We had a good meeting, I think. We went over  
17 how -

18 MEMBER MUNN: We've lost Mike.

19 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

20 MEMBER MUNN: Or I've lost -

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I thought we  
22 lost everybody for a second.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 MEMBER ANDERSON: Oops, I was on  
2 mute. No. I'm here. I'm here.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Ted, are  
4 you still on?

5 MR. KATZ: Yes, I'm here.

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. I guess  
7 we just lost Mike.

8 MEMBER MUNN: Have we lost Mike  
9 again?

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I don't think we  
11 ever got him back. Okay. While we're waiting  
12 for Mike to come back on, are there any other  
13 Work Group Chairs that want to provide an  
14 update? You don't need to, but -

15 MEMBER ANDERSON: As the new Chair  
16 of the 6001 Work Group, we've got - we've  
17 begun to get our assignments but we haven't  
18 met yet.

19 MEMBER BEACH: Jim, this is Josie.  
20 I do have a short update for Mound. The  
21 Mound Work Group is scheduled to do five  
22 former Mound workers for interviews next week

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and will travel to Germantown to review<sup>^^</sup>  
2 documents.

3 Both the interviews and the  
4 document reviews will be conducted in a secure  
5 location, and as you heard earlier from LaVon,  
6 DCAS will be issuing a revision to the mound  
7 petition evaluation in April, and they will be  
8 recommending a Class associated with the  
9 radon exposures.

10 The Work Group is working to  
11 schedule a conference call to discuss that  
12 issue before the May meeting, so we hope to be  
13 ready for them to present and us to make a  
14 recommendation.

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thanks, Josie.  
16 Any other Work Groups?

17 MEMBER ROESSLER: Jim, this is Gen  
18 Roessler. A quick update on Linde. Since our  
19 last meeting there was a technical call  
20 between SC&A and OCAS. We expect some  
21 materials to come from that, and we have an  
22 April 16th Work Group teleconference.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   We hope to pull things together<sup>^1</sup>  
2                   and then make a report at the meeting in  
3                   Niagara Falls.

4                   CHAIRMAN MELIUS:        Okay.        Thank  
5                   you.

6                   MEMBER GIBSON:     Jim, this is Mike.

7                   CHAIRMAN MELIUS:        Yes,     Mike.  
8                   Welcome back, Mike.  We lost you there for -

9                   MEMBER MUNN:     Mike who?

10                  MEMBER GIBSON:     Mike Gibson.    My  
11                  battery died on my phone.

12                  CHAIRMAN MELIUS:    Oh, is that what  
13                  it was?    Okay.    You were just starting your  
14                  Work Group report.  We went on and did a few  
15                  others while we were waiting for you to get  
16                  back on.  Go ahead, Mike.

17                  MEMBER GIBSON:    Okay.  As I said,  
18                  we met in Cincinnati, and we had a discussion  
19                  with CDC and DCAS personnel about their ten-  
20                  year review on worker outreach, how our  
21                  mission and their mission overlaps and where  
22                  it doesn't, and made some progress there.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   We       also       looked       at       our  
2       implementation   plan   and   did   some   initial  
3       tasking   to   SC&A   to   get   that   underway,   so   I  
4       think   we   made   some   progress   and   hopefully  
5       we'll   have   another   meeting   here   in   the   next  
6       probably   couple   of   months,   and   get   things  
7       underway   to   further   the   record.

8                   CHAIRMAN MELIUS:   Great, thanks,  
9       Mike.    Any   other   Work   Group   Chairs   with  
10      updates   they'd   like   to   -

11                  MEMBER CLAWSON:   Yes, Jim, this is  
12      Brad.   It's   been   a   long   time   coming,   but   we  
13      finally   got   a   Work   Group   set   up   for   Pantex,  
14      and   it's   going   to   be   coming   up   I   believe   it's  
15      May   fifth,   fourth   or   fifth.

