## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

+ + + + +

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION
AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

WORKER OUTREACH WORK GROUP

+ + + + +

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2012

+ + + + +

The Worker Outreach Work Group met in the Zurich Room of the Cincinnati Airport Marriott, 2395 Progress Drive, Hebron, Kentucky, at 9:00 a.m., Josie Beach, Chair, presiding.

## PRESENT:

JOSIE BEACH, Chair WANDA MUNN, Member PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official LYNN AYERS, SC&A
TERRIE BARRIE\*
WILFRED CAMERON, ATL\*
MARY ELLIOTT, ATL
CHRIS ELLISON, DCAS
JOE FITZGERALD, SC&A
J.J. JOHNSON, DCAS
MARK LEWIS, ATL
ARJUN MAKHIJANI, SC&A\*
VERNON MCDOUGALL, ATL
JENNY LIN, HHS
JOHN STIVER, SC&A\*
DAVE SUNDIN, DCAS

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

<sup>\*</sup>Participating via teleconference

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

<u>Page</u>
OCAS-PR-012 Procedure Review Changes - NIOSH6
PROC-010 Discussion - SC&A/NIOSH71
Review NIOSH's Responses for Rocky Flats Pilot Study Findings and Recommendations - NIOSH
Choose Next Site for Review, Recommendations, and WG Discussion - SC&A/NIOSH/WG
ATL Outreach Activities - ATL153
Ten-year Review Implementation - NIOSH183
WG Implementation Plan Including Mission Statement Recommendations and WG Discussion - WG
Next Steps for Worker Outreach - All221
Adjourn

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

(9:06 a.m.)

MR. KATZ: This is the Advisory
Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Worker
Outreach Work Group. The agenda for today's
meeting is posted on the NIOSH website under
the meetings section, under today's date, and
let's do roll call. We are speaking about
Rocky Flats today and we may be speaking about
some other sites, but we don't know which; Los
Alamos is one.

So if anyone has conflicts with either Rocky Flats or Los Alamos, I don't what other sites we'll be talking about --

CHAIR BEACH: Well, we might be running through a variety of sites, but -- Brookhaven. I don't know.

MR. KATZ: Okay. And if people have conflicts at that point with the site we're talking about, you just need to note your conflict when we get to talking about that site. So let's begin with the Board

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Members, with the Chair.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Thank you. As Ted said, the agenda is posted. I didn't put times down, but I did want to go over a couple of key things. Breaks, I'm going to try and shoot for the first break this morning at 10:30 to 10:45 and then lunch from 12:00 to 1:00.

I did have here, under Number 5, Worker/Worker Representatives Comment Session, and we'll either do that right before lunch or right after lunch, depending on where we end up time-wise, for those of you that want to plan for that.

The first item is, we're going to talk about OCAS PR-12, the procedure, and under that first item there's actually three We have the procedure that J.J. documents. sent 11/1; should be the final out on We also have the updated matrix procedure. that was sent out in October. It's Revision 5, if you're looking for that.

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And then Stu sent out a NIOSH position on worker outreach selected sites. That follows along with our matrix. That was sent out October 19, 2012. So we'll get started with those three under that first item. And, J.J., I'm going to give it to you for the procedure if you want to get started with that.

I didn't know if we should go through the matrix or the procedure, but the procedure, I think, is probably the closest to being done.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, it's done, based on the responses for comment that were provided in the last worker outreach meeting.

And the only thing I can say is that I've gone through and incorporated the expectations in the matrix that was provided, sent out, shows that, at least I believe, most, if not all of them, have been updated in the procedure.

CHAIR BEACH: Right.

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. JOHNSON: And the procedure is
2	in a state ready to go.
3	CHAIR BEACH: Yes. I agree with
4	that. I just wanted to make sure, since it
5	says draft, that everybody agrees and didn't
6	find anything in the re-review reading of it.
7	MEMBER MUNN: No. I certainly
8	didn't and, J.J., thank you for the format
9	that you provided. It made it very easy to
10	figure out the updates that you had provided,
11	and that's
12	MR. JOHNSON: I listened to your
13	advice.
14	MEMBER MUNN: Thank you.
15	CHAIR BEACH: Yes. I like that as
16	well. So if there's nothing else on the
17	procedure, I guess it's ready to post, right?
18	MR. JOHNSON: The only difference
19	you'll see is, the broad print will be regular
20	print.
21	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So when can we
22	expect this to be posted and out on the drive?

MR. JOHNSON: I would say, I would
have to give it to Stu for his review, or Jim,
and then based upon their signatures on that,
it'll be out there. I would say within a
month; likely less.
CHAIR BEACH: Can you let us know
when that happens so we don't have to keep
looking?
MR. JOHNSON: I will. I'll shoot
you an email.
CHAIR BEACH: Awesome. Okay.
MR. KATZ: So does the Work Group,
then, want to just provide a closeout missive
to the Procedures Subcommittee on this? This
procedure has been reviewed and we completed
review.
CHAIR BEACH: Do we do that before
or after we hear from Jim and Stu?
MR. KATZ: I mean, if it's
essentially done, I think you could do it.
CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So I just need
to send Wanda an email. Wanda?

MEMBER MUNN: Email. Yes. That's all I need is just an email. CHAIR BEACH: Okay. MR. KATZ: A paper record. MEMBER MUNN: Yes. A record. MR. KATZ: Electronic record. This is not really a MR. SUNDIN: substantive issue with respect to the main point here, but Chris brought it to attention yesterday that on Page 4, talking 10 about focus group, you talk about 10 to 12 11 individuals. We're probably 12 going 13 downgrade that to nine. MR. KATZ: Nine, right. 14 15 MR. SUNDIN: For obvious reasons, 16 and there may be a stray typo or two that we would clean up, but I wanted to let you know 17 that that was something --18 19 CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So this is just going to go straight to nine? 20 MR. SUNDIN: Nine or less. 21 22 CHAIR BEACH: Nine or less. Okay.

MR. KATZ: That's a Paperwork Reduction Act-related matter.

CHAIR BEACH: Right. Okay. I'm just going to put that item down. All right. So the other part of this is the matrix, if everybody has that in front of them, I thought we would just go through it. There's several that are in progress that I think are ready to close, but we just need to have agreement on that.

And then any that we aren't in agreement on, we can decide what we're going to do with those. So the first one -- is everybody at that point, F1, Page2? I don't think I need to reread this to everybody. I went through it and verified what was closed, what actions had been taken care of, and so my reading of this is, everything we asked NIOSH to do, SC&A's comments, were completed, most of them as of updated September 2011, so I'd put ready to close on that one.

MS. AYERS: Which number are you

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

on?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR BEACH: F1, it's, "The procedure does not provide direction for tracking, trending, evaluating, or responding to worker input."

MR. FITZGERALD: September 12th is the update, so that's pretty current.

CHAIR BEACH: Yes. So we closed out, or finished up, a lot of work in August at our last meeting. And step by step, I believe they're all completed, unless somebody sees something different, I'm going to call that closed.

MEMBER MUNN: It looks good to me.

CHAIR BEACH: What do you think,

Phil?

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: I think it looks good.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So F1 is now closed based on the fact that everything has been completed. And that mostly goes back to the procedure PR-12 being completed.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MEMBER MUNN: Yes. CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Ready to move on to F2? "The procedure does not specify criteria for identifying action items evaluating the adequacy and timeliness of response resolutions." If you go through, there was three action items listed and all three have been completed as of September 2012 as well, so I viewed that as ready to close. 10 Any discussions; comments? MEMBER MUNN: No. The transfer is 11 done. 12 13 CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So hearing nothing, I'm going to say that one is also 14 15 closed. Any problem with how we're doing 16 this? MR. KATZ: No. This is perfect. 17 18 Good. 19 CHAIR BEACH: Okay. All right. So F3 looks like we'll have a little bit of 20 discussion here. "The majority of expected 21

not available

22

documentation is

in OTIS-4

meetings conducted within the effective period of PR-12." Recommended actions, Number 1 was completed back in December of 2010.

Under NIOSH, there was two recommendations, the second one was completed with Appendix F and the first one is the one, "Re-evaluating the meeting minutes meetings conducted since the implementation of PR-12 based on the new action items criteria determining if there is additional action items."

That one is still in progress, so, J.J., I guess we're going to look to you for that.

What we did is MR. JOHNSON: Okay. through and looked back at what went meetings were out there that the minutes supported outreach and of those minutes, they were returned to the people who -- the HPs in They were requested to review minutes, determine if there were any additional action items that may have been

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	overlooked in the initial taking of the
2	minutes.
3	Their responses came back negative,
4	that they found no additional action items,
5	and that's where we are.
6	CHAIR BEACH: So does that cover
7	all of them?
8	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
9	CHAIR BEACH: A hundred percent?
10	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
11	CHAIR BEACH: Okay.
12	MEMBER MUNN: Sounds closed to me.
13	CHAIR BEACH: It sounds closed to
14	me too.
15	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes.
16	CHAIR BEACH: Do we need to look at
17	those or is the Work Group satisfied with
18	that?
19	MEMBER MUNN: I'm personally
20	satisfied with the work that's been done.
21	CHAIR BEACH: So then once that's
22	done, J.J., the minutes get posted on the web

site, is that correct; once they're reviewed and -- is that the process?

MR. JOHNSON: Right. Our process for posting minutes is that, once the minutes are completed, they go through, generally, an initial redaction, and then they go through DOE for their review. When we get them back, then we take those minutes and post them on the web after another final redaction, and that's kind of like a draft.

Once we put them out there, and if we get any comments back within 60 days, we update those, then we take the minutes and update them as necessary, and then they become the final minutes, and they are replaced and/or not changed on the web.

MEMBER MUNN: How do you make the decision about the comments that come back; whether they're substantial enough to merit --

MR. KATZ: Someone on the line is not muted and they're dialing their phone at the same time they're listening. Hello?

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Somebody's on the line and dialing their phone
while they're listening. Can you please
somebody listening on the phone is not on mute
and we can hear your doings, including your
dialing of your phone. Can you please put
your phone on mute? Press *6 if you don't
have a mute button; whoever that might be.
Why don't we try carrying on?
Sorry.
MR. JOHNSON: If the comments back
are strictly editorial, I don't think I return
them.
MEMBER MUNN: Well, I was concerned
with content.
MR. JOHNSON: If there's a content,
then based upon my judgment, I'll determine
whether it goes back and if it's a significant
change, then it will go back. There'd be no
question about that.
MEMBER MUNN: All right. Good.
But you're essentially the arbiter.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, I do that too.

MEMBER MUNN: Okay. Good.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Comments? Phil, what do you think? Okay. Then I'm going to call this one closed. This won't be the last look we have at those notes, so we'll have other places to look at those. So the next one is F4. This one's also going to have some discussion.

"The procedure fails to consider other venues of worker outreach. The multiple subjected to equivalent venues are not standards for documentation of the particular Is the two-track system for concern. obtaining and documenting worker input that give site expert interviews, appears to records, more weight than worker input obtained through outreach meetings?"

This one is in progress. There's several paragraphs to review on this. It breaks down to, on Page 9, the Work Group recommended actions. NIOSH was to look at the feasibility for capturing and tracking

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

information in the OTIS drive for any type of meeting or correspondence deemed potentially important, grouped to dose reconstruction, for example, there may be added fields in OTIS to accommodate this application through a separate tracking system.

So if you look under the Work Group recommendations and actions, this is still in progress. The Work Group agreed it's important goal to give attention to worker input by virtue of significance, regardless of the source. J.J., I'm going to put this one on you because I guess this is a tough one.

Well, MR. JOHNSON: in past we've indicated that the outreach meetings, tracking system will not handle the additional venues as noted here. And additional venues might be emails, might be a docket, might be letters, might be other forms of communication, and with that, NIOSH is looking at another system, but if you will, I'd like to pass that on to Chris because she's kind of

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I think, focusing and supporting that effort.

MS. ELLISON: Right. You know, part of the struggle and challenge with this is, we can receive comments from individuals so many ways and, you know, like J.J. said, through email, and really, the most proper way for people to submit comments is through the docket, and we try to encourage people to do that because there's a formal process for that.

So, you know, we have the comments that we receive and, you know, comments that are made to us at meetings, we have letters and emails, phone calls, there's a wide variety of ways for that information to get to us. And we have met and discussed how to best capture that. And we've sort of determined that we need another system, like J.J. said, to do that.

And so, right now, they've concentrated on probably the easiest target area, which is letters. So they're working on

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a system to capture comments from letters at the current time.

CHAIR BEACH: Can you expand on what kind of progress you've made on that, because I know you're looking at putting them into a system and creating a system for that?

MS. ELLISON: Right. And they're working on that system right now, and I haven't seen any draft of it. We have our technical team that's working on that.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MS. ELLISON: You know, the long-range goal, what I would like to see happen with these comments is not so much -- I'd like to see the system set up so that whatever venue you're getting that information from, we can pull out the comment and pull out the NIOSH response, and then have the system put those two together so that we can post that stuff out on the web site to help get more information out there, so that people know what comments we're receiving and how we're

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

responding to those comments.

So that's another long-range goal of this system, which is, again, kind of making it a little bit more complex. But I know they're working on the basic structure and kind of looking at the letters, and to see what categories, and how it's going to be laid out. So they're still in that framework portion of that system; that database.

MR. KATZ: So you may understand this, but I don't. A clarifying question: is this tracking system intended, in part -- I mean, I heard you just say, in part, it's intended so that you can let the world know how you're responding to, but it seems like the most important part of this is ensuring that input that comes in gets addressed and considered.

MS. ELLISON: Right.

MR. KATZ: And is that part of the intent of the system?

MS. ELLISON: Yes. That's all part

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of the framework. And I think, right now, the challenge is trying to figure out what all we need to capture and how that's going to work in this framework, this database. MR. KATZ: But so then this would be a system that the relevant HP would access or be notified through to know that they have a comment on, say, Rocky Flats --MS. ELLISON: Right. MR. KATZ: -- that they should consider that came in by email, or letter, or That's the idea? what have you. MS. ELLISON: Right. MR. KATZ: Okay. MS. ELLISON: Again, another one of those framework bells-and-whistle things that we have to figure out. MR. KATZ: Sure. MS. ELLISON: You know, who's going to input the information and how's it going to notify people who need to respond to it?

MR. KATZ:

Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So that's what

1	you're setting up.
2	MS. ELLISON: Yes.
3	MR. KATZ: No, I understand.
4	MS. ELLISON: There's a lot to
5	think about and consider.
6	MR. FITZGERALD: So really, this is
7	sort of a conceptual stage. You're looking at
8	the possibility of, maybe, letters or
9	correspondence being the first test bed.
10	MS. ELLISON: Right. Exactly.
11	MR. FITZGERALD: But you haven't,
12	as you've just said, defined the framework or
13	figured out the bells and whistles, you call
14	them, figured out that framework of the
15	system.
16	MS. ELLISON: You know, we've
17	provided that information to the technical
18	team. I've not seen anything come back from
19	them yet.
20	MR. FITZGERALD: Okay.
21	MR. KATZ: So they're developing
22	the software for it.

MS. ELLISON: Yes. MR. KATZ: Yes. Okay. MEMBER MUNN: And you're thinking site-specific data gathering, terms of I mean, I'm thinking, where right, or not? does it go? MS. ELLISON: And I'm sure it will of information wide range cover Some of it could be site-specific, comments. some of those comments could be program-wide. 10 And then those site-specific comments will 11 get farmed out to the appropriate people to 12 13 respond to those comments. 14 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, I'm just 15 thinking about where it's going to be. 16 were a seeker of great truth, where would I come to the web site to look for some comment 17 I've made about us? 18 19 MS. ELLISON: Right. Well, you know, I haven't thought about all of that, but 20 if it's a site-specific comment, we have the 21

individual site pages which will carve out a

1	spot on those individual site pages for those
2	comments to be displayed.
3	MR. KATZ: Yes. My guess is, this
4	system is going to be an internal system.
5	MS. ELLISON: Yes, it is.
6	MR. KATZ: That's not going to be
7	available to the public.
8	MS. ELLISON: No.
9	MEMBER MUNN: No.
10	MR. KATZ: That's going to be a way
11	to make that there are responses to comments.
12	MS. ELLISON: It's a form for us to
13	track everything.
14	MR. KATZ: And then it'll feed
15	whatever you post out on the web for the
16	public.
17	MEMBER MUNN: Okay.
18	MR. FITZGERALD: Is there any sense
19	of the time frame for the framework? You
20	know, I know that right now you have ideas and
21	considerations for the design group.
22	MS. ELLISON: Yes. Unfortunately,

I have not been given the time frame from our technical team yet.

MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. So they have the notions, but they haven't come back to you.

MS. ELLISON: Right.

MR. FITZGERALD: Okay.

MEMBER MUNN: Sounds like this one will have to continue in progress.

CHAIR BEACH: Yes. And how is this going to be different from what's out there already? I know we went from WISPR to the OTS, that can't be used to track these different forms of worker comments? I mean, are you reinventing --

MR. JOHNSON: It can be used, to some degree, as a platform to review what might be able to be used for these other venues, meaning the OTS tracking system, but again, the OTS tracking system was specifically developed with its intention of looking at issues associated with outreach

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

meetings. And there, in part, is, you know, the route where it separates it from other communications, other venues, that may have some input into NIOSH.

MS. ELLISON: And when we get to it, part of the beauty of having our technical team work on this, you know, they developed the OTS, and so hopefully, we're hoping that this new system that they're working on will be able to pull stuff from other places. You know, so I think once that framework, and we've got it all down of how this is going to work, it will pull from other places.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Sounds like it's going to be interesting to see the plan or to see it in action. Okay. Well, we'll -
MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Will these comments be posted to the public or just posted on the hard drive?

MS. ELLISON: My hope and desire is that we can get them out on the public site. Just, you know, strip out all of the details,

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we don't want the commenter's name, you know, and the just want the comment NIOSH response. MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Okay. MEMBER MUNN: So somewhere in that you'll have a basket for things that don't fall naturally into other categories. MS. ELLISON: Right. We'll have to see what that is and where the best place is 10 to put that out there. I think it might 11 require its own individual page. MEMBER MUNN: Very possibly. 12 MS. ELLISON: Right. 13 Probably, I would 14 MEMBER MUNN: 15 think. 16 MS. ELLISON: Right. That would be the easiest solution. 17 CHAIR BEACH: And so just to put 18 19 you on the spot a little bit more, so you're talking about letters first and then you're 20 going to go -- have you thought about further 21

MS. ELLISON: The next one?

CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

MS. ELLISON: My guess, no.

CHAIR BEACH: That's fair.

MS. ELLISON: You know, I'm trying to think, it might be best -- I would think our next ploy would be to use something that we can pull from, whether it be the telephone calls or maybe we could pull from NOCTS or, you know, worker outreach comments where we could pull from another system, you know, to be the next piece; would be my guess. I'm pretty much leaving that up to the technical team.

CHAIR BEACH: Sure. Okay. All right. So the second recommendations under this -- what are we on, F4? "To develop a proposal for resolving the dual-track system for site expert interviews and worker outreach I'm not going to read the whole meetings." paragraph, but the answer, the recommended "Appendix E provides guidance answer was,

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

regarding the identification, tracking, resolution, and consideration of impact of action ideas from worker outreach meetings.

