# THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

# CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

#### convenes the

SUBCOMMITTEE FOR DOSE RECONSTRUCTION REVIEW MEETING 1

#### ADVISORY BOARD ON

#### RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

The verbatim transcript of the Subcommittee Meeting of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health held in Naperville, Illinois on December 11, 2006.

# <u>C O N T E N T S</u> December 11, 2006

WELCOME AND OPENING COMMENTS DR. LEWIS WADE, DFO	6
SEVENTH SET OF CASES	7
SELECTION OF CASES	39
COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	81

#### TRANSCRIPT LEGEND

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

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

- -- (sic) denotes an incorrect usage or pronunciation of a word which is transcribed in its original form as reported.
- -- (phonetically) indicates a phonetic spelling of the word if no confirmation of the correct spelling is available.
- -- "uh-huh" represents an affirmative response, and "uh-uh" represents a negative response.
- -- "\*" denotes a spelling based on phonetics, without reference available.
- -- (inaudible)/ (unintelligible) signifies speaker failure, usually failure to use a microphone.

# PARTICIPANTS

(By Group, in Alphabetical Order)

#### BOARD MEMBERS

# EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

WADE, Lewis, Ph.D.
Senior Science Advisor
National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Washington, DC

#### MEMBERSHIP

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

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

Miamisburg, Ohio

GRIFFON, Mark A.

President

Creative Pollution Solutions, Inc.

Salem, New Hampshire

MUNN, Wanda I.

Senior Nuclear Engineer (Retired)

Richland, Washington

PRESLEY, Robert W.

Special Projects Engineer

BWXT Y12 National Security Complex

Clinton, Tennessee

# IDENTIFIED PARTICIPANTS

BEHLING, HANS, SC&A BEHLING, KATHY, SC&A HINNEFELD, STUART, NIOSH HOMOKI-TITUS, LIZ, HHS MAURO, JOHN, SC&A

#### PROCEEDINGS

1 (11:10 a.m.)

# WELCOME AND OPENING COMMENTS

# DR. LEWIS WADE, DFO

DR. WADE: We'll now begin. This now is a meeting of the Subcommittee for Dose Reconstruction. This will be the first meeting of the Subcommittee for Dose Reconstruction.

There was a Subcommittee for Dose Reconstruction and Site Profile Review. That subcommittee has now been replaced by this Subcommittee for Dose Reconstruction Review.

The subcommittee is chaired by Mark Griffon.

Its members include Mike Gibson, Dr. Poston and Wanda Munn.

Dr. Poston, are you on the line?

(No response)

Dr. Poston is not with us. Brad Clawson is listed first as an alternate, so Brad will be at the table as a voting member of the subcommittee for this meeting. We're waiting for Wanda Munn to join us, and then all of the subcommittee members, with Brad acting as an alternate for Poston, will be present.

MR. HINNEFELD: She's on the phone -- she's on a phone call.

DR. WADE: Okay, Wanda's on a phone call and should join us in a moment. Mark, if you want to begin.

### SEVENTH SET OF CASES

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GRIFFON: Sure. Okay, I think we've got a very -- very short time for the subcommittee today so two primary things we want to discuss and the first thing on the agenda is the seventh set of cases. And we have in your -in your binders NIOSH has provided two sets of selected cases. The first set -- the first six pages include cases where, to the best of their ability, they've determined that it was full internal and external. And we've been through this -- this discussion of how they classify before. It's not -- not certain, but it's the best they can pull from the database. The additional column, I did talk to Stu in between meetings and one additional field was added, I believe. Right, Stu? This is the final field here, the date the DR was approved. We had asked to get some indication of when these DRs were approved so we could better

1	determine if we were going to look at some of
2	the old TIBs that were outdated and and have
3	since been replaced.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: That's correct, and this is the
5	date that the draft dose reconstruction was
6	approved, and so that would reflect that the
7	TIBs and the technical documents in effect at
8	that time, as opposed to a you know, a final
9	as being sent to DOL or something. That may
10	happen quite a bit later. So these are the
11	dates that the draft dose reconstruction was
12	approved.
13	MR. GRIFFON: Now the these aren't sorted by
14	date approved, are they, these cases we got
15	provided or anything, they're sorted
16	MR. HINNEFELD: No, they're sorted by date
17	approved.
18	MR. GRIFFON: They're sorted by date approved.
19	They are sorted by
20	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
21	MR. GRIFFON: date approved.
22	MR. HINNEFELD: The most recently approved
23	MR. GRIFFON: Okay.
24	MR. HINNEFELD: is on top.
25	MR. GRIFFON: Most recent to okay.

1	MR. HINNEFELD: Good.
2	MR. GRIFFON: All right. And then the second
3	cases are randomly second handout we have is
4	a random selection of of 200, so the random
5	selection's eight pages long and it's 200
6	MR. HINNEFELD: Correct.
7	MR. GRIFFON: cases? Okay. And And the
8	first set is is six pages long. How I
9	think you told me on the phone or in an e-mail,
10	is it like 250 cases as best estimates at this
11	point? These are all
12	MR. HINNEFELD: It's going to be about 230.
13	MR. GRIFFON: 230?
14	MR. HINNEFELD: Yeah.
15	MR. GRIFFON: And this is the balance,
16	basically, of what you have in
17	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
18	MR. GRIFFON: of adjudicated cases.
19	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, of adjudicated cases that
20	are identified best estimates that have not
21	already been selected by the Board for review.
22	The 120 cases that were selected in the first
23	six sets have been excluded from both lists.
24	MR. GRIFFON: Okay. I guess, you know, in
25	terms of going forward and selecting cases, a

24

25

couple of -- some of the discussion I had with Stu on the phone was, you know, other than this date of approval -- which I think is certainly an important factor in helping us decide what cases we want -- there may be other factors that -- that are not readily available in NOCTS. They're -- they're factors that you sort of have to open the case up to find out, such as, you know, if -- if you have -- well, if you have a Hanford case and -- and we randomly select them and they're all from the 300 area, you know, then we're -- we're probably not getting a -- a good distribution of what we might want to look at. The other criteria I was thinking of is, you know, in terms of there's certain TIBs that are used fairly often or certain site-specific TIBs, and we may want to look at application of certain TIBs. And if we don't open a case, we may -- we may think that a certain case, given that it's a certain site, would use a certain TIB. But until we open it up, we don't see whether it relies on one TIB or another TIB, you know, but --

MR. HINNEFELD: That's correct, and we don't

have a handy -- you know, automatic way to identify that in the database.