16                  CHAIRMAN MELIUS:   Congratulations,  
17      Brad.

18                  MEMBER CLAWSON:   Yes, it's been a  
19      long   time   coming.

20                  CHAIRMAN MELIUS:   We'll set off  
21      fireworks   or   something.

22                  MEMBER CLAWSON:   You better not do

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: For my own Work  
3 Groups that I chair, Surrogate Data and the  
4 SEC Issues, we also have Work Group meetings  
5 scheduled the week before our Niagara Falls  
6 meeting. I can't remember the exact dates,  
7 but Surrogate Data is meeting by conference  
8 call, and we'll have an in-person meeting of  
9 the SEC Issues Work Group mainly to focus on  
10 the 250-day issue.

11 MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer.  
12 I'll just fill that part in. The SEC Work  
13 Group is on May 11th, and the Surrogate Data  
14 conference call is on the 13th of May, and  
15 then I'll also report TBD 6000 which I think  
16 is officially renamed now since we have a  
17 separate TBD 6001 Work Group. TBD 6000 is  
18 meeting on the 12th in Cincinnati, May 12.

19 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Anybody  
20 else? Okay, thank you, and the next item is  
21 new Work Group assignments. Actually Henry  
22 and Paul have just pointed out, I did appoint

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a 6001 Work Group which is the offspring of  
2 the original TBD 6000-6001 Work Group with  
3 Henry Anderson as the Chair and the other  
4 members are Mark Griffon and Bill Field, and  
5 Mark is sort of the liaison or the coordinator  
6 with the 6000 group, so that group - I also  
7 appointed Dick Lemen to the - Richard Lemen to  
8 the Procedures Work Group. I believe he  
9 attended the recent meeting of that Work  
10 Group.

11 There are - there is one Work  
12 Group from our last meeting I still need to  
13 appoint. That's the one for Lawrence Berkeley  
14 National Labs. I'll try to do this week, and  
15 then one other issue came up and we may talk a  
16 little bit more about this when we talk about  
17 the SC&A tasking, but in reviewing sort of  
18 Site Profiles, one Site Profile had not been  
19 reviewed by SC&A but also Site Profiles that  
20 had been reviewed but there'd never been a  
21 Work Group and any resolution of the comments  
22 on those.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   That included the Portsmouth and  
2 Paducah sites which essentially are SECs, but  
3 there are Site Profile issues there, and we -  
4 going through those, I asked John Mauro to do  
5 a quick review of what needed to be done, so  
6 we need to do some Site Profile review  
7 updating since those reviews were done a few  
8 years ago, and there are some significant  
9 changes to the Site Profile.

10                   At the same time we'll also  
11 propose a new Work Group be assigned to review  
12 those sites, and I think we can combine those  
13 since those sites are quite similar. That and  
14 it might be more efficient to have one Work  
15 Group reviewing those, so we're going to  
16 propose that we also establish a Work Group  
17 for that review.

18                   Any questions on that? Okay. Ted  
19 Katz, managing conflicts when tasking SC&A.

20                   MR. KATZ: Thanks, Jim. I was  
21 actually talking before but, muted, to myself.

22                   I just wanted to note before we got onto

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that, with the Portsmouth Paducah, I think the<sup>^</sup>  
2 thought was that X-10 folds in with those two  
3 possibly as a Work Group subject.

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Correct, and I  
5 also think we probably need formal Board  
6 action to establish a Work Group.

7 MR. KATZ: Right.

8 MR. HINNEFELD: This is Stu  
9 Hinnefeld in Cincinnati. I think K25 would be  
10 the plan that's more similar. It's the -

11 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Right, right,  
12 it's K-25. Can we have a motion to establish  
13 a Work Group to review the Site Profiles on  
14 Portsmouth, Paducah, and K-25?

15 MEMBER CLAWSON: I make a motion.  
16 This is Brad. I make a motion to set up a  
17 Work Group to review these.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thank  
19 you. Second to that?