NIOSH has indicated that PR-12 will not address a broad range of venues from which input can be received. SC&A has already identified an alternate proposal from NIOSH to address this concern. So same thing?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. I was going to say. If we were to look at the venues that you're talking about, I think that would go a long ways to making sure it's a broader input, which is what this is all about.

CHAIR BEACH: Yes. That's what I thought too. I just wanted to make sure it was on --

MR. FITZGERALD: So I think the original finding was that, with the site activity, you tend to get the site experts by way of Site Profile and SEC evaluations much more direct, and the worker input came from all kinds of different venues, most of them

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

not handled quite the same way, so I think this would help.

CHAIR BEACH: Hopefully. It would be nice to eliminate that dual track. Okay. So in progress and we wait to hear, hopefully, from Chris how that's progressing. Do you have any idea at all? Did they give you any kind of sense of time; months, weeks, days?

MS. ELLISON: No.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. It's a big job after listening to Wanda's Procedures Work Group create that system.

MEMBER MUNN: It's long.

It's long. Yes, but CHAIR BEACH: to do it right, the end result is worth it. Okay. So F5, "The procedure does not describe process for assuring that worker feedback is accurately and completely documented." is in progress. There items were two associated with that and the first one, as of September, they've both been completed. me look at this.

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Okay. So this one is -- the second part of this, Chris, kind of goes back to you.

Updated on September 12th, "The revised procedure includes additional announcement that meeting minutes will be posted to the NIOSH web for their validation," you talked about that, J.J., "for 60 days."

So I guess that is, sorry, that is completed. So as far as I'm concerned, it's ready to close if the Work Group agrees with that.

MEMBER MUNN: It appears to be done. I don't know what further action we could anticipate.

CHAIR BEACH: No. Okay. That gets us through to the observations. Observation 1 is closed, 2 is closed, 3 is in progress. Observation 3, "There is no provision for soliciting comments from workers who are unable to physically attend the meetings." And I believe that has been completed based on the latest procedure.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

There is a statement incorporated in the procedure PR-12 that addresses that issue. So I believe that one is closed too, unless anybody has anything else or comments on that.

MEMBER MUNN: In any case, it was an observation rather than a finding. So it appears to have been addressed adequately.

CHAIR BEACH: Correct. Okay. So Observation 4 is closed, 5 is closed at the last meeting, and that takes us to outstanding 97 findings. That is in progress, except for, if you look, the last item, Number 3, "Provide updates for sites where meetings have been conducted since June 2011." Response is pending.

And that takes us to our October 19th position paper that Stu sent out. So did everybody get a chance to review this? I thought it was very helpful. And I guess, J.J., we're going to give it to you to discuss and talk about, you know, the NIOSH paper

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

here.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

CHAIR BEACH: That's okay?

MR. JOHNSON: Generally, you know, the first page is just kind of like an overview of where NIOSH is with regards to the program and supporting activities. And the next couple of pages go through and breakdown the -- let's see, are we talking about the facilities that did not have outreach?

CHAIR BEACH: Yes, that was what that was for. And this just, basically, justified the Category 1, 2, and 3. I thought it was well done.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. What was done is an evaluation of the facilities based upon where they exist right now with regards to SECs or, perhaps, issues that might be still within the appropriate site Working Groups. And so it was broken down in Category 1, 2, and Category 1 was broken down into two groups; sites for which SEC status has been

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

granted and work was completed except for occasional dose reconstructions; and B, sites for which the Board has considered but not recommended SEC status for which work is complete except for the occasional dose reconstructions.

And NIOSH's position is that worker outreach is not warranted in these two categories. Category 2, sites where SECs have been granted as a portion of the operational period and a recommendation has not been reached for the remainder of the operational period, and sites where there have been a Site Profile review, findings have not yet been resolved.

NIOSH's position on this is that Categories 2A and 2B, the need for worker outreach will be determined by the finding, resolution, and process under the auspices of the respective Work Groups. Meaning, based upon their review and need, outreach will be initiated and that will be based on staff and

availability of personnel at that time.

And then we have the last group, which is the remaining sites. NIOSH will consider pursuing worker outreach activities and outreach resources are available, keeping in mind other project priorities. And again, the ability to identify a target population judgment of the likelihood of and some obtaining helpful information will also influence to see about where to conduct outreach activities. And that's it.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MR. FITZGERALD: So I guess my only comment would be, I thought this was a very helpful matrix, or listing, with an understandable rationale. Is this something that could be posted on, you know, the DCAS web site, in case there's any questions about how, you know, worker outreaches actually begin?

CHAIR BEACH: That's a good idea.

MR. FITZGERALD: I mean, that's the

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

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

first time I think I've seen this kind of thinking, but I think it makes sense. MR. JOHNSON: I would have to talk with Stu to validate the appropriateness of putting this on the web. Not that it's inappropriate --MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I understand what you're saying. I would certainly JOHNSON: MR. 10 like to get Stu's --MR. FITZGERALD: I guess my thought 11 was that if somebody was expecting, you know, 12 13 maybe an outreach effort or something, and, you know, was wondering why, you know, another 14 15 site, maybe, had the attention that they did 16 not. I mean, this would at least buy some perspective and, you know, be helpful from 17 18 that standpoint. 19 CHAIR BEACH: Well, and it would seem to me that the last page, that is going 20 ever-changing list as well, as 21 an

are

added

sites

different

22

that,

to

potentially.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. FITZGERALD: Correct.

CHAIR BEACH: So that would be a nice way of keeping track of that as well.

MR. FITZGERALD: This sort of answers the question. You have a finite amount of resources. You can't do everything, but it does provide a perspective that it was well-thought-out as something you can do and, you know, why these are priorities the way they are. And I guess I hadn't seen that in this form before and I thought it was pretty helpful.

The one thought I had MR. KATZ: about this in terms of, just for clarity's sake, is that, this is sort of prioritization scheme and it doesn't foreclose the possibility that, in some of categories, generally, you wouldn't do outreach, but you may have a reason to do one, for example, if their SEC is already done and but you're doing lot of dose SO on, а

reconstructions and there's some questions as to whether you know everything you should know, that might be a good reason to do an outreach even though, for example, it might be listed under Category 1. So anyway, my point is just, I think, rather than it be quite black and white foreclosed, that we wouldn't do them Category 1, for example, but that those would not be a priority. CHAIR BEACH: Well, and possibly, it says NIOSH's position is that, "Worker outreach is not warranted in Category 1 and 2.", may be an explanation of why it would be in order if --MR. KATZ: Or not generally warranted, or whatever. Yes. If it's going CHAIR BEACH: to be posted, that would be --MR. KATZ: Yes. I just mean --CHAIR BEACH: Yes. I agree with

that.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. KATZ: I don't imagine you
2	would foreclose the possibility of doing an
3	outreach in some of those circumstances, had
4	you enough dose reconstructions, and questions
5	arose about whether you know everything you
6	need to know, right, for one of those
7	facilities.
8	MR. JOHNSON: Well, the question
9	would warrant too, where would this be posted
10	on the web? I mean, you know, I'm not certain
11	that there's a spot that it could be
12	MR. KATZ: Yes, unless you created
13	a web page related to
14	MS. ELLISON: Right.
15	MR. KATZ: you know, current
16	outreach activities to let the public know
17	where you're doing outreach.
18	MS. ELLISON: Right, or it could be
19	posted under the technical documents page as a
20	little piece on the development of them.
21	MR. KATZ: Right.
22	MS. ELLISON: I mean, there's a

couple places we could parse it into. MR. KATZ: Yes. MS. ELLISON: And I would see it maybe not being a PDF, but actual text and working it on there. MR. KATZ: Sure. One observation was AYERS: that this wasn't really meant to be, like, an ongoing policy, so to speak. I mean, it was a 10 response to a specific paper and generated from SC&A on this PROC-97 issue, 11 which is sort of finite. And I don't know if 12 the SC&A paper, is it posted somewhere, like 13 under this Work Group? 14 15 CHAIR BEACH: That June paper? MS. AYERS: No, it was a December 16 2010 --17 Well, I think all 18 MR. FITZGERALD: 19 the paper did was just pose the question about 20 wanting to know if there was an underlying rationale for how resources and priorities are 21

I think this answers the question.

done.

MS. AYERS: Right. Well, it just
seemed like they were tied together. I
thought if the one was out there anywhere,
then it would make sense to put the answer in
the same place as the
CHAIR BEACH: I don't know if it
is. That's a good question.
MR. KATZ: Well, I mean, we post
SC&A White Papers now, but I don't know if
that one would get posted. That's more like a
memo or something, right, than actually, a
formal White Paper.
CHAIR BEACH: I went looking for it
and didn't find it.
MR. KATZ: Yes.
MEMBER MUNN: It was
MR. KATZ: Go ahead. Sorry, Wanda.
MEMBER MUNN: Pretty much an
internal inquiry.
MR. KATZ: Right.
MEMBER MUNN: And there's a note of
caution, things of this type, I'm reading
NEAL R. GROSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

category here, responses of this type, have a tendency to be, you know, aimed at a specific audience, namely, us, for a specific purpose, namely, this one, and sometimes when placed in broad distribution have a tendency to raise more questions and concerns than they actually answer.

So perhaps it would be wise for us at this juncture to wait, as J.J. has indicated, and have him check --

CHAIR BEACH: Oh, of course.

MEMBER MUNN: -- with others, because it's not crystal clear that this is serving the purpose that we attempt to serve when we're talking in terms of outreach and providing the kinds of information that people need.

MR. KATZ: Right. It's Stu's discussion, of course, it's just Joe made, I thought, a good suggestion that there may be a public that would be actually interested in this information, in which case --

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. FITZGERALD: And I kind of agree with you. I think this was written as a response, and that was your point, and I think you were raising the same kind of comments that, you probably want to recast it for a broader audience. If it was going to be on a public web site, you'd probably write it a bit differently.

But I think the information that's delivered is kind of helpful because I think, in general, you're trying to figure out, you know, I'm at a certain site, or, you know, I understand this site got a visit from ATL, am I going to get a visit? You know, it just sort of answers the question how those decisions are made and whether or not that expectation -- you know, it might be some feedback as to, you know, maybe we'd like to have some outreach consideration that you apply.

You know, it just sort of promotes that, but I agree, I think you have to write

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

it carefully and make sure it's not going to pose more problems.

MEMBER MUNN: Well, the other thing is, this is a slice in time. This is a response to here and now.

MR. FITZGERALD: Right.

MEMBER MUNN: And as Josie pointed out, it would be a nice way to have this hanging somewhere and continually providing us with the information we'd like to have at a glance, but what that also would require is the staff and the time to maintain a running information stream for this kind of thing because these things could change on an almost weekly basis.

MR. FITZGERALD: Right.

MEMBER MUNN: So there are negative aspects to the consideration.

MR. SUNDIN: Well, how about if we bring the issue back to Stu and say, the Work Group found it very helpful and there were some additional suggestions.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR BEACH: And appreciated it, don't forget that part, because this has been hanging out there a long time --

MR. KATZ: Right. That's all that's being said, I think.

CHAIR BEACH: -- to have an answer.

Okay. So that closes out that finding from

97. J. J., you're probably happy about that.

Finally off the table. Been hanging on to that for a little while.

MR. JOHNSON: I'm happy for little things, yes.

CHAIR BEACH: That is a little thing. Okay. So I'm just going to go back through the actions that came out of this. The first one is for me to email Wanda stating that the procedure has been reviewed and is satisfactory to the Work Group, and we closed that. Then I have NIOSH to provide an update on open items prior to next -- about two weeks, at least, before the next Work Group meeting, would be helpful to us.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And, you know, I went back through here and the only one that I found that was open was F4, the two-track, that system, which a lot of that falls on Chris' domain there. Did I miss anything? Is there anything else? Everything else is closed.

And then the second action item is to talk to Stu about the potential of posting this list on the web site at some point or some way.

MR. KATZ: With amendments.

CHAIR BEACH: With amendments, possible amendments, yes. If nothing else, if it's posted as a Work Group paper, is it on there now? On the web site?

MR. KATZ: No.

CHAIR BEACH: Because it was a White Paper, basically.

MR. KATZ: I don't think it is on the web site. I mean, some of these, they're White Papers, and they're sort of memos, and then they'll post something that's not even

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	quite a memo. I'm not sure.
2	CHAIR BEACH: So even if it didn't
3	get posted in its own actual place on the web
4	site, if it was put in as a White Paper, at
5	least people could go back and reference this
6	matrix if they were interested in what the
7	findings were and how they were resolved.
8	That would satisfy part of that, so just a
9	thought.
10	MR. KATZ: So, Wanda, you may want
11	to report out at the next Board meeting, since
12	this Work Group really closed out the
13	procedure, rather than, Wanda, it would make
14	more sense for you to report out to the Board.
15	CHAIR BEACH: You said Wanda, are
16	you
17	MR. KATZ: I meant you. I looked
18	at you and said Wanda. Josie.
19	CHAIR BEACH: We're
20	interchangeable.
21	MR. KATZ: You are. You're both
22	from Memphis.
	1

CHAIR BEACH: I know.

MR. KATZ: You know, all you DOE eople are alike.

CHAIR BEACH: I know we are. We all glow on our own. That's what they tell us.

MR. KATZ: Anyway, I would try to just sort of get a tradition of reporting back to the full Board when we close out Procedures and Site Profiles and so on.

CHAIR BEACH: Right. And so hopefully this will be posted on the web by then. J.J. indicated maybe a month to get the signatures and whatnot, so it'd be nice to be able to say, yes, it's out and it's been --yes. Sorry.

MS. AYERS: I actually had a question. I'm sorry. I didn't catch it when you were zipping through the observations, but on Observation 3 there is one point of discussion, it would be covered under an action item. It had to do with posting

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	informal presentations on the web site.
2	CHAIR BEACH: Oh, you're right.
3	MS. AYERS: And there were some new
4	restrictions because they were informal and
5	they didn't have a formal Member review
6	process.
7	CHAIR BEACH: Which number are you
8	
9	MS. AYERS: This is Observation 3,
10	Item 2.
11	CHAIR BEACH: Item 2. Okay.
12	MS. AYERS: Action 2.
13	CHAIR BEACH: I guess there's two
14	parts to that, isn't there? Okay. Does
15	everybody know where she's at? You know, when
16	I was looking through this
17	MEMBER MUNN: You're on Page 14?
18	CHAIR BEACH: Yes, Page 14, so
19	NIOSH investigation of feasibility of posting
20	outreach meetings, presentations, is in
21	progress and that, we talked about with Chris
22	at the ten-year review, parts of that there,

last week, or the last meeting, and I know we're going to cover that, possibly, later.

Do you remember that? I know --

MS. ELLISON: That one, I think, fell under the issue of continuing to post things in a timely manner. And I think we had discussed that, but we do post presentations, but any product from SC&A does not get posted unless I'm sent it saying that it's PA-cleared.

MR. FITZGERALD: And this is a different issue. This is one that, I think, Stu raised, either it was agency-wide or government-wide, restriction of posting anything that wasn't from a formal source. In other words, if you wanted to post slides from somebody's presentation at a meeting, that would not be considered a formal source that should be on the web site for an agency.

CHAIR BEACH: Right.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  FITZGERALD: And I think that's the way it was left.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. ELLISON: Because we have been asking those individuals and those individuals that do that at public meetings now know that if they submit it to the docket, it will get posted that way.

MR. FITZGERALD: Right. So I think there was a clarification, I think, the Work Group was asking for. And at the time, I think just raising Stu that was as restriction that needed to be addressed and that's the way it was left from the last time. So has that been settled? As long as you submit it to the docket, that's the avenue that --

MS. ELLISON: People, individuals from the public, yes, they are encouraged to submit those items to the docket. And when I say the docket, each individual will recreate the individual site pages on the site page for Bethlehem Steel, GSI, whatever the site is, when that page first gets developed, we send a request to the NIOSH docket office saying we

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	need a docket number for this page.
2	MR. KATZ: That's a separate issue.
3	CHAIR BEACH: So that's a separate
4	issue. This one goes back to checking into
5	posting the presentations from worker outreach
6	meetings on the NIOSH web site.
7	MS. AYERS: These are the DCAS
8	presentations.
9	MR. KATZ: These are NIOSH
10	presentations.
11	MS. ELLISON: Oh, his meetings.
12	They've not been provided to me?
13	MEMBER MUNN: If they were not
14	numbered documents, it was our understanding
15	that they are not expected
16	MS. ELLISON: I do know I
17	questioned their review and clearance process
18	and I think that's
19	MEMBER MUNN: That's the issue. I
20	think the real issue is whether the material
21	is cleared.
22	MS. ELLISON: Right. Exactly.

1	MR. FITZGERALD: So right now, for
2	example, it doesn't sound like those
3	presentations are posted.
4	MS. ELLISON: They are not. I can
5	tell you right now, they are not there.
6	MR. FITZGERALD: They're not there.
7	MR. SUNDIN: What sort of
8	presentations are we talking about?
9	MS. ELLISON: If we go out to do a
10	worker outreach
11	MR. SUNDIN: I mean, what is it?
12	Is it a slideshow?
13	MR. JOHNSON: Yes, it could be a
14	handout talking about the specific site that
15	they're working with. And focusing on the
16	history, as well as looking forward, as the
17	needs of the SEC petition came up for
18	evaluation.
19	MR. SUNDIN: But these are being
20	uploaded out into the public forum. I have a
21	hard time understanding why it could not be
22	posted on the web site. You know, if there's

1	a review process, they would take care of
2	that.
3	CHAIR BEACH: These are common
4	documents, aren't they? I mean, you don't
5	recreate them for every single meeting. Don't
6	you use the same ones?
7	MR. KATZ: They could be meeting-
8	specific.
9	MR. FITZGERALD: And I think the
10	underlying thought when the Work Group
11	discussed this was the fact that, you know,
12	for those workers who did not make that
13	meeting
14	CHAIR BEACH: Couldn't make the
15	meeting.
16	MR. FITZGERALD: it would be a
17	way to at least have access to the material.
18	CHAIR BEACH: Right.
19	MS. AYERS: The discussion is there
20	in the minutes.
21	MR. JOHNSON: What we're looking at
22	is see how we can get these early on in the

process so that they can be reviewed, they can be reviewed by DOE also, prior to their presentation. We haven't tested it, but we're looking to see if we could possibly make this happen because, like a thunderstorm, SEC meetings come up and they go, you know, and within that short time frame, or long time frame, if we plan ahead, we're going to work with it.

If we can't plan ahead, then we may not provide any presentations or presentations may not necessarily be able to go through the proper channels for review and approval.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So we're going to leave that one open. Can you still look to being able to do that? It's still an open item or --

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. We have the external review, which would be done by DOE, we have the internal review, which would be done by NIOSH. And so they're two separate, hopefully parallel, activities so they can be

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

done in a timely manner for the expected meeting. CHAIR BEACH: Okay. MR. KATZ: So the ambition is to do it when you can. MR. JOHNSON: Yes. When the timing works MR. KATZ: out, to do it and get it posted as well. MR. JOHNSON: Right. 10 MR. KATZ: Okay. Good. CHAIR BEACH: So I'm hearing that 11 that's the expectation and that's the answer, 12 does that satisfy this or do we need to 13 actually see it in play? 14 15 MEMBER MUNN: It seems to me it 16 needs to be resolved --17 CHAIR BEACH: Okay. with 18 MEMBER MUNN: 19 definition as to what the parameters are going 20 to be; what can go and what can't. least a response from NIOSH as 21 to where

they're going to go with it in the future.