MR. GRIFFON: Right, right. So I -- I -- I guess part of -- part of what we were -- you know, we were discussing was how can we best go forward with our sampling without doing a lot of treading over the same ground, getting the same types of cases, but -- but also, you know, we want to keep in mind that this is an audit process, that we're looking as an overall audit function.

So I don't know if anybody has any thoughts on how -- how best to proceed. Part of my concern on going too far is that -- you know, I -- I think we need to explore the -- the parameters we want to get at a little farther before we just start selecting audit cases that may be redundant. That's my concern here. So --

DR. WADE: Could -- could -- John Mauro, could you speak to us briefly as to -- give us a sense of the timing and the needs from your review point of view. Where are you, when do you need to hear from the subcommittee on the seventh, eighth, ninth --

DR. MAURO: Sure. We're in the middle of the

1 sixth set of cases. I would say we're probably not going to achieve -- get to the point where 2 3 we're clear of that and ready for the next set 4 -- six weeks, that -- on that order, when we --5 will be good to have -- to get that started, so let's -- let's plan on if we had the list six 6 7 weeks from now, that would be very --8 DR. WADE: Early February the Board meets 9 again, the subcommittee will meet again. 10 MR. GRIFFON: And we also have a phone call 11 Board meeting in there, yeah. 12 DR. WADE: Right, and could do a subcommittee. 13 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 14 Would it be -- so I guess you don't DR. WADE: 15 have to decide today is what we're hearing. 16 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 17 DR. WADE: There is an opportunity for you in January to -- you know, you could sharpen your 18 19 focus now and then make your selection and --20 MR. GRIFFON: That's what I -- my -- my 21 preference right now is -- is -- is to have 22 some dialogue on what we think about our 23 sampling approach, what para-- what parameters 24 we need to -- to better -- to enhance our 25 audit, and then save -- you know, hold off on

1 the actual selection of cases right now, but 2 bring -- bring these criteria back to the full 3 Board for a discussion and maybe fine-tune how 4 -- how we want to select these cases going 5 forward. DR. WADE: And then we might use part of the 6 7 next Board call to have a subcommittee call and 8 possibly make the selection? 9 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 10 DR. WADE: Okay? 11 MR. GRIFFON: That's a possibility, anyway. 12 know Wanda has some questions, or you look like 13 you... 14 MS. MUNN: Well, I'm a little puzzled about how much information we will need from these data 15 16 in order to satisfy our own personal desires 17 for a wide distribution of cases. And I quess 18 my thought is, what am I going to ask Stu to 19 bring me in addition to --20 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 21 MS. MUNN: -- this list right here. And as you 22 pointed out, in a case that I'm familiar with, 23 sure, it makes a big difference what area 24 people work in. But I am questioning whether 25 that's easy information for --

1 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 2 MS. MUNN: -- us to find. And I -- I don't 3 want to send NIOSH back to go through, blow by 4 blow, each one of these files --5 MR. GRIFFON: Right, the other --6 MS. MUNN: -- so I guess -- might we consider 7 the other approach, might we consider making 8 our selection based on the information we have 9 here and then ask, from that number -- which 10 will be a considerably smaller number than 11 these pages of data that we have here -- if we 12 could ask, from that number, if there is 13 perhaps one additional item of information, 14 like if it's -- if it's a job category for a 15 specific -- or whether it's --16 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, yeah --17 MS. MUNN: -- another --18 MR. GRIFFON: -- that's sort of what I -- I 19 have two -- two follow-ups and I -- I mean I 20 think that's sort of what I was thinking, and 21 then -- then part of my concern is on -- on 22 doing that, but it's sort of a screening 23 device. I -- I mean we -- we'd be -- 'cause 24 we'd have -- we'd select and then we'd have to

open the cases and, you know, who is -- who is

25

1 "we" I think is an important factor, too --2 MS. MUNN: Yeah, it is. 3 MR. GRIFFON: -- but I think we'd have -- we --4 we have to decide our parameters, maybe, and 5 then ask NIOSH to open those cases so we 6 wouldn't -- you know, I mean -- you know, it -it is an audit, so I -- we don't want to open a 7 8 case and look and say well, that one looks like 9 a real good case. You just want to open the 10 case to be able to look at certain parameters 11 of interest for -- for sampling. 12 MS. MUNN: It is, in my view, our 13 responsibility as the subcommittee to identify 14 what those parameters are --15 MR. GRIFFON: Right, right, right. 16 MS. MUNN: -- for Stu, and I -- I really don't 17 want to ask him to bring me another rock until 18 I tell him specifically what rock it is. 19 MR. GRIFFON: No, I agree. I -- I -- I don't -20 - I -- I agree with you on that standpoint. I 21 would -- I wouldn't ask him to do it for two fif-- 250, you know --22 23 MS. MUNN: Yeah. 24 MR. GRIFFON: -- that -- that doesn't make 25 sense. The other thing I -- I -- I wondered if

we could go back and examine our statistics that we have from our last six sets of reviews and -- and -- and add that -- this parameter which we don't know necessarily what they are, but it might be work area. I know to some extent we -- we -- in our original matrix that 6 7 I talked about different parameters we were interested in, we talked about job title, and we also -- I understand why it's not in this 10 matrix because it's difficult. People change job titles, it's not readily -- something you 12 can readily pull from NOCTS, but maybe in our -13 - in our summary matrix of -- of the six sets 14 that we've done so far we can say okay, then we 15 can sort and look and say okay, we've got 16 Hanford cases --17

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

11

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. HOMOKI-TITUS: I can --

MR. GRIFFON: -- you know, we -- we've got, you know, 15 cases and they cover -- you know, are they all from the same area, are they all -you know, we can start to outline it that way, and then when we -- so -- so we have the -- the past set to deal with, too. That's supposed to help us -- you know, the -- the original notion was that as we track this, we find out what

we've done and we fill in those other cells so that we see that we've covered a range of different cancers, a range of different, you know, years worked and sort of things like that.

MS. MUNN: Do you have a feel for what specific other categories you might be wanting to focus on?

MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, I -- I think the two I've just raised were the -- the -- that work area, work location, and I'm not sure exactly how easy that is even to determine. If people were all over the place, that's tough. But work area and -- and I guess the external and internal methodology. And -- and I think in most cases it can be either -- you know, even in -- even in -- and correct me if I'm wrong, Stu, but even in best estimate cases it's not always that you use an individual's urinalysis data to calculate their intake and dose. In some cases you use the site-wide model -- right? -- for --

MR. HINNEFELD: Sure, there'd be some sites where there'd be a site dose model that would be used.

1 MR. GRIFFON: Site dose model, right. 2 MR. HINNEFELD: There would be some cases where 3 an inter-- or a coworker dataset may be used to 4 fill in monitoring gaps or moni-- you know, 5 unmonitored periods or -- yeah, unmonitored 6 periods. 7 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 8 MR. HINNEFELD: And so those would likely be 9 considered best estim -- or could be considered best estimates. Use of a coworker model would 10 11 not exclude something from being a best 12 estimate. There -- there are some 13 overestimating techniques which would exclude 14 them from being a best estimate. There may be 15 a fit to the bioassay to -- the individual's 16 actual bioassay, so there are --17 MR. GRIFFON: But even --18 MR. HINNEFELD: -- a handful -- a handful of 19 techniques that would fit into the -- the best 20 estimate category. 21 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. And instead of just saying 22 overestimating technique, then we might have a 23 column that says, you know, TIB whatever. 24 MR. HINNEFELD: TIB whichever, right. 25 MR. GRIFFON: You know, and then we -- and then

1	we could say you know, that would tell me
2	okay, we've you know, we've sliced and diced
3	TIB-8 and 10 up and down across the board, you
4	know. Maybe we don't need five more cases that
5	that use TIB-8 and 10. You know what I
6	mean? That's that's so I guess the
7	the work area and the the you
8	know, what what method was applied for a DR
9	external and internal, what TIB or what
10	method was used.
11	MR. HINNEFELD: Yeah.
12	MR. GRIFFON: I don't know how
13	MR. HINNEFELD: Well
14	MR. GRIFFON: You think it it is
15	MR. HINNEFELD: the only
16	MR. GRIFFON: Are we getting to a place where
17	we get a combination of methods for a lot of
18	cases or
19	MR. HINNEFELD: Yeah. Yeah, you'll have
20	bioassay for a certain period and coworker for
21	others maybe, have a single employee, could
22	happen like that.
23	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, so even that might not work
24	too well then.
25	MR. HINNEFELD: You have you know, it you

1 have people who -- who didn't work their entire 2 career in the same location, but you know, 3 maybe worked from 300 to 400 area to 100 areas, 4 moved over the course of their employment --5 MR. GRIFFON: Right. MR. HINNEFELD: -- so they'd be at multiple 6 7 locations. I mean we can list all the work 8 locations that are identified. Work locations 9 aren't always known. 10 MS. MUNN: No. 11 MR. HINNEFELD: Job titles aren't always known. 12 MS. HOMOKI-TITUS: Lew --13 MR. HINNEFELD: We will always --14 MS. HOMOKI-TITUS: -- I'm sorry to interrupt, 15 but the subcommittee's going to have to be 16 aware that at some point this is going to 17 become identifiable and these may have to go 18 into closed session if all of this information 19 is going to be on documents that are made 20 public. 21 MR. HINNEFELD: Yeah, I think --22 MS. HOMOKI-TITUS: Be aware. 23 MR. HINNEFELD: -- things like, you know, 24 specific years, how many years they've worked 25 at this location, how many years they worked at

1 that location, that -- it lends more and more 2 toward being identifiable, and so the more we 3 put on here the more we have to worry about 4 that. The dose reconstruction technique I 5 think won't matter. I don't think there's any 6 one -- I don't think anyone will necessarily be 7 able to tell from that -- could be identified 8 from that. 9 MS. MUNN: Right, I wouldn't think so. 10 So that -- I don't know if you MR. GRIFFON: 11 have any parameters in mind, Wanda, that you 12 were thinking. 13 MS. MUNN: I don't have any specific parameters 14 that I could put in an envelope and say this is 15 the -- this is specifically what I want 16 because, for just the reason that Stu has 17 indicated, this is a -- from -- it appears that 18 we're getting into an amorphous zone where I --19 from my personal knowledge of the site you've 20 already mentioned, workers freely moved from 21 300 to 400 to 200 --22 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 23 MS. MUNN: -- and the type of the work that 24 they did and the type of exposure to which they 25 might have been privy was pretty much the same.

But nevertheless, it would -- would have varied. I don't think there's any way we can get specific without crossing over the line of identifiability, and I -- and I -- what I'm grappling with is not wanting to send them away asking for more information without being very concrete about what we need. And I'm not --

MR. GRIFFON: Right.

MS. MUNN: -- able to come up with that myself.

I'm hoping someone else can.

MR. GRIFFON: Well --

DR. MAURO: I have a suggestion and it might be a shortcut. It's neutron dosimetry, over and over and over again, places that emerge whether we're doing a site profile or doing a dose reconstruction audit, the area that is always the most sensitive, that tests the robustness of the work that's being done, is neutron dosimetry -- from an external point of view. So in picking a case -- and I know it's not on your list -- in addition to all the other parameters, whenever we are -- we find problem areas that we need to discuss, it seems to be a recurring theme -- how was neutron dosimetry dealt with and is it scientifically sound,

1 whether it's a coworker model or it's the 2 actual measurements that were used. So if it 3 hel-- and that goes toward a lot of all the old 4 OTIBs we were talking about, and it's probably 5 pretty easy when you go into your case to say 6 well, did -- was neutron a contributing dose to 7 this particular person's POC. And if the 8 answer is yes, I know that it would probably 9 make for a place -- a place for auditing that 10 would lend insight into the robustness of the 11 dose reconstruction. 12 MS. MUNN: Thank you, John. So perhaps that gives us one guideline. I don't think I would 13 14 want that to be the only guideline --15 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 16 MS. MUNN: -- but perhaps we might ask that 17 half of the cases we choose fall into that category and the other half that it not be such 18 19 a -- an --20 MR. GRIFFON: Well, I'm not ready to give up on 21 my undefinable parameters, as you seem to have. 22 But -- I mean I -- I know work area is not an 23 easy -- easily definable area, but -- and --24 and we do get in-- possibly into the privacy 25 issues, but -- I mean you have that information

