UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

+ + + + +

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

109th MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 20, 2016

+ + + + +

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

PRESENT:

JAMES M. MELIUS, Chairman

JOSIE BEACH, Member

BRADLEY P. CLAWSON, Member

R. WILLIAM FIELD, Member

DAVID KOTELCHUCK, Member

JAMES E. LOCKEY, Member

WANDA I. MUNN, Member

JOHN W. POSTON, SR., Member

GENEVIEVE S. ROESSLER, Member

LORETTA R. VALERIO, Member

PAUL L. ZIEMER, Member

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official

REGISTERED AND/OR PUBLIC COMMENT PARTICIPANTS:

ADAMS, NANCY, NIOSH Contractor AL-NABULSI, ISAF, DOE BAGRIER, HARRY BAKER, STEVE BARTON, BOB, SC&A BEHLING, KATHY, SC&A FITZGERALD, JOE, SC&A FROWISS, ALBERT HINNEFELD, STU, DCAS KOTSCH, JEFF, DOL LIN, JENNY, HHS MAURO, JOHN, SC&A OSTROW, STEVE, SC&A NETON, JIM, DCAS RAMSPOTT, JOHN RUTHERFORD, LAVON, DCAS STIVER, JOHN, SC&A TAULBEE, TIM, DCAS

Contents

ROLL CALL	4
Idaho National Laboratory SEC	6
SEC Petition Status Update	7
Update from Workgroups and Subcommittees 19	9
Dose Reconstruction Committee 20	0
Rocky Flats Work Group 23	1
Plans for the March 2016 Board Meeting 24	4

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 11:01 a.m. MR. KATZ: Let us begin with roll call. 3 And, okay, a couple things to note before I get 4 started with that. The agenda's online on the 5 6 Advisory Board section of the NIOSH web site under 7 today's meetings or meetings, today's date. people who want to see the agenda can follow on 8 9 there. One sort of minor change to the agenda, 10 11 we have the Idaho National Laboratory SEC petition on the agenda, and we noted this to petitioners in 12 1.3 How much discussion that was to get advance. depended on our Work Group meeting which we just 14 15 had, and the Work Group meeting -- there's more work to be done, to be short about it, and Josie, who 16 17 chaired that meeting, will give everybody and 18 update. And so we won't have an action on that SEC 19 for this teleconference. I just want to make that 20 clear up front. ROLL CALL 21 22 And then let's get on with roll call.

1	And I'll just do it alphabetically because it's
2	easiest. The only conflict of interest for the
3	agenda is Brad Clawson for INL.
4	(Roll call.)
5	MR. KATZ: Okay. Very good. That
6	takes care of roll call.
7	The other thing I'll just take care of
8	before I hand it over to Dr. Melius, the Chair, is
9	just registering the absentee votes from the
10	November Board meeting.
11	In November the Board acted on two SEC
12	petitions, one for Battelle Laboratory, King
13	Avenue in Columbus, Ohio and one for Kansas City
14	Plant, Kansas City, Missouri. And the final votes
15	came in from absentee Members on January 5th. The
16	absentee Members for part or both of those actions
17	were Dr. Lockey, Dr. Lemen, Dr. Richardson, Dr.
18	Poston and Dr. Roessler.
19	And the final vote tallies for those
20	actions, for Battelle it was 15 to 0, in other words
21	unanimous and complete for extending that SEC
22	Class, which is all Atomic Weapons Employees who

1	worked at the facility owned by Battelle
2	Laboratories at the King Avenue site in Columbus,
3	Ohio from '56 to '70. And there's more verbiage
4	to go with that.
5	And the vote for Kansas City Plant was
6	15 in favor of the action, 1 against, which was Dr.
7	Lemen, one abstention, Dr. Richardson. And the
8	action was in support of the NIOSH recommendation
9	that dose reconstructions are feasible for all
10	workers at this facility. So the Secretary is not
11	recommended to designate an SEC Class for that
12	facility.
13	And that completes those actions. And
14	I'll turn this over to Dr. Melius.
15	Idaho National Laboratory SEC
16	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thanks, Ted.
17	The first item on our agenda is an update on Idaho
18	National Laboratory, and Josie Beach has been sort
19	of the acting chair of that Work Group, so I'll turn
20	over to Josie for a
21	MEMBER BEACH: Okay, Jim.
22	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Go ahead.