20 MEMBER BEACH: This is Josie. I  
21 second it.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. I guess

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 since we're on a call I guess, Ted, you need<sup>^7</sup>  
2 to do a roll call or can we can do this by -

3 MR. KATZ: I think we do need to  
4 do this by roll call because there are people  
5 who have conflicts.

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, Okay,  
7 that's what I thought.

8 MR. KATZ: For K-25.

9 MEMBER MUNN: We'll clarify here  
10 that we are establishing a single Work Group  
11 for these three, correct?

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Correct.

13 MR. KATZ: That's correct, and I  
14 assume the Board members know that they have  
15 the K-25 conflict, but let me see if I can't  
16 do the roll call accordingly so that we don't  
17 call for a vote from the person who's  
18 conflicted, so let me just check that quickly  
19 before I do.

20 Okay, I've got it. I think I've  
21 got it here. Okay. If I miss someone who has  
22 a conflict, you know who you are, but

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 otherwise I'm going to call the roll without<sup>^^</sup>  
2 the individuals who have conflicts, so Henry  
3 Anderson.

4 MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes.

5 MR. KATZ: Josie Beach.

6 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

7 MR. KATZ: Brad Clawson.

8 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes.

9 MR. KATZ: Dr. Field.

10 MEMBER FIELD: Yes.

11 MR. KATZ: Mr. Gibson.

12 MEMBER GIBSON: Yes.

13 MR. KATZ: Mr. Griffon.

14 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.

15 MR. KATZ: Dr. Lemen.

16 MEMBER LEMEN: Yes.

17 MR. KATZ: Dr. Melius.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

19 MR. KATZ: Ms. Munn.

20 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

21 MR. KATZ: Dr. Poston, oh, that's  
22 right. I'm sorry. Dr. Poston is absent. Dr.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Richardson.

2 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.

3 MR. KATZ: Great. Dr. Roessler.

4 MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes.

5 MR. KATZ: Mr. Schofield.

6 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes.

7 MR. KATZ: And Dr. Ziemer.

8 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.

9 MR. KATZ: Okay, so that's  
10 unanimous for all members who are able to vote  
11 present.

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thanks.  
13 Now, Ted, we have the issue of managing  
14 conflicts when tasking SC&A.

15 MR. KATZ: Yes, thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: We just had an  
17 example.

18 MR. KATZ: We do. This is how we'll  
19 handle - Jim, you're absolutely right that  
20 it's not just for PERs that the issue arises.

21 It also can arise for procedures where it  
22 gets complicated where procedures address a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 number of sites but not all sites. It's not a<sup>100</sup>  
2 general matter.

3 I have not gotten - for those  
4 complicated cases, and they're really only -  
5 they're a small minority. The high-fired I  
6 think is one of them, the PER. Other than  
7 those, and I don't have resolution there, so I  
8 can't give guidance on how we'll handle  
9 tasking for that, but for everything else  
10 where it's site specific, and that's the only  
11 cases it would matter where it's site  
12 specific, whether it's a Site Profile or a  
13 PER, I had discussed this at the February  
14 meeting right now the interim guidance that I  
15 have for how to do that is simply to have the  
16 member in a face-to-face meeting certainly to  
17 recuse on the record and then leave or none of  
18 us leave the table actually when it's a joint  
19 discussion like with PER but simply to recuse  
20 on the record for the discussion in advance of  
21 the discussion on that site and then at the  
22 point of voting, obviously that person would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 be recused as well, meaning not vote, but they<sup>101</sup>  
2 could stay at the table.

3 So - and then it's just we're  
4 following in effect a modified version of that  
5 for a teleconference where I think it's more  
6 efficient for me probably to identify the  
7 individuals who were recused than having to go  
8 through that definitely in advance of the  
9 discussion.

10 So I've actually - if there aren't  
11 any questions about that, I was actually going  
12 to address that for the upcoming tasking that  
13 you have.