1	in the files.
2	MR. HINNEFELD: Sometimes.
3	MR. GRIFFON: Sometimes.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: Not always.
5	MR. GRIFFON: I mean you can say unknown.
6	MR. HINNEFELD: Right.
7	MR. GRIFFON: And we can say you know, we
8	can list you know, if if they list three
9	or four
10	MR. HINNEFELD: Uh-huh.
11	MR. GRIFFON: we can list three or four.
12	MR. HINNEFELD: Right.
13	MR. GRIFFON: I don't know that it's you
14	know, I know it it's it's not going to be
15	a perfect criteria.
16	MR. HINNEFELD: I think to be at all have a
17	manageable amount of work for that I mean
18	that, to me, is as far as I know, is a
19	manually opening the case and looking at
20	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
21	MR. HINNEFELD: the records from the site
22	and see what you know about where the guy
23	worked. So as you said earlier, we would want
24	to have a manageable number of cases to look at
25	

1	MR. GRIFFON: Oh, yeah, yeah.
2	MR. HINNEFELD: as opposed to 250
3	MR. GRIFFON: No, I'm talking post
4	MR. HINNEFELD: or 230
5	MR. GRIFFON: This is kind of a screening
6	thing.
7	MR. HINNEFELD: Sure, if we select, you know
8	MR. GRIFFON: We select them
9	MR. HINNEFELD: 25 or 30 or something
10	MR. GRIFFON: Right, right.
11	MR. HINNEFELD: and we would go characterize
12	those, that's probably a manageable I
13	well, it would be quite a bit of work, but it's
14	at least a doable amount of work.
15	MR. PRESLEY: Can I say something as an
16	alternate?
17	DR. WADE: Yes, uh-huh.
18	MR. PRESLEY: Along with the neutron dose, can
19	you not go back and look at your higher
20	probability in job descriptions? Now what I'm
21	saying is you go in and you look at your job
22	descriptions of the people that had the higher
23	probability of exposure.
24	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, we could make some
25	subjective judgments about that. You know,

1	just sort of what we think, you know, with
2	jobs that would be more highly exposed.
3	MR. PRESLEY: Right.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: Again, job we don't always
5	have a job title.
6	MR. PRESLEY: Right.
7	MR. HINNEFELD: But for the cases were we do
8	MR. PRESLEY: That's correct.
9	MR. HINNEFELD: we could make some judgment
10	about that. Some job titles are easier than
11	others
12	MR. PRESLEY: Right, I realize that.
13	MR. HINNEFELD: in terms of deciding, but
14	you know
15	MR. GRIFFON: And what about what about this
16	potential of the method used, Stu? How
17	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, that's I mean that's
18	open and look. I mean if we're going to open
19	the case and look for some things, we could
20	have a list of things that we're going to
21	check.
22	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
23	MR. HINNEFELD: We could check the the
24	that would be a fairly I mean that should be
25	capturable (sic) in every case

1 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 2 MR. HINNEFELD: -- that you could list what was 3 the internal technique or internal dosimetry 4 method and what was the external dosimetry method -- or methods --5 6 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 7 MR. HINNEFELD: -- and so that should be 8 discernable in every case and it's just a 9 matter of opening the dose reconstruction 10 report and looking. So that's discernable. 11 MR. GRIFFON: And that would be more or less 12 captured in the DR report, wouldn't it? MR. HINNEFELD: Yeah, it'd be in the DR report. 13 14 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, yeah, so you wouldn't have 15 to open the whole case file. 16 MR. HINNEFELD: Wouldn't have to have the whole 17 case file. 18 MR. GRIFFON: The raw data or anything. 19 MR. HINNEFELD: For -- for location --20 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 21 MR. HINNEFELD: -- for work location --22 MR. GRIFFON: Location. 23 MR. HINNEFELD: -- you're going -- you're --24 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 25 MR. HINNEFELD: -- going to have to look in the

1 file. And depending upon where the person 2 worked, you may have to look in different 3 locations. Like some sites, if you op-- if 4 there are dosimetry records, you've got a 5 pretty good indication of where a person worked 6 from their -- especially Savannah Riv-- like 7 Savannah River bioassay record is -- is really 8 pretty good, you know, you know --9 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 10 MR. HINNEFELD: -- what area they were in or 11 what reactor they worked at. But other sites 12 may not be so good. 13 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, right. 14 MR. HINNEFELD: I mean the -- and some -- some 15 sites are okay for some years and not so great 16 for other years, so it would be a little tricky 17 to kind of summarize work location. We could 18 give -- I mean it may have to be sort of like a 19 freeform field, you know, as opposed to data 20 elements that you could come up with a dataset 21 element for. 22 MR. GRIFFON: Right. But the -- the external 23 and internal method shouldn't be as -- as --24 MR. HINNEFELD: I don't think -- I don't 25 envision any -- any problem. Now maybe I'm

1 overlooking something. 2 MR. GRIFFON: Shouldn't be as resource-3 intensive as the -- the work area one, I don't 4 think. Would it? 5 MR. HINNEFELD: I'm thinking it would not. MR. GRIFFON: Right. 6 7 MR. HINNEFELD: I think it would not. 8 MR. GRIFFON: I mean the other -- and we can --9 I -- I'd propose that we bring this to the full 10 Board and whatever we discuss and maybe coming 11 to a final, but I mean I would almost propose 12 to try the work area, the external/internal 13 method, the neutron dosimetry -- just for this 14 first -- if we go through this seventh set, 15 let's select 20, let's do try that with these 20. You know, let NIOSH --16 17 MR. HINNEFELD: We can put -- we can put job 18 title on, because if we have a job title it'll 19 be in our database. 20 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, and job title, I'm sorry. 21 MR. HINNEFELD: So we can put job title in --22 or job titles. Sometimes we'll have one, 23 sometimes we'll have more than one. Sometimes 24 the one --25 MR. GRIFFON: Now how --

