## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

+ + + + +

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

# ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

#### 72nd MEETING

+ + + + +

# THURSDAY OCTOBER 7, 2010

+ + + + +

The meeting convened at 11:00 a.m., Eastern Standard Time, via teleconference, Paul L. Ziemer, Acting Chair, presiding.

#### PRESENT:

PAUL L. ZIEMER, Acting Chair
HENRY ANDERSON, Member
JOSIE BEACH, Member
BRADLEY P. CLAWSON, Member
R. WILLIAM FIELD, Member
MICHAEL H. GIBSON, Member
RICHARD LEMEN, Member
JAMES E. LOCKEY, Member
WANDA I. MUNN, Member
DAVID B. RICHARDSON, Member
GENEVIEVE S. ROESSLER, Member
PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official

REGISTERED AND/OR PUBLIC COMMENT PARTICIPANTS

ADAMS, NANCY, NIOSH Contractor
BARRIE, TERRIE, ANWAG
HOWELL, EMILY, HHS
HINNEFELD, STU, DCAS
FITZGERALD, JOE, SC&A
KOTSCH, JEFF, DOL
LIN, JENNY, HHS
MCKEEL, DAN
MAKHIJANI, ARJUN, SC&A
MAURO, JOHN, SC&A
NETON, JIM, DCAS
RABINOWITZ, RANDY, Contractor
RUTHERFORD, LaVON, DCAS
SUNDIN, DAVE, DCAS
WADE, LEW, DCAS

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

Roll Call, Mr. Katz, DFO	4
Welcome, Acting Chair Ziemer	9
Discussion of NIOSH 10-Year Program Review, Dr. Wade	10
Reviewing Public Comments to Board, Mr. Katz, DFO	14
Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition Status Update - Mr. Rutherford, DCAS - Update on petitions to be presented at the November 2010 Board meeting	21
Status of DOL Policy Issuance on Use of Ruttenber Data, Mr. Kotsch, DOL	29
Coordinating DCAS Support of Board Activities, Acting Chair Ziemer	41
Updates from Work Groups and Subcommittees (as necessary) WG/SC Chairs	51
Board Correspondence, Acting Chair Ziemer	62
Future Plans/Suggestions for the November 2010 Board Meeting Agenda, All Members	63
Adjournment	73

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(11:00 a.m.)
3	MR. KATZ: It's eleven o'clock.
4	Let's begin. This is Ted Katz. I'm the
5	Designated Federal Official for the Advisory
6	Board on Radiation Worker Health. And this is
7	a teleconference meeting which is the
8	teleconference meetings are primarily to get
9	us prepared for upcoming face-to-face Board
10	meetings. We have one in November in Santa
11	Fe.
12	Let us begin with roll call. Now,
13	I believe Dr. Melius, you're not on the
14	line, is that correct?
15	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: I just got
16	an email from him, Ted, and he'll join us
17	later he hopes.
18	MR. KATZ: Okay. I have that
19	email too. I just wanted to make certain he
20	wasn't there. Absent, Dr. Melius. Dr. Ziemer
21	has volunteered to act as Chair for this
22	meeting. Let me get us going though with roll

- 1 call of Board Members and others, beginning
- with Board Members. We've just heard Dr.
- 3 Ziemer, but let's go on down the list with the
- 4 rest.
- 5 MEMBER BEACH: Josie Beach.
- 6 MEMBER ANDERSON: Henry Anderson.
- 7 MEMBER GIBSON: Michael Gibson.
- 8 MEMBER LOCKEY: Jim Lockey.
- 9 MEMBER MUNN: Wanda Munn.
- 10 MEMBER FIELD: Bill Field.
- 11 MEMBER ROESSLER: Gen Roessler.
- 12 MEMBER RICHARDSON: David
- 13 Richardson.
- MR. KATZ: Okay, I thought I heard
- maybe Wanda Munn got trampled by someone else.
- 16 Are you on, Wanda?
- 17 MEMBER MUNN: They wouldn't dare.
- 18 Yes.
- 19 MR. KATZ: Okay. Now I know Bob
- 20 Presley probably cannot make it. So -- and I
- 21 didn't hear him. I thought Dr. Lemen, Dr.
- 22 Poston --

- 1 MEMBER LEMEN: Dr. Lemen is here.
- 2 MR. KATZ: Was that Dick?
- 3 MEMBER LEMEN: Yes.
- 4 MR. KATZ: Okay, so we have Dr.
- 5 Lemen.
- 6 MEMBER GIBSON: Ted, this is
- 7 Mike. I'm here.
- 8 MR. KATZ: I heard you, Mike.
- 9 I've got you checked off.
- 10 Do we have Dr. Poston? Okay. I
- 11 didn't hear Brad Clawson. Okay. Apparently
- no Mr. Clawson, no Dr. Poston, no Mr. Presley,
- 13 and no Dr. Melius. Dr. Poston wasn't
- 14 expected. Dr. Melius isn't expected right
- 15 now. So I think we can get started. Let me
- 16 ask everyone who -- on the line -- well, let
- 17 me do the rest of the roll call first and then
- 18 I'll get to this.
- 19 MEMBER CLAWSON: Ted, this is
- 20 Brad.
- 21 MR. KATZ: Okay.
- 22 MEMBER CLAWSON: I'm the one who

1	spoke	over	Wanda.

- 2 (Laughter.)
- 3 MEMBER CLAWSON: Sorry, Wanda. I
- 4 dared.
- 5 (Laughter.)
- 6 MEMBER MUNN: That's okay. We'll
- 7 take care of that later.
- 8 MR. KATZ: I also want to say I
- 9 didn't get Phil Schofield. Phil, are you on?
- 10 Okay, let me go to the rest of the
- 11 roll call. How about NIOSH ORAU Team?
- 12 MR. HINNEFELD: This is Stu
- 13 Hinnefeld from DCAS.
- DR. NETON: Jim Neton, DCAS.
- MR. RUTHERFORD: LaVon Rutherford,
- 16 DCAS.
- 17 MR. SUNDIN: Dave Sundin, DCAS.
- 18 MR. KATZ: Okay. Very good. How
- 19 about SC&A Team?
- DR. MAURO: John Mauro, SC&A.
- 21 MR. FITZGERALD: Joe Fitzgerald,
- 22 SC&A.

- DR. MAKHIJANI: Arjun Makhijani,
- 2 SC&A.
- MR. KATZ: Very good. How about
- 4 other HHS or federal officials or contractors?
- DR. WADE: This is Lew Wade.
- 6 MS. HOWELL: This is Emily Howell.
- 7 MR. KATZ: Emily.
- 8 MS. HOWELL: Hi. I think I spoke
- 9 over Nancy.
- 10 MS. LIN: This is Jenny with OGC.
- 11 MR. KOTSCH: Jeff Kotsch,
- 12 Department of Labor.
- MS. RABINOWITZ: Randy Rabinowitz,
- 14 contractor.
- MR. KATZ: Did I hear someone from
- 16 DOE?
- 17 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Phil Schofield,
- 18 I'm on the line.
- 19 MR. KATZ: Great. Glad to have
- you, Phil. Moving along, last, but not least,
- 21 any members of the public on the line who
- 22 would like to be recognized?

1	DR.	McKEEL:	This	is	Dan	McKeel.
---	-----	---------	------	----	-----	---------

- MS. BARRIE: This is Terrie Barrie
- with ANWAG.
- 4 MR. KATZ: Welcome to both of you.
- 5 Let me ask everyone when you're not speaking
- to the group, mute your phones. If you don't
- 7 have a mute button, hit \*6. Right now,
- 8 there's quite a bit of background noise, so I
- 9 imagine a few people are not muted.
- 10 And then Paul, it's your agenda.
- 11 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Thank you
- 12 very much, I'll call the meeting to order. I
- do want to ask if everyone can hear me. The
- line at this end seems very faint. Is anyone
- 15 having trouble hearing me? I don't hear any
- 16 response. You either didn't hear me or --
- 17 MR. KATZ: Paul, you're very clear
- 18 on this end.
- 19 DR. MAURO: Paul, this is John.
- 20 You're very clear.
- 21 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay, very
- 22 good. Thank you. I assume everyone has a

1	copy	οİ	the ag	genda.	It v	vas (	distribu	ıted	рУ
2	email	to	Board	Members	and	it'	s been	on	the

So we will proceed through

- 4 the agenda as it's given in order. Dr. Melius
- is unable to be here, at least at the start of
- 6 meeting. He may join us later at which point
- 7 I'll yield the

website as well.