1	MEMBER BEACH: Okay. Thank you.
2	Yes, I do have a summary progress update to give
3	out, or give to you.
4	So the initial Class Definition for the
5	chemical processing plant, CPP, at the Idaho
6	National Laboratory, INL, for the period of 1963
7	to 1974 was proposed by NIOSH to the Advisory Board
8	on March 26th of 2015, and it read: "All employees
9	of the Department of Energy, its predecessor
10	agencies and their contractors and subcontractors
11	who worked at the Idaho National Laboratory in
12	Scoville, Idaho and were monitored for external
13	radiation at the Idaho Chemical Processing Plant,
14	CPP, e.g., had at least one film badge or TLD
15	dosimeter from CPP between January 1st, 1963 and
16	December 31st, 1974 for a number of work days
17	aggregating at least 250 days occurring either
18	solely under this employment or in combination with
19	work days within the parameters established for one
20	or more Classes of employees in the Special
21	Exposure Cohort."
22	During the review of that initial

report both NIOSH and SC&A identified issues regarding the state of current claimant dosimetry records necessary to adjudicate the proposed Definition. To allow for further evaluation, additional data capture was undertaken to obtain necessary dosimetry files mainly related to the construction workers at CPP.

NIOSH modified the Class Definition in July of 2015 to effectively split the proposed Class into two separate periods with different requirements, and that reads: dosimetry "All emplovees of the Department of Energy, its predecessor agencies and their contractors and subcontractors who worked at the Idaho National Laboratory, INL, in Scoville, Idaho and (A) who were monitored for external radiation at Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, CPP, they had at least one badge or TLD dosimeter from CPP between January 1st, 1963 and February 28th, 1970; or (B) who were monitored for external radiation at INL and with at least one film badge or TLD between March 1st, 1970 and December 31st, 1974 for a number of work

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

days aggregating at least 250 days occurring either solely under this employment or in combination with work days within the parameters established for one or more other Classes of employees in the Special Exposure Cohort."

Specifically, a single external monitoring result directly related to CPP was required for the period of 1963 through February 1970 with the remaining period, March 1970 through 1974, only requiring evidence of external dosimetry at the site.

NIOSH and SEC evaluated in tandem the revised Class Definition by reviewing the adequacy and completeness of badging records stipulating work locations for INL claimants in the NOCTS database with findings of these evaluations delivered to the INL Work Group in August and September 2015, respectively. As a result of both evaluations it was determined that there were 18 claims that lacked a clear records basis requiring additional data capture at INL to provide sufficient evidence of work location in either CPP

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2 These selected claims were discussed at both the Work Group and Full Advisory Board 3 meetinas in November of 2015. Additional 5 supplemental records were received directly from 6 INL throughout December of 2015 as they became 7 available. The final supplemental data search was transmitted from the U.S. Department of Energy, 8 9 DOE, and uploaded on December 30th, 2015. At that time NIOSH determined that there were still 10 11 three claimants warranting another search of available records at INL the week of January 4th, 12 1.3 2016. During that site visit NIOSH discovered 14 15 that there were a set of visitor cards and temporary 16 film badge reports that had not been catalogued and 17 therefore were not recognized and compiled by DOE 18 during the supplemental data request from the fall of 2015. 19 20 INL Work Group met via teleconference on January 15th, 2016 to discover the current 21 22 status of the Special Exposure Cohort, SEC, Class

or not CPP.

At that meeting a number of issues 1 Definition. 2 were raised by the Work Group Members regarding the latest round of records evaluation in support of 3 the proposed SEC Class Definition. The following I'll list: 5 The completeness and adequacy of the 6 7 recently discovered records, the INL visitor cards and temporary film badges. NIOSH reported that it 8 9 would be difficult to validate their completeness 10 without a secondary index or database to which to 11 compare. 12 Second, reliance on subjective 13 judgments based on weight of evidence to determine worker location where definitive locations records 14 15 are lacking. NIOSH indicated that it is difficult 16 to prove a negative and that such judgments are 17 common and supportable for dose reconstruction. 18 And third, discrepancies in spelling of names on temporary badge records and 19 20 absence of other identifiers such as Social 21 It is not clear if it would be Security numbers. 22 feasible to correct or accredit erroneous name

entries so that no badge records are missed. 1 2 The Work Group has scheduled face-to-face meeting in Cincinnati for the INL Work 3 Group; it's scheduled for March 1st, 2016, advance of the Advisory Board meeting later in 5 6 March to discuss these and other issues concerning 7 the status of the proposed SEC Class Definition, as well as any additional results from ongoing 8 9 evaluations of the most recent supplemental 10 records data capture. 11 One comment I did get that I'm going to 12 go ahead and read out is from Gen. And she thought 13 that it would be important at that time during our March 1st meeting to discuss whether there is a 14 15 level of completeness and adequacy in the records 16 that can be accepted. This is something that the 17 Work Group is going to have to discuss. The Board 18 Members are going to have to think about that as 19 well. The Work Group, NIOSH and SC&A agreed 20 21 during our discussions on Friday that 100 percent 22 certainty in the records is not possible, so we're