1 MR. HINNEFELD: -- we have will be the last one 2 they had. 3 MR. GRIFFON: -- how we disseminate this, we'll 4 have to be careful with the Privacy Act 5 concerns. MR. HINNEFELD: Well, we'll -- what we do, when 6 7 we generate a list we'll send it up to our OGC 8 and -- and have them tell us if it's okay or 9 not. 10 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. It may be that we can't 11 show this full matrix in -- in -- in open 12 session. 13 MR. HINNEFELD: Right. 14 MR. GRIFFON: But we can still use it, you know, for our purposes, yeah. 15 16 MS. BEHLING: Excuse me, Mark, this is Kathy 17 Behling. It seems to me that if you're 18 interested in determining how the dose 19 reconstructions were done and the types, you 20 should be able to easily look at the reference 21 list on the DR report, bo-- I would think that 22 that's not too terribly difficult of a 23 screening method. 24 MR. GRIFFON: Right, I think that's what Stu --25 Stu agreed with me on that. Thanks, Kathy --

1 MS. BEHLING: Okay. 2 MR. GRIFFON: -- yeah. 3 MS. BEHLING: Thanks. 4 MR. GRIFFON: Okay. So -- I mean as a -- as a 5 preliminary -- I don't know if there's other factors that we want to consider, but I think 6 7 that's some preliminary parameters that I might 8 be interested -- I think we should pull -- pull 9 this as a discussion piece back to the full 10 Board and see if, you know, we -- we've 11 selected 20 cases, we want NIOSH to sort of 12 pre-screen those for us and give us this extra 13 information before we finally select. Maybe we 14 want to do more than 20, maybe we want to do 15 Yeah, just -- you know. 16 MS. MUNN: That would sound reasonable to me, 17 based on the fact that --MR. GRIFFON: We're going to --18 19 MS. MUNN: -- we're -- we're saying we're going 20 to sift these --21 MR. GRIFFON: Right, right, right --MS. MUNN: -- after we see them. 22 23 MR. GRIFFON: -- I apologize, yeah. 24 MS. MUNN: And -- and I -- I guess the 25 methodology of the DR is -- is an easy enough

1 thing to do, but I'm -- I'm still a little 2 concerned about being a little more definitive, 3 if we can be, in terms of what any other 4 selective categories we come up with. 5 DR. BEHLING: Mark, this is Hans Behling. 6 if we're going to select on a basis of neutron 7 exposure, try to select neutron exposure prior 8 to the use of the multi-purpose TLD. 9 words, prior to 1972, because that's really 10 where the NTA film and the problems with 11 neutron assigned exposures --12 MS. MUNN: Uh-huh. 13 DR. BEHLING: -- comes into play. 14 MS. MUNN: Yeah. 15 So you're saying pre- and post-MR. GRIFFON: 16 '62, if they can give us that --17 DR. BEHLING: '72. 18 MR. GRIFFON: '72, I'm sorry, '72, yeah. 19 DR. WADE: While you have a pause -- this is 20 Lew Wade -- I just -- and again, I don't think 21 it will influence this discussion one way or 22 the other, but I think it's always important to 23 keep in mind what the chartered purpose of the 24 committee and subcommittee is. And very 25 simply, the Advisory Board on Radiation Worker

1 Health shall advise the Secretary of HHS on the 2 scientific validity and quality of dose 3 reconstruction efforts performed for this 4 program. So really that is your charter, and I 5 don't think you're straying from it. 6 it's always good to have that on the record as 7 you have these discussions, though. 8 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 9 DR. MAURO: Excuse me, I have a radical idea. 10 Instead of 20, could you give us 30? 11 MR. GRIFFON: I -- we just said 30. 12 DR. MAURO: Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't hear --13 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 14 DR. MAURO: -- I wasn't even listening, I'm 15 sorry. 16 MR. GRIFFON: 'Cause we're going to lose some -17 18 DR. WADE: Well, you say give you 30 or --19 MR. GRIFFON: Oh --20 When the time comes to turn over DR. MAURO: 21 the seventh set to us, rather than selecting 20 22 -- 'cause you know, we've been being delivered 23 sets of 20, three a year. Now what's happening 24 is, as you probably notice, is that we are 25 still working on our sixth set -- which were

24

25

last year. Right now the seventh is going to be for the new fiscal year, which in theory started October 1st. What I'm getting at is that the machinery of processing the cases -it's -- certainly it will take more time to do 30 than 20, but it -- remember the cycle we go through. We go through -- we prepare it, then we interact on a one on one. There's -- there is an iterative process. Now in my mind, and I'd like to very -- matter of fact, this is the first time I'm bringing this up and I haven't even spoken to Hans and Kathy about this, but if we were mov-- if we had a pulse of 30 moving through the system as op-- two pulses of 30 as opposed to three pulses of 20, I have a feeling that we'll be able to get through the 60 by the end of the fiscal year more effectively than if we tried to push three sets of 20. This is an idea that just struck me as I was sitting here and I -- you know, and I'm not quite sure whether Hans and Kathy see it the same way -and whether you see it the same way, whether or not that would be --

MR. GRIFFON: My --

DR. MAURO: -- positive or not.

1 MR. GRIFFON: My -- my only reluctance on that 2 is that in order to get -- assign you 30, then 3 we'd probably have to pick 45, and then NIOSH 4 would have to get all these parameters for 45 5 cases, when it's really a trial balloon. I 6 mean it -- you know, I'm not sure how that work 7 area field -- we may do it once and say you 8 know what, this isn't really helping us and we 9 end up dropping it. So I'd rather -- at least 10 for this cycle -- do -- have NIOSH do 30, with 11 the product at the end of the day being to 12 assign you 20 out of that. I think that makes 13 14 MS. MUNN: I agree. 15 MR. GRIFFON: -- especially where we're trying 16 to -- you know, this is preliminary. 17 DR. WADE: But I think John's idea in time --18 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, yeah, in time --19 DR. WADE: -- could prove --20 MR. GRIFFON: -- I agree with you, yeah. 21 for the first cycle I think -- let's make sure 22 23 MS. MUNN: Let's do. 24 MR. GRIFFON: -- these fields aren't wasting a 25 lot of time and not giving us what we want

1	anyway, you know, so But so I would
2	propose at least as a draft on the subcommittee
3	that we we do this. We select 30 cases for
4	NIOSH to pre-screen based on the parameters,
5	including neutron dosimetry pre- and post-'72,
6	work area, job title, external methodology and
7	internal methodology.
8	DR. WADE: And you're thinking of selecting
9	those 30 today?
10	MR. GRIFFON: If we if we have time.
11	DR. WADE: Okay, we do.
12	MR. GRIFFON: But first of all, do people agree
13	with that that premise, the parameters?
14	MS. MUNN: Well, I
15	MR. GRIFFON: At least as a preliminary
16	approach.
17	MS. MUNN: I'm still a little concerned about
18	the the lack of clarity on the edges of
19	those parameters, but yeah, you're right, this
20	is a trial balloon and if
21	MR. GRIFFON: Right.
22	MS. MUNN: if NIOSH
23	MR. GRIFFON: I'm not sure if
24	MS. MUNN: thinks they can handle it
25	MR. GRIFFON: I'm not exactly sure what some