1	Right now
2	MR. KATZ: I think we just had
3	J.J.'s response, though. I mean, their
4	ambition is to do it when they have enough
5	time to clear the material and to post it in
6	advance of the meeting.
7	MEMBER MUNN: And that's fine. It
8	needs to go in the matrix saying that.
9	CHAIR BEACH: Okay.
10	MS. AYERS: So if it's not there in
11	advance of the meeting, is the conclusion that
12	it has no value after the meeting is over or
13	would it be of value
14	CHAIR BEACH: I still think it
15	would be of value, yes.
16	MEMBER MUNN: Well, as Joe
17	mentioned, the concern was for people who
18	couldn't make the meeting, and that's a
19	relatively discrete group.
20	CHAIR BEACH: Okay.
21	MR. LEWIS: Are you talking about -
22	- this is Mark Lewis here. These meetings,

you know, I'm in charge. Vern and I and Mary, you know, we go out and try to get information if it's an SEC meeting, you know? And lots of times we do use like overhead or handouts because there's questions that you are asking about the SEC. Now, if it's a Site Profile meeting and we're going to do a rollout, different story.

But if there was some questions that you're wanting to know about an SEC and some ladies or gentlemen can't make the meeting, you know, I understand that being, definitely, a good document for them to have, you know, out because we kind of use that either as a presentation or handouts on what material, what kind of conditions, for a certain period of time.

But once that is done and it's over, and the SEC is either granted or not granted, what then? Is it on the web site or if it's posted or not? You know, I mean, there's some factors here, like J.J.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

mentioned, thunderstorms come and they go like SECs, and there's a period of time here when, you know, we need to have a meeting, you know, I just wanted to mention it from a point of, you know, someone who's going to help facilitate the meeting that, we don't want to get ourselves painted in a corner here.

MR. KATZ: So they're only useful for the time while you're gathering information that deals with the SEC. That's absolutely correct. You know, once the SEC is decided, these SECs don't get decided that quickly, but --

MS. AYERS: So you wouldn't, maybe, go back to 2004 and post presentations that are --

MR. KATZ: No. There's no point to be retrospective, but for where there's a live SEC, and you're going out and collecting information, I understand what's being said, it's useful to have that posted then, and then others could contact you that didn't even know

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

about the meeting if they have information pertinent to the questions that you were asking at the meeting.

Just a good stimulus for those folks and point of information.

MR. FITZGERALD: I think that Dave's comment was pertinent earlier where, you know, if this is being disseminated at a public meeting, it had degree some of clearance, internally, already anyway, so the question is a mechanical one; can you, you know, post it either during or after?

MS. ELLISON: I'm confused.

MEMBER MUNN: No, it doesn't really have to have had clearance. You know, depends the circumstances of that on particular meeting. It seems to me that you're only going to be able to do this on a situational basis anyhow, on a meeting by You have to make a professional meeting. judgment from one meeting to the next.

MR. FITZGERALD: Wanda, I'm just

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

62 commenting that before something is, you know, presented or handed out, I would assume, Mark, that, you know, NIOSH gives you the go-ahead, right? MR. LEWIS: Yes. MR. FITZGERALD: So that checkpoint is covered. it MR. LEWIS: Does make difference? Is the thing triggered when we see a PowerPoint presentation? Is that when it's triggered, like, a presentation is put on here or you know what I'm saying?

Well, it's whatever CHAIR BEACH: you're going to present at your meeting and somebody that would like to be at meeting, but can't be there, then they can go to the web site, look it up, and see what you're presenting and then make comments if they wish to.

MS. LIN: Wait, hold on. I think Chris has a point here.

> MS. Give her an opening AYERS:

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

here.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. ELLISON: What's confusing me is, the worker outreach meetings that we conduct that  $\mathsf{ATL}$ does for us, these invited meetings. They are not open to public. Therefore, if we put this stuff -and the meeting announcement that this worker outreach meeting is occurring does not get put site because it is a the web meeting, but it's not to the public.

A lot of times that meeting announcement does not get put on the web site until those minutes are ready and put up there.

MR. KATZ: Right.

MS. ELLISON: So I agree we need to give this information to people who can't attend the meetings. I don't think the web site is the way to do it. I'm sitting over here going, I'm confused where this is going.

MS. AYERS: Well, don't the minutes go to the web site?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MS. ELLISON: They do after the
2	meeting.
3	MR. LEWIS: After they're redacted
4	and everything.
5	MS. ELLISON: And if we want to put
6	those discussion papers up there then, that's
7	the proper time, I would think, but I don't
8	see it happening ahead of time. I'm just
9	afraid if we put them up there ahead of time,
10	you guys are going to get swamped with people
11	who aren't true invitees, intended people, for
12	that meeting.
13	MR. LEWIS: If I knew somebody
14	wasn't going to be at the meeting, we could
15	mail that copy to them, things like that, or
16	hand-deliver it to them, or whatever, get it
17	to them.
18	MS. ELLISON: Yes.
19	MR. LEWIS: But I certainly would
20	hate to have it posted because then I'd have
21	so many it's a focus group, invited number
22	of people, especially like we did out at Rocky

Flats last time, and we still have trouble controlling who showed up. You know, we want people who are knowledgeable. MS. ELLISON: You have an intent. Yes. And that's where MR. LEWIS: my point was. I was kind of worried about that, and how it would be posted, and how, you know, when it's posted. ELLISON: Yes. And I was MS. hearing the discussion thinking, I understand how it would work. MR. KATZ: So it almost sounds like it would be better, if you're going to do this, to post it after the meeting has occurred. MS. ELLISON: Exactly. And then you'd have no MR. KATZ: issue of -- but, I mean, still while you're collecting information, and then you'd have no issue about people wanting to come to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

meeting because it's already occurred, but

yet, you still have the opportunity to collect

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

information from people who didn't know about the meeting who might actually be well-situated to answer some of the lines of inquiry that are posted.

MS. ELLISON: And then, honestly, on each one of the individual site pages we have a little section called comments on NIOSH documents and it directs them how to submit comments to the docket, so that we would post these presentations and people see it afterwards, and would like to provide a comment, there's the means for them to do that through the docket.

MR. KATZ: That seems like an excellent approach, actually. That seems like an excellent approach.

CHAIR BEACH: So that would be true of a focus meeting, but there's different worker outreach meetings that aren't focused where you have the number of, you know, specially invited folks, right? There's presentations that you do at other worker

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

outreach venues besides a focus Work Group or a focus --LEWIS: Lately, it's been MR. mostly SEC meetings. Earlier on we had the Site Profile meetings, but lately, it's been an SEC. Isn't that right, Vern? That's what we've been doing? MR. MCDOUGALL: Yes, we haven't had a large meeting for quite some time. 10 MR. JOHNSON: Actually, it should make no difference. If a person has 11 minutes and you have a presentation, once the 12 13 minutes approved, the presentations are associated with it are set in order --14 15 CHAIR BEACH: Okay. MR. JOHNSON: -- by Mike. 16 MS. LIN: But you still have the 17 18 problem with posting these informal 19 presentations on the CDC web site. You still have to get special permission for them. 20 it's not just a done deal that, once you go 21

through the internal clearance process, they

can go on the web.

CHAIR BEACH: Correct. And that's what we had the discussion, in August, that same discussion -- was it August? Our last meeting -- and we were supposed to hear back from NIOSH on that, maybe the process, or the lack of a process, so I guess we'll leave that open and NIOSH to provide a response on that now that we've kind of discussed the issue.

MS. LIN: You want to think about more information doesn't necessarily mean it's a better educational tool. I mean, a lot of time when you go to these worker outreach meetings and the information became stale on the web site, I'm not sure how that serves the public.

CHAIR BEACH: Yes. I think this started off, really, as just wanting to have that information to the workers that weren't available to be at the meeting.

MS. LIN: Sure.

CHAIR BEACH: And if it turns out

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that there's not a venue for that, then we need to know that so we can close this out as well, but some of the ideas that were brought up today seem like they are good thoughts or possible avenues.

MR. LEWIS: Well, then I can go ahead and mention Simonds Saw. We did Simonds Saw. I had a list of concerns that was up to the SEC for NIOSH. I had a few addresses and, of course, I went out and talked to a few folks, but I gave them a copy of the concerns that NIOSH had and some questions that they wanted to know more about during the SEC period.

Some folks couldn't make it, but I went to their homes, gave it to them, a lot of them I called, I mentioned the questions to them over the phone, but I, preferably, would like to see them face to face. The ones that didn't feel like coming, I talked to on the phone. But there was a lot of folks that gave us comments at the SEC, that meeting for

Simonds Saw, that weren't there and were aware of the input that they could give, you know?

So we kind of do that now. So just because it's not written down, you know, somewhere, that's what we do, the same way that Joslyn, I was up there, you know, the questions that we had, gave the concerns to the people who were the workers at the covered period in time. I just made sure I talked to the covered period workers, you know, and gave them the list of topics that can get input on this.

You know, and the same we had at Rocky Flats, we do use that, but just because it's not formally there or posted, doesn't mean it's not happening.

MR. KATZ: And so the whole point of this discussion is just, this is another tool for reaching out to people that, as you said, you may not even know exist, who have information. It's just another way of getting that information out there so that you might

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

get a response that's useful.

CHAIR BEACH: And we haven't heard your presentation, so that'll probably be part of it. Okay. Lynn, thank you for bringing that back up to attention. The other action item I put down was SC&A to update the matrix for us before the next meeting. So as always, we keep that updated.

The next item, if we're ready to move on if there's nothing more from the first item. The break's in about 15 minutes, but I think this one won't take too long, the PROC-010 discussion. And I don't know who wants to take the lead on that. I know SC&A brought that to the attention of NIOSH and then NIOSH looked at it at the last meeting.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, let me just give a little background. We mentioned this at the last meeting that in the course of just doing our work at different sites, it became pretty obvious that the process that was laid out for interviewing workers was taking some

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

undue time at some sites because of a loop in terms of redacting the interview notes.

We actually submitted changes, went back through another cycle of review, and at some sites, that cost six to eight months, depending on the site, which was a heck of a long time when you're talking about interview information. So as far as process-wise, what we're proposing is that there's some ways, and this is based on experience, where we think we can at least eliminate one of the loops that might require a classification review at the site.

And that information, we laid out in this memo that we sent after the meeting. And I think we have a response, actually an editing, a redline strike, but a useful editing of the memo that laid this all out, by NIOSH. So with that as an introduction, I don't know if anybody wants to -- and a lot of this, I think, is just making it a lot more policy-based, meaning, how it

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would work between the agencies, which we're not cognizant about, so I think this improved the process that were proposing and kind of put it in the context of what would work between NIOSH and DOE.

And I really didn't have any problems with the edits, but -- I don't know who wants to talk about it?

MR. JOHNSON: Stu looked at it and he provided some comments back. Another thing I'd like to present is the fact that we need to have DOE look at this document because of a couple things; one, for the additional efforts put on their part to review questions that might be presented that are associated with the clearance of the questions.

And the other part is, having those questions and getting them to a potential interviewee and having them complete something, now you may have some sensitive material, in an uncontrolled area, associated with those questions prior to the meeting.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

even though it does well-And prepare an individual, it may well put some information out there at risk. MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I certainly think those are issues. Josie, I think what J.J. or Stu also are recommending is that, the Work Group may want to engage DOE, someone like Greg Lewis or Fred Lewis, in this drafting using this edit, so I think the edits 10 are good, and maybe asking for any comments on that side. 11 12 CHAIR BEACH: Okay. 13 MR. KATZ: I mean, I think the easiest thing is for DCAS to shoot this over 14 15 because it comes under the security plan, 16 basically. MR. FITZGERALD: Right. 17 MR. KATZ: And if you're wanting to 18 19 amend that security plan, that's something 20 that DOE then needs to --CHAIR BEACH: Okay. 21 MR. JOHNSON: Is that what we could 22 **NEAL R. GROSS** 

1	do, Dave?
2	MR. SUNDIN: Sure.
3	MR. FITZGERALD: You know, like he
4	said, we think the changes are helpful so, you
5	know, whatever DOE responds.
6	CHAIR BEACH: So the action would
7	be for J.J. to send the initial SC&A request
8	and Stu's edits to Greg to review that
9	procedure? Would that be
10	MR. KATZ: I mean, I think they
11	would just send the modified proposal as Stu
12	modified it, since Joe thinks it's fine.
13	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.
14	MR. KATZ: Send that modified
15	proposal to Greg Lewis
16	CHAIR BEACH: Okay, to review.
17	MR. KATZ: and say, can we amend
18	PROC-010 and explain why.
19	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, and just as a
20	further response to what J.J. was commenting
21	on, it is balancing. I mean, you know, you
22	might make it more efficient in one part of

the process, but create maybe other issues in other parts of the process. And, you know, there is, right now, a loop that, at some sites, requires their classifiers spend another cycle of time looking at our interviews.

So we're trying to eliminate that step, but if it creates, you know, more sensitivities up front with the interviewee, I think is your point, that's something that DOE might say, on balance, that's not going to help the situation. You know, you might make it more efficient here, but you might add to the burden or the sensitivity, so I understand what you're saying there. I think that's something DOE would have to advise NIOSH and the Work Group.

like MS. AYERS: Ιt seems biggest concern out of the whole proposal is question of whether the or not it's appropriate to solicit written responses from the site experts prior to the visit. You

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

know, that's probably the most problematic part of it.

And actually, after reading some of the ten-year review sort of discussions about the perceived burdens on claimants and petitioners that, you know, there may be some issues related to that, even, from, you know, asking somebody to provide a written response or something.

So maybe it would be better to just try to gather what information we can and provide that to the interviewers in advance, just from the regular recruiting process, rather than asking people to -- well, anyway. Just saying there's room for adaptation on the proposal.

MR. FITZGERALD: And, you know, again, Greg and his staff may actually have a counter-proposal --

MS. AYERS: Suggestions. Sure.

MR. FITZGERALD: -- you know, to meet the objective of maybe more efficiency or

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

maybe some other tweaks to the PROC-010 It's been there for quite a while now, that, you know, maybe this is a useful about, thing to think but maybe the particulars have to be resolved. It's not as easy as just changing stuff. is, I think, MR. KATZ: This

MR. KATZ: This is, I think, anyway, good timing for DOE to consider, too, how well this PROC-010 works.

CHAIR BEACH: Right.

MR. KATZ: It's just been in effect for a few years now.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So that's an action item for NIOSH to send this modified version of PROC-010 to DOE, Greg Lewis in particular, for a review. And I guess that's back on NIOSH to report back to the Work Group on the outcome of that.

Okay. I think it's a good time to take our morning break. It's 10:20, so about 15 minutes? That work for everyone?

MR. KATZ: Okay. So folks on the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	phone, at about 10:35 we'll start back up
2	again. I'm just putting the phone on mute.
3	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
4	matter went off the record at 10:20 a.m. and
5	resumed at 10:39 a.m.)
6	MR. KATZ: Worker Outreach Work
7	Group meeting, we're back from a brief break.
8	Josie.
9	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So we are
10	ready to look at NIOSH's response to the pilot
11	review of Rocky Flats. There is a, I guess
12	it's a memo that was posted on November 2nd,
13	so everybody, hopefully, at this Work Group
14	meeting should have that available to them.
15	And, J.J., I guess I'm just going to ask you
16	if you'd go through this, pretty much, step-
17	by-step and
18	MR. JOHNSON: Sure. I could do
19	that.
20	CHAIR BEACH: That would be great.
21	MR. JOHNSON: Do you want me to
22	read this?

CHAIR BEACH: Well, maybe just give us the overall thought behind it and then definitely go through each one of the answers to the six --

MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

CHAIR BEACH: Well, five, technically, and six for the Work Group.

MR. JOHNSON: Basically, the thought process was to go back and look at each of the NIOSH responses. We looked at NIOSH will attempt or try to improve and with regards to that, found those responses and then there was another search done within the responses for the word "do better."

And in that, the categories were identified as public comments Board at occurrences; information eight meetings, submitted with an SEC petition, occurrence; public, or petition, or a comment that Rocky Flats Working Group made, and comments originally from a occurrence; June 2004 outreach meeting from Top Hat, one

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

occurrence.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

NIOSH's position is that, for public comments made at Board meetings, a been developed for process has tabulating comments, developing responses those appropriate, and referring comments to the appropriate Working Group when the comment could relate to the activities of the Working Group. The resulting document it provided to the Board for its further use, as it deems appropriate.

Information submitted with an SEC petition is addressed in the Evaluation Report for those petitions and subsequent Board discussion of the petition. And NIOSH's view, there should be no expectation of direct feedback individuals to who provide information with petitions. The manner in which that information is addressed determined by the Evaluation Report and its discussion.

And similarly, public or petitioner

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

comments made at Working Group meetings are disposed by the Work Group discussion. Individuals who participate in the Work Group discussion can follow Work Group discussions to learn how the information they provide was treated.

NIOSH takes a number of steps, some of which are recent improvements, to make it easier for interested parties to follow Work Group discussions. The longstanding practice of placing Work Group transcripts on the web site serves this effort, as does the recent enhancement of making White Papers and other discussion items available on the web site in advance of Work Group meetings.

Based on the information, NIOSH views the fact that there's only one instance of the 101 comments that were reviewed in the pilot review that were improvements in the responsiveness and is warranted, but a specific process improvement has not been made.

NIOSH has also considered the specific recommendations made in Section 3 of the report of the pilot review. And I guess I'd like to go over those right now.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. But J.J., before you do that, is there any comments on that first section; the first four or five paragraphs that J.J. went over? That's kind of more of a background of what we're doing than anything. Okay. I just wanted to --

MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

Recommendations: clarify with DCAS management what are current expectations regarding worker limitations outreach and what to extent current practices or procedures would mitigate the concerns identified by SC&A pilot review of Rocky Flats worker outreach. Tn its individual response it says, SC&A comment: evaluations, "DCAS acknowledges the need to improve responsiveness in some cases, to how questions remain as this will accomplished, what constitutes the and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

baseline internal policy, or defines staff expectations that will guide such improvements?"

"DCAS management's expectations with respect to the worker outreach are: DCAS will respond to correspondence that requires a response as soon as possible. Regardless of the method of communication, email, conventional mail, et cetera, responses will use the same method of communication as the original correspondence. DCAS tasks ATL to review the Advisory Board meeting transcripts to identify and list public comments."

"DCAS prepares responses to these comments when appropriate and forwards the list of comments and responses to the Board. Comments that are related to ongoing Subcommittee or Work Group discussions are forwarded to the Chairman of the respective Subcommittees and Work Groups."

"When DCAS attends any meeting for claimants, claimant representatives,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

advocates, or other members of the public will be present, the expectation for dealing with questions are; try to answer any question you get right there and then, no documentation is required. Encourage the questioner to send their question to DCAS by mail or email. This places the question in an existing tracking system and eliminates the issue of incorrect statement of the question by the DCAS staffer."