1	going to have to come to some decisions there.
2	And, Jim, that's my report.
3	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thank you,
4	Josie.
5	MEMBER BEACH: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any questions or
7	Josie's report?
8	(No audible response)
9	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I would just add that
10	it is something that we're going to bring back to
11	the Board at the March meeting and we'll schedule
12	more extensive time and give people time to read
13	the various background reports and so forth. It's
14	a complicated situation to go through and we didn't
15	feel it could be dealt with easily on the phone.
16	And plus, the Work Group wasn't ready to really make
17	a recommendation yet. In fact, we had just gotten
18	some of the reports of information a couple of days
19	before our Work Group meeting, not from lack of
20	effort on the part of NIOSH and SC&A, but just
21	timing issues and access issues there. So you will
22	hear more about this at our March meeting.

1	MEMBER BEACH: So, Jim, I did forget to
2	mention also; this would be part of the report, we
3	are going back to Idaho next week. Most of us will
4	be there bright and early Monday morning. Some of
5	you from the East Coast might be a little late. But
6	we are planning another round of interviews and
7	data capture.
8	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
9	MEMBER BEACH: So that is happening.
10	MR. KATZ: Right. And this is Ted.
11	Let me just also add that I'll get the court
12	reporter, who's on the line, but the company to
13	expedite the transcript from that March 1 Work
14	Group meeting so that all the Board Members have
15	that in hand as well. I think that would be
16	helpful.
17	MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I think it would be
18	helpful, too. And it will be out, I'm sure, the
19	Friday
20	(Simultaneous speaking)
21	MR. KATZ: Oh, of course. I mean, that
22	should be ready in any event.

1	MEMBER BEACH: Yes.
2	MR. KATZ: But I mean, the March 1 is
3	actually a shorter time frame than the contract for
4	the transcripts.
5	MEMBER BEACH: Yes.
6	MR. KATZ: But they have a means of
7	expediting these.
8	MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I just wanted to
9	add that that would be an important one to review
10	also.
11	MR. KATZ: Sure.
12	MEMBER BEACH: Thanks, Ted.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: Josie, I have a
14	question. This is Ziemer.
15	MEMBER BEACH: Okay.
16	MEMBER ZIEMER: I just wanted to follow
17	up. Maybe this question should go to NIOSH, but
18	I know that Tim Taulbee mentioned those 18 claims
19	that they were going to follow up when he reported
20	at the meeting in November. Now, what are the
21	status did I miss what's the status of those
22	18 claims that they were following up on?

1	MEMBER BEACH: I can answer that, but,
2	Tim, did you want to just go ahead and summarize?
3	And then Bob, if Bob's on the phone, he could
4	summarize as well. Those have all been rectified.
5	MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, they have? Okay.
6	That's what I wondered.
7	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, that
8	information was available for the worker, but there
9	is a redacted report that is out. It actually came
10	out last Friday, the day of our meeting, our Work
11	Group meeting, that has some of this information.
12	There's a lot of Privacy Act issues with giving some
13	of the details in there, but there is a redacted
14	report out that should be available on the web site
15	now that has that information.
16	MR. KATZ: Yes, I can circulate that to
17	the rest of the Board. I can do that now after the
18	meeting.
19	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, that's fine. I
20	just wondered what the status was. I didn't need
21	the specifics right now.

CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, and there's

1	also a non-redacted report that I assume will still
2	be available on
3	MEMBER BEACH: K: drive.
4	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, on the K: drive.
5	Yes. Try and remember my alphabet.
6	(Laughter)
7	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: So, but thank you.
8	Okay. Next item on our agenda is the
9	highlight of our meeting, as always. LaVon
10	Rutherford.
11	SEC Petition Status Update
12	MR. RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Dr.
13	Melius. This is LaVon Rutherford. I will give a
14	brief update on what we've got planned for March.
15	We only have a couple of new Evaluation
16	Reports to present at the March Advisory Board
17	meeting. We'll be presenting Argonne National Lab
18	West. That's a Class that's evaluated from 1951
19	to 1979, all workers. That Evaluation Report is
20	in internal review and on schedule to be released
21	to the Board about a month before the scheduled
22	meeting.