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

15 MR. KATZ: Okay, so I assume we're  
16 not going to be discussing the PERs then based  
17 on the discussion we just had, but there a  
18 number of Site Profiles that Jim sent around  
19 to propose the possibilities for tasking.

20 Let me just identify the  
21 individuals who are recused from those  
22 particular ones, and there's only two. That

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is - and one is absent anyway when it comes to<sup>100</sup>  
2 West Valley. Dr. Poston is absent, so there's  
3 no issue there.

4 For Portsmouth, Dr. Lockey is  
5 recused from the discussion as well as the  
6 voting, and that's it for these three - West  
7 Valley, Paducah, and Portsmouth, as far I  
8 know.

9 If any one of you, of course,  
10 knows of a conflict that I don't know of, you  
11 can recuse yourself.

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thanks, Ted.  
13 Any questions on the general issue, on the  
14 conflict of interest/tasking issue? At some  
15 point if it ever gets so complicated, we may  
16 even have to sort of split up the tasking in  
17 some way when it - I think there are ways to  
18 deal with it.

19 Either that or we let Henry vote  
20 on everything to decide since he has no  
21 conflicts, at least the last I checked.

22 In terms of SC&A assignments,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're not going to do the PERs, but there are<sup>102</sup>  
2 two - you all received an email from John  
3 Mauro that there were some issues with the  
4 tasking we did last time that - some had to do  
5 with the Santa Susana, the other site was  
6 folded into Hanford, so three of the Site  
7 Profiles we assigned weren't - really there  
8 wasn't work to be done on them or the work  
9 would be done under other auspices.

10 I think for the Canoga and De Soto  
11 sites which are part of Santa Susana, it made  
12 more sense to - since the Work Group was  
13 meeting to let the Work Group deal with those  
14 issues rather than us trying to assign  
15 anything.

16 It wasn't even clear that there  
17 needed to be any additional Site Profile  
18 reviews on those sites - work, but the - let  
19 the Work Group decide that when they meet.

20 Just sort of going through the  
21 list quickly, on the next site down I believe  
22 on that was the West Valley site up in Western

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 New York which is the site - about 75<sup>100</sup> or  
2 something like that requests there, cases that  
3 have been filed there, but it is something  
4 that - where the Site Profile needs to be  
5 reviewed, so I think that would be the first  
6 one we would propose, and I guess we need to  
7 do these separately so we need to do a motion  
8 to assign that to the SC&A for review?

9 MEMBER CLAWSON: Go ahead, Josie.

10 MEMBER BEACH: This is Josie. I  
11 recommend that we assign SC&A the tasking of  
12 West Valley site from our review.

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

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Ted, do  
16 you need to do this?

17 MR. KATZ: Yes, why don't I do it.  
18 Really there are no individuals recused, but  
19 since we're on the telephone -

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

21 MR. KATZ: Why don't I just do it  
22 - if everybody just responds as quickly as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 possible. Dr. Anderson.

2 MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes.

3 MR. KATZ: Ms. Beach.

4 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: A point of order -

6 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

7 MEMBER ZIEMER: - before you vote.

8 Could I raise a point of order?

9 MR. KATZ: Yes.

10 MEMBER ZIEMER: There's been some  
11 discussions the last month or so. I think Ted  
12 maybe - I'm not sure how widespread these are  
13 amongst the Board in terms of the tasking of  
14 the contractor, but we did have some  
15 discussions. By we I'm talking about  
16 certainly Dr. Melius and I did when we were  
17 working in terms of how we will evaluate the  
18 work of our contractor, and one of the issues  
19 that came up was specificity in tasking, and  
20 are we going to - perhaps not ready for that  
21 yet, but a general tasking like we're doing  
22 right now is pretty broad and doesn't seem to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have a lot of sort of restriction parameters<sup>106</sup>  
2 on it.

3 I'm just wondering how this is  
4 going to play out in terms of going forward  
5 with tasking of the contractor and the issues  
6 of specificity in tasking.