"DCAS staff are to travel with a supply of note cards so that the question and contact information, in order to be able to provide a response, upon development of a computer application for tracking comments and questions, the note cards will be used to enter comments into the application."

"Minutes of meetings, when prepared, are entered into the SRDB and are procedurally required to be considered during any subsequent revisions to technical documents. DCAS attendees at these meetings

## NEAL R. GROSS

may either capture comments on note cards during attendance or review the minutes for relevant comments, either way, these comments will be entered into the computer application for tracking comments."

CHAIR BEACH: So does anybody want ask questions in-between these or wait until J.J. goes through the entire list? What's your thought?

MR. JOHNSON: If there are issues, why don't we just address them, each one, by their merit, you know, right now?

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. I guess for me, on the first one, under 3A, "Try to answer any questions you get right there with no documentation required." I just put a question mark there because -- I guess I'm wondering what that means. You answer the question, but if you don't document it then how do you track if there's something that needs to be tracked there?

MEMBER MUNN: Well, editorial nit.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

That needs to be two sentences. A period after "there," then "no documentation is required." If it's a public meeting, especially if it's a Board meeting, then it's going to go into the minutes anyway, and documentation, he means no additional documentation would really be required.

If there's not an outstanding issue for the questioner, then it's been addressed.

MR. JOHNSON: Someone asks a question, the question is responded to, and the response is sufficient, it's complete and closed.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. And I guess I wonder why some of this doesn't go back to PROC-012, because how you do this is based on the procedure, correct? Doesn't this get right --

MR. JOHNSON: This is focusing, in part, on minutes and it addresses that in D, and we review the minutes, and we have our issue tracking system, and outreach tracking

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	system. This other information, these other
2	applications, are to address other
3	applications like questions that somebody
4	might approach a person at a meeting that are
5	different than the minutes of an outreach
6	meeting.
7	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So for A, I
8	understand that part of it, but when you get
9	down to B, which was the question I was going
10	to have there, again, is, the meeting minutes
11	and what you do with it, that's all part of
12	PROC-012, correct?
13	MR. JOHNSON: No.
14	CHAIR BEACH: No?
15	MR. JOHNSON: Meeting minutes are
16	Procedure-012, but when it comes to somebody
17	asking a question, yes.
18	CHAIR BEACH: Okay.
19	MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Now, you asked
20	one question, but it's two full questions.
21	CHAIR BEACH: Yes.
22	MR. JOHNSON: It's addressed in

Procedure-012, yes, but also, if a question came about in another venue other than an outreach meeting, that's what it's addressing.

MS. ELLISON: As in a full Board meeting. You know, and if the public is in attendance, they might not come up to us and ask a question. I think some of this is pertaining to, if you're at a full Board meeting, and the public is there, and someone comes up to you with a question, how do we document that?

They're not up to the mic, it's not on the official record, but we're still receiving comments from individuals, and I think that's where Stu -- or where this writing is coming from.

CHAIR BEACH: Yes. I guess I'm trying to take it step-by-step because the first response talked about correspondence. The second talked about Advisory Board meetings and what you're doing.

MS. ELLISON: Right.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR BEACH: The third -- so, you know, I didn't really have any questions on the third one, so the first answer, I understand the question, but when you get down to C, "DCAS staff are to travel with a supply of note cards so that the questions and contact information," I guess for the tracking purposes.

MS. ELLISON: And I think in cases of those note cards, Stu likes for people to travel to the Board meetings with those note cards in case someone comes up to them with some questions, that we have a way to track that, you know, especially if we can't get back to the them or if we can't answer that question on the spot, it's a way for us to track it and get back with them later.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MS. ELLISON: Does that help clarify that a little?

CHAIR BEACH: So that one, yes, it does help clarify that.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. ELLISON: Okay. And, you know, if we do also attend as part of the Joint Outreach Task Group, which is in conjunction with the Department of Labor and the Department of Energy, we do also attend, from time to time, town hall meetings that the Joint Outreach Task Group is holding.

So, you know, again, there, we have access to members of the public that may come up to us and ask questions. You know, that's another example of something outside of the typical worker outreach meeting.

MR. FITZGERALD: And, Josie, I know we talked about this at the last meeting a little bit, but in terms of the, I guess, recommendations that were in that report, I really thought these were pretty good, sort of, tactical, you know, here's how we're going to do it, but I think part of the issue that we had on some of the comment responses is, clearly, things that progressed.

And I think that was the message

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that Stu gave. You know, we are doing better.

And the question that was on the table was,
what's the difference in terms of objective or
approach between, you know, what was looked at
five years ago at Rocky, for example, and
where it is now?

And, you know, just around this table I think everybody has a different take on what worker outreach is and we had a lot of discussion trying to figure out if my picture is different than your picture, and a lot of it is just simply trying to inform each other. And I think it'd be very helpful just to have that.

You know, because when you talk about these different venues that you're looking to encompass in your tracking, for example, that's a pretty significant change. I mean, a lot of what was found in the review at Rocky was that there was lots of venues of input, information, but only a portion of that was being captured.

And I think what you are saying in terms of your pursuit to find ways to make sure a lot of that does get captured, I think that's a pretty significant difference and somehow, strategically, I was thinking, strategically, it defined, you know, here's what we're about in terms of what we're after in worker outreach and these all fall down as activities to get there.

These are, sort of, the how-tos, you know, but yet, that's sort of getting everybody on the same page as to what worker outreach really means now. And that, in a way, then being able to contrast where we've been in the past. I grant you that Rocky was a long time and how things were done, it's much different now, so the question was, you know, where is that now defined?

I mean, how are you looking at worker outreach? And I think I've gleaned it from what you've said, but I really haven't seen it, sort of, laid out as a, you know, our

activities will focus on making this happen. And what is that this that's going to happen? And I think some of that will be venues, some of it will be a little bit more aggressive. Т think the note cards, for example, being prepared to, you know, bring this back. I think all of those are pretty laudable and if there's any way that one could just be able to lay that out, that would be great. CHAIR BEACH: Yes. Thank you. think that's what asking for I'm is answer than what we're seeing here, because I know they're doing it. ELLISON: Well, you're more MS. definition than explanation. CHAIR BEACH: Yes. MS. ELLISON: Okay. MR. FITZGERALD: If nothing else, it'd be nice to be able to say everybody's, sort of, on the same page as to what worker

outreach means now and, you know, that might

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

be a little bit ambitious, but it sounds like a lot of times we're just, you know, at counter purposes in terms of how they're looking at that.

And, you know, I think part of it is resources. I think you can do so much, but, you know, the question is there's a prioritization that goes on in terms of what can be done. I think that's part of the equation as well.

CHAIR BEACH: Well, and I'm procedure-oriented too, so I like to see that, if you have a new procedure, is it working? Is it doing what it's supposed to be doing? So I guess I wanted to see something in that framework also.

MR. SUNDIN: Just so I can, sort of, fairly represent the question to Stu, the way this answer starts out now is it, essentially, applies to any meeting where claimants, their reps, advocates, or other members of the public are present, Chris has

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sort of alluded to a few examples, I think this applies, really, to every kind of meeting.

If you want an iteration of the kinds of meetings where we encounter claimants, I'm not sure --

CHAIR BEACH: I don't think that's really necessary.

MR. SUNDIN: -- or what elements of this procedure would apply --

MR. FITZGERALD: I was thinking, you know, typically, when does your strategic planning in terms of, you know, whether the activities make sense in light the way the agency's objectives are changing and what have you. In this particular case, I think the objectives and the approach to worker outreach has obviously shifted in a positive direction.

And when we have these conversations of was it really clear, the then versus now, what is the now in terms of the attributes and the objectives that you see is

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

important to worker outreach, then it makes more sense to see the activities because the activities are, you know, what you're doing that supports that new vision or new objective.

MR. SUNDIN: That's a different question than what was on the list before.

FITZGERALD: Well, I think MR. of that's kind what translates the recommendation was, you know, I think there was some response that said we'll do better, and when we had the conversation with Stu it was sort of, is there any way we can get a fix on, you know, where things are as far as now? You know, and that kind of helps everybody understand what you're thinking is as far as what worker outreach would be at this point in time and some of the attributes that you want to see in that.

And I think the activities themselves make sense, but, you know, I think what's missing is that, sort of, a lead-in

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that says, okay, you know, in terms of worker outreach, we are going to be more encompassing on the venues that we want to track and be responsive to.

We're going to be perhaps more aggressive in terms of being prepared and having the capabilities to elicit and record inputs from workers. I think of the 3 x 5 cards as being sort of prepared to do so, and that's a message from here on out, everybody is a possible conduit of information right now, not just the formal worker outreach meetings, but actually, everybody in the staff level is a conduit of information.

I think that's an important message, but I think all that sort of falls into, this is what it's about now and these activities make it happen. That's the how part.

DR. MAKHIJANI: Josie, this is Arjun.

CHAIR BEACH: Hi, Arjun.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

DR. MAKHIJANI: Sorry to interrupt.

I can hear everybody, but I couldn't hear

J.J. very well. I joined late. I'm sorry.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So J.J. has taken note of that, I'm sure. Thank you. Okay. Anything else on that first grouping before we move to the second?

JOHNSON: Okay. The second recommendation, "Clarify with DCAS management whether any form of self-evaluation of worker outreach progress is conducted currently, and status of activities and so, how the program enhancements are made available to NIOSH. there culture of continual Is а improvement in DCAS' approach to outreach communications that is manifest in its procedures, program direction, and program results that can and is being monitored in terms of NIOSH response that it will will that be determined better, how measured?"

"NIOSH does not employ a self-

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

evaluation of worker progress. The first part of this document, which is the analysis of NIOSH's try-to-do-better responses, reveals that the majority of the required improvement, listening and responding to public comments, are at Board meetings and have been adopted."

CHAIR BEACH: So before we move on,

I highlighted that and you say two different
things in that paragraph. One, there's no
self-evaluation currently being done for, and
I'm assuming that's worker outreach, so how
worker outreach is handled. But then it does
review the public comments at Board meetings
has been adopted and is working very nicely
for the last, what, year or so we've been
doing that?

I guess my question goes back to:
everybody self-evaluates at some point and if
there's no self-evaluation, how do you gauge
progress or how you're doing, I mean, or take
credit for some of the things that you are
doing or changing?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, perhaps in some cases, you know, if you don't broadcast the things you're doing, no one knows.

CHAIR BEACH: Right.

MR. JOHNSON: And in the other case, we don't know that we have tools to put in place to self-evaluate how well we're doing or how poorly we're doing.

I think the tracking KATZ: system that you're putting in place will be a good tool for that because you'll have, in one place, all of the substantive input that you receive and you'll be able to look at that that everything same system and see is responded to, which is sort of to everyone's concern.

So I think actually that system you put in place will make it very easy for you to track how well you're doing it, and handling all those, you know, making sure that input doesn't fall through the cracks.

MR. JOHNSON: Right. Exactly as

## NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you look at the overarching turn of outreach.

MR. KATZ: Yes.

MEMBER MUNN: And as Stu says, the majority of the required improvement has been adopted and is working.

CHAIR BEACH: I guess I'd like to see you take some credit or at least, you know, kind of maybe broadcast what you have changed, or what you are doing, and possibly through this program and the ten-year review, I mean, some of that will come out, but I don't know, it'd be nice to see something. So I have no suggestion there. Deep in thought? Are you thinking about how to do that?

MS. ELLISON: Well, my thought was that those action items, that is part of one of those action items from the ten-year review that we are working on and I would think would eventually be reports from those action items, so I don't think it would come out in these reports.

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, the ten-year

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

review itself was almost an evaluation to know, progress gauge, you the satisfaction. So that, you know, was process that gave you that kind of feedback, so the question is, is there going to be an ongoing -- I think that's part of the ten-year review plan to see how those steps that are being taken in response to the ten-year -which is what you're saying, I think, how those are being accomplished or that, in fact, satisfies some of the early concerns.

CHAIR BEACH: I know even my company out at work, sent out surveys for the second time in, I'd say, five years, plantwide, companywide, surveys of, you know, how are we doing and, I mean, everybody does that at some point, so I was surprised --

MR. FITZGERALD: It's hard not to get a receipt anymore without being told, why don't you fill this out.

CHAIR BEACH: That's true.

MEMBER MUNN: Are you available for

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a survey?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

MEMBER MUNN: Please take a few minutes to fill --

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So I don't have anything else for 2, unless anybody else does.

MR. JOHNSON: Recommendation 3, "Is there an institutional means or management system by which DCAS tracks or follows on worker comments in an overall integrated fashion? Who is responsible for overseeing the division's responsiveness to such comments, whether received formally or informally, and what actions are taken to responsiveness, timeliness, ensure and accountability?"

"DCAS intends to develop a comment tracking computer application to provide a method for managing comments and responses.

Once developed, the communications team lead will likely have the lead role in ensuring

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	comments are treated appropriately."
2	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. That's good.
3	So, of course, I wrote down when I read that,
4	the timeline for this, and I know we talked
5	about it, Phil, but that was my first
6	question, and then the second one is, who
7	would have access to that? Would the Work
8	Group, the Board, have access to that? And 1
9	know you may not be able to answer that at
10	this point, but
11	MS. ELLISON: Yes, I can't answer
12	that at this point. I, offhandedly, don't
13	know why not.
14	CHAIR BEACH: And then there was a
15	lot of questions and does that pretty much
16	answer all of those questions within that
17	Number 3? So you don't know who will be
18	responsible for you mentioned that earlier.
19	MR. KATZ: Chris.
20	MS. ELLISON: The communications
21	development team lead.
- 1	1

CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MR. FITZGERALD: I want to echo though, I think this is a pretty spiffy initiative.

CHAIR BEACH: I do too.

MR. FITZGERALD: And this is kind of the substance of this comment because we saw so many venues. If nothing else came out of the pilot, it was just the number of venues that exist for worker input and I think this is pretty responsive to that if you can manage to come up with the framework to do it.

CHAIR BEACH: I agree.

MR. JOHNSON: 4? "How are DCAS staff members oriented to, or trained, for effective worker outreach communications? What quidance is provided staff to by Management's expectations management? outreach, question 2, are covered periodically at health physics staff meetings."

CHAIR BEACH: I guess that's pretty vague and broad, since none of us get to attend those meetings. Do you guys do

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

something formally or just like, okay, today we're going to do some training, or does ATL - I guess you guys aren't really DCAS staff, but a lot of this goes over to ATL side of the house too.

MR. LEWIS: Well, that's our life. You know, I mean, so just every day, you learn something new, and it's hard to track something like that too, you know, but that's, you know, we're always discussing, staff call, we get together and have conference calls and we do a lot of different outreach that we get to, but it's continuous training on that. You're always learning something new.

CHAIR BEACH: I guess this kind of goes back to you lead from the top down. So if the top are worker-outreach-oriented, then people down below will be as well. And this was mostly trying to get a handle on how you're trained.

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: I think this is a question for people doing the outreach, this

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

kind of little deviation here, what if you have a person that approaches you willing to give some information, but then he says, "I'm afraid it's classified." How is that reflected in the training to handle that particular situation?

MR. LEWIS: Vern's going to answer that one because I know he's done some review. Go ahead, sir.

MR. MCDOUGALL: If somebody says they have -- and we also cover this affirmatively at the beginning of any meeting, if somebody indicates that what they would like to say may be classified, then we tell them that we can make arrangements for them to provide that information to a Q-cleared person in an appropriate setting.

And we always admonish people at the beginning of every meeting against saying anything that they even think might be classified in that open meeting.

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Okay. But so

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	this is taught in training to all of the
2	people going out in the field.
3	MR. MCDOUGALL: Well, yes
4	MR. LEWIS: From our company,
5	basically
6	MR. MCDOUGALL: Yes, you're looking
7	at them plus
8	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Okay. I'll take
9	that as a yes.
10	MR. MCDOUGALL: Yes, we go through
11	the same contractor training that NIOSH
12	requires.
13	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Okay. Because
14	this question has come up recently with some
15	people.
16	MR. MCDOUGALL: We're constantly
17	aware of it. We had a very clear actually,
18	some guest came and admonished everybody at
19	the beginning of the Rocky Flats meeting, but
20	then, still, when the minutes were reviewed,
21	you know, the classifier found something in

there that they wanted to classify.

For years now, we've always that process, Phil. MR. LEWIS: Well, last time, Phil, we have a classification officer with us, and in the case of Rocky we did too, and like Vern said, we still got something out of it. MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes, well, I know the question, comment, came up also that some of these people were wondering how they 10 were being given Q clearances for 11 basically, is what they've been told. MR. KATZ: They are, right? 12 13 does that. 14 CHAIR BEACH: Yes. MEMBER SCHOFIELD: And they were 15 wondering about that process and, you know, 16 say they haven't had a Q in ten years. 17 The basic concept for 18 MR. KATZ: 19 that is that it's one-way communication, it's from the person who's being interviewed back 20 to NIOSH, DOE. They're not receiving any 21 information, they're only giving information, 22

that's why they can handle that logistically in a pretty efficient way. Otherwise, it would actually be quite difficult, but that's how they do that.

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Okay. That probably would be good to have spelled out

O

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

probably would be good to have spelled out somewhere. I mean, the fact that this is available to people who want to give some kind of information or testimony, they can do it without violating any kind of federal law.

MR. KATZ: Right. And I think DCAS, in a lot of them, goes to significant efforts, as you've just heard, to let people know that they can provide -- if they have classified information and they wish a venue to provide that, that that'll be established.

MR. LEWIS: Are you saying maybe something should be put on the web site about that?

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes, exactly, because this has been kind of a concern that some people have kind of held back. They go,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

well, wait a minute. You know, last time when I got my Q it took a year of investigation. Now you're telling me I can come in, they can give me one in one day?

You know, they're very uncomfortable because a lot of them -- you know, things they did, information they have, they know at the time they did it it was classified.

MR. LEWIS: And they might want to put something on the docket, but fear of classification keeps them from it. So you're saying, make a comment on there saying, if you want to, but you're worried about classification, this is the route to take; or something.

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Right. I mean, you know, quite bluntly, a lot of them says, I don't want to go to jail and have to pay a big fine because of, you know, this, and yet, there's information I would like to give.