1	The other report is Lawrence Livermore
2	National Lab, and that Class is all employees from
3	1974 to 1995. And that report is scheduled to go
4	through internal review later this week, but we
5	expect to have that report to the Board sometime
6	about a month before the March meeting.
7	But those are the only two reports that
8	we plan to present for the March meeting. And no
9	addenda, no other reports are planned. Any
10	questions?
11	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: LaVon, we did hear
12	you say 30 days, correct?
13	MR. RUTHERFORD: Excuse me? Yes,
14	about
15	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
16	MR. RUTHERFORD: Each report will be
17	out about a month before, or 30 days before the
18	March meeting. So both the Lawrence Livermore
19	National Lab and the Argonne National Lab West
20	reports will be out about 30 days prior to the
21	meeting.
22	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Any

1	questions for LaVon?
2	(No audible response)
3	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: If not, we'll move on
4	to Subcommittee and Work Group reports. And we do
5	this by volunteer. Why don't we start with
6	Subcommittee? Wanda?
7	Update from Workgroups and Subcommittees
8	MEMBER MUNN: Okay. This is Wanda.
9	Our Procedures Subcommittee has not met for several
10	months. We are scheduled to meet on February the
11	24th. That's a Wednesday. So at the end of next
12	months.
13	We have a number of carryover items from
14	our last meeting. And Kathy has provided us with
15	a list of active findings which shows that we have
16	total active findings right of about 50. We will
17	be addressing some of those, but only those that
18	we have already addressed in one way or another.
19	So we'll have a better report for you when we meet
20	in March.
21	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thank you.
22	Dave Kotelchuck?

1	Dose Reconstruction Committee
2	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Dose
3	Reconstruction Review?
4	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
5	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: We last met on
6	December 1st and we discussed the blind reviews in
7	more and in great detail, the draft report to the
8	HHS Secretary. That took most of the meeting.
9	There were a number of pieces of data that we wanted
10	to gather, for example, on female employment and
11	female claims in the report. That has been put
12	together by various folks in NIOSH and SC&A and
13	ORAU.
14	So I am working on that report now and
15	I hope to finish the revisions by this weekend. So
16	I'm hoping that we can get this out to the Board
17	within the week and folks will have plenty of time
18	to look it over and make suggestions on that draft
19	at the March meeting.
20	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And we will schedule
21	time for doing that, but if people could try to get
22	any comments into Dave beforehand also
23	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Very good.

1	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: and share them I
2	think with the rest of the Board so we understand
3	the significant concerns people may have about the
4	report.
5	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Right.
6	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: The draft. Good.
7	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Good.
8	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thank you, Dave.
9	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yes. We are
10	meeting also on just to say our next meeting is
11	February 10th.
12	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
13	Rocky Flats Work Group
14	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: That's Rocky
15	Flats. Pardon me. Pardon me. We have our
16	meeting scheduled for our next meeting
17	scheduled. Let me look it up.
18	MEMBER BEACH: It's February 10th,
19	Dave.
20	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: It is February
21	10th?
22	MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

1	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay. I thought I
2	had confused it with the Rocky Flats meeting.
3	Okay.
4	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. Thanks.
5	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any Work Group
7	chairs wish to make reports?
8	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Well, Dave again.
9	Maybe on Rocky Flats. We do not have a meeting of
10	the Work Group scheduled. LaVon and NIOSH folks
11	have done an updated report on tritium. They have
12	written a draft of a response letter to the
13	claimants, and we are fundamentally waiting for
14	data on the critical mass lab. LaVon and we had
15	hoped that he would be able to go over the data in
16	January, but unfortunately it will not be available
17	until February. So that is delaying our final
18	decision on Rocky Flats. As soon as we get the
19	critical mass lab data and have an update on that,
20	we will schedule a Rocky Flats meeting.
21	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thanks, Dave.
22	LaVon, do you have anything to add?

1	MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, I would like to
2	add that the February trip is actually just a data
3	capture trip itself. It was originally scheduled
4	for January. The site was unable to support us
5	until February. So we'll go through the documents
6	in February. I think Ron Buchanan with SC&A is
7	planning on attending. And we'll go through that
8	data, pick what we want. And then it will be up
9	to get the site to release that information. So
LO	I wouldn't expect that information to be released
L1	until February, but I do expect that we will be able
L2	to get the report updated and have a Work Group
L3	meeting prior to the following Board meeting in
L 4	August.
L 5	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Good. Yes,
L 6	no, I also read it. Ted and I were corresponding
L 7	yesterday and I sort had heard some of that. So
L 8	we'll not be able to talk about Rocky Flats in the
L 9	March meeting.
20	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: No.
21	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any other Work Group
22	chairs with updates?