1 of those fields are going to look like when we 2 ask --3 MS. MUNN: Yeah. 4 MR. GRIFFON: -- them to fill them, but I think 5 if we try it in a preliminary fashion, and then if it's not the -- it's not going to give --6 7 yield the information we want, I think we then 8 drop it from future requests, you know. 9 MS. MUNN: That's certainly a reasonable 10 approach, I think. 11 DR. WADE: It's a working plan then. So to 12 play it out, if we were to pick 30, we'd give 13 them to NIOSH, ask NIOSH to report back to the 14 subcommittee prior to the Board call on the 15 11th of January --16 MS. MUNN: Yes. 17 DR. WADE: -- at which time the subcommittee 18 could also meet and possibly make its selection 19 of 20. 20 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 21 MS. MUNN: Uh-huh. 22 DR. WADE: Okay, that's a plan. All it takes 23 is 30, the selection of 30. 24 MR. GRIFFON: Right. Stu? 25 MR. HINNEFELD: How bad is it if we are not

1	ready by the by the conference call?
2	Because it's a fair amount of work.
3	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: It'll be a fair amount of work
5	to get this information for these 30 cases.
6	DR. WADE: It doesn't mean you're a bad person,
7	Stu.
8	MR. HINNEFELD: I'm just saying that we may not
9	be able to be ready in a month, with the
10	holidays in between.
11	MR. GRIFFON: Right.
12	MR. HINNEFELD: So it may go to the next
13	like whatever some date after that or the
14	next Board meeting before we'd be able to
15	provide the additional or the more robust list.
16	DR. WADE: And that would mean that we would be
17	alerting SC&A of the next of the seventh set
18	the first week in February.
19	MS. MUNN: Yes.
20	DR. WADE: Acceptable, John?
21	DR. MAURO: Yes.
22	DR. WADE: Okay.
23	MR. GRIFFON: Okay. All right. So we've got
24	15 minutes. Do we want to deci want to try
25	to

1 DR. WADE: I don't care if you people eat lunch 2 or not, it doesn't bother me. You're paid the 3 same. 4 MS. MUNN: Thanks ever so -- and I have such a 5 wonderful luncheon plan laid out. 6 MR. GRIFFON: I guess we should try to -- try 7 to proceed through. 8 DR. WADE: Or come up with an algorithm and 9 just -- might work quickly. 10 SELECTION OF CASES 11 MR. GRIFFON: Well, let's -- let's just start -12 - I -- I guess we could start with the full external/internal cases and the date the DR was 13 14 approved certainly goes from most current to 15 least, so it would make sense to start from 16 page one, I believe, 'cause we want to avoid 17 some of these older TIBs that we've already 18 reviewed. 19 DR. WADE: Correct. 20 MR. GRIFFON: So any -- I'm looking at ID 21 number 301. It's a Y-12 case. Any votes for 22 or -- or I'll -- I'll just go down the list, as 23 Paul usually does this function, 302, Huntington Pilot Plant? 24

MS. MUNN: Hold on. Non-melanoma, respiratory.

25

1	MR. CLAWSON: Is there any special criteria you
2	want or just a rough
3	MR. GRIFFON: Well, our our normal criteria
4	here, and then we're going to have NIOSH look
5	in these other criteria, you know, and so I
6	think, you know, the usual criteria that we've
7	how we've selected these.
8	DR. WADE: We try to be about around the
9	probability of causation or
10	MS. MUNN: And
11	MR. GRIFFON: Well, not necessarily
12	MS. MUNN: and
13	MR. GRIFFON: but yeah.
14	MS. MUNN: And various and a full spread of
15	sites, as well. So sure, that looks good to
16	me, 302.
17	MR. GRIFFON: Huntington?
18	MS. MUNN: 302, Huntington.
19	MR. GRIFFON: Do we have a a I don't have
20	my list handy of the sites that we've sampled
21	already, the statistics of
22	MS. MUNN: I don't, either.
23	MR. GRIFFON: sites we've sampled thus far.
24	MR. HINNEFELD: You've done one from Huntington
25	Pilot Plant.

1	MR. GRIFFON: Just just done one, yeah.
2	Well, let's just let's just go through and
3	get a preliminary list anyway 303?
4	MS. MUNN: No, we've done similar ones.
5	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
6	MS. MUNN: Likewise 304.
7	MR. GRIFFON: Right.
8	MS. MUNN: Likewise 305. Wait a minute, 306?
9	MR. GRIFFON: 306? We haven't done a lot of
10	Mound and this one is over over 50, but how
11	many Mound cases have we done? Sorry, Stu,
12	to
13	MR. HINNEFELD: Looks like three.
14	MS. MUNN: Okay.
15	MR. GRIFFON: That is a full DR. Worth looking
16	at? All right, 306 we got. 307?
17	MS. MUNN: No.
18	MR. GRIFFON: 308, 309?
19	MS. MUNN: No.
20	MR. GRIFFON: 310?
21	MS. MUNN: Hmm, 311.
22	MR. GRIFFON: 311? Again, it's over the 50
23	percentile, thyroid cancer, Hanford. We've got
24	quite a few Hanfords, but
25	MS. MUNN: I don't remember how many thyroids

1 we've done --2 MR. PRESLEY: That's what I was going to say, I 3 don't -- I don't think we've done a whole lot 4 of thyroids. 5 MS. MUNN: I don't think we've done a lot of thyroid, that's what caught my eye. 6 7 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 8 MR. HINNEFELD: If you'll look ahead at 314's 9 also a thyroid from Hanford but it's less than 10 50 percent if you want to look at that one. 11 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, 314 looks like --12 MS. MUNN: Maybe that's a better choice. 13 MR. GRIFFON: -- maybe a more interesting one, 14 yeah. 15 DR. WADE: Okay. 16 MR. GRIFFON: Okay, 314? Moving on down the 17 list, 315, Savannah River? 316 --MS. MUNN: Yeah. 18 19 MR. GRIFFON: -- 317 through 321 are all Y-12. 20 MS. MUNN: 322 is not very high, but it's a 21 different --22 MR. GRIFFON: Kansas City Plant, we --23 MS. MUNN: Yeah. 24 MR. GRIFFON: -- we haven't really seen that. 25 MS. MUNN: Might be good.