MR. JOHNSON: Is the purpose of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	that one-day Q for them to relieve what they
2	know, the information, and say nothing
3	thereafter about what they said?
4	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: That's correct.
5	MR. KATZ: Yes. They're just
6	cleared for the time that they're interviewed
7	to convey what they have to say.
8	MR. JOHNSON: So they can release
9	what they have.
10	MR. KATZ: Yes.
11	MR. JOHNSON: And it's a DOE thing.
12	MR. KATZ: Yes, I don't know what
13	you can say on public web sites and stuff
14	about this kind of material, so I'm not really
15	sure what DCAS can do in terms of I mean, I
16	know when they go to meetings, they make these
17	statements. I don't know how much they can
18	put on a web site in this arena. Joe probably
19	has more of a sense of what
20	MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I was
21	thinking, the only thing would be just, you
22	know, if we had some kind of a worker

outreach-type venue you would say if there's a concern over the classified nature of your work, contact so and so, and that could be handled on a person-by-person basis. MR. KATZ: Oh, yes. MR. FITZGERALD: Because I think that's kind of what we do now. That's what they do. MR. KATZ: Right. MR. FITZGERALD: I mean, we just sat down with Rocky Flats this week. MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes, but that knowledge is not widely out there. I mean, there's not really anything you can go to and say, well, this is how I can go ahead and still give information. They look at site and, you know, just like anybody who's ever had a Q, those don't happen overnight. MR. KATZ: So, Phil, I mean, I think that's a good point. I think that's just something that has to be looked into.

don't know how much latitude we have for

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

speaking about these matters, for example, to put information on a public web site about a process or what have you. So, I mean, that's something that you could just -- Grady, or whoever's your lead for these sort of security matters, can follow up with you and see what latitude there is, but there may not be a lot of latitude.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, I think a point of contact, but, you know, Phil, you raise a good point. I mean, the people we talked to this week are quite surprised that they could talk freely and they are reassured, not even by us, but the host group there that, you know, they were given this one-day Q, but, you know, we had the need to know, they did not, so we had to be careful it was a one-way communication.

You know, we could not have a conversation and add information that, you know, we know. So it's very careful. It's one-way communications. That's the whole

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	basis for the clearance. And it's difficult
2	because if you have
3	MR. LEWIS: Yes. You cannot
4	connect, you want to reiterate
5	MR. FITZGERALD: Well, no, you
6	can't respond and add information that they
7	should know.
8	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes. Okay.
9	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Ready to move
10	on to 5?
11	MR. JOHNSON: 5, "How does DCAS
12	invite, assess, and respond to worker feedback
13	on the effectiveness of its worker outreach
14	communications program? How does DCAS gauge
15	relative satisfaction with its procedures,
16	programs, and outcomes, and use such feedback
17	for performance improvement? Is there some
18	form of surveying or other means to solicit
19	feedback?"
20	"DCAS outreach contractor, ATL,
21	provides class evaluation forms to attendees
22	at dose reconstruction and SEC workshops. ATL

and DCAS conduct one two-day workshop per year in Cincinnati and a few one-day workshops per year in the vicinity of the covered facilities. Those class evaluations are reviewed for potential modifications to the workshop."

"Other than that, DCAS does not have a process for inviting and responding to worker feedback on the effectiveness of its worker outreach program."

CHAIR BEACH: Any questions on that one? I had a couple. First one, I'm going to ask this of Mark and Vern, what happens to the evaluations from the workshops? I know you get them, you solicit those at the end, but what do you do with that information?

MR. MCDOUGALL: Well, the first thing we do is we provide them to NIOSH so that they have a check on our performance. The next thing that we do is we take those seriously, and if you could look at the agenda, and I think you saw this a little bit,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

if you look at how the agenda for these
workshops has evolved over time, we actually,
in a number of ways, have factored in some of
the suggestions that have come up into
evolving that workshop.
CHAIR BEACH: Okay.
MR. MCDOUGALL: Okay?
CHAIR BEACH: All right. So do you
typically only get about the workshop or do
you get other feedback that goes beyond the
workshop?
MR. LEWIS: We get thank-you emails
and stuff.
CHAIR BEACH: Sure. That's a
feedback loop, though. Yes.
reedback 100p, chodgh. les.
MR. MCDOUGALL: Yes, this is just a
MR. MCDOUGALL: Yes, this is just a
MR. MCDOUGALL: Yes, this is just a level 1 evaluation of the training program, so
MR. MCDOUGALL: Yes, this is just a level 1 evaluation of the training program, so it's just about the workshop.
MR. MCDOUGALL: Yes, this is just a level 1 evaluation of the training program, so it's just about the workshop.  CHAIR BEACH: Okay, because I know

that go beyond and then critique the program or offer more stuff, so typically, you don't get that type of --

MR. MCDOUGALL: We used to get more than we do. I think if you went back and looked at the first couple workshops, you got more of people wanting to take that opportunity to vent, not about the worker outreach program, but about DCAS as a whole. We don't really see that much of that anymore.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. And then the other piece of that is, once you get that, NIOSH, is there anything that happens with that?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, we review them and, you know, at times, Vern has come back to us and said, well, you know, it looks like they'd like to have a three-day instead of a two-day because of the amount of material packed into a small package. And sometimes they'll come back and say, we need a little bit more kind of clarification or

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

understanding in certain packages that are provided.

And we'll work with Vern and Vern will work with our team members in order to update those particular training packages. So that's kind of what we get and how we get it,

CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

and improve the process.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. JOHNSON: Sometimes it's just not reasonable to extend something from two days to three days because of --

CHAIR BEACH: Sure.

MR. JOHNSON: -- already the time constraints put in there.

CHAIR BEACH: Sure. So then the other part of my question was: how does DCAS know how they are doing and if there's no process in place for worker feedback, how do you know how you're doing? And I guess it goes back to several of these different topics.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I think when it

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

comes to feedback, when we have our list of venues addressed, and issues that come in, and questions that come in, we'll probably see a lot of what is good and what issues, you know, people have out there that, perhaps, putting them in one tracking system, we'll be able to better understand that.

CHAIR BEACH: Yes. I think that's going to be a huge piece of this. All right. Any questions or comments? The last one is, basically, for the Work Group, so I guess for action items, there's really not going to be any action items for this list, other than, maybe, taking some of this back to Stu and maybe give us some more information on each one of these if it's possible.

MR. JOHNSON: I mean, I think the answers that Stu provided are the answers we have.

CHAIR BEACH: Right.

MR. JOHNSON: You may not like the answers, but that's where we are on some of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

these things. And I just would observe that we do have a lot of channels available to people to comment on all kinds of things. It's that we do not have a formal evaluation system which would be a complicated endeavor, but that's not to say that people wouldn't feel, I think, free to comment on our outreach program or any other aspect.

But in terms of allocating resources, it's not an area where we've chosen to invest.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. All right. So Number 6, the question is, "Given experience gained with the pilot review, take steps to review suggested process improvements identified and to revise the current review plan to incorporate positive changes to enhance efficiency and -- " what is that?

MEMBER MUNN: Efficacy.

CHAIR BEACH: "Efficacy," thank you, "consider the following," not a word I'm familiar with, "consider a follow-up review of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

more recent site-specific worker outreach experiences to gauge institutional improvements in communications and responsiveness over the past four and five years since Rocky's experience."

So that brings us to, if we're finished with this, talking about other sites to look at. And I know -- how are we doing on time? We've got plenty of time. Last meeting, SC&A had come up with a list of four sites and then we talked about a couple more. And I know NIOSH was going to look at these sites and then maybe give us some feedback on, you know, if some of this criteria was met at these sites.

And I didn't really pin Stu down on it. So, J.J., I don't know if you guys had any conversations about that.

MR. JOHNSON: The only conversation we had was that NIOSH doesn't really have a good choice for the next choice, and I'll just leave it there.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. KATZ: Can I -- I mean, the one thing that we asked, I think, a piece of information that the Work Group really doesn't have good access on, I mean, people may have a sense because they've been involved in Work Groups, and so on, but they won't, you know, have, certainly, not a quantitative sense.

But what we were wanting to know is, which of these sites, for example, was there a lot of engagement so that there would be a lot of action to consider over a period of time; a lot of input so that there'd be real meat to consider in terms of how responsive was NIOSH to those comments.

So that's what, I think, the Work Group wanted to know about these sites, which of these was quite active in terms of receiving input from workers.

MR. JOHNSON: I think your point, you brought that up last time, and I think you pointed out Fernald.

CHAIR BEACH: Fernald and LANL.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. KATZ: LANL were a couple that
2	occurred to me that seemed to me, just
3	generally speaking, that there had been quite
4	a bit of input, but as thoughts.
5	CHAIR BEACH: Well, and Area 5, I
6	kind of discounted because we haven't met for
7	a couple of years and it's still an ongoing
8	site.
9	MR. KATZ: Yes.
10	CHAIR BEACH: Chapman Valve was one
11	of interest, but there again, we didn't know.
12	I mean, there's plenty of claims, but that's
13	a relatively old site also, isn't it? And how
14	much worker outreach has been done?
15	MR. MCDOUGALL: I can tell you, we
16	only had that one meeting way back.
17	CHAIR BEACH: Yes.
18	MR. LEWIS: 2005.
19	MEMBER MUNN: That's had a lot of
20	activity with Chapman, but
21	CHAIR BEACH: But we're looking at
22	

1	MEMBER MUNN: that doesn't mean
2	anything in terms of interaction with the
3	plant population. You're right about Santa
4	Susana. We've not
5	CHAIR BEACH: That's on Phil now,
6	so he's the Chair of that one. Brookhaven
7	might not be a bad choice, although we're
8	still not done with Brookhaven, but that
9	doesn't mean we can't
10	MR. FITZGERALD: There's quite a
11	bit that has been accomplished.
12	MR. KATZ: I mean, you need an
13	updated product, basically, to be able to work
14	with, either an updated Site Profile, TBD, I
15	mean, because that's what you're looking at to
16	look for a responsiveness to technical input.
17	CHAIR BEACH: And we're working on
18	the Site Profile now, so it's not updated, but
19	I don't know if you'll get that on any of
20	these at this point. Those are usually
21	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Area 4 is being
22	worked on right now.

starting to become quite dated it seems like.

1	CHAIR BEACH: Well, initial worker
2	outreach meetings were in 2008, so that's
3	rather outdated.
4	MR. KATZ: Okay. So that is in the
5	ballpark.
6	CHAIR BEACH: LANL, anybody recall
7	worker outreach meetings?
8	MEMBER MUNN: Well, it dates back
9	to dirt and so I
10	CHAIR BEACH: Recent?
11	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: LANL's been
12	pretty darn active over the years.
13	CHAIR BEACH: Recent?
14	MR. LEWIS: Well, it was last
15	summer we did two years ago?
16	MR. MCDOUGALL: Well, let me see if
17	I can get it.
18	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: One brief
19	comment.
20	MR. SUNDIN: That was 2010.
21	MR. MCDOUGALL: LANL is probably
22	relatively recent and there was a lot of

1	worker comment.
2	MR. LEWIS: Does it have to be a
3	DOE site?
4	MR. KATZ: No, it doesn't have to
5	be.
6	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Just one
7	comment. We've gotten emails that people on
8	the south end of the table here need to speak
9	up. Just having a hard time hearing you.
10	CHAIR BEACH: Thank you.
11	MR. KATZ: Well, thanks, Phil.
12	MR. LEWIS: I know recently, SC&A
13	was down at W.R. Grace, right? Is that out of
14	the league?
15	MR. KATZ: No, that's not even
16	workable because that's still in process. You
17	need to have something where a document has
18	been updated or an SEC has been completed.
19	That's what you're looking for.
20	CHAIR BEACH: Well, Fernald is
21	still in process. I mean, they did do some
22	work on an SEC. I'm game for LANL if

1	MEMBER MUNN: I don't see there's
2	any objection to it. It seems to fulfill all
3	the criteria that we established for sites we
4	wanted to look at. It certainly provides a
5	copious opportunity for the kind of
6	information that we're looking for. I can see
7	no objection to it personally.
8	CHAIR BEACH: Do we want to just do
9	one site or a couple of sites?
10	MEMBER MUNN: I think one would be
11	more
12	MR. KATZ: I'd take one bite at a
13	time.
14	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: LANL's going to
15	be a big bite.
16	MEMBER MUNN: Yes. It would be a
17	very large bite.
18	CHAIR BEACH: Yes. I was just
19	wondering, it doesn't really fall into that
20	small site, but I don't think we're going to
21	be successful on that.
22	MR. KATZ: It doesn't have to be a

small -- I mean, if you have a controlled period or action that you're dealing with. So if you're dealing with one SEC, you sort of select an SEC, the action was completed, and you're looking at the information relevant to that SEC action.

CHAIR BEACH: Right.

MR. KATZ: The input relevant to that. So, I mean, that's what contains it; in effect.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Any other comments or shall we decide on the site; LANL?

MEMBER MUNN: Let's do LANL. It's far enough different in its activity and its type of workers than Rocky to be able to create a few new avenues of inquiry. One of the laboratories would be really -- something like Brookhaven would be ideal, but if we don't have the basic material to work with in terms of information about a plethora of worker interactions, then we're not getting the information we look for, so LANL will

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

provide us with that. CHAIR BEACH: Okay. MS. AYERS: When was the Site Profile? MR. KATZ: Sorry? When was the Site MS. AYERS: Profile? So I think you'd be MR. KATZ: looking at the latest completed SEC section 10 for input related to that. I don't know about 11 whether there's also an update to a TBD that you could tie into this. You know, you can 12 look at that with a -- Joe can look into that, 13 or you, with DCAS to see if there's one of 14 15 those actions that you can couple with it, but 16 the one I'm thinking of is the SEC action, because we all know that was completed and 17 went forward. 18 19 MEMBER MUNN: And it's recent enough that this Work Group will have an 20 opportunity to, least intellectually, 21 at

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

evaluate the progress that NIOSH has made in

evolving its worker outreach process.

CHAIR BEACH: So if that's the site that's agreed upon --

MR. KATZ: We can test -- as part of this tasking, I'd like to discuss, and I talked to Josie about this on the phone and I talked to Jim, Dr. Melius, about this too, a little bit about procedure, how to do this, versus what was done at Rocky Flats, because the one issue that I spoke about with Josie and Dr. Melius is really the Board's purview relates most heavily, or more specifically, to how well are the comments being addressed.

So it's sort of the technical side of that because that's all about quality of science, and so on, versus the issue of service, or how well do we get back to people and tell people thank you for your input and this is what we did. That's sort of the service component of this and that was a focus of Joe and your review of the Rocky Flats.

I mean, a lot of time was spent,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sort of, tracking down how well people received feedback on their input, but that's really beyond the Board's normal purview. So I think Jim agrees that, really, it would make much more sense to spend your resources more economically on addressing the question of, what input came in and was it addressed?

I mean, that question, which is the core question for the Board, really, and how well is worker input being taken into account?

CHAIR BEACH: That kind of takes us back to our implementation plan, Number 3, and we are going to look at that later on today. So I don't know if we want to jump into that, but you bring up a good point.

MR. KATZ: Yes. I'm just raising it now because this has to do with tasking SC&A and they need to know what the scope of their review would be.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. And we asked them, the last time we did Rocky, to give us a plan. So we would task them with that same --

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. KATZ: A protocol up front.
2	CHAIR BEACH: A protocol up front
3	and then a review.
4	MR. FITZGERALD: But I think what
5	you're saying, well, what both of you are
6	saying, are very relevant. And I wasn't
7	directly involved in the implementation plan
8	last time, but it was written to that
9	objective; Objective 3.
10	CHAIR BEACH: Right.
11	MR. FITZGERALD: So, you know, if
12	you don't want the objective addressed in its
13	full scope, then that would be useful
14	information.
15	MR. KATZ: Yes.
16	DR. MAKHIJANI: Hi. This is Arjun.
17	May I make a comment?
18	CHAIR BEACH: Yes.
19	DR. MAKHIJANI: Ted, just adding
20	one thing to your list of two items is, how
21	well was that input documented, because that
22	has been a difficulty in the past. NIOSH is

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

1	documenting things much more thoroughly now, I
2	realize, so to judge what the response was,
3	you need to review the documentation of the
4	input.
5	MR. KATZ: Sure. I mean, I think
6	part of, you know, Arjun or Joe, when you,
7	sort of submit a protocol, an approach, for
8	this next one that, you know, you would cover
9	any kind of fine details like that.
10	DR. MAKHIJANI: Sure.
11	MR. KATZ: Sure.
12	CHAIR BEACH: Yes. If you look
13	under Number 3, one of the bullets is, "How is
14	feedback provided to the Work Groups in
15	response to their comments?" I think that's -
16	_
17	MR. KATZ: Right. No, we did have
18	that and they did that for Rocky Flats, for
19	sure.
20	CHAIR BEACH: Which is another
21	reason why I wanted us to look at this for
22	that purpose too is to make some suggestions

on how to streamline that. Okay. So we're tasking LANL to SC&A, but we're asking for an implementation plan?

MR. KATZ: Yes, a protocol.

CHAIR BEACH: Protocol.

MR. KATZ: Yes.

CHAIR BEACH: Do we need another meeting?

MR. KATZ: I think it would be fine in terms of process, if you just submit a protocol. We can distribute it to the Members by email. If Members have an issue and we need a Work Group meeting, that's fine, but if we don't, if no one has an issue and it's pretty straightforward, then we can just carry forward and not have to hold up SC&A in getting started.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. I think there's some process issues that, clearly, you know, it may be a two-step process where we establish what the scope of commentary is, which gets into what we got into with Rocky,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

making sure this is bite-sized enough, and sort of practical aspects of whether this is feasible, resource-wise.

So I think, you know, there's a little bit of scoping as part of the plan and then a proposal based on that scoping that, you know, addresses the cost efficiency of the process as well as the objectives that the process will accomplish, which gets me back to the original comment that, it would be very helpful for the Work Group to chew on what Ted's suggesting so that we have a pretty good scope to go forward with.

CHAIR BEACH: Well, I think we need to focus, when we get to the implementation plan this afternoon, focus on Item 3, and review that, and maybe make some changes to that today so that we can move forward more efficiently. I agree with that.

MR. KATZ: And the other thing I would just say, Joe, is, whoever takes the lead for this for SC&A in sort of developing

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that protocol, I mean, feel free to, sort of, get some front information from DCAS so you know issues of sort of volume of comments, and so on, to help you with that so that you can have as complete a proposal.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. That's an iterative process. That'll impinge on everybody if it turns out to be a monster. don't think anything approaching what Rocky Flats was, but on the other hand, I've been involved with Los Alamos and I know there's been a fairly healthy amount of exchange, so I'll certainly work with whoever you identify. I'll be the lead in terms of framing this up, but I think that's an important question to answer for the Work Group is --

MR. KATZ: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: -- you know, how feasible will it be, from that standpoint, and then, you know, here's the approach, the process.

CHAIR BEACH: Right.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. KATZ: Right, because that'll
help us, for example, if we need to do a
sample as opposed to like we did with Rocky
Flats versus just follow the comments that
came in.
MR. SUNDIN: I think some of this
will probably fall out when we decide what the
document change that we want to sort of track,
or what changed with respect to LANL, that
seems relevant to gauge worker input.
MR. FITZGERALD: As I recall, I
think they were holding the TBDs because the
SECs were coming out in phases, so it wouldn't
make any sense to revise the TBD while that
was in progress.
MR. KATZ: So it may just be the
SEC.
MR. FITZGERALD: It may just be the
SEC.
MR. SUNDIN: Well, there's
certainly been a Board meeting recently out
there that you had a lot of comments to look

1	at there.
2	MR. FITZGERALD: Right. And it's a
3	rich field, as far as the document, that it'll
4	reflect, you know, the issues received. It
5	may very well be the SEC-associated documents,
6	which, thankfully, I know about, so it won't
7	be too hard.
8	MS. AYERS: So there'll be NIOSH-
9	generated documents related to the SEC
10	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, there's been
11	various White Papers and, you know, products
12	that reflect inputs.
13	MR. KATZ: There's the ER and then
14	the amendment to the ER
15	MS. AYERS: Okay.
16	MR. KATZ: are the final
17	products.
18	MS. AYERS: That was my confusion,
19	because I know with Rocky, with the SEC
20	process, the ER was at the very beginning and
21	so, obviously, it didn't respond to the
22	comments because they came after it came out.