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: This is Jim  
8 Melius. I guess my response on this is that  
9 we have a procedure I believe we adopted a  
10 long time for Site Profile reviews, and so  
11 since this is the first time that this site is  
12 being reviewed, the Site Profiles, and it's -  
13 I think it's essentially tasking them to  
14 follow that procedure and, you know John has  
15 prepared a cost estimate based on I believe  
16 it's \$60,000 based on what is the standard  
17 Site Profile review given the size of that  
18 Site Profile and complexity.

19 Let me just finish a second. The  
20 issue of specificity I think was more of an  
21 issue with work groups assigning SC&A  
22 particularly during the SEC evaluations or on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 follow-up of a Site Profile issue where NIOSH<sup>107</sup>  
2 and SC&A may disagree. The Work Group wants  
3 to assign SC&A to do follow-up.

4 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, I agree with  
5 that. I'd like to move forward in support of  
6 this motion. I do think that when we reach  
7 that point of talking about the issue broadly,  
8 we probably should look at the full scope of  
9 even Site Profile tasking in terms of what  
10 does that mean.

11 Obviously we have a quote in a  
12 sense here, but these are not firm quotes.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

14 MEMBER ZIEMER: I just want to  
15 make sure as we go forward we don't lose sight  
16 of the fact that we need to be fairly tight as  
17 we go forward both for our benefit and for the  
18 contractor so that they can have a fair  
19 evaluation too that the parameters that  
20 they're working against are very clear.

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: No, I think it's  
22 a good point, Paul, and I would just add that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for the next issue, Paducah and Portsmouth,<sup>100</sup>  
2 John Mauro has actually identified particular  
3 issues that from the old Site Profile review  
4 that would be need then to be updated because  
5 NIOSH has updated the Site Profile and so that  
6 was - there is specificity and actually I  
7 think in the future if I were doing this at  
8 another Board call it would be to add - maybe  
9 should add the specificity to the - so to  
10 speak to the motion or to the proposal so that  
11 it's clear, but there is background  
12 documentation that I have from John, I can't  
13 remember who he copied it to other than I know  
14 Ted for sure, that has that information in it.

15 So when we're - go to task on the  
16 next one, there are specific areas that would  
17 be reviewed and so it's not a wide open - you  
18 know, review the whole Site Profile again.  
19 It's just particular specific areas that have  
20 been updated, and then there are some that are  
21 left to the discretion of the Work Group to  
22 decide on what further work would do.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I mean some where it's clear cut<sup>100</sup>  
2 and others it should wait until the Work Group  
3 to weigh in on.

4 MEMBER ZIEMER: Thank you for  
5 clarifying that. Sorry to interrupt.

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: No, I actually  
7 had that as the next sort of sub-agenda item  
8 to talk about. Anyway, go ahead.

9 MR. KATZ: Thank you, Paul. I  
10 don't recall whether I got Josie's vote. Ms.  
11 Beach.

12 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

13 MR. KATZ: And then Mr. Clawson.

14 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes.

15 MR. KATZ: Dr. Field.

16 MEMBER FIELD: Yes.

17 MR. KATZ: Mr. Gibson.

18 MEMBER GIBSON: Yes.

19 MR. KATZ: Mr. Griffon.

20 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.

21 MR. KATZ: Dr. Lemen.

22 MEMBER LEMEN: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: Dr. Lockey.

2 MEMBER LOCKEY: Yes.

3 MR. KATZ: Dr. Melius

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

5 MR. KATZ: Ms. Munn.

6 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

7 MR. KATZ: Mr. Presley.

8 MEMBER PRESLEY: Yes.

9 MR. KATZ: Dr. Richardson.

10 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.

11 MR. KATZ: Dr. Roessler.

12 MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes.

13 MR. KATZ: Mr. Schofield.

14 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes.

15 MR. KATZ: Dr. Ziemer.

16 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.