1	MR. GRIFFON: Okay, 322.
2	MS. MUNN: Hmm, 26
3	MR. GRIFFON: We got some just around 50
4	percent, several just over 50 percent.
5	MS. MUNN: 327's interesting.
6	UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah.
7	MR. GRIFFON: Certainly a different facility,
8	huh?
9	MS. MUNN: Yes, brand new.
10	MR. GRIFFON: Okay, 327. 28, 30, 31, 32
11	going on to the next page.
12	MS. MUNN: I suddenly jump from 333 to page
13	3, that's why.
14	MR. GRIFFON: What's that, Wanda? I couldn't -
15	-
16	DR. WADE: It was just
17	MS. MUNN: Oh, I'm muttering to myself. I
18	missed the page.
19	MR. GRIFFON: All right.
20	MR. PRESLEY: Can I suggest one?
21	MR. GRIFFON: Uh-huh.
22	MR. PRESLEY: 335, urinary organs excluding the
23	bladder for Mound, that's different, would it
24	not be, Stu?
25	MR. HINNEFELD: Hang on a sec.

1	MR. PRESLEY: 335.
2	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
3	MR. HINNEFELD: Yeah.
4	MR. GRIFFON: Okay, 335.
5	MS. MUNN: Good.
6	MR. HINNEFELD: You've done a few, done maybe
7	four out of 120.
8	MR. GRIFFON: 339 is a Fernald how many
9	Fernald cases have we done?
10	MS. BEHLING: I show nine, Mark.
11	MR. GRIFFON: Nine?
12	MS. BEHLING: Yes.
13	DR. WADE: You want to say yes or no?
14	MR. GRIFFON: No, I'm I'm skipping it.
15	MR. CLAWSON: You going to skip
16	MS. MUNN: Oh, what about 337?
17	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
18	MS. MUNN: Livermore.
19	MR. GRIFFON: 337?
20	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
21	MR. GRIFFON: How ma Lawrence Livermore, have
22	we I don't know how many we've done on that.
23	MR. HINNEFELD: Three, according to my list.
24	DR. WADE: Okay?
25	MR. GRIFFON: All right, 337. The next number

1	that comes up, people can speak up. I'm down
2	to 345.
3	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
4	MR. GRIFFON: 345's interesting, an unknown POC
5	and cancer.
6	MS. MUNN: Yeah.
7	MR. HINNEFELD: Yeah, sorry, I should have I
8	tried to fill those in. When I got this query
9	there were a couple missing and I tried to fill
10	those in. I can find it.
11	MR. GRIFFON: I don't know that it's essential
12	in this process.
13	DR. WADE: There's a Bridgeport Brass coming
14	up.
15	MS. MUNN: Yeah, 348.
16	MR. GRIFFON: Well, that's a different
17	Bridgeport Br is it?
18	MR. PRESLEY: You got a
19	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
20	MR. PRESLEY: 348.
21	MR. GRIFFON: Is that a different Bridgeport
22	Brass? It's not Havens Lab, it's
23	MR. HINNEFELD: Correct, there's one's
24	called Ha one's Havens Lab and the other one
25	is Adrian, Michigan. Havens Lab is in the east

1	coast somewhere, I forget northeast
2	somewhere.
3	MR. GRIFFON: Right.
4	MS. MUNN: Reasonable, 348, or not?
5	MR. GRIFFON: Which one, 348? Again, it's over
6	50 percent.
7	MS. MUNN: Yeah, it is.
8	MR. GRIFFON: Several of them we've picked
9	already over 50.
10	MS. MUNN: Then what about 351?
11	MR. GRIFFON: Okay. Yeah, I like that better.
12	I think that makes that's Havens Lab,
13	though, yeah. 351 you said, Wanda?
14	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
15	DR. WADE: Yes?
16	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
17	MS. MUNN: Are we going to what about 354,
18	very low POC but it's a site
19	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
20	MS. MUNN: we haven't done
21	MR. GRIFFON: I don't think we've done
22	Aliquippa Forge, have we?
23	MR. HINNEFELD: I don't believe we have. I
24	don't have that one handy.
25	DR. WADE: 354?

1	MR. GRIFFON: 354, yeah.
2	DR. WADE: Okay.
3	MS. MUNN: Same is true of 363.
4	MR. GRIFFON: 363?
5	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
6	MR. CLAWSON: Superior Steel?
7	MS. MUNN: Another low POC, but
8	(unintelligible) site.
9	DR. WADE: So 363?
10	MR. GRIFFON: 363, I
11	MR. PRESLEY: 363 is
12	DR. WADE: Superior Steel.
13	MR. GRIFFON: Question on that the Superior
14	Steel, is that one model for the site? Is that
15	a site model or
16	MR. HINNEFELD: I believe Superior Steel is a
17	dose model.
18	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
19	MR. HINNEFELD: I think it's a dose model, but
20	I won't
21	MR. GRIFFON: A dose model for all workers at
22	that site. Right?
23	MR. HINNEFELD: I think, I don't know for sure.
24	MR. GRIFFON: And have we done Superior Steel
25	before? I thought we did one of those ca

1	yeah, John's nodding yes.
2	MS. MUNN: So we have one.
3	MR. GRIFFON: Huh?
4	MS. MUNN: We have one already.
5	MR. GRIFFON: We've done one and it's the same
6	dose model for all workers, so I don't think we
7	
8	MS. MUNN: No, no point.
9	MR. GRIFFON: So forget 363.
10	MS. MUNN: Likewise 365.
11	MR. GRIFFON: I'm on to page three, I don't
12	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh. So 374, again, over POC,
13	but again, it's a site.
14	MR. PRESLEY: How many have we done for
15	Pinellas?
16	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, I think we see a pattern
17	here. We see some uranium facilities and
18	Hanford and Savannah River a lot, you know.
19	MR. HINNEFELD: Yeah.
20	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
21	MR. GRIFFON: So I don't know it I mean -
22	-
23	MR. PRESLEY: How many have you done for
24	Pinellas?
25	MR. HINNEFELD: According to my count, we