3

- 8 Chair back to him since he is the official
- 9 Chair. But this came up at the last moment
- 10 and he did ask me to fill in, so I'm glad to
- 11 do that for him.
- 12 So I do officially welcome
- 13 everyone. We appreciate you all being here on
- 14 the call this morning. Hopefully, we'll be
- 15 able to go through the agenda in a concise
- 16 manner. And I don't anticipate that this will
- 17 be an extended meeting, but certainly we're
- open to any discussion items on these agenda
- 19 matters that anyone might have.
- 20 So thank you for being with us.
- We'll begin with, well, the first
- item is a discussion of the 10-year review. I

1	don't know what remarks Dr. Melius was
2	intending to make, but I do want to call on
3	Dr. Wade to give us an update on the status of
4	that and then see if Board Members have
5	comments or questions.
6	Dr. Wade, would you kind of give
7	us a status report?
8	DR. WADE: Can you hear me, Paul?

ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: 9 Yes. 10 DR. WADE: Very good. The status report is a little bit different than it's 11 been before in that as you'll notice at Phase 12 1 of the review where we're looking at five 13 issues are individual dose 14 issues. Those 15 reconstruction, Special Exposure Cohort, 16 customer service, timing, quality of science 17 Those pieces have all been completed. issues.

You've seen the three pieces that
have been produced by government contractors,
that is the DR piece, the timing piece, and
the Special Exposure Cohort piece. The docket
is open to receive comments on those pieces.

1	Those pieces are being modified based upon the
2	comments we've heard to this point and they
3	will reappear on the website once they're
4	modified to reflect the comments that we've
5	received to this point.
6	There will be a little bit of a
7	delay in terms of the other three pieces.
8	That's the quality of science piece and the
9	customer service piece in that those pieces
10	were authored by NIOSH employees, not NIOSH
11	contractors, and therefore, there's a hurdle
12	that we have to go through in terms of
13	clearing the NIOSH office through the NIOSH
14	process and that's underway. As soon as that
15	hurdle is cleared, those reports will be
16	distributed to you. They will also appear on
17	the website. So we're making progress.
18	I have in my hands all of the
19	pieces for Phase 1. They're just going
20	through the various reviews necessary to be
21	shared as appropriate. So that's my brief
22	report.

1	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay, thank
2	you, Lew. Are there any questions by the
3	Board Members?
4	I'll just make an additional
5	comment here or a question perhaps. Lew, I
6	assume that on those first three pieces,
7	there's still opportunity for Board Members to
8	review and comment on those. I, myself, am
9	working on Randy Rabinowitz's part and have
LO	completed my review. I'm still working on the
11	comments and still in Nancy Adams's piece as
L2	well. So I assume we're still okay time-wise
L3	on getting those comments in.
L4	DR. WADE: Certainly, Paul. And
L5	once the pieces are modified and appear, there
L6	will be an opportunity to comment upon the
L7	modified piece as well. So yes. Board
L8	Members, at your convenience, please.
L9	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Other
20	questions, Board Members?
21	Hearing no questions or comments,
2.2	so I'm assuming that we're completed with that

-				
1	٦.	Τ.	em	
_	_	L	$ \frac{1}{1}$	•

- 2 Dr. Wade, any of your other -- I
- 3 know Randy is on the line. I didn't hear
- 4 whether Nancy was, but any of the other
- 5 participants have comments they want to make?
- 6 DR. WADE: I certainly will let
- 7 them speak for themselves.
- 8 MS. ADAMS: This is Nancy Adams I
- 9 have no comments.
- 10 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Very good.
- 11 Let's proceed then. The next item is called
- 12 Reviewing Public Comments to the Board and Ted
- 13 Katz has the lead on this. As background
- 14 material, I might point out that earlier this
- 15 fall, I think the date was August -- no,
- 16 that's not the right date. In any event, I
- 17 quess it was in September, Mr. Katz
- 18 distributed the latest set of tracking items
- on public comments. So Ted, do you want to
- 20 comment on that and take us through any issues
- 21 that you want to raise?
- 22 MR. KATZ: Thank you, Paul. This

1 is Ted. In mid-September, I think it was 2 probably the 15th or thereabouts, I sent to 3 all the Board Members a sort of new format for of 4 this project we have now the Board responding to comments as it wishes, public 5 6 comments that are heard during the full face-7 to-face Board meetings, be they comments during the public comment session or during 8 the other place we get them, during the SEC 9 10 sessions, too.

I went through public comments at the last teleconference a quarter ago or two quarters ago. And in that case I think Jim and I both felt that that was perhaps not the best approach. I ran through the comments, what had been done, how they had been disposed of in one way or the other by DCAS or by the Board during the Board meeting in direct response to the comment and then raised the opportunity for Board Members to engage on any of the items that they might, whether they hadn't been fully responded to or whether they

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 had thoughts about the responses to date.

2 So we're going to try to do this a 3 different way now because I think really it just felt a little uncomfortable the sort of 4 the weight of the presentation was on me and I 5 think it's best for the Board to speak for 6 So what I've distributed to you is a 7 tracking document just like we had for the 8 last session where we went through this, that 9 10 is prepared by DCAS and its contractor that shows all the comments in very summary form, 11 12 really, just almost practically titled. 13 shows their disposition in terms of those 14 items that either DCAS responded to 15 independently, subsequent to the meeting, or 16 that might have been responded to in real time during the Board meeting and then those that 17 had not yet been responded to. 18 19 So you have that again in one of distributed to 20 the I documents you

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

easier for you, what I did was broke up that

And then to make this,

21

22

September.

I hope,

appended it with the actual transcript of the
dialogue related to that comment, so that you
could see exactly and fully what the comment
was and what response might have been made
during the Board meeting to the comment and
then consider whether there are matters that
are unaddressed that you think the Board ought
to engage in more fully, or whether there's an
item there that DCAS responded to and you
might have advice for DCAS and responding
differently or more fully or what have you.
So you have those two documents.
The document with the transcripts, of course,
The document with the transcripts, or course,
is quite long because I have all those public
is quite long because I have all those public
is quite long because I have all those public comments, page by page, but I've done it so
is quite long because I have all those public comments, page by page, but I've done it so that each one is a separate item and should be
is quite long because I have all those public comments, page by page, but I've done it so that each one is a separate item and should be easy, at least for you to work with. There

And then in the November meeting,

1	we're planning for Board Members to raise
2	those comments, just those comments for which
3	you feel there ought to be more Board
4	discussion. So that's what will happen in
5	November. At least that's Jim's and my plan
6	for what would happen in November. And
7	really, I'm just raising this to you now in
8	this session so that if you have thoughts
9	about the presentation of these materials, it
10	would make them easier for you to work with or
11	thoughts about the process going forward, you
12	could raise those. And my hope is to have
13	both I've sent to you the May comments in
14	this package as I've described it and I
15	believe DCAS is working on the August comments
16	and will be presented in a similar in the
17	same format.
18	So that's where we are with it.
19	And what I would like to know now is if you
20	have thoughts about this process or the
21	presentation, any changes you'd like to see?
22	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Thanks, Ted.

1	It's been very helpful, I think, to see these
2	individual comments addressed and some
3	followup being done. So that's very helpful.
4	Let me ask now, Board Members, do
5	you have comments or questions for Ted at this
6	point?
7	MEMBER ANDERSON: This is Andy. I
8	think the process presented here should work
9	well for us. I absolutely agree. It's very
10	useful to see those comments and then at least
11	track them to a certain extent.
12	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Thanks,
13	Andy. It was my impression in reading these
14	that we probably don't want to get into a
15	situation where we, in detail, take action on
16	approving or disapproving every comment, but
17	rather as you review them, Board Members
18	this is my own thoughts now and they don't
19	necessarily represent what we're going to end
20	up doing but it just seems to me that it
21	would make sense if you see something that
22	raises a red flag either in the response, if

1	you feel it's unresponsive or incorrect, then
2	you would raise that issue at the follow-up
3	meeting. Was that your intent, Ted?
4	MR. KATZ: Yes, as well as I
5	mean there may be comments there that haven't
6	been responded to that you feel should be and
7	there may be situations where, for example,
8	DCAS may have responded to it or the Board may
9	have responded to it in part during that Board
10	meeting, but you feel like a more robust Board
11	response is deserved.
12	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Sure, right.
13	There are a number of them that are labeled
14	as no response necessary and those are the
15	ones you're referring to if the Board Members
16	feel there should be a response?
17	MR. KATZ: Sure.
18	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Those that
19	were no response is necessary typically are
20	ones where a comment is made simply for the
21	record. Okay. Other comments or questions,
22	Board Members?