17 MR. KATZ: That's unanimous.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. The other

19 issue for the tasking is the Paducah and

20 Portsmouth updates, and again I think you've

21 heard the explanation. These are Site

22 Profiles that have been reviewed a few years

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ago. There's never been a Work Group. We<sup>111</sup>  
2 need to sort of resolve the comments and - but  
3 before doing that it made sense to update the  
4 Site Profile reviews. No sense having them  
5 review old information, and so there are, as I  
6 mentioned, specific areas that have been  
7 identified where updating would be needed.  
8 The estimated cost on that is about \$10,000.

9 I guess we would need a motion to  
10 task SC&A on Portsmouth and Paducah. I think  
11 we can - can we do them together?

12 MR. KATZ: No, we can't because we  
13 have a difference between the two with the  
14 conflict.

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, then we  
16 need an update on - a motion to update  
17 Paducah.

18 MEMBER CLAWSON: This is Brad. I  
19 make a motion to update Paducah.

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Your turn, Brad.

21 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. Second or  
22 what?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: No, no, you've<sup>110</sup>  
2 got the first. Who wants the second?

3 MEMBER ANDERSON: I'll second it.

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Henry Anderson  
5 seconds. Go ahead, Ted.

6 MR. KATZ: Okay. Thank you. Dr.  
7 Anderson.

8 MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes.

9 MR. KATZ: Ms. Beach.

10 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

11 MR. KATZ: Mr. Clawson.

12 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes.

13 MR. KATZ: Dr. Field.

14 MEMBER FIELD: Yes.

15 MR. KATZ: Mr. Gibson.

16 MEMBER GIBSON: Yes.

17 MR. KATZ: Mr. Griffon.

18 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.

19 MR. KATZ: Dr. Lemen.

20 MEMBER LEMEN: Yes.

21 MR. KATZ: Dr. Lockey.

22 MEMBER LOCKEY: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 MR. KATZ: Dr. Melius.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

3 MR. KATZ: Ms. Munn.

4 MEMBER MUNN: Aye, yes.

5 MR. KATZ: Got it. Mr. Presley.

6 MEMBER PRESLEY: Yes.

7 MR. KATZ: Dr. Richardson.

8 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.

9 MR. KATZ: Dr. Roessler.

10 MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes.

11 MR. KATZ: Mr. Schofield.

12 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes.

13 MR. KATZ: Dr. Ziemer.

14 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.

15 MR. KATZ: Okay, unanimous. One  
16 member is absent, Dr. Poston.

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And we need a  
18 motion to task SC&A to update the Site Profile  
19 review on Portsmouth. Do I have a motion?

20 MEMBER CLAWSON: I move. This is  
21 Brad. I move to do it for Portsmouth.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Second to that?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER BEACH: This is Josie. I  
2 second it.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, Josie  
4 Beach seconds it. Go ahead, Ted.

5 MR. KATZ: Okay. Thank you. Dr.  
6 Anderson.

7 MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes.

8 MR. KATZ: Ms. Beach.

9 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

10 MR. KATZ: Dr. Clawson.

11 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes.

12 MR. KATZ: Dr. Field.

13 MEMBER FIELD: Yes.

14 MR. KATZ: Mr. Gibson.

15 MEMBER GIBSON: Yes.

16 MR. KATZ: Mr. Griffon.

17 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.

18 MR. KATZ: Dr. Lemen.

19 MEMBER LEMEN: Yes.

20 MR. KATZ: Dr. Melius.

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

22 MR. KATZ: Ms. Munn.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

2 MR. KATZ: Mr. Presley.

3 MEMBER PRESLEY: Yes.

4 MR. KATZ: Mr. Richardson.

5 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.

6 MR. KATZ: Dr. Roessler.

7 MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes.

8 MR. KATZ: Mr. Schofield.

9 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes.

10 MR. KATZ: Dr. Ziemer.

11 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.