1	So knowing that there's other
2	MR. FITZGERALD: Now, that raises
3	the other question about, I don't want to
4	muddy the waters too much, but whereas we were
5	using, you know, formal documents, TBDs, and
6	what have you, for Rocky, given the state of
7	affairs at Los Alamos, these would clearly be
8	these intermediary documents, the SEC-related
9	documents, which aren't quite the same thing.
10	They're not issued to the documents.
11	They're, sort of, Work Group-
12	related White Papers and materials that were
13	exchanged.
14	MR. KATZ: And then the ER was
15	amended though, right? Wasn't it? Am I not
16	remembering correctly? I thought the ER was
17	amended at the end of the process.
18	MR. FITZGERALD: Well, at the end
19	of the process when the SEC decision was made,
20	then it was amended at that point.
21	MR. KATZ: Yes. So it runs all the
22	way to that point because that's the final,

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

sort of, adjudication of issues by NIOSH.

MR. FITZGERALD: Right. Yes, but it's, without getting into it, a summary thing that basically says, you know, that it wraps the issues, but it doesn't get into --

MR. KATZ: Fine details.

MR. FITZGERALD: -- these finer details as a TBD might. So I'm just saying, we'll look at that and come back to the Work Group and if that proves to be, you know, an issue, then we'll bring it back to you and you can, you know, talk it over, but, you know, this will be a different beast.

CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

FITZGERALD: And we want to MR. make sure we look at, you know, for example, on what makes it an effective feedback tool for the Work Group, and for NIOSH, you know, we'll look at that part first; so feasibility, the value, and then are there any issues that we should bring back? We'll do this iteratively with NIOSH and, you know,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

certainly do it in realtime so that we're not waiting for the next Work Group meeting, but we'll try to come to some conclusions and pass those on to the Work Group so you can actually have that in advance.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MR. KATZ: Sounds good.

CHAIR BEACH: So kind of a two-step tasking then; you deliver the protocol, the scope, feasibility, and then you would be tasked to move forward or not, as the case may be.

MS. LIN: Josie, I would just ask that, I probably need to check the timeline for the Secretary's action on this SEC, the latest one, that covered 1976 to 1995. I'm assuming that's the SEC that you guys want to focus on. So let me just check on the timeline because I don't want the Work Group, or the Board, to act on the presumption that this SEC petition will be decimated.

CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. KATZ: Sure.
2	CHAIR BEACH: Any backup sites? I
3	guess, hearing that, maybe we should have a
4	second one.
5	MR. KATZ: Well, I don't think
6	it'll be an issue.
7	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. I just don't
8	want to have this conversation again if
9	MR. KATZ: Formally we can't,
10	right, presume.
11	CHAIR BEACH: Right. But would
12	there be a backup in case just so we could
13	just keep moving forward if
14	MS. LIN: Well, I mean, I could
15	tell you the timeline, like, tomorrow
16	CHAIR BEACH: Tomorrow. Oh, okay.
17	MS. LIN: so I don't think
18	that's going to hold up the process too much.
19	And so you still have to come up with the
20	protocols so
21	MR. FITZGERALD: I don't think this
22	will be a problem. It'll take us a while to

1	frame this up.
2	MR. KATZ: Yes. I'm expecting at
3	least a month of thinking, and talking, and so
4	on.
5	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. Just doing
6	the research and contacting, you know, DCAS
7	and trying to get some of these things nailed
8	down.
9	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Thank you, and
10	before we leave that, I want to go back to
11	ATL, you guys conduct a two-day workshop once
12	a year and then several one-day workshops.
13	It's been about three or four years since we
14	attended one of your two-day workshops.
15	MR. LEWIS: Come on down.
16	CHAIR BEACH: Do you have one
17	scheduled for
18	MR. LEWIS: Next year. We'll have
19	one, probably, next fall right, Vern?
20	MR. MCDOUGALL: You just missed it.
21	It was in September.
22	CHAIR BEACH: Yes. We weren't

ready for it then. So I guess we don't have
to discuss it now, but I'm thinking that, as a
Work Group, we should probably go.
MR. MCDOUGALL: You're welcome. If
some of you want to come, you know, with
NIOSH's set-up course, to one of the local
workshops. Actually, we're probably going to
go out to New Mexico in the spring. We were
thinking about doing it about this time of
year.
MR. KATZ: It used to be that the
Board go, I haven't seen them in a while, but
we used to get these notices to say that
there's an outreach meeting activity. We get
these notices so that any Board Member could
go attend. That's sort of the easiest way to
handle this and then
MR. MCDOUGALL: They should be
auto-generated out of the
MR. KATZ: Yes. I mean, it used to
come, regularly, through to all of the Board.

They just get a little quick notice.

1	MS. ELLIOTT: It has to	be
2	scheduled and there hasn't been anyt	hing
3	that's now labeled.	
4	MR. KATZ: Okay.	
5	MS. ELLIOTT: We put the meet	ings
6	in the OTS and then I generate the emai	l to
7	all of you to notify you of the meetings.	
8	MR. KATZ: Okay.	
9	MS. ELLIOTT: Really, we hav	en't
10	had	
11	MR. KATZ: You haven't had them	•
12	MS. ELLIOTT: Not since July.	I
13	think I sent the last one out in July.	
14	MEMBER MUNN: It's around	here
15	somewhere, right?	
16	MS. ELLIOTT: Fort Wayne is	the
17	last one.	
18	MEMBER MUNN: Yes. It's not	that
19	far away.	
20	MR. KATZ: Okay. So for Work G	roup
21	Members, if you want to coordinate and	l go
22	together to one, then we should	just

communicate when we get one of these notices.

Otherwise, I mean, you're always, all the
Board Members, welcome to attend any of these
functions when they see the notices.

CHAIR BEACH: So what I wanted to do is put that on Number 9, for next steps for worker outreach, I would like to see Work Group Members go, but I would also like to kind of do an audit of it as well, and I don't know if that's something we could task or not.

We did that in the past and had --

MR. KATZ: Yes.

CHAIR BEACH: So like an informal or just -- because that's part of one of our tasks in the implementation plan, is to look at that information.

MR. KATZ: I mean, we can get into this discussion later, but this, again, moves into the territory of service versus quality of science. So tasking and evaluation of how well we're educating people is beyond the scope of the Board.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIR BEACH: Oh, it is. Okay.
2	MR. KATZ: Yes. So, I mean, it was
3	within the scope of the ten-year review, and,
4	you know, the ten-year review was shared,
5	certainly, with the Board for their input, but
6	it's sort of, you know, if Stu wants the Board
7	to do an evaluation like that, it can invite
8	the Board too and we can consider that, but
9	it's beyond the charter of the Board.
10	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Well, I know
11	we had done that early on and maybe we were
12	out of bounds at that point and didn't realize
13	it.
14	MR. KATZ: Well, there were a
15	number of meetings where we had sent someone
16	to go and attend, and watch and see what
17	happens at the meetings. Yes.
18	MEMBER MUNN: But essentially, it's
19	a suggestion for it.
20	CHAIR BEACH: Sure.
21	MR. KATZ: Yes. So bottom-line is,
22	the contract really doesn't cover it and I'm
	NEAL R. GROSS

not going to task SC&A with sending people to observe and evaluate a worker outreach meeting to see how well they're educating folks.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So that answers that, then the rest of us, as Work Group Members, are, of course, invited; welcome.

MR. KATZ: Yes.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Perfect.

MR. LEWIS: If NIOSH doesn't care, we sure don't care.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MR. KATZ: You'd welcome their attendance.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So we do have a few minutes and are we finished with this topic or any other questions on the sites for review? I did put on the agenda that we would either have worker representatives or advocates have a chance to comment and we do have 15 minutes before lunch, so if there's anybody on the phone that would like to make a

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

4	Comment / quescions:
2	If you're on mute, we will give you
3	a couple of minutes.
4	MR. KATZ: Yes. They're still
5	alive.
6	CHAIR BEACH: So hearing none, I
7	will ask again after lunch
8	MR. KATZ: Yes.
9	CHAIR BEACH: prior to ATL's
10	presentation. And it is now, oh, I don't
11	know, a quarter to 12:00, so let's go to lunch
12	and be back at 1:00? Does that work?
13	MR. KATZ: Yes.
14	CHAIR BEACH: 1 o'clock?
15	MR. KATZ: So 1 o'clock for folks
16	on the line. Thanks.
17	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
18	went off the record at 11:48 a.m. and went
19	back on the record at 1:18 p.m.)
20	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So we're at
21	the ATL presentation.
22	MR. MCDOUGALL: Okay. It seems
1	

like years ago, Mike had tasked us to take a few minutes to explain how we do what we do. And then events kind of got away from us. We never got back to it. This, I hope, will give you just a little bit better perspective on what we're doing when we're not actually sitting in a meeting, okay?

There's a little bit more to it than meets the eye.

MEMBER MUNN: Yes. We always love the mystery, Vern.

MR. MCDOUGALL: Okay. First, let me say something about the knowledge base. And I think like a contractor, okay? I think like a support contractor. If I was pitching a proposal, this is kind of the way I would lay it out.

The first thing that we know is, we know what the organizations are at every DOE site. And it can be a little obscure sometimes. For example, at Idaho, you know, pretty much everybody knows about the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Steelworkers local, but there's also a Teamsters local up there, and there's actually a local of the Amalgamated Transit Union for, basically, historical reasons.

What was the one outside of LA?

MR. LEWIS: Santa Susana?

MR. MCDOUGALL: Santa Susana, that's a UAW local; United Autoworkers local. And we first approached them years ago. The first thing they did after, I think it was Mark, approached them was, they called the international. But we also had a relationship with the international and those folks said, yes, it's okay to talk to them. They're acceptable people. They're upstanding people.

And that's personal connections. It really is important because there's a lot of cultural issues. We understand the complexities of the organization structures, with the metal trades councils and such, and in some cases, building trades councils in some locations doing what a metal trades

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

council would do at another site.

And we basically came to this, I think, with a level of trust when we started this, a reservoir of trust, and we've built that by our actions over a number of years. We know, basically, the people who are going to be interested, or concerned, about this in pretty much all of the national labor organizations.

And, Wanda, I want to note, we don't know the ANS chapters. We know where they are, but a lot of the people that we're reaching, the ANS-type people, are the people that NIOSH tends to find on their own; the site experts. We're dealing, largely, with a different group of people.

And with the AWE sites, it's helpful to have a knowledge of labor history and to know how different industries were organized, in different parts of the country were organized, and it helps you get an idea of where to look for the labor organizations

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	when you're looking for organizations that
2	would have existed 30 or 40 years ago. Barry?
3	MR. LEWIS: I may want to bring up
4	a point there, but a lot of those folks here
5	with the trust, and knowing the key people, a
6	lot of folks, when I was working in the
7	steelworkers, I trained at those sites. So
8	I've known them prior to this law coming in in
9	a lot of cases, and, Josie, you know that
10	don't you?
11	CHAIR BEACH: Yes.
12	MR. MCDOUGALL: Guess we'll pause
13	for minute here.
14	MR. KATZ: Okay. This is Ted with
15	the Worker Outreach Work Group meeting. We
16	just had to replace our phone equipment, but
17	you haven't missed much. ATL has just begun
18	discussing how they do their work. Okay.
19	Carry on.
20	MR. MCDOUGALL: Okay. Thank you,
21	Ted. Okay. The skills that are essential for
22	this task, first, worker training. And Buck,

and Mark, and I all have at least a decade or two of experience in worker training in occupational health and safety. Buck has published in some of the theory of interactive training; participatory training.

Mark just said he did this for many years before he came to this work. I've run safety and health training programs number of large unions. But I want to say here that, a lot of what we deal with with people is kind of an ongoing, informal, in addition to the workshop-type training, it's mentoring, it is teaching people, if you're get people involved, especially trying to people not part of active who are an Department of Energy site where they have, for example, Rad Worker II training, and all that.

There's a lot of information that they need to kind of absorb before they can really begin to participate and provide useful input. I'll give you an example, when NIOSH asked us to approach the folks at Evendale,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

okay, there was nobody at Evendale, either in the active unions or in the retiree organizations, who knew what a health physicist was, okay?

So we're starting from a very low level of familiarity with what a lot of us here take for granted. And it takes a bit to bring them along. It takes a bit just to reach the point where they really understand why it's important for them to have the input. So this is part of what we're doing, pretty much, every day.

Me've got a request in for travel now for Mark to go to Metropolis. New leadership there. We don't think they know much about radiation. We know they don't know much about the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program. To have the ability to really participate at any level at all, takes a bit of mentoring.

Organizing, and I want to talk about Mark in this case, because he has the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

organizing skills. Some of you who may have seen this at Joslyn, we've done this at Texas City, and I can't think of the other sites.

MR. LEWIS: Simonds Saw.

MR. MCDOUGALL: And Mark used to be a union organizer. When you're dealing with that much of an organization, with these old folks, it actually requires, sometimes, personal house calls. Actually going out to people's houses. Some of those folks at Texas City didn't even have telephones.

MR. LEWIS: That's right.

MR. MCDOUGALL: But if NIOSH says they want to talk to those folks that worked there back then, you know, we go out and Mark's basically teaching them almost one person at a time; explaining to them what this program is and why their input is being sought.

And then research, I don't think I need to say too much about research, but that goes back. The researchy stuff that we do is

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

really more on the AWE side when we're trying to figure out a group; how we can locate a group of former workers. Mary? Stop me anytime.

I want to talk about constraints because I think we sometimes forget, and when we're working with the health physicists, if you ask a question and you don't get an answer right away, it's not that the people that we're asking are sitting at desks like we are, in front of computers, and they're reading email, and they don't have anything else more important to do than to get back to us.

Union folks are often busy with other issues. I'll use an example of Mark's old local. The president of that local down at Portsmouth is one of the smartest people I know in the labor movement about radiation and about this program. And he had a couple issues. They've had a couple issues down there that he has articulated. He went up to NIOSH and met with Jim Neton and some others

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	on slow cookers.
2	And they got some other issues
3	about the eligibility, but in the last several
4	months, he's been busy trying to negotiate a
5	new contract, and also lobbying because I
6	don't think it was a new contract, well, it
7	was a new contract
8	MR. LEWIS: Yes, new contract.
9	MR. MCDOUGALL: but then they
10	also had issues about people coming over from
11	
12	MR. LEWIS: Covered side to non-
13	covered side.
14	MR. MCDOUGALL: Right. What was
15	the other company?
16	MR. LEWIS: Bechtel Jacobs?
17	MR. MCDOUGALL: No.
18	CHAIR BEACH: USEC.
19	MR. MCDOUGALL: USEC. He was
20	consumed, for quite a while, with working out
21	the rights and the benefits for people who had
22	been assigned over from the DOE side to USEC

and then were coming back, okay? That's a squeaky wheel. That's the bread and butter of that local union right now. And we have to understand we have to take a back seat.

When he gets some of his big immediate problems solved, yes, he'll come back to our issues, but if NIOSH asks the question and the union doesn't get back for weeks or months, sometimes there's a reason.

AWE site workers, as I said with Evendale, one of the things that we did for the Evendale people, for example, was, before one of our workshops, we put on a one-day version of Rad Worker II. We didn't dress them out, but what we gave them was what DOE calls the academic core of Rad Worker II, which basically teaches them the basic principles of radiation, okay?

Why, for internal dose, an alpha emitter is worse than a gamma emitter, okay? Why it's different for external, just a few basic things so they could kind of understand

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

more about the process. And coming back to the final point in this slide, all of the stakeholders that we deal with are, basically, volunteers, okay?

Union folks, when you go down to W.R. Grace and you're going to have a meeting with the union folks, or if we're trying to get some information out of what is now Nuclear Fuel Services folks down there, understand that they only do this after they work a full eight-hour shift, okay?

Then, as volunteer, I don't have to tell Josie, that's when they start to do this work. There are very few full-time union safety and health people in this arena. So these are all people who are doing it nights and weekends, and we have to take all of this into consideration when we're dealing with folks. Mary? Okay. So what did we do?

First thing we do is we maintain these relationships. We maintain the communications. We've got a number of ways

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that we do that. We have conference calls with folks, probably the conference calls are about every two months. Mark and Buck, basically, do something that amounts to salesmanship.

They will call folks periodically just to check in and see if there's anything we can help them with. We have to stay in touch. You kind of have to maintain that relationship.

MR. LEWIS: Because if we don't, the leaders will change on us. We won't even know because, you know, some people are elected yearly, some two years, we have to stay with it.

MR. MCDOUGALL: And we try and flow the information in both directions. And this may go back to what Chris and Josie, and all you, were talking about this morning with, how do you capture this information? You know, the news we flow down to the union folks tends to be breaking news, okay?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

One of the things that we do is, when you all have a meeting and you decide certain things about the Special Exposure Cohorts, we make sure we flow that information down to all of the stakeholders who we know about who may have an interest in it.

In fact, I don't know if I got a different slide on that, but once we know what you're going to be talking about at a Board meeting, we let every local union whose ox could be gored by that topic know, not only that you're going to talk about it, know when you're scheduled to talk about it, and if and when there are materials posted that pertain to that, we get those out to them so they can look at those in advance, okay?

And sometimes we broker the information. We broker questions coming back.

MR. LEWIS: When we get the NIOSH updates and we see something on there that pertains to somebody, we get a hold of them at the same time too.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. MCDOUGALL: National
2	organizations, we deal with the metal trades
3	department of the AFL-CIO. We deal with the
4	safety and health departments of the
5	international unions that represent the
6	workers at these sites. We deal with national
7	building trades and the CPWR, the Center for,
8	whatever CPWR is called today. Well, they
9	don't call it that anymore, it's the Center
10	for Construction and Research and
11	MS. ELLIOTT: Training.
12	MR. MCDOUGALL: Something like
13	that.
14	MS. ELLIOTT: Research and training
15	I think.
16	MR. MCDOUGALL: Okay, Mary. Our
17	process at AWE sites, and J.J. just asked us
18	about a couple AWE sites a couple weeks ago,
19	about what the local organizations are. Okay.
20	So the first thing we do, we use our skills
21	to identify what we think are the local
22	organizations and then we use our networks and

our connections to identify the key people.

An example, J.J. asked us about a couple locations recently where they had been rolling uranium, okay, steel pipes where they had been rolled in uranium. So we figured out that these were both steelworkers locals, one has been defunct since the 1960s, one is actually still in operating health, okay?

We've worked with the steelworkers, steelworkers have an organization called SOAR, which is Steelworkers Organization of Active Retirees, that has chapters in a number of areas around the country. So we've reached through that organization, so we're ready, if NIOSH pulls the trigger on this, to start working at the local level.

And again, we have to explain all this. We have to teach. There's an awful lot of teaching that goes on daily on this, because this is not something that's in a lot of people's -- when there was oil, chemical, and atomic workers union, and even when there

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

was PACE at the beginning of this, there were people in the national organization who were more attuned to this because the Department of Energy was a bigger part of that organization's life.