1	MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. It
2	was helpful for me to have the page references
3	there. I appreciate that.
4	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: From the
5	transcript.
6	MEMBER MUNN: Yes.
7	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Yes, thank
8	you. That is helpful, Ted.
9	MR. KATZ: Okay, good.
10	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: It makes the
11	document a little long, but nonetheless, it
12	saves us from going back and digging through
13	those transcripts to try to find the exact
14	wording.
15	MR. KATZ: Right, you can just
16	take the tracking document, find those
17	comments that you have interest in, and then
18	it's very easy to search it in the longer
19	document and pull it up.
20	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Right. Any

# If not, thank you. We'll proceed

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

others?

1	to the next item which is a presentation by
2	LaVon Rutherford which is an update on the SEC
3	petition status.
4	So LaVon, we appreciate hearing
5	what's coming down the pike.
6	MR. RUTHERFORD: All right, thank
7	you, Dr. Ziemer. Actually, we plan to present
8	five SEC Evaluation Reports at the November
9	meeting. Hangar 481, which is a revision to
10	an Evaluation Report, we actually, the only
11	thing that was revised in that Evaluation
12	Report was a new picture was placed in of the
13	actual Hangar 481. And we also allowed the
14	petitioner some time to review all the
15	documentation that was FOIA'd. That
16	petitioner has reviewed all that information
17	and is ready to move forward with discussion.
18	Texas City Chemical, we've revised
19	our Evaluation Report and that report should
20	be out within the next couple of weeks. And
21	we will present that revised evaluation at the

Simonds Saw and Steel, it's an 83.13

meeting.

1	Petition Evaluation. This report should be
2	out in a couple of weeks. It is in its final
3	stages of review now.
4	Linde Ceramics, again another
5	83.14. It's for a period of the early
6	operational period 1947 to 1953. We have held
7	up releasing this Evaluation Report until the
8	radon tunnel issue, we felt like we had
9	addressed that. We have a position out on
10	that radon tunnel exposures and we're ready to
11	release this Petition Evaluation and that's
12	coming through now and we anticipate that will
13	be out within the next few weeks as well and
14	we will present that one.
15	BWXT, as you may recall, we
16	recommended two Classes for BWXT, the two
17	early operational periods. We recommended
18	those at the July meeting. The Board
19	concurred with those recommendations and both
20	Classes have been added.

We also committed, at that Board

to continue our evaluation of the

meeting,

21

1	later years, the 1985 to 2001. We completed
2	our evaluation of that period of BWXT and we
3	will be presenting an 83.14 evaluation
4	recommending some additional years at BWXT.
5	So again, the five are Hangar 481,
6	Texas City Chemical, Simonds Saw and Steel,
7	Linde Ceramics, and BWXT.
8	Also, in my SEC summary update, I
9	will be presenting our findings of our review
LO	of the SEC Class Definitions. If you recall,
11	that review is going back from the beginning
L2	of our first Classes that were added under the
L3	rule and looking at how we added those Class
L4	Definitions, the basis for the Class
L5	Definitions and if it would change based on
L6	how we have been recommending Classes today.
L7	So again, I will be doing a report
L8	on that as well and that's about it.
L9	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay, thank
20	vou. LaVon Board Members, do vou have

MR. HINNEFELD: Paul, this is Stu

21

22

questions for LaVon?

1	Hinnefeld.	There's	one	other	thing	that	's	not

- 2 a new or revised petition, but we'll be
- 3 presenting to the Board one more time the GE
- 4 Evendale SEC. At least we expect to, isn't
- 5 that right, LaVon?
- 6 MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, that is
- 7 correct. I apologize about that. That is
- 8 actually an update that we will be providing,
- 9 based on what information that we have found
- 10 through discussions with GE out of the United
- 11 Kingdom as well as some additional research
- that we've done on-site.
- 13 Thanks, Stu, I appreciate that.
- 14 MEMBER ROESSLER: This is Gen
- 15 Roessler. Do I have my mute off?
- 16 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Yes, you do,
- 17 Gen.
- 18 MEMBER ROESSLER: Okay, LaVon, on
- 19 the Linde, you gave the dates quickly, but I
- 20 think they are not correct. I was just
- looking through my paperwork here. I think
- the SEC that we're now working on, I'm the

1	Work	Group	Chair,	is	107.	And	I	think	the

- dates are January 1, 1954 through July 31,
- 3 2006.
- 4 MR. RUTHERFORD: Dr. Roessler, you
- 5 are correct. That is for that SEC. What we
- 6 are presenting is actually a new Petition
- 7 Evaluation that was for the earlier years. If
- 8 you remember, we actually have an SEC from the
- 9 1942 through 1946 period. This Petition
- 10 Evaluation here will cover the 1947 through
- 11 1953 period. The reason that we had held up
- on this Petition Evaluation was because of the
- work on the one that you were speaking to, the
- 14 work on the residual period. It was
- 15 recognized that the tunnel exposures needed to
- 16 be also addressed in this Petition Evaluation
- 17 as well. So we held up on releasing this
- 18 Petition Evaluation until radon exposures in
- 19 the tunnel for that residual period which that
- 20 information is used as well in this Petition
- 21 Evaluation.
- 22 MEMBER ROESSLER: Okay, when you

1	mentioned	the	tunnels	that	raised	а	red	flaq.

- 2 So yes, it's okay. I understand. Thanks.
- 3 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Other
- 4 questions or comments?
- 5 MEMBER LOCKEY: LaVon, Jim Lockey.
- 6 When will you update the General Electric?
- 7 Do you have a date on that?
- 8 MR. RUTHERFORD: We will be doing
- 9 that update at the November meeting. Again,
- 10 we have had some additional discussion with
- 11 GE. We have also done additional data capture
- on site and we have had some correspondence
- with GE out of the United Kingdom as well.
- 14 MR. HINNEFELD: This is Stu. We
- 15 can provide -- rather than hit the Board with
- 16 it cold at the meeting, we can provide a
- 17 summary of essentially what we're going to say
- 18 in advance. But I don't have a date for that
- 19 just yet. Is there a date you need it by?
- 20 MR. RUTHERFORD: Stu, would that
- 21 be a couple of weeks before the meeting?
- 22 MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, it should be

1	at	least	a	couple	of	weeks	before	the	meeting	١.
2				MR. RU	THE	RFORD:	Okay,	thai	nk you.	

- 3 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay, any
- 4 others? I'll throw this out as a general
- 5 question, but I think some of these are going
- 6 to require then some additional work by the
- 7 Board's contractor. For example, we have
- 8 revised ERs on Texas City Chemical and Simonds
- 9 Saw.
- 10 MR. RUTHERFORD: Actually, Dr.
- 11 Ziemer, the Simonds Saw is not a revision.
- 12 It's a first issuance.
- 13 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Or a first
- issuance, okay, yes. I thought you had said
- 15 revision, but you're right. That's first
- 16 time.
- 17 Texas City Chemical though is a
- 18 revised, I believe.
- 19 MR. RUTHERFORD: That is correct.
- 20 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: And --
- MR. RUTHERFORD: Hangar 481 is a
- 22 revision, but Hangar 481 was never given to

1	+ho	Daard	contractor.
<b>T</b>	LHE	Board	contractor.