12 MR. KATZ: So that's unanimous

13 with Dr. Lockey recused, and Dr. Poston is

14 absent. CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay,

15 fine. I just want to add briefly Ted

16 circulated a document on evaluation of SC&A

17 performance, sort of, process. It also dealt

18 with some of the tasking issues, and Dr.

19 Ziemer and I worked with him on that document,

20 so it reflects our input and I don't know,

21 Ted, if you heard back from any of the Board

22 members on it, but basically in terms of - and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the tasking was essentially just a reminder on<sup>116</sup>  
2 some of the parameters on that, and the  
3 performance was just to make sure that we had  
4 a process in place so that, you know,  
5 particularly Work Group Chairs.

6 If there are any issues about  
7 performance that they communicate those so we  
8 know that they're going - it's going on so  
9 it's reflected in performance, and it also, I  
10 think, if there are issues not only just  
11 performance review but also in terms of  
12 feedback in trying to resolve any issues that  
13 should come up, and we just looked at it as a  
14 way of just formalizing something that would  
15 be helpful so that as the quarterly and annual  
16 performance reviews are done, we have  
17 documentation and we're not trying to remember  
18 back a year ago what happened, what particular  
19 document or in a particular Work Group  
20 meeting, so I think we're generally pleased  
21 with SC&A performance, but we just thought it  
22 would be helpful to have a document in place.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 I remind you if you haven't had a<sup>117</sup>  
2 chance already to at least take a quick look  
3 at that, and if you have questions or would  
4 like clarification, we can bring it up at the  
5 next Board meeting.

6 MEMBER MUNN: When was that sent  
7 around, Jim?

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Ted, do you  
9 remember?

10 MR. KATZ: I'm sorry I couldn't  
11 tell what Wanda said.

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Wanda asked when  
13 was that - your document sent around?

14 MR. KATZ: It was sent around  
15 several weeks ago - I'm looking. Let me look  
16 and see if I can find the deadline for it, and  
17 I think you have another week to respond.

18 I can't find it that quickly, but  
19 I'll send you an email with a reminder.

20 MEMBER MUNN: That's all right.  
21 If it's been in the last - yes, if you'd send  
22 a reminder it would be helpful.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: That's fine. I'll do<sup>110</sup>  
2 that.

3 MEMBER MUNN: Thank you.

4 MEMBER GIBSON: This is Mike.  
5 Ted, was that sent to the CDC email or to our  
6 personal email?

7 MR. KATZ: It was sent to CDC  
8 email for everybody and also to anyone else  
9 who has a government email, it was sent to  
10 those as well. Anyone who doesn't have the  
11 CDC email or a government email, it was sent  
12 to their personal email.

13 MEMBER BEACH: And, Ted, this is  
14 Josie. I believe you - if we didn't have a  
15 comment, you didn't need to hear from us,  
16 correct?

17 MR. KATZ: Right, that's right.  
18 I'm not asking for you to comment if you don't  
19 have one. That's right.

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, it was sent  
21 around on March 18th, and the comments were  
22 due by this Friday.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: In reality, if you want<sup>110</sup>  
2 to comment next week as well if it slipped by  
3 for some of you, next week would be fine too  
4 because I'm out through Wednesday of next  
5 week.

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Board  
7 correspondence, again, a quick update. There  
8 hasn't been much since the last meeting. I  
9 think there were follow-up inquiries regarding  
10 our Los Alamos meeting.

11 I think Representative -  
12 Congressman Lujan from New Mexico, we just  
13 wrote back quickly, you know, saying, yes, we  
14 were going to meet in the Los Alamos area, and  
15 I believe that was it since the last meeting.  
16 Ted, do you recall anything else?

17 MR. KATZ: There was also a  
18 letter, I don't know when it came in, so  
19 perhaps it was raised at the Board meeting,  
20 but from Senator Durbin, we responded.  
21 Senator Durbin was interested in GSI.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: That came up at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Board meeting. That was - as I recall.