Now, with the steelworkers, the safety and health people at the national level all come out of the industrial side, okay? So there's more of an education process that's involved and forget it when you start dealing with the Teamsters and some of the other internationals that we deal with. Okay. Everything works better when you have an organization.

MR. KATZ: Even the phone.

MR. MCDOUGALL: And one, it doesn't have to be a union, okay? Unions are the most convenient. For the non-health physics people, the unions are the most convenient. But we have found retiree organizations, just sometimes informal retiree clubs. That's, basically, what Mark found up at Joslyn, was

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

just a bunch of guys who get together once a month for breakfast, okay, and we work with them.

Down in Pinellas, we found -- and that's primarily a professional employees group down there, but we found some folks that got together twice a year for a dinner dance. And we went and we sat in the living room of the people who ran this and they got on the phone with another guy, who maintained a mailing list on some old 1990s technology spreadsheet, and he gave us the mailing list.

So we had an organization to work with and we had a place. We had the worker outreach meetings at the same place that they danced so they could find it.

MR. LEWIS: And then subsequent meetings there, not just us, so other people do that.

CHAIR BEACH: So before you move on, let's say SC&A is going into a place and they're going to do some document review, do

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	you have a contact number where, like, let's
2	say Lynn is doing that, heading to Kansas City
3	looking for retirees, would you share that
4	information if you had contacts?
5	MR. LEWIS: Yes.
6	CHAIR BEACH: I don't know if
7	that's viable, but it sounds like
8	MS. AYERS: I've been thinking the
9	same thing for the last 15 minutes.
10	MR. MCDOUGALL: Okay. At the
11	Kansas City plant, about 90 percent of the
12	hourly workers are organized by the machinists
13	union.
14	CHAIR BEACH: Right.
15	MR. MCDOUGALL: Okay? So the first
16	stop is with the leadership of the machinists
17	union.
18	CHAIR BEACH: Right.
19	MR. MCDOUGALL: And the thing is,
20	yes, and then you tell them what you need and
21	then they can help you reach out.
22	CHAIR BEACH: So I understand all

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that, so what I'm asking then is, if someone
like Lynn, if she's organizing something,
could she contact you, Vern, or Mark to say
MS. LIN: And I think it should go
to DFO and also to NIOSH.
CHAIR BEACH: That's my question.
MR. MCDOUGALL: Okay. Well, the
protocol, and J.J., or David, will tell us
what the protocol is, but yes, there's always
an issue of a contractor contacting another
contractor, but certainly, you know, whatever
the proper channel is, certainly
CHAIR BEACH: That's what I was
asking.
MR. MCDOUGALL: we share the
information we know.
CHAIR BEACH: Sure.
MR. MCDOUGALL: There's a group
called the JOTC, Joint
MR. LEWIS: Outreach Task Group.
MR. MCDOUGALL: Outreach Task
Group, okay, that is Department of Labor,

NIOSH participates, Chris participates, Department of Energy participates, and NIOSH involved. Without having got us an organization, okay, folks think that they can a mailing or put just do an ad in newspaper and get a group, and people will respond.

And sometimes the JOTG has held outreach meetings where there were more feds than there were people in the audience, okay? There's another way to do that, but yes, if you want to go to Kansas City, you should talk to the machinists and the guards, and the guards union has office space right in the machinists' hall.

CHAIR BEACH: Well, I wasn't just talking about Kansas City, there's --

MR. MCDOUGALL: Well, yes, but as an example.

CHAIR BEACH: Is there a protocol, which Jenny said, getting with NIOSH -- anyway.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. LEWIS: I know, recently, can
2	we mention W.R. Grace where we was asked to
3	help you guys found them anyway, didn't
4	you, Joe?
5	MR. FITZGERALD: Well, yes. Ron
6	Buchanan had the question of, you know, what
7	would be the entry point? And I think that
8	was coordinated through NIOSH and then through
9	you all, so that's how that worked.
10	MR. SUNDIN: I mean, just to
11	clarify my understanding, is the contractor
12	always the contact there at the government
13	side, the contractor's technical
14	representative, in this case it would be Ted
15	for SC&A, and then he would contact his
16	counterpart for the COTR for ATL and say, hey,
17	this is what's happening, so it just keeps
18	everybody sort of
19	MR. LEWIS: That's how we do it.
20	CHAIR BEACH: Makes sense.
21	MR. MCDOUGALL: Okay. Every site
22	is different. History influences how people

respond to this outreach. You folks see it when you go around the country. The approach of people at a place like Los Alamos or Rocky, is very different from the response at a place like Brookhaven or Savannah River. I think it has a lot to do with people's historic, over the last several decades, relationship with the Department of Energy contractor and how that has influenced their outlook, okay.

I have, on both coasts, contacted organizations to start to explain this process, and the union people told me, we don't have a problem. If we had a problem, management would have told us, okay? That's not what you hear at Rocky or some of the other sites.

So there's a big cultural difference at these sites in terms of how people respond to this program. And in terms of organizations, if you go into a site like Oak Ridge, and we deal with the unions in Oak Ridge, the Knoxville unions, the Oak Ridge

sites are an important part of their business, okay.

You got to Santa Susana, it's the LA building trades. It's not as important. You even go into Las Vegas today and the test site is not as important. Well, now it may be, but before the housing bust, the test site just wasn't as much of a focus because they were building like crazy, so the test site wasn't as much of a focus of that union's activity as it once had been.

So these are all the things that you have to kind of appreciate as you do this outreach work. Oh, and we have one more. This is the part that you see. This is the part that you folks see and this is really what, primarily, Mark and Mary do. I want to say something about the venue.

We were, at one point, questioned or criticized because we were using union halls for meetings and there was an inference that we were doing it just in order to save

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

NIOSH money. But in fact, we try and do a venue that is comfortable, familiar and convenient for the folks, and that's usually a union hall.

It's usually handicapped-accessible because they're usually one-story buildings. What happens if you don't do it that way, Mark had a meeting set up for the Joslyn workers at the place where they had breakfast, okay? We knew they'd be able to find it. Two weeks before the meeting, that restaurant went out of business.

MR. LEWIS: The manager calling me up says they had a power loss and they didn't want to redo the contract, or the lease of the building, and just closed it up.

MR. MCDOUGALL: But we moved it to a hotel, maybe a mile away, and some of the folks didn't find it. All right? Our attendance suffered because we didn't have it in the place they were used to going. We are respectful of people's sensitivities, or the

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

local sensitivities, and local issues. We always try and look at these through the eyes of the participants.

MR. LEWIS: And that part of respect there with Joslyn, I just mentioned it, that a guy come to my mind. He had all kinds of information. He worked covered period. I knew his name. He would not give me his phone number. Says he don't give his phone number out. I didn't get it. I didn't get off nobody, so I respected his wishes, but at the same time, his story never got told, but I heard it that one day, but, you know, that was it.

He just said, no, won't give out my phone number. I said, okay, sir. Thank you, and shook his hand, and got along fine, but he wouldn't give me his phone number.

MR. MCDOUGALL: Okay. And finally, we run it as a meeting, okay? It's not just a bunch of people sitting around. It's a meeting that has a beginning, a middle, and an

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

end. We know what we have to do to start it.
The health physicists develop an agenda, they
develop a set of questions that they want to
get answers to, and in a setting like that,
sometimes it takes a referee, because you can
get two, three people at Nuclear Metals, we
have five or six people who wanted to talk at
once.
So you've got to have somebody
referee the meeting, just as you would a
meeting of any organization, a homeowners
association, or anything else, okay? That's
what I got.
MR. FITZGERALD: In terms of lines
of inquiry, are you saying that health
physicists would identify certain issues that
they would like raised?
MR. MCDOUGALL: Yes.
MR. FITZGERALD: Do you do the
raising for them?
MR. MCDOUGALL: Generally not, and
Mark can speak to Rocky, I wasn't there, but

the health physicists who at Nuclear
Metals, Ed from ORAU came in with he had a
set of questions, okay? And he actually
passed it out so people could follow along.
And we went through question by question.
MR. FITZGERALD: He set it up and
organized it, but if there's technical issues
to be raised, you have somebody to do that
part of it.
MR. MCDOUGALL: Yes. There's,
typically, two health physicists, at least,
but typically, somebody from NIOSH and
somebody from ORAU, and they'll ask the
questions in their terms and they're listening
for the answer.
MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. That's kind
of important just knowing what they're after.
Okay.
MR. JOHNSON: And many times also,
questions will be developed and Vern will look
at them and make them more to the level of the

folks that we're working with.

MR. FITZGERALD: Exactly. If you can't understand them.

MR. MCDOUGALL: But J.J. makes a good point, it's a question of culture, it's a question of vocabulary, okay? And again, especially when you're dealing with AWE folks, the jargon of health physics is, you know, you know exactly what you're saying; they don't. They don't know what a health physicist is necessarily.

Actually, the Nuclear Metals people hadn't seen -- they didn't see a health physicist for the first ten or more years.

MR. LEWIS: It's just more or less, being a good moderator, knowing that your body language, also, is just as powerful as your words, being courteous to people, making sure you know the local politics. Sometimes, like we had at Rocky, there was one lady they didn't want on the site, you know, in the interview there, that showed up, but kind of got to know what, you got to know, not kind

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of, who's welcome for the host that hosts the meeting; who they want there and who they don't; who they perceive as, you know, their allies or not allies.

You know, they don't want someone that they think is working against the good of their people coming into their own place saying something, you know? So that's kind of the, just, background work. You need to know that. That's important too, otherwise, it leaves a bad taste in their mouth, that if you make the people you're trying to help mad, you know?

MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

MR. LEWIS: But Mary always -that's when she mentions about things being
recorded at the beginning of the meeting, as
Vern alluded to, you know like that. There's
a lot to do for the meeting itself. You know,
setting everything up is one thing, but the
bread and butter is the meeting and getting
the information to and from the people.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	And I like doing them. I'll tell
2	you, I like it.
3	CHAIR BEACH: Well, thank you. A
4	long-awaited presentation. It is good to know
5	what you're doing behind the scenes. I think
6	it was helpful for me.
7	MR. KATZ: Yes. I thought that was
8	very enlightening.
9	CHAIR BEACH: Yes. Very much so.
10	All right. Anything else on that? All right.
11	So then the next actually, do we have
12	phones.
13	MR. KATZ: We're offline.
14	CHAIR BEACH: Oh, we are offline.
15	MR. KATZ: This one died as well.
16	CHAIR BEACH: I suspected that.
17	MR. KATZ: Unceremonious death.
18	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So Chris, we
19	had you on the list for an update on ten-year
20	
21	MS. ELLISON: On the action items?
22	CHAIR BEACH: Yes. And you want to
1	

do a real quick background and then where you're at, where you're going?

MS. ELLISON: Sure. I can do that. You know, part of the ten-year review, one of the pieces that they looked at was the quality of service that is provided under the program and from the report that was generated, they developed a set of action items.

And for the quality of service, there were four action items, and so that's what we'll discuss here a little bit. Progress, or what we've completed, under those action items.

The first one, I think we pretty much discussed at length this morning, that was the issues related to the customersupplied information, so I'm not going to go back over that because it was the same thing that was discussed at length this morning there.

The next action item was issues related to the understandability and quality

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of information. And the action was that DCAS will continue ongoing efforts to evaluate and improve the understandability and quality of DCAS communication vehicles.

And that was pretty much completed at this time, in that, we've reviewed the letters and the fact sheets. We've made updates to some of those items. One of the items that is on the long-range target is the reconstruction report, but from beginning of the program until now, important to note that ORAU has made modifications to the report.

If you look at a dose reconstruction report that was done as far back, maybe, as three or four years ago and compare that to one completed in the beginning of the program, and one now, you can see a progression of how they have taken it upon themselves to change, but there are plans and hopes to look at that dose reconstruction report and see where we can update and make it

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a little bit more understandable, a little bit more easy to understand, user-friendly.

CHAIR BEACH: That's important.

MS. ELLISON: That is on the long-range target out there. The next action item or issue relates to the access of information.

And this one is pretty much an ongoing effort because in it, it does say the DFO and staff will continue efforts to see that the Board and Work Group products are posted to the Web site as soon as practical.

And, you know, we have always maintained that we will try to get it up there as soon as possible, hopefully, within a 24-hour period of receiving it. It is important to note that we do have a 2:30 deadline for when we can send stuff, even though we in DCAS do the work to update the web pages, we still have to send those files forward to the NIOSH Web team, who then will post it.

And then CDC server only sweeps and picks up those updates every two hours. So

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it's not like we can update the page and get it up there immediately. And I know sometimes we get crunched with things sent to us kind of at the last minute and we didn't get it up there as soon as we can, but there are those processes that we have to go through.

I just want to kind of get that out there so people are aware of some of that. Some recent activity on the website, we're still trying, I believe last time I had mentioned that we had redone the Board page, and that's pretty well taken care of. And we are also revamping the SEC sections on the individual site pages, and we're still trying to get to some of those.

Something new that has hit our target -- oh, and we also have been putting up a lot of the past White Papers and things. So we're catching up on those and SC&A is well-aware that we can only post 508-compliant documents, and so very good about just sending us those, which is great.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

And one of the new things that has hit recently that will be a target for the website, that will take some time to do is, HHS has mandated that by April of 2013, every web page, every file, must be 100 percent 508 compliant. So right now, we're going to have to shift some of our efforts into ensuring that the web pages are compliant, and more importantly, the PDFs.

So that probably hit within the past week. So I think that's about all I have on that. I should have asked if there were any questions so far? And if not, moving on to the fourth one, which is issues related to the perceived burden on claimants and petitioners. And at current time, this one I see as being completed. We've updated the CATI information on the web and the letters that go to them.

And also, we've updated SEC letters and provided more information. And I know, from talking with Josh Kinman, our SEC

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

petition counselor, he has received some comments back from a couple of the petitioners thanking him for the letters because they do provide people with so much information, that they're easy to understand, so we've gotten a little bit of feedback from a couple of petitioners at least.

And I know one of them came early on when we had first changed the letter, so this person had received a couple of standard letters, the old letters, and then the next letter was one of the new ones, and had commented that, hey, this is information. And, you know, we'll always continue going through the process that we've done in the past, and that is, you know, if we receive call from а someone about. the information, they're not understanding things in the letter, they're not understanding things on the web, you know, we have calls, we have email addresses, and we watch those emails addresses, you know, for comments, and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	we do take them under consideration, and we'll
2	consider that in the future.
3	However, at the current time, that
4	action item is pretty much complete. That's
5	really about all I have.
6	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Questions,
7	anybody? I guess, from our standpoint, we
8	just continue to hear updates at our meetings.
9	MS. ELLISON: Right. You know,
10	primarily it'll be the web items.
11	CHAIR BEACH: So that first item
12	and then this
13	MS. ELLISON: Oh, yes. I forgot
14	about the first item, because I didn't talk
15	about it.
16	CHAIR BEACH: And then the second,
17	where you're still updating some of the new
18	MS. ELLISON: Yes.
19	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Any comments,
20	issues? Okay. Thank you, Chris. So the next
21	one is getting into the review of the
22	implementation plan and the mission statement.

One thing on that, we sent out the presentation that Mike did, I don't know, a year ago. When was this? February of 2009.

So the presentation, basically, just went through the entire mission statement and implementation plan, but then on the back there was a couple of pages, future plans, ongoing tasks, recommended actions, I don't know if anybody had a chance to look at all of that in preparation for this meeting.

The ongoing tasks, we've completed most of that work. The one thing I did want to point out on the recommended actions. There was a couple of bullets. The first one has been completed. The second one, because of the continuous nature of activities stipulated in this implementation plan, the Worker Outreach Work Group requests, that the Group function be elevated to a Subcommittee level.

And I just wanted to have a brief discussion on that and see what people's

### NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

thoughts were. I don't see that happening,
but since it was, as an action, I thought
maybe we should put that to rest or whatever.
MR. KATZ: Yes. You can put it to
rest.
CHAIR BEACH: Well, I assumed we
would, but I always just
MR. KATZ: Well, this was a desire
of Mike's. I'm not sure what his interest in
it was.
CHAIR BEACH: Well, we had talked
about it early on.
MR. KATZ: Yes.
CHAIR BEACH: Yes. He felt like
there would be enough to continue it, but,
yes, I don't see that. But if I'm going to
report out, I wanted to kind of clarify some
of that.
MR. KATZ: Sure.
CHAIR BEACH: And the
implementation plan, too, if we make changes,
this was approved and voted on by the full

Board, so I'm assuming we'd have to do that again if we decide to make any changes? I guess I'm asking for that.

MR. KATZ: Yes, but I don't think you necessarily need the Board's approval to change your plans. I mean, the Board gave you a broad charter and you came back and gave them a lot of detail, which is sort of unusual. Most Work Groups don't go back to the Board and lay out how they're doing their work like this Work Group has, but you're certainly welcome to update them on your plans.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MR. KATZ: I mean, I think it's a good thing to keep the Board up to date on what your focus is.

CHAIR BEACH: Yes. Well, I kind of inherited some of this, so I guess I was part of the decision-making, but I guess I'm looking for some direction from this Work Group of what our direction should be or are

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

there any future thoughts that anyone might have? Wanda, Phil?

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Go ahead, Wanda.

MEMBER MUNN: An observation, I suppose, there was an original concern about the level of effectiveness of worker outreach from all aspects of the Board and NIOSH activity. I think a fairly good job has been done of not only looking at that, but also documenting. Where we've been, where we wanted to go, and most of the actions that we've specified as being desirable have, in fact, been undertaken and are in process.

It seems that we have not identified any major concern with worker outreach that hasn't been addressed in some way. I agree with Ted that the second bullet can be put to rest, that does not appear to rise to the level of need that an ongoing process would require.

If we have other aspects of this process that are identified as perceived

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

shortcomings, then we certainly can address those at a future date. It's easy enough that we constitute the organizational group here.

But I don't see any new concerns that have not been identified. I think that's the big question; do we have outstanding concerns that haven't been identified? I personally don't see any. I'm content with the course that we've taken here and with the items that we have documented and have moved forward on.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: And I feel that, basically, as far as what ATL, NIOSH, and everybody is doing is pretty good. You know, really, the biggest thing is the lack of ability to go back and look at the comments to see if those things have actually been addressed in some way.

And it seems like to me, that's all come together and it's coming together real well, that that can be researched very easily

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

if somebody wants to know or has a need to know, but I think it's pretty well set in order. We'll need some monitoring every now and then to make sure we're still there.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So should we get into the mission -- well, the mission statement, I don't know if anyone had a chance to look at it. I did and didn't see that it really needed to be updated or modified, but that was just my thought. And what about the actual steps? Did anybody have a chance to go through it and make any judgments or thoughts?

I know we did say we were going to focus on the Objective 3. So I guess, let's just start there. Evaluation Objective 3, determine whether that OCAS, but we know that it's DCAS, giving now is thorough consideration to information received from workers through the worker outreach efforts, incorporating consideration of that material into the work products as appropriate and adequately communicating the impact the

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

substance, comments to workers.

After the Rocky Flat pilot review,
I guess, Ted, I want a little more information
on the bullet we were talking about, and I
think it was -- is it the second to the last
bullet, how is feedback provided to the
workers in response to their comments?