- 2 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Right.
- 3 MR. RUTHERFORD: It just is a
- 4 reminder. That was one where we held up, or
- 5 the Board held up taking action on it until
- 6 the petitioner had time to review some FOIA
- 7 documents and they've completed that.
- 8 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Right. So
- 9 the revised ERs, like on Texas City Chemical,
- 10 is that ready or what's the time table for
- that actually being distributed to the Board,
- 12 roughly?
- 13 MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, it will be
- 14 within the next week and a half. I say week
- and a half because it's pretty much ready to
- 16 go, but I have to verify it will not require
- 17 another DOE ADC review.
- 18 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Right, and
- 19 then the privacy review will follow
- 20 immediately so we can get those out to the
- 21 petitioners as well.
- MR. RUTHERFORD: Correct.

1	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay, thank
2	you. Certainly, we want to have those all
3	distributed well in advance of the Board
4	meeting.
5	Other comments or questions?
6	Okay, let's proceed then. The next item on
7	the agenda is the status of the Department of
8	Labor's, actually, review of the Ruttenber
9	data and what there I guess there's a final
10	policy issuance? Jeff Kotsch is on the Board
11	or on the phone. Not on the Board, Jeff,
12	but on the phone. Can you give us a report on
13	where we stand on that?
14	MR. KOTSCH: Sure, Paul. Good
15	morning. This will be fairly brief.
16	At the last meeting, I noted that
17	we would we will be using the building data
18	from what we call the Ruttenber database as
19	input into the placement of people into the
20	SEC Class at Rocky Flats, as well as we'll
21	also use the indications of positive neutron
22	dose, check those against dose reconstruction

1	to determine if they indeed included neutron
2	dose in their evaluation and if they didn't,
3	we're working with NIOSH on how we'll resolve
4	that.
5	I checked with our policy group
6	yesterday. They are in the final management
7	review phase of the bulletin that will
8	basically provide the details of how that
9	how the use of the Ruttenber database will be
10	used in putting people into the SEC Class at
11	Rocky Flats. So I'm hoping I can never
12	predict those things, but we're hoping that
13	will pop out in the next few weeks and then
14	I'll let you know because it will be available
15	to be reviewed.
16	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Thank you
17	very much, Jeff. I wonder if is Mark
18	Griffon on the line? I know Mark was awaiting
19	the final disposition on this, but at least
20	the Board will have an opportunity to at least
21	become informed on what the intent is and how
22	that database will be used in the placement

1	of p	eople	at	location	ons	on	site	and	how	that
2	plav	s into	the	final	ad i	udi	cation	of	the	cases

- 3 then.
- 4 MR. KOTSCH: Right.
- 5 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Board
- 6 Members, any questions on that information or
- 7 generally on the Ruttenber data?
- 8 MEMBER RICHARDSON: This is David
- 9 Richardson. Can you hear me?
- 10 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Yes. Go
- 11 ahead, Dave.
- 12 MEMBER RICHARDSON: I had asked
- this question before and I just want to follow
- 14 up some more on it. I have no problem with
- 15 bringing in information to help making a
- 16 decision. My question was sort of about the
- 17 chain of custody of the data.
- 18 Why aren't you going directly to
- 19 the contractor and getting the same
- 20 information?
- MR. KOTSCH: We do get information
- from the contractor as well as from NIOSH and

1	from a number of other sources. This is just
2	another piece of data to determine whether
3	or another piece of information to see if it
4	provides any additional information.
5	MEMBER RICHARDSON: The
6	information that Ruttenber got should be the
7	information that you would get from the
8	contractor. If it's not, it raises a question
9	either about something which happened in the
10	transmission of the data or something which
11	has changed in the contractor's database since
12	they transmitted it to Ruttenber.
13	I'm sort of confused about this
14	issue. What is there that you want from the
15	Ruttenber data which you can't obtain from the
16	Department of Energy or one of their
17	contractors?
18	MR. KOTSCH: We think we can get
19	pretty much all that information from the site
20	data that we have. This is just an additional
21	check. This is just another piece of
22	information that we're using. It's been

1	offered as a source of information.
2	MEMBER RICHARDSON: I can speak
3	sadly from my own experience. Whenever you
4	have more data, you're always finding
5	contradictory information and how do you
6	resolve those contradictions? Is there a
7	priority or a hierarchy to the information?
8	MR. KOTSCH: In this case I don't
9	know if there's a hierarchy per se between the
10	Ruttenber and the site, but these things are
11	done on a case-by-case basis. The evidence is
12	weighed as far as what the source of it is and
13	the discrepancies are resolved on a case-by-
14	case, if there are any.
15	MEMBER RICHARDSON: I guess I find
16	that unsatisfying. I would like, a priori,
17	there to be a procedure in place for when
18	there's a contradiction to be resolved.
19	Ideally, you would like to know the origin of
20	that contradiction. You can go back to hard
21	copy records and figure out which electronic
22	file has been has had errors introduced

1	into it. But on a case-by-case basis really
2	doesn't tell me anything about what the
3	principles of what how you think the
4	information has been obtained, been
5	manipulated, and why you have an expectation
6	that one is more or less valid than the other?
7	MR. KOTSCH: The way the
8	compensation program works is we weigh all the
9	in each case, all the evidence is weighed
10	and determined and if there are
11	contradictions, those are attempted to be
12	resolved.
13	MEMBER RICHARDSON: I believe that
14	if the Board, I mean, and other people want,
15	it's not a
16	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: I'm
17	wondering, Dave, if we have an opportunity to
18	see what's in the bulletin which Jeff, I
19	assume, will explain how you intend to use the
20	database vis-a-vis the claims. Is that
21	correct?
22	MR. KOTSCH: Yes. The bulletin

1	provides guidance to the claims examiners, to
2	the field staff on how to use the data, the
3	information in that database in conjunction
4	with the other sources of information that
5	have to place people into the Class.
6	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Certainly,
7	Dr. Richardson has raised some interesting
8	points. We do have to keep in mind that, in
9	reality, our Board doesn't have any sort of
10	jurisdiction over how the DOL actually carries
11	out its responsibilities in this regard, but
12	at least we do have the opportunity once
13	seeing the bulletin and then the intended use
14	to at least express concerns, if there are
15	any, as to how the material is used.
16	Dave, I would assume that although
17	we have no official sort of say on this, at
18	least we could make Jeff and the others at DOL
19	cognizant of concerns that might be raised.
20	If I understand correctly, and maybe counsel
21	can also help on this, but in terms of the
22	issues that Dr. Richardson has raised, I don't

1	know if Emily Howell or others would be able
2	to at this point give an opinion as to what
3	our input on that matter might be, but we
4	could at least discuss it at the next meeting.
5	MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. One
6	of the problems with attempting to put
7	together procedures for someone else to
8	follow, and especially given our experience in
9	this particular program, is the enormous
10	variance of type of information that's
11	available from which people can work.
12	The fact that we have a site that
13	has something like the Ruttenber data does not
14	give us any assurance that other sites will
15	have similar kinds of studies which we could
16	even call for supplementary information. So
17	it's difficult to see how one can move away
18	from the individual aspect of how one weighs
19	the data. It simply is impossible to say that
20	we all have even nearly the same kind of data
21	from which to work, even inside certain areas
22	where we might have additional studies. Some

1 p	eople	may	not	have	been	included	in	the	study
-----	-------	-----	-----	------	------	----------	----	-----	-------

- 2 and yet have other data from which dose
- 3 reconstruction can work.
- 4 So due to an enormous variety of
- 5 sources of information we have, it would seem
- 6 almost impossible to begin to fairly establish
- 7 something that would be criterion worthy.
- 8 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Given that,
- 9 however, I think in this specific case, Dr.
- 10 Richardson, you can weigh in on this again,
- 11 but it seems to me that you're raising the
- 12 general question of perhaps consistency on how
- things are adjudicated. Clearly, it's done on
- 14 a case-by-case basis, but are there some sort
- of operational rules that provide the sort of
- 16 underlying methodology for how this is done,
- even though it is on a case-by-case basis. If
- 18 there is a conflict in Ruttenber data versus
- 19 say the DOE database, what is it that's done,
- 20 what has priority and is there a decision-
- 21 making tool so that we don't get different
- 22 decisions for the same kinds of differential