2 MR. KATZ: Okay, and then we  
3 responded to Senator Reid too. I think that  
4 probably was addressed at the Board meeting.

5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: That was also at  
6 the Board meeting, yes.

7 Okay, the May Board meeting, we're  
8 meeting in May in Niagara Falls. The meeting  
9 starts the Wednesday - it's Wednesday,  
10 Thursday, and Friday. I've had some  
11 discussions with Ted already. My guess or  
12 sense or whatever you want to call it, would  
13 be that people will want to try to get back  
14 home on Friday if they can rather than waiting  
15 until Saturday, at least some of the Board  
16 members.

17 Given that, I think we would try  
18 to - if that assumption is correct, then we  
19 would try to plan on starting Wednesday  
20 morning but try to finish up sometime around  
21 lunch time or so on Friday rather than  
22 worrying a lot about losing our quorum or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 trying to get too much business done Friday<sup>101</sup>  
2 afternoon, so is that how people would like to  
3 have the meeting scheduled?

4 MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. I  
5 have no problem with your scheduling your  
6 meeting that way, but I will not be coming  
7 back home Friday night.

8 MEMBER PRESLEY: Jim, this is Bob  
9 Presley. That's great because my flight is  
10 out of there about 5:05, something like that.

11 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

12 MEMBER LOCKEY: Jim, Jim Lockey.  
13 I think it's great too.

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, so if  
15 there's no objections, I think that's the way  
16 we'll do it. It's not the busiest airport to  
17 get - easiest to get out of, and I think that  
18 makes sense, so we will - after what LaVon  
19 told us, we will have a packed agenda, so it  
20 will be busy, and maybe we'll try to start  
21 right at nine or 8:30 a couple of mornings or  
22 something like that. We'll work out something

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reasonable for that.

2 Any particular agenda items people  
3 would like to have added to the agenda? We  
4 will have in addition to the - I believe it  
5 was eight if I correct it - really nine SEC  
6 evaluations to deal with.

7 We'll also have - we have  
8 discussions on surrogate data. We have  
9 discussions on the Bethlehem site. We will  
10 have follow-up on Chapman and Blockson I  
11 believe at that meeting.

12 Am I missing something, Ted?

13 MR. KATZ: I think you're hitting  
14 the main points. There may be another item or  
15 two.

16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: But if you have  
17 things you would like discussed beyond the  
18 usual items or anything specific, let us know.

19 I think we will be - you have to have a 30-  
20 day notice, Ted?

21 MR. KATZ: That's correct. That's  
22 going to happen pretty quickly in April.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. One other<sup>102</sup>  
2 reminder is that Niagara Falls, New York, is  
3 right across from Niagara Falls, Ontario, and  
4 if you want to visit some of the sites, you  
5 need to cross the border, so bring your  
6 passport or other appropriate identification,  
7 but I don't believe they're accepting motor  
8 vehicle licenses, at least not - unless you  
9 have the enhanced motor vehicle license.

10 There's been an ongoing  
11 bureaucratic battle about that, but I'm pretty  
12 - they certainly tightened up a little bit on  
13 identification, but there's a bridge. It's  
14 fairly easy to get across to the Canadian  
15 side.

16 Any questions on the Board  
17 meeting? If - any other items, if not, we can  
18 - with that, do we have a motion to adjourn?

19 MEMBER PRESLEY: I make that  
20 motion.

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Bob Presley,  
22 second to that?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   MEMBER LEMEN: I second, this is<sup>104</sup>  
2                   Dick.

3                   CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Dick Lemen gets  
4                   that, and I think this one we can do by  
5                   acclamation. We don't need a roll call. No  
6                   one's conflicted I hope.

7                   MR. KATZ: Nobody I don't think.

8                   CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Good. We  
9                   will be talking to you all, and we'll see you  
10                  all in May in Niagara Falls.

11                  (Whereupon, the above-entitled  
12                  matter was concluded at 1:12 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701