MR. KATZ: Yes. And it also is in that paragraph that you just read, and communicating feedback to the workers on it, and that's, again, those are both elements that are really service elements as opposed to elements of evaluating quality of science and so on.

CHAIR BEACH: So what's changed from when we developed this, then, on that aspect?

MR. KATZ: So, I mean, we just didn't really focus on this, but it's beyond the scope, really, of the Board, and it's beyond the scope of the SC&A contract as an issue, I mean, because SC&A's contract really

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

parrots the Board's charter. And it's not a priority to -- it's a priority for DCAS to be concerned about the quality of the service and education for workers, but that's just not the Board's business.

And as I said, I mean, I think at any point, DCAS can ask the Board for its feedback, input on that matter, but it's not something for the Board to take on its own initiative to evaluate.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So that means we would need to rewrite the objective?

MR. KATZ: So it's just shaving off that last element. I mean, it's not spending the resources to look at the feedback, timeliness, effectiveness of feedback, however that's worded in the paragraph and in the bullet. I mean, that's the only piece. That can just come out.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. We've got determining whether DCAS is giving thorough consideration to information received from

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	workers.
2	MR. KATZ: Right and that's
3	important.
4	CHAIR BEACH: That's okay. Through
5	the worker outreach efforts, so that's
6	important.
7	MR. KATZ: Yes. All that's good.
8	CHAIR BEACH: Incorporating
9	consideration of that material into the work
10	products.
11	MR. KATZ: Right. And that's all
12	exactly on target in terms of what the Board's
13	charge is.
14	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So then the
15	part, as appropriate and adequately
16	communicating the impact of the substance, so
17	that's the section we're talking about.
18	MR. KATZ: Right. It's
19	communicating the impact back to workers. I
20	mean, again, it's not like that's irrelevant
21	for DCAS whatsoever, because I think it's very
22	important for them. It just doesn't fall

1	under the Board's charge.
2	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. I'm waiting
3	for my wordsmither to chime in here, but she's
4	being silent. Okay. So then if we put a
5	period after work products, does that cover
6	it?
7	MR. KATZ: Yes.
8	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So then we get
9	to examine the process by which DCAS and its
10	contractors evaluate worker input.
11	MR. KATZ: Yes.
12	CHAIR BEACH: First bullet, how
13	does DCAS catalog and consider worker input
14	for inclusion into the technical documents,
15	such as Site Profiles, SEC Evaluation Reports.
16	That one's okay?
17	MR. KATZ: Yes.
18	CHAIR BEACH: So maybe we just go
19	through the ones that aren't okay.
20	MS. LIN: Josie, why don't we go
21	through each one.
22	MR. KATZ: I don't have it in front

1	of me.
2	MS. AYERS: Yes, I don't think I
3	do.
4	CHAIR BEACH: You want to? Okay.
5	MS. LIN: Yes.
6	CHAIR BEACH: So the first one's
7	okay. The second one, what criteria are used
8	to identify comments that deserve
9	consideration for a response or action by
10	NIOSH.
11	MR. KATZ: Yes. That's good.
12	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Third bullet.
13	Are the appropriate personnel evaluating the
14	comments received.
15	MR. KATZ: That's still good.
16	CHAIR BEACH: Still good?
17	MR. KATZ: Yes.
18	CHAIR BEACH: Were follow-up
19	discussions held with participants providing
20	substantive comments when necessary?
21	MR. KATZ: That's following up on
22	information they've provided. It's still

probably good. Yes, I have to say, for example, that one that we just mentioned, are the appropriate personnel considering the comments, isn't something that we've looked at.

CHAIR BEACH: Well, that's why I kept hesitating a little bit.

MR. KATZ: Yes. And, I mean, I don't know about Joe's opinion, but at the end of the day, it's really more an issue of -- I mean, they're not going to go dog down who actually considered the particular comments, they're going to dog down were the comments considered taken into account? I mean, regardless of who did it, I mean, so I'm not sure that they're going to --

MR. FITZGERALD: I was thinking that this really spoke to whether some of these issues where the health physicists actually had a chance to decide if the comment was substantive or not, or whether it was just not getting to the technical staff.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. KATZ: Right. No, and then
2	that came up in a discussion as a question.
3	MR. FITZGERALD: And it has come
4	up. Yes, I think that's what that means.
5	MR. KATZ: Right.
6	MR. FITZGERALD: And that has come
7	up.
8	CHAIR BEACH: So does it need to be
9	worded different?
10	MR. KATZ: All I was saying about
11	that is, I don't think we've really made an
12	effort to sleuth out that issue as to whether
13	the information is getting to the health
14	physicist. But given all that's transpired
15	since then, it doesn't seem like that's sort
16	of a front-burner concern.
17	MR. FITZGERALD: Well, as it turns
18	out, it hasn't been. I guess it was a
19	question going in and after having spent all
20	that time with Rocky, I would say we haven't
21	found any instances where, you know, a
22	technical issue wasn't getting to a technical

person. I guess that was the original --MR. KATZ: Right. That was exactly the issue up front, so I'm not sure that it's something that we need to worry about in terms of our sleuthing, because, really, we're just more interested in, were the comments taken into account, regardless of --CHAIR BEACH: So it's okay the way it stands? 10 MR. KATZ: So it could be dropped It's not really being used, is what I'm 11 saying. It wasn't used and isn't being used. 12 13 CHAIR BEACH: Okay. And I was hearing a little bit of --14 15 MS. AYERS: I think the PR-012, 16 of, process kind of addressed it, sort because, like, from the perspective Joe was 17 saying, is it getting to the technical staff 18 19 and that Appendix E, you know, describing how the HPs are the ones that are going to -- then 20 it's going to get on to the SRDB and they're 21

going to need to review it. So I think it

hasn't been ignored. I think it was dealt with through that process. CHAIR BEACH: Yes. So early on, it was more of an issue then. Okay. So we can, what do you think, Wanda, take it out? Phil? MEMBER MUNN: I think it can go out, actually. MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Take it out. CHAIR BEACH: Okay. 10 MEMBER MUNN: But it doesn't seem to gain us anything. 11 CHAIR BEACH: All right. So the 12 13 next bullet is, were follow-up discussions held with participants providing substantive 14 15 comments when, and I say that incorrectly, 16 necessary. And we said that was okay? Because we're asking -- well, that's kind of 17 18 part of that isn't it? 19 MR. KATZ: I mean, I think what's intended, I don't know how much we've done it, 20 but I think what's intended is, if you get 21 some comments that are substantive, and it's

not enough, did someone follow back with that person to get the whole story, or whatever, right? CHAIR BEACH: Right. MR. KATZ: I mean, that's sort of the idea I think. MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. I think that one, in particular, is an important one because some of these issues, at face value, almost necessitate some kind of follow-up just to understand exactly what the problem is. CHAIR BEACH: Right. MR. FITZGERALD: In some cases, that was done very well. In most cases, it done very well, but а lot of questions can't be answered that quickly the first time around. CHAIR BEACH: Okay. And the next bullet, what processes or procedures are in place to ensure that NIOSH is following up on

MR. KATZ: Well, that's still good.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the response action items.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR BEACH: It's still good. And the next bullet, how is feedback provided to the workers in response to their comments.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  KATZ: And that's the part that can drop off.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. And next bullet is, did DCAS conduct research to evaluate substantive comments, you guys understand what I'm saying, by participants and assess their impact on NIOSH documents, processes, and procedures.

MR. KATZ: Yes, and that's good.

CHAIR BEACH: That one's good.

Okay. And then we talk about, conduct a systematic review or worker outreach databases at a point in time in relationship to the impact on technical documents. Select a sample of Site Profiles, SEC Evaluation Reports where worker outreach meetings have been done to document whether and how worker input has been considered and include and evaluate if exclusions were appropriate.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. KATZ: And that's ongoing.
2	We're still doing it. And I think that's sort
3	of the heart of, you know, what this Work
4	Group is doing.
5	MS. LIN: And maybe the Work Group
6	would consider at what point do you have a
7	certain comfort level that you can consider
8	your mission fulfilled.
9	MR. KATZ: Exactly.
10	CHAIR BEACH: At some point.
11	MR. KATZ: Right. So you're going
12	to do the LANL, and after LANL, you may want
13	to re-evaluate, how much more do we need to
14	know
15	CHAIR BEACH: Right,.
16	MR. KATZ: as to, is the system
17	working? Are the trains running
18	CHAIR BEACH: Yes.
19	MR. KATZ: or not?
20	CHAIR BEACH: Absolutely. Okay.
21	So next bullet is, were the action items in
22	OTS or responses in WISPR and the predecessor

1	databases appropriate to the comments
2	received. That is ongoing. Everything's been
3	transferred from WISPR into OTS, right?
4	MEMBER MUNN: Yes, we've been told
5	that's true.
6	CHAIR BEACH: Last meeting, so I
7	guess my question is, can we drop WISPRs off
8	of here or do we just leave it and move on?
9	MR. KATZ: I mean, I think the only
10	thing that remains on that front is
11	development of this new tracking database.
12	CHAIR BEACH: Which is future.
13	That's in the future.
14	MR. KATZ: Yes. You want to stick
15	with that issue, the new tracking, you know,
16	sort of, meta-tracking database that's being
17	developed, tracking system.
18	CHAIR BEACH: So do we want to add
19	that then?
20	MR. KATZ: Yes, I mean, I think
21	that sort of replaces what you've already
22	completed.

1	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. I want to keep
2	the, were the actions in OTIS, because I think
3	we still want to look at that so that anything
4	new, is it being placed in there, and then how
5	would we write it for the
6	MR. KATZ: We don't have a name
7	yet, do we?
8	CHAIR BEACH: No, we don't.
9	MR. KATZ: We don't have a name for
10	the new tracking system for
11	CHAIR BEACH: Future tracking
12	system
13	MR. KATZ: worker comments.
14	CHAIR BEACH: Okay.
15	MS. AYERS: The integrated tracking
16	system.
17	MR. KATZ: Yes.
18	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So next bullet
19	is, were recurrent issues appropriately
20	responded to. That one's Dave's. Were
21	comments applicable to the DOL portion of the
22	process forwarded to DOL for consideration?

MEMBER MUNN: We've discussed that many times and I thought that we had reached the conclusion that it's neither our purview to tell DOL what to do or to point out their shortcomings. I thought we had reached that agreement, perhaps I'm incorrect.

MR. KATZ: Well, I mean, I think what many Work Groups have learned is that, I mean, DCAS does a pretty good job of sending up to DOL and DOE issues as they find them that are germane to -- for example, you know, site definition, you know, period of time, that coverage, and all that. They seem to, essentially, be a pretty solid system.

CHAIR BEACH: So did we have any issues with that, Joe or Lynn, for Rocky or was it just a non -- this last bullet on DOL?

MR. FITZGERALD: There were only a couple of issues which did not deal with the rad portion and I think we actually cited that as saying that I think the issue there was simply -- you know, it was one of these, it's

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

not us; was sort of the response. Well, we thought maybe it would be helpful to, you know, have it conveyed to -- but this is five years ago.

And, you know, again, I think the recognition is, I think, the Board meetings that I've been at, that happens very quickly now because you have the DOL rep sitting right there.

MEMBER MUNN: Right. He's part of the response.

MR. FITZGERALD: So I think, in the beginning, five years ago, it was a legitimate question raised, but I think it's sort of moot now. I think it's happening, sort of like that one other issue we struck. It's happening and I don't think it's a front-burner issue anymore.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So what do you say, drop it, everybody, or leave it? It doesn't matter.

MEMBER MUNN: Well, I don't see

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	that it serves a purpose for us.
2	CHAIR BEACH: I think it's an
3	automatic that it's going to happen.
4	MEMBER MUNN: Yes. Current
5	framework of process.
6	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So that is
7	Objective 3. How about any additions that we
8	want to make to 3 based on the last pilot? Is
9	there anything that and, Joe, maybe you can
10	give us any ideas?
11	MR. FITZGERALD: Well, the context
12	of Objective 3, you know, I think there's
13	enough there. I mean, it's really the
14	manifest reflection of input in the written
15	documents. And I think, you know, we're
16	familiar with that. That's the main course of
17	this review. So I think that's enough.
18	CHAIR BEACH: Okay.
19	MR. FITZGERALD: The rest of it's
20	really, you know, how do you get there, you
21	know, process-wise? And I think, there again,
22	we have some experience in that. So I think

we have enough in that objective. A lot of these bullets are really just, sort of, guideposts, things that I think the Work Group thought at the time would be bases to touch in doing the review.

But, you know, now that we've been there, we know what bases are important and which ones are less important, so I think that's what you're doing. You're whittling it down a little bit.

MEMBER MUNN: They were items to look at.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. Right.

CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So what's your thoughts on the rest of this? Start with Objective 1, go through it, or are we good with what we have? And then, Ted, do I need to type this up again or can I have SC&A do it for the changes? Is that something I'll need to do?

MR. KATZ: No, you don't need to do it. SC&A can do that, or I can do that,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

anybody, but we can get that done. If SC&A is willing to whittle that down, yes.

CHAIR BEACH: So I can make the

changes and send it. Okay. Because, you know, it's DCAS instead of OCAS and those all need to be changed.

MR. KATZ: So is there anything left to do under Item 1?

CHAIR BEACH: Well, the issuance of PROC-012, I think, took care of --

MR. KATZ: That's all taken care of.

CHAIR BEACH: -- most of 1. I guess we should go through and check. So determine whether DCAS is taking appropriate measures to solicit worker input into Site Profiles, SEC petitions, evaluations, and other technical documents. How about if you just review, instead of me reading every one of these, just see if there's anything that we still have left to do? Because I think most of these bullets are now covered under PROC-

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

012.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. KATZ: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: If I can offer, I think, you know, 1 and 2, this was directed to the policy, primarily --

MR. KATZ: Right.

MR. FITZGERALD: -- and now with the policy work pretty much in hand, a lot of this wording is suggesting implementation, which, you know, if you're going to go to worker outreach meetings, for example, or you're going to see what comes out of the development of this tracking system --

CHAIR BEACH: Sure.

FITZGERALD: -- you're really looking how things actually at are implemented. So you're moving from, really, policy looking at the side to implementation side, so that's 1 and 2 become.

CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: And it sounds like you're already equipping yourselves to look at

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the outcomes. You know, as things get implemented, you're going to be going to meetings, looking at the tracking system, doing things like that, which, now that PR-012 is pretty well set, it's more, how is PR-012 being implemented and how is the tracking system being done.

I mean, it's all looking at results rather than policy.

MEMBER MUNN: Is it working well?

Yes. It's set up now.

CHAIR BEACH: Well, some of this deals in, 1, deals with the OTS scheduling and notification system; is it adequate? And I guess, just the ongoing review of sites like LANL will take us into the OTS at some point there.

MR. KATZ: Yes. I think Objective 3 ends up being, you know, the game. I mean, I think 1 and 2 you sort of put to bed and as, sort of Joe was saying, on a policy level and it's execution comes out under 3. So I think

### NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	3 is really what's left of I haven't read 4
2	yet.
3	And 4, too, you've looked at a lot
4	of the communication vehicles. I mean, I'm
5	sure this Work Group would be kept abreast as
6	major changes are made, but you've looked at
7	the most recent improvements.
8	CHAIR BEACH: Well, 4 really gets
9	us just into the ten-year review; a lot of
10	what's happening there, doesn't it?
11	MR. KATZ: I was just thinking, for
12	example, they had shared with you improvements
13	in the letters to claimants and
14	CHAIR BEACH: Right.
15	MR. KATZ: And the rest of it is,
16	yes, quality of service.
17	CHAIR BEACH: Yes. Which I know I
18	Xed out the last three bullets just because
19	MR. KATZ: Yes. So I think 3 is
20	the game. I mean, this could be whittled down
21	to Objective 3.

CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

1	MR. KATZ: And you could report out
2	on what you've accomplished on the other
3	objectives.
4	CHAIR BEACH: Yes. Looks like I
5	have some work to do.
6	MR. KATZ: Well, I think it'll be
7	easy once Joe culls down this plan to its
8	remaining element.
9	CHAIR BEACH: Yes. Okay.
10	MR. KATZ: Are you good? Oh, were
11	you wondering about
12	MS. AYERS: No. I just wasn't
13	following what you were saying there.
14	MR. KATZ: Oh, I was just saying,
15	once these four objectives are pulled down to
16	one, which is Objective 3, I mean, you'll
17	have, sort of, the story.
18	CHAIR BEACH: So you're talking
19	about the scope and the
20	MR. KATZ: So 1, 2, and 4 are,
21	basically, you guys have knocked that off
22	CHAIR BEACH: Right.

MR. KATZ: -- to the extent you will, and your work will be focused on 3, and you can, I think, let the Board know that and the current plan with LANL. CHAIR BEACH: Okay. MR. FITZGERALD: And it might just be, sort of, an overview of implementation. You know, LANL is certainly one facet, but, you know, just even talking about things like 10 the tracking system is another facet, it's slightly different, but those are all facets 11 the look implementation 12 at effective that is. 13 CHAIR BEACH: Yes. 15 MR. So you could FITZGERALD: 16 certainly couch it in the context of looking at implementation as opposed to --17 18 CHAIR BEACH: Okay. 19 MR. KATZ: Well, did we already report out on Rocky Flats, what we learned 20 from Rocky Flats? 21

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

No.

CHAIR BEACH:

14

MR. KATZ: So that would be a piece of the report too. CHAIR BEACH: Yes. That's a piece of that. We were waiting for NIOSH's piece of it. MR. KATZ: Yes. That's right. CHAIR BEACH: And I don't think we're getting anything else on Rocky Flats, is that what I'm hearing? 10 MR. FITZGERALD: I think so. 11 CHAIR BEACH: Okay. All right. So we have future plans. So other than what 12 13 we've discussed today, is there any other future plans that -- next steps for worker 14 15 outreach? I don't think we can actually set 16 up meeting right now. MR. KATZ: Until we hear back from 17 Joe on new protocol for the next. 18 19 CHAIR BEACH: And so we'll do that via email. We probably won't even need a 20 phone call for that, will we, do you think, to 21 move forward on the second part of --22

1	MR. KATZ: No. We may not even
2	need the phone call. If there are issues, it
3	just depends on, after Joe's done his digging,
4	what the issues are. If Joe thinks there are
5	real issues to discuss, we'll set up a
6	teleconference.
7	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. I think if
8	you decide if it's something that would
9	benefit from a call versus written comments or
10	it might be written comments would be
11	sufficient.
12	MR. KATZ: Right.
13	MR. FITZGERALD: And red-line mark
14	it. That kind of thing. We'll see how it
15	goes.
16	MR. KATZ: Great.
17	CHAIR BEACH: Okay.
18	MS. LIN: I was just coming to the
19	distribution of
20	MR. KATZ: No.
20	MR. KATZ: No.  CHAIR BEACH: In the future? Okay.

1	I think we've got a future mapped out.
2	MEMBER MUNN: Pretty well
3	identified, I think.
4	CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Well, then I
5	will call this meeting adjourned, if there's
6	no disagreement.
7	MR. KATZ: Thank you.
8	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
9	matter went off the record at 2:33 p.m.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
2.2	