1 information. But perhaps that was wha	at I	Γ
---	------	---

- was trying to understand.
- Is that what you were saying, Dr.
- 4 Richardson?
- 5 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes, exactly.
- 6 It's -- I mean --
- 7 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: It's a
- 8 consistency issue.
- 9 MEMBER RICHARDSON: It's a
- 10 consistency issue and there is -- I mean, when
- 11 I -- there's a starting assumption here that
- 12 more information is better and that's not
- 13 necessarily always the case. I mean here you
- 14 have, your expectation is that two data
- 15 providers have given you -- they should be
- 16 identical information. The type of
- 17 information describing Ruttenber collected or
- 18 compiled into a database was not information
- 19 that you went back and generated de novo. It
- 20 was information abstracted from site records.
- Now, if you got Ruttenber's
- 22 compilation, kind of a cache that you did of

1	the data, and you got another source, a cache
2	of the same information, when you have two
3	sources of it, I think it would be worthwhile
4	to think about a principle for saying which
5	one you're going to take as the standard.
6	DR. MAKHIJANI: This is Arjun.
7	May I say something about that last comment?
8	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Sure, Arjun.
9	DR. MAKHIJANI: David, I'm not
10	sure that Jim Ruttenber's information was all
11	from records. I think there were interviews
12	and some new information that was generated,
13	although this is now from memory of some years
14	back, having worked with the Board on this
15	question. We can look into that. There might
16	be some new information there.
17	MS. HOWELL: Dr. Ziemer?
18	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Yes.
19	MS. HOWELL: Hi, it's Emily. I
20	was just going to say, certainly the Board can
21	inquire of DOL whether or not they have
22	procedures in place to address consistency

1	concerns. If the Board has an opinion that
2	they can reach without additional work about
3	the best practices, then those are something
4	that the Board could potentially include in a
5	letter to DOL, but once we get kind of beyond
6	that to further inquiry and then debate about
7	procedures that DOL might apply, that's kind
8	of moving outside the scope of this Board's
9	responsibilities in terms of advising NIOSH.
10	And of course, any questions or information
11	that the Board provides to DOL, they're free
12	to respond to as they see fit.
13	I mean, obviously, the Ruttenber
14	data is something that we've been going around
15	within the Board and with DOL for several
16	years now. And I think you guys have
17	outstanding questions, you know, Jeff has been
18	hearing your concerns and perhaps can address
19	them, but in terms of advising DOL about how
20	they should be verifying worker data and
21	employment, there you get into an area where
22	really we're kind of moving beyond what the

1 Board is intended to do.

2 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Thank you, 3 Emily, and that certainly was my impression too, in terms of how we address this kind of 4 I think, though, it would be useful 5 an issue. 6 for us, Mr. Katz, to put this on our agenda for the next meeting at the time when we'll 7 have presumably the actual bulletin in hand so 8 we have an understanding of how the Ruttenber 9 10 data is being used to adjudicate cases. question that 11 believe the Dr. Richardson 12 raised is not unlike one we are raising for 13 ourselves and that is, how do we maintain consistency in our decision-making processes 14 15 throughout this whole program? It's certainly 16 a useful question to consider, and if there's objection, we'll ask t.hat. Dr. Melius 17 no include it in the agenda for the next meeting. 18 19 MR. KATZ: Paul, that's fine. Μy 20 only question about this is whether Mark might not want to have actually the small, the Rocky 21 Flats Work Group chew on this and any other 22

1	issues	they	might	have	prior	to	it	being	а

- 2 whole Board matter.
- 3 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Well, that's
- 4 certainly appropriate. That's why I asked if
- 5 Mark was on the line to react to this. But
- 6 certainly it would be his prerogative if he
- 7 wants to get his Work Group to take a look at
- 8 this prior to the meeting. That's certainly
- 9 in order and I assume that you would work with
- 10 him on that to at least ask the question as to
- 11 whether he wants to do that and maybe to
- 12 apprise him of the question that was raised by
- 13 Dr. Richardson.
- MR. KATZ: Right, and I'll do
- 15 that. My only question is, I'm acutely aware
- of how many Work Group meetings we already
- 17 have scheduled prior to that meeting. It may
- 18 not be able to be done before.
- 19 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Understood.
- 20 MR. KATZ: But we won't lose this
- issue one way or the other.
- 22 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Right,

1	right. Okay, any other comments on this? If
2	not, we'll move to the next item which is an
3	issue of coordinating activities which
4	includes coordinating the Work Group and the
5	Subcommittee issues and the work products of
6	NIOSH and its contractor and the work products
7	that come from our Board support contractor as
8	well. And Dr. Melius was heading this one up,
9	but I think it's fairly straightforward in
10	terms of the agenda and that is to take a look
11	at the documents that we have in hand. And
12	Ted, you can help us on this.
13	We have several documents that
14	have been distributed to the Board Members,
15	one of which was Work Group coordination of
16	DCAS support tasks. We had one dated in
17	August and I think we had a more recent one.
18	In my files here it's dated September 16th
19	which gives the listing of the Site Profile
20	reviews that are in hand or when they're
21	scheduled to be delivered, any Evaluation
22	Report deliveries, and SEC items and other TBD

1	tasks for the various Work Groups and
2	documents to be delivered and what the
3	delivery dates are.
4	Does everyone have a copy of that
5	document? Or anyone that doesn't, let us know.
6	I believe the date on it was September 16th.
7	Ted, can you speak to this?
8	MR. KATZ: I believe that's right.
9	That sounds like the right date, yes.
10	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: And I
11	believe, Ted, you've asked that people let you
12	know if there are items that need to be added
13	to this listing. Is that correct?
14	MR. KATZ: Yes, there's two
15	matters, I think, to be addressed. One is if
16	you are expecting work products that aren't
17	showing here, we want to catch those. So
18	please let me know. For example, Paul sent a
19	couple items to me earlier today or yesterday,
20	I think, which I've forwarded to DCAS, but so,
21	for all of you Work Group Chairs and
22	Subcommittee Chairs, if there's items that

1	you're awaiting and they're not reflected
2	here, we want to capture them.
3	And then the second main issue
4	following that is if you see something is
5	coming up, whether it's an item that's
6	specifically requested by your Work Group, or
7	it's, for example, a TBD update, DCAS is
8	revising a TBD, you weren't aware of it and
9	you see the dates, then the issue there is
LO	just the timing of that and whether that works
L1	with your schedule for your Work Group. Being
L2	aware of that is one thing, but also if it's a
13	priority to move something up, then to be able
L4	to let DCAS know that their schedule, it would
L5	be if an item could be moved up, it would
L6	improve the work of the Work Group. And DCAS
L7	can then possibly work with some of those
L8	items and reorder them to meet your needs.
L9	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: And in fact,
20	this is very helpful in terms of your actual

scheduling of Work Group times because you

will have an idea of when things will become

21

1	available.	Ιf	vou	have	White	Papers	or	other

- 2 review documents that are being generated, and
- 3 you know what the delivery dates are, that's
- 4 very helpful in terms of scheduling Work Group
- 5 times. I think the document is very helpful
- for all the Work Groups.
- 7 Let me ask if there are comments
- 8 or questions on this. Again, it's an
- 9 informational item for you.
- 10 MEMBER CLAWSON: Paul, can you
- 11 hear me?
- 12 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Yes.
- MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay, I'm sorry,
- my mute button isn't working here.
- 15 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: This is
- 16 Brad, right?
- 17 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes, this is Brad,
- 18 I'm sorry. What date was that sent out
- 19 because I'm not -- I'm having --
- 20 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: I show it as
- 21 the 16th of September.
- MR. KATZ: Yes.

1	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: And I think
2	it was called something like Work Group
3	Coordination for DCAS Tasks or something along
4	that line.
5	MR. KATZ: Yes, the title is
6	October Teleconference Item DCAS Coordination.
7	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: DCAS
8	Coordination, right.
9	MEMBER CLAWSON: Ted, could I just
10	have you send that to me. I'm not showing it
11	on my files here.
12	MR. KATZ: Okay, I sent it to both
13	of your addresses, but I'll send it again.
14	MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay, if you
15	would, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.
16	MR. KATZ: No problem.

# 20

it?