1	(No audible response)
2	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Between the holidays
3	and the last meeting wasn't that long ago, so
4	I don't think we've had that many meetings or
5	anything to update.
6	Plans for the March 2016 Board Meeting
7	So, okay. If not, then the next item
8	on our agenda is the next meeting. So, Ted, do you
9	want to
10	(Simultaneous speaking)
11	MR. KATZ: Sure. Let me just update
12	you all on where and how things like for that. It's
13	a little bit out still.
14	But we're planning to meet. They're
15	pinning down a hotel. CDC's pinning down a hotel
16	right around now, actually, for the Tampa area. So
17	it will be there. And to remind everyone, the
18	dates we're looking at are March 23rd-24th.
19	The agenda as it looks right now is
20	about a day-and-a-half, depending on how things
21	hold up. We have all the usual business.
22	We'll have a session on NIOSH dose

reconstruction reviews, the methods issue. 1 2 then we'll need to add to that some time also to the report to the Secretary on dose 3 discuss reconstructions. So those two go nicely together. 4 As LaVon mentioned, we have Lawrence 5 6 Livermore SEC and Argonne National Laboratory 7 Those are new presentations from NIOSH for the Board. 8 expect, I 9 And then we think, 10 Pinellas Site Profile review to be completed then. We hope for it to be so we have some time for that. 11 Idaho National Laboratory, of course, 12 which we've discussed today. That will be on the 1.3 agenda. 14 15 And then one that is a little bit more 16 uncertain at this point because we don't yet have the SC&A report in hand to know what kind of slog 17 18 that will be for the Work Group, but as you recall 19 we've had a Carborundum SEC. The Board acted on 20 part of it and there's a piece remaining, I think 21 the residual period. And SC&A is doing a review. 22 It's just about finished with that. So that should

1	be coming to the Board soon and the Work Group, but
2	then the Work Group will have to work through
3	whatever material is there, issues to resolve for
4	that.
5	So at this point have that scratched in
6	tentatively on the agenda. Whether it survives or
7	not depends on how much work there is for the Work
8	Group to do, and how quickly they can get it done.
9	And that covers what I expect for Tampa.
10	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Which is probably
11	more important for the Board Members is that we're
12	estimating that to be about a day-and-a-half
13	meeting.
14	MR. KATZ: Right.
15	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: So all day on the
16	23rd and half a day on the 24th.
17	MR. KATZ: Right. Correct.
18	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: If that helps people
19	in terms of the planning and so forth.
20	Any questions on that or anything to add
21	or subtract from the agenda?
22	(No audible response)

1	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. If not, I
2	don't think we have any further business today.
3	Thank you, everybody, for
4	(Simultaneous speaking)
5	MEMBER CLAWSON: Hey, Jim?
6	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
7	MEMBER CLAWSON: This is Brad. I was
8	just wondering from the NIOSH standpoint of Sam
9	Glover's sites, I was wondering who's kind of
10	replacing him on some of these sites.
11	MR. HINNEFELD: This is Stu. I'll see
12	if I can remember. Lawrence Livermore is going to
13	be Mark Rolfes. Hanford is going to be Chuck
14	Nelson. Let's see, where else do we have him
15	involved?
16	MR. RUTHERFORD: Sandia National Labs
17	are both Chuck Nelson.
18	MR. HINNEFELD: Okay.
19	MEMBER CLAWSON: Who's got Los Alamos
20	and Sandia?
21	MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, Los Alamos
22	National Lab is Greg Macievic.

1	MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay.
2	MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, the Sandias are
3	Chuck Nelson.
4	MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. So that will
5	be Chuck Nelson? Okay. Yes, I just wanted to know
6	who the point of contact kind of was.
7	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thanks, Brad.
8	Anything else from again, if not, we'll see
9	everybody in the Tampa area in March or at Work
10	Group or Subcommittee meetings in between.
11	MEMBER BEACH: Sounds good.
12	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thank you, all, and
13	enjoy the rest of the winter.
14	MR. KATZ: Thanks, everybody.
15	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
16	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
17	went off the record at 11:32 a.m.)