17

18

19

No, I have a copy. MEMBER MUNN:

ACTING CHAIR

ZIEMER:

- attempted to print it that 21 Ι and was
- disastrous. 22

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

anyone else that needs a copy that didn't get

Is there

Т	MR. KAIZ. Wanda, It's impossible
2	to print.
3	MEMBER MUNN: It clearly is. I
4	thought I would print it so that I could go
5	over it.
6	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Actually,
7	it's not impossible to print, and I if you
8	just
9	MEMBER MUNN: You've printed it,
10	you're telling me?
11	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Yes. You've
12	got to go into go to your page set-up to
13	start with, to get the right page set-up and
14	then you can also adjust what information is
15	on a page. This is an Excel spreadsheet, I
16	believe.
17	MEMBER MUNN: Yes.
18	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: And what you

what I was attempting to do and so far have

want to do is get it so that everything in the

horizontal direction is all on one page.

MEMBER MUNN:

19

20

21

22

Yes, and that was

1	not	been	successful	in	doing	it.	And	it	is
---	-----	------	------------	----	-------	-----	-----	----	----

- 2 difficult to really --
- 3 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Offline,
- 4 I'll send you some instructions. I had to
- 5 fiddle around awhile.
- 6 MEMBER MUNN: I'll try it again.
- 7 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: There is an
- 8 opportunity in Excel under page set-up to tell
- 9 it how -- you can change what the width of
- 10 that is.
- 11 MEMBER MUNN: I'll attempt it
- 12 again.
- 13 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Yes, get all
- the columns on one page.
- 15 MEMBER MUNN: I quess I was
- offering an excuse for not having reviewed it
- more thoroughly than I did. But it certainly
- 18 appears to be a comprehensive list.
- 19 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Yes.
- 20 MEMBER MUNN: And I can see this
- is going to be very helpful for some of us.
- 22 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay.

1	MEMBER MUNN: Once I get it in a
2	form where I can read it.
3	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Any other
4	questions or comments on that item?
5	MEMBER CLAWSON: My question is,
6	one of the things is like what I've just got
7	into, I've been told that I will have a
8	certain file, I'll have a response by a
9	certain time and then when that time passes,
10	I'm all of a sudden notified that it's a month
11	later. I'm just wondering, you know, I guess
12	I would just expect that the courtesy, if
13	they're not going to make some of these papers
14	to us in time that they let us know a little
15	bit up front instead of the last minute. Is
16	this going to be possible with this?
17	MR. HINNEFELD: This is Stu.
18	We'll do that to the extent possible.
19	Sometimes we don't get word ourselves in a
20	very timely fashion, so we will try to
21	incorporate that into our work process to make
22	sure we get some timely indication of dates

1 that may not be met in advance of the ac
--

- 2 date itself.
- MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, yes. We
- 4 were setting up a Work Group on the
- 5 understanding that this paper would be to us
- 6 by this time and this time came and passed.
- 7 Luckily, we had scheduled a Work Group later,
- 8 but --
- 9 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Which Work
- 10 Group is that, Brad?
- 11 MEMBER CLAWSON: Fernald.
- 12 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Fernald.
- 13 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay, and so I
- just, you know, I hate at the very last minute
- to have to cancel a Work Group meeting because
- not being notified that something isn't going
- 17 to be there or whatever. I want these Work
- 18 Groups to be as meaningful as possible.
- 19 MR. HINNEFELD: We'll try to
- 20 establish a process for getting the
- information out as quickly as we can.
- 22 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. Well, my

1	biggest	thing	is	if	there's	а	change	from	what

- the original agreed-on time was going to be.
- 3 We all know that things are going to come up.
- 4 It happens to all of us on this, but just to
- 5 be notified so that we can make more
- 6 arrangements or whatever would be appreciated,
- 7 Stu.
- 8 MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, we'll give it
- 9 a shot. I'm guessing you're talking about
- 10 sliding of a couple weeks. You're not talking
- 11 about a couple of days, right?
- 12 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes, this is
- 13 sliding a month.
- 14 MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, I know. I
- think I know what you're talking about.
- 16 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Well, thank
- 17 you. The first thing when you get it is go
- through and make sure you're even on there. I
- 19 don't even see Fernald on this list.
- 20 MEMBER CLAWSON: I know. That's
- 21 why I was requesting because I wanted to see
- 22 kind of how it was responded to, but Ted will

1	get	that	to	me	and	we'll	go	from	there.

- 2 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: And then
- there were some others missing. That's one of
- 4 the things I was communicating to Ted. So
- 5 take a look. Make sure the facility of
- 6 interest is actually on the list and then you
- 7 can go from there.
- 8 MR. KATZ: So everybody, send me -
- 9 if we're going to do this individually as
- 10 opposed to on the conference call, send me
- 11 your concerns. When you look through this
- 12 list, you find the items that aren't showing
- there. Send them to me and I'll take care of
- communicating with folks at DCAS on this.
- 15 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Any other
- 16 comments or questions on this? Okay. Let's
- 17 move on then. The next item is updates from
- 18 Work Groups and Subcommittees as necessary.
- 19 And the "as necessary" part simply means if
- 20 you have some particular issue to raise or
- item of interest to the Full Board, then you
- 22 report that. If you don't, then you can

1	simply indicate no report.
2	I might add that for those of the
3	Work Group Chairs, if the only thing you have
4	to report is the time of the next Work Group
5	meeting, that's fine. Just indicate when
6	you'll be when the Work Group meeting is
7	scheduled and that will be in the record here.
8	You all should have copies of that
9	schedule, in any event, but that's fine if
10	that's your report.
11	So let's go through them, and Ted,
12	can you do this on a roll call basis and we'll
13	just take the Work Groups in order?
14	MR. KATZ: Yes, absolutely.
15	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Including
16	the Subcommittees. Let's do the two
17	Subcommittees and then we'll do the Work
18	Groups.
19	MR. KATZ: Okay, well, we don't
20	have Mark for Dose Reconstruction
21	Subcommittee, but Wanda?

ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Well, can we

1	ask if anyone from that Subcommittee has do
2	we have anything to report?
3	MR. KATZ: Well, this is Ted. I
4	can report. We have a meeting scheduled for
5	November 8th.
6	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay.
7	MR. KATZ: And we will be doing a
8	number of things including selecting another
9	set of dose reconstructions, possibly dealing
10	with selecting dose reconstructions for a PER
11	review, going over quality assurance issues
12	that have been raised and the first hundred
13	dose reconstructions that was reviewed, and
14	continuing on with the Subcommittee's review
15	of the eighth and ninth seventh, eighth and
16	hopefully into the ninth sets of dose
17	reconstructions. That's more or less the
18	agenda for that meeting.
19	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay.
20	MEMBER MUNN: Thank you, Ted. I
21	was thinking, goodness, we're doing all kinds
22	of things in that Subcommittee, but I wasn't

2	Wanda, the other Subcommittee, the Procedures
3	Subcommittee. We last met in July. We're
4	still having some issues with the electronic
5	database. It's been transferred over to DCAS'
6	hands, but we have one or two items,
7	especially our issue of linkage to other
8	documents so that we don't have to incorporate
9	full documents into the database itself.
10	Those things are still being worked on. We're
11	trying to get those smoothed out.
12	We at our last meeting did
13	complete our discussion with respect to the
14	first of the two-page archives that we would
15	use as sort of a structure to follow or follow
16	for the summary reviews that are going to be
17	taking place and placed on the website for the
18	public to have access to. We presented that
19	at the last Board meeting and that was
20	approved in its current form.
21	We're right now discussing with
22	the Agency how to get that new portion of the

prepared to report on a thing. And this is

1	site	ready	and	get	the	archived	material	up
---	------	-------	-----	-----	-----	----------	----------	----

- and on it. In the interim, SC&A has provided
- 3 the Subcommittee with four more of the two-
- 4 pagers for this archived document.
- 5 We have been looking at it and
- 6 anticipate spending some time with suggestions
- on those four at our upcoming Subcommittee
- 8 meeting which is scheduled for next week, the
- 9 13th, I believe.
- 10 We've had quite a bit of
- 11 discussion about how this database that has
- 12 been so valuable to us and has been so
- 13 difficult to get up and running will factor
- into the use by other Subcommittees and Work
- 15 Groups over time. There's some difference of
- opinion in the Subcommittee as to how that may
- 17 play out, but we ultimately expect at a bare
- 18 minimum that the platform itself will be
- 19 available and to any and all Work Groups who
- 20 want to use that instead of the paper matrix
- 21 form which is commonly used by most of the
- 22 Work Groups currently.

1	We're discussing the best method
2	for having Work Groups report back to us on
3	actions which Procedures Subcommittee
4	transfers to the individual Work Group for
5	resolution of the findings on them.
6	And we have asked NIOSH to take a
7	closer look at the open items which we are
8	carrying, many of which have to do with old,
9	old procedures that were established when we
10	were first getting up and running which have
11	been superseded since then and are still being
12	carried on our list as being open, open
13	primarily because that procedure is no longer
14	in use. So we expect to get a report on that
15	particular item next week. And it's our
16	intention to have the four new summary reports
17	available for the Board at the Los Alamos
18	meeting for them to pass judgment on. That's
19	about it.
20	MR. KATZ: Thank you, Wanda.
21	Let's go then to Work Groups. Blockson I
22	don't think we need a report for. Brookhaven,

_	_				_
1	ъŢС	$\sim$	_	$\sim$	ر.
1	111	JO	- 1	↽	

- 2 MEMBER BEACH: No report there for
- 3 me either.
- 4 MR. KATZ: Thank you. Chapman, I
- 5 don't think we need a report. And same goes -
- 6 Fernald, Brad?
- 7 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes, we've got a
- 8 Work Group scheduled for November 9th. That's
- 9 about it. That's about all I can say there.
- 10 MR. KATZ: Thank you. The next
- one is Hanford, which Dr. Melius chairs.
- 12 There's no Work Group scheduled for that at
- this point. The next one is INL, Phil is the
- 14 Chair.
- 15 Phil, are you with us?
- 16 MEMBER MUNN: I don't think so.
- 17 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Phil was
- 18 with us earlier. I wonder if he's on mute
- 19 perhaps. Phil, if you're speaking, you're on
- 20 mute.
- MR. KATZ: Okay.
- 22 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: We can skip

- ahead.
- 2 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: There I am. I
- 3 got it off mute.
- 4 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay, Phil,
- 5 there you are.
- 6 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: We have an INL
- 7 Work Group meeting November 30th and the
- 8 gaseous diffusion plants, December 1st.
- 9 MR. KATZ: Okay. Thank you, Phil.
- 10 He's killed two birds with one stone here.
- 11 Lawrence Berkeley, Dr. Ziemer.
- 12 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: No meeting
- 13 scheduled at this time.
- MR. KATZ: Linde, Dr. Roessler.
- 15 MEMBER ROESSLER: We're scheduled
- 16 to have a Work Group meeting on Thursday,
- 17 October 14th at the Cincinnati Airport
- 18 Marriott starting at 9 Eastern.
- 19 MR. KATZ: And the next is Los
- 20 Alamos, that's Mark Griffon. We do have a
- 21 meeting scheduled for LANL. Let me remind
- 22 myself when it is. It's --

1	MEMBER ROESSLER: The third, Ted,
2	November 3rd.
3	MR. KATZ: Thank you, Genevieve.
4	MEMBER ROESSLER: You're welcome.
5	MR. KATZ: Next we have you,
6	Josie, Mound.
7	MEMBER BEACH: I have no report
8	for Mound, although we do have a Work Group
9	meeting. I guess I do have something to say.
LO	November 5th. I just sent an email to Brant
11	looking for information on where we are with
L2	action items. I'm considering postponing
L3	that, but won't know for a day or two and I'll
L4	let you know, Ted, as soon as I hear back from
L5	Brant.
L6	MR. KATZ: That will be good to
L7	know because I have it penciled in for the
L8	November Board meeting.
L9	MEMBER BEACH: I'm concerned
20	because I haven't gotten anything from NIOSH,
21	so I'm not sure we're going to be ready.

KATZ:

MR.

Let's

talk

22

offline,

1	maybe later this afternoon, Josie?
2	MEMBER BEACH: Okay. Sounds good.
3	MR. KATZ: The next is, let's see,
4	Nevada Test Site, there's nothing active
5	there. Bob is not with us.
6	Pantex plant, Brad?
7	MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes, we've got our

- tour finally for the end of this month, the 8
- We're going to go down there. 9 25th.
- 10 going in and touring the Pantex facility.
- Thank 11 MR. KATZ: you, Brad.
- Pinellas, Phil? 12
- 13 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: On Pinellas,
- 14 we're trying to settle most issues there in
- the Mound Work Group. If we can settle them 15
- 16 from Mound that will settle the majority of
- 17 issues at Pinellas.
- Thank you, Phil. 18 MR. KATZ: Dr.
- 19 Poston was not on when we started for Piqua.
- 20 Are you with us, Dr. Poston? Okay, we do not
- have a Work Group scheduled for Piqua at this 21
- point. 22

1	Then Rocky Flats is Mark. I just
2	discussed that earlier. There's no Work Group
3	scheduled, but maybe they'll take up this
4	issue of interest from Dr. Richardson and
5	others once that issuance comes from DOL.
6	Santa Susanna is Mr. Gibson.
7	MEMBER GIBSON: Ted, DCAS is still
8	working on some stuff and it will probably be
9	early spring or late winter before we have a
10	meeting on that.
11	MR. KATZ: Thank you, Mike.
12	Savannah River site is also Mark. And we are
13	working on having a teleconference prior to
14	the Board meeting. It's uncertain that a
15	couple of you on the Work Groups still need to
16	respond to me as to whether you can do it, but
17	it looks like if it will happen, there will be
18	a teleconference on the 10th of November. So
19	those of you on the Savannah River site Work
20	Group if you haven't responded already, let me
21	know if that date works. It would be a one to
22	two hour teleconference, that's it. I think

- in the p.m., the afternoon.
- Next, we have one of Dr. Melius's
- 3 Work Groups, SEC Issues. And it is -- he's
- 4 working on that. It's unclear when it will
- 5 meet. It probably will meet in advance of the
- 6 Board meeting.
- 7 Then we have TBD-6000, Dr. Ziemer.
- 8 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Yes, we'll
- 9 be meeting next week on Tuesday in Cincinnati.
- 10 We have some documents both from NIOSH and
- from our contractor to review, as well as some
- 12 new information from the petitioner. So that
- 13 will take place on Tuesday.
- 14 MR. KATZ: Thanks, Dr. Ziemer.
- And for everybody, we're dealing with GSI.
- 16 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Yes. General
- 17 Steel Industries primarily is the focus at
- 18 this point.
- 19 MR. KATZ: TBD-6001, Dr. Anderson?
- 20 MEMBER ANDERSON: We have not met.
- We have a meeting coming up on November 4th,
- or at least we're holding that date. It is

1	sort	of	depending	on	what	additional
---	------	----	-----------	----	------	------------

- 2 information becomes available.
- MR. KATZ: Thank you, Henry.
- 4 Surrogate Data is Dr. Melius. He has not
- 5 scheduled a Work Group. I'm not certain
- 6 whether there will be a Work Group in advance
- 7 of the November Board meeting for that.
- 8 Weldon Springs, Mr. Gibson.
- 9 MEMBER GIBSON: Yes, Ted. October
- 10 19th we have a meeting scheduled for Weldon
- 11 Springs and then while I'm on the line,
- 12 October 20th for Worker Outreach Work Group.
- 13 MR. KATZ: Thank you, Mike. That
- 14 covers the slate.
- 15 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay. Very
- 16 good. Thank you, Ted. Thank you, Work Group
- 17 Chairs.
- 18 The next item on our agenda is
- 19 Board correspondence. I've not been privy to
- this. Ted, you'll have to tell us whether or
- 21 not there's correspondence that Dr. Melius was
- 22 intending to present or was this just a

1	general item?
2	MR. KATZ: I don't know that Dr.
3	Melius was intending to present anything at
4	this teleconference. We did just very
5	recently in the last week receive a letter
6	from Congressman Olson, and according to Board
7	procedures, that will go before the Board, so
8	you will get copied on that and it will be an
9	item for discussion in November.
LO	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay. So no
L1	other correspondence that we need to address
L2	at this time?
L3	MR. KATZ: No, not at this
L4	meeting.
L5	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Then finally
L6	we have suggestions for the November Board
L7	meeting agenda and anyone that has comments
L8	Ted, let me have you lead it off. Do you have
L9	any questions on this? Or can you tell us
20	anything that and would you also talk a
21	little bit about the Los Alamos tour?

Sure.

MR. KATZ:

22

Let's start with

1	the tour. In advance of the Board meeting on,
2	I believe it's November 15th, I have not I
3	do not have firm plans from DOE yet. They do
4	affirm that there will be something, an
5	overview or tour or both. And it was
6	discussed that an overview might actually be
7	more effectively done at the museum. And so
8	that's one possibility. That probably will
9	happen.
LO	And then the question is whether
11	there can also be a tour of the site, whether
L2	it's a windshield tour or whether we could
L3	actually go into some facilities and they're
L4	still working that question with the site. So
L5	I don't have a report as to how that will come
L6	out at this point.
L7	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: So we don't
L8	know at this point timetable-wise, for
L9	example, a museum tour could readily be done,
20	I assume, in the afternoon.
2.1	MR. KATZ: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER:

22

Which might

1	affect travel for some folks in terms of
2	whether they leave on Sunday or Monday. So I
3	guess
4	MR. KATZ: So my aim would be, if
5	we're limited to a museum event, would be to
6	do that in the afternoon so that those who
7	could come in that morning can. I mean, for
8	those of us who are more far-flung, we're
9	going to have to come in on Sunday anyway.
10	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Right.
11	MR. KATZ: But absolutely, I have
12	that intent.
13	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay, and
14	then on the agenda itself we know which SEC
15	petitions are coming up. LaVon has reported
16	on that. We have agreed to at least include
17	something about the Ruttenber data and the DOL
18	documents on the agenda.
19	Are there other items, Board
20	Members, that you want to highlight or confirm
21	that will be on the agenda, particularly
22	relating to any of your Work Group issues? Is

1	there anything to come before the Board? I'm
2	not aware that any of the Work Groups have
3	items that they're elevating at this time at
4	the Board level, but if you do, we need to
5	make sure they're on the agenda.
6	MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda, Paul.
7	I don't mean to highlight it, but it is our
8	hope from the Procedures Subcommittee to have
9	the material that SC&A has given us.
10	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Which would
11	be the next four short documents?
12	MEMBER MUNN: Correct, the next
13	four summaries. We hope to have those ready
14	to present to the Board.
15	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Have those in
16	advance, yes. Right. Okay. Other items,
17	Board Members?

- MEMBER CLAWSON: Do we have a --
- what time we'll end on Thursday plan yet?
- 20 MR. KATZ: This is Ted. We plan to
- 21 end by noon.
- 22 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay.

1	MR. KATZ: On Thursday.
2	MEMBER CLAWSON: So we can try to
3	get a flight out.
4	MR. KATZ: And right now I will be
5	sending you shortly, I hope by the end of the
6	day, an initial draft for you to look at of an
7	agenda and it's looking like it will be, the
8	first two days will be quite full.
9	MEMBER CLAWSON: So we sort of
10	have overflow to Thursday?
11	MR. KATZ: We have a good, long
12	hardworking day and Thursday a half day.
13	MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. And how do
14	we get what's the best way to get up there?
15	Are we going to be approved to rent cars, or
16	
17	MR. KATZ: You can fly directly
18	in, if you want. There's connections, I think
19	you have to go through Dallas-Fort Worth.
20	MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay.
21	MR. KATZ: Or you can fly to, for

example, Albuquerque and drive.

Т	MEMBER CLAWSON. Okay.
2	MR. KATZ: That reminds me, Zaida
3	has not heard from most of you. Most of you
4	have not booked the hotel which is a due date
5	of this coming Tuesday, so all of you that
6	haven't proceeded with your travel plans
7	should probably do that over this weekend.
8	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Ted, part of
9	that I think was uncertainty, both on the tour
10	part and the ending times.
11	MR. KATZ: I understand that.
12	MEMBER CLAWSON: Ted, also, too,
13	the hotel is not recognizing anybody arriving
14	before Monday.
15	MR. KATZ: Well, Zaida can
16	straighten that out.
17	MEMBER CLAWSON: I know, I just
18	wanted to mention that.
19	MEMBER ROESSLER: Does anybody
20	know about, apparently there's a train that
21	goes from the near the Albuquerque airport
22	on up to downtown Santa Fe. Does anybody have

1 a	any i	information	on	that?

- 2 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: That train
- 3 won't work for anybody.
- 4 MEMBER ROESSLER: Okay. That's
- 5 good to know.
- 6 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: It's a commuter
- 7 train and the hours are such that it really
- 8 doesn't help -- I would strongly recommend
- 9 people just flying to Albuquerque, get a
- 10 rental car. There's no real taxi service in
- 11 Los Alamos for going up there and stuff. So I
- think that would be the best bet for people.
- 13 MEMBER ROESSLER: Okay, thank you,
- 14 Phil.
- MR. KATZ: You can fly right into
- 16 Santa Fe.
- 17 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: You can, yes.
- 18 MR. KATZ: Is that a problem? I
- 19 mean, tell us, Phil, if that's --
- 20 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: That airport
- 21 and some of the flights are usually pretty
- 22 small planes and kind of sketchy at times. I

1	would	still	strongly	recommend	maybe	just
---	-------	-------	----------	-----------	-------	------

- flying to Albuquerque and get a rental car.
- 3 MEMBER LOCKEY: Hey, Brad, you
- 4 driving?
- 5 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes, I'm driving,
- 6 so you fly into Santa Fe.
- 7 (Laughter.)
- 8 MEMBER LOCKEY: Thanks a lot. Do
- 9 you know which way Santa Fe is from
- 10 Albuquerque?
- 11 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes, I do.
- 12 ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay. Any
- other serious comments on the agenda?
- 14 MEMBER CLAWSON: I was just
- 15 wondering if we're going to have time as a
- 16 Board to be able to go over some of these
- 17 conflicts of interest. I've just had a few
- 18 things come up.
- 19 MR. KATZ: We don't have an
- 20 administrative session for that, Brad.
- 21 MEMBER CLAWSON: We will, okay.
- 22 MR. KATZ: We do not. We do not.

1	We do not have an administrative session set
2	aside. If this opens up because, for example,
3	Josie said that Mound may not be ready for
4	this meeting, if we have time open up and we
5	can set aside an administrative session, but
6	we don't have one set there right now.
7	MEMBER CLAWSON: I think,
8	personally, myself, it's something we need to
9	start addressing. So if we could, it would be
10	a good thing.
11	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: We can
12	address that in open session, can't we?
13	MR. KATZ: In February, we have to
14	do your annual training in any event. In
15	every year you have to do conflict-of-interest
16	training, ethics training, I should say. And
17	so it might be just as well to just leave that
18	and you can raise your questions in February.
19	That'll be in Augusta.
20	MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. Because my
21	problem is I'm losing people that have been
22	working on my Work Group and I'm just trying

1 t	to understand what's going on here.
2	MR. KATZ: Okay, well, you can
3 a	always communicate with me, Brad.
4	MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay.
5	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Other
6 g	questions pertaining to the agenda?
7	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: One thing I'd
8 1	like to kind of see on there is at least a
9 b	orief discussion on the length of time it's
10 t	taken for some of these worker interviews to
11 b	pe processed through DOE before they can be
12 p	posted. We've got ones from different sites
13 t	that are they've been with DOE for quite
14 s	some time now.
15	
16	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Maybe we can
17 h	have that as a subset of the DOE update.
18	MR. KATZ: Right.
19	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Any others?
20	Thank you, Phil. Any other?
21	Okay, so Ted will be sending out a
22 p	oreliminary agenda. You'll have an additional

1	opportunity at that time, I believe, to, if
2	something pops into your mind, to ask for that
3	to be put on the agenda. Is that correct,
4	Ted?
5	MR. KATZ: Yes, yes. I'll be
6	sending you an email, I hope this week, with a
7	draft agenda.
8	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay.
9	MR. KATZ: So please do let me
10	know if you have suggestions.
11	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: Okay, are
12	there any other items to come before us? If
13	not, I believe we'll declare the meeting
14	adjourned. And thank you all very much.
15	MR. KATZ: Thank you very much,
16	Paul, for hosting.
17	ACTING CHAIR ZIEMER: You bet.
18	And we'll see you all in Santa Fe.
19	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
20	matter went off the record at 12:17 p.m.)
21	