1	haven't done any for Pinellas.
2	MS. BEHLING: I show one.
3	MS. MUNN: And that's
4	DR. WADE: Bless you.
5	MR. GRIFFON: Was that you, Kathy?
6	DR. WADE: Kathy said one for Pinellas.
7	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
8	MR. GRIFFON: That was one bark for Pinellas.
9	Okay.
10	MS. MUNN: 375 is on then?
11	MR. GRIFFON: 375, yeah, we'll add 375,
12	Pinellas. Okay. Have we done Paducah? We've
13	done at least
14	MS. MUNN: Yeah, we have, but I don't remember
15	how many
16	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, I don't know, either.
17	MS. MUNN: we've done.
18	MR. HINNEFELD: I have two.
19	MR. GRIFFON: You have two?
20	MR. HINNEFELD: My my list shows two.
21	MS. BEHLING: I have two, also.
22	MS. MUNN: Sounds like it's two, and the
23	diagnosis is very similar to the
24	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
25	MS. MUNN: preceding one.

1	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, I don't think we need that
2	one.
3	MS. MUNN: There's another Harshaw down there
4	very interesting, 393.
5	MR. GRIFFON: Harshaw, 393?
6	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
7	MR. GRIFFON: Okay. I'm just scanning down the
8	whole next page. It looks like Savannah and
9	Bethlehem.
10	MR. CLAWSON: Have we done very many from
11	Chapman Valve?
12	MS. MUNN: Yeah, we've done several, it seems
13	to me.
14	MR. GRIFFON: No, I don't have we done any
15	Chapman Valve?
16	MS. MUNN: Am I wrong?
17	MR. HINNEFELD: According to my list, there's
18	been one in the first 120.
19	MR. GRIFFON: But we also have it on the table
20	at we did do one?
21	DR. MAURO: Chapman Valve is interesting
22	because the they use a generic exposure
23	matrix, and that exposure matrix was
24	substantially revised on October 16th, last
25	month, so I suspect most Chapman Valves that

1	have been done, if they were done prior to the
2	and I don't believe there've been any
3	Chapman Valves done dose reconstructions
4	done using the new exposure matrix, so
5	MR. GRIFFON: Right, this is 6/22/05, this one.
6	DR. MAURO: I think that I don't think there
7	are any adjudicated Chapman Valves that have
8	been completed that were performed using the
9	most recent version of the exposure matrix.
10	MR. GRIFFON: So you may have to re-evalu and
11	I don't know if NIOSH is re-evaluating
12	MR. HINNEFELD: This this'll this'll be
13	re-evaluated
14	MR. GRIFFON: Right, so
15	MR. HINNEFELD: Program Evaluation Report,
16	really there's a there's an open discussion
17	about Chapman Valve and what will the you
18	know, what will the final dose model look like,
19	if there is a final dose model
20	MR. GRIFFON: Right.
21	MR. HINNEFELD: so it at that point then,
22	once we have one if we have one then
23	we'll go back and evaluate the
24	MR. GRIFFON: Right.
25	MR. HINNEFELD: cases that were done

1 previously. 2 MR. CLAWSON: Okay, I just --3 MR. GRIFFON: I'm not sure it's worthwhile 4 picking it up now. 5 MR. CLAWSON: Right, I --6 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 7 MR. CLAWSON: -- understand that. I just -- I 8 didn't think we'd had very many. 9 MR. PRESLEY: How many have we done for Iowa 10 Army Ordnance, Stu? 11 MR. HINNEFELD: According to my list, we've --12 gosh, I've only done one. But now --Iowa -- that's an SEC --13 14 MR. PRESLEY: Right. 15 MR. HINNEFELD: -- so -- and it is a dose 16 model, so any non-presumptive cases that are to 17 be done -- I mean there may be presumptive 18 cases in here that were done before the SEC was 19 added. Well, those would have gone the SEC 20 route by now. 21 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 22 MR. HINNEFELD: If it's a non-presumptive 23 cancer case, then it would be in accordance 24 with the dose model for Iowa Ordnance Plant 25 that's been published since the SEC for the

1	non-presumptive cases, so
2	MR. PRESLEY: This one was done 2004.
3	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: I don't remember dates. I
5	don't remember when it was
6	MR. GRIFFON: So I don't know if those are
7	worth looking at
8	MR. PRESLEY: Okay.
9	MR. GRIFFON: yeah, since we dealt with it
10	in the SEC. I'm looking on page five
11	MS. MUNN: Five? Whoa, we went right past
12	four.
13	MR. GRIFFON: Well, there there's just so
14	many of the same sites showing up, so
15	MS. MUNN: Yes, I see.
16	MR. GRIFFON: I'm trying to skimming past
17	them. I'm wondering if we, you know, might
18	want to get into the random list. What time is
19	it? Oh that's all right, we can work
20	through lunch.
21	DR. WADE: Through lunch, okay.
22	MS. MUNN: But on page four, down at the
23	bottom, it's the first time I have seen that,
24	455.
25	MR. GRIFFON: Page four at the bottom?

1 MS. MUNN: On page four, item 455, what is the 2 POC? 3 MR. GRIFFON: Oh. 4 MR. PRESLEY: Fifty. 5 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, it's at 50. 6 MS. MUNN: That would be kind of interesting, 7 to me. 8 No significant digits, either. MR. GRIFFON: 9 I haven't -- I haven't seen that. MS. MUNN: 10 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. Well, we've done quite a 11 few Savannah River, though. 12 MS. MUNN: Yes, we have done a lot of them. MR. GRIFFON: 13 Yeah. 14 MS. MUNN: But the POC alone is interesting 15 enough to me to... 16 MR. PRESLEY: What do we do in a case like 17 that? Does that get compensated when it comes 18 out to -- if one does come out to 50? 19 MR. GRIFFON: Greater than or equal to. 20 It has to be more than. MS. MUNN: 21 MR. PRESLEY: Greater than or equal to? Okay. 22 MR. HINNEFELD: Yeah. 23 MS. MUNN: Yeah. 24 MR. GRIFFON: I mean I -- how -- how many do we 25 have for Savannah River? Quite a few, but...

1	MR. HINNEFELD: By my count there are 21 out of
2	the first 120.
3	MR. GRIFFON: Twenty-one, and what was our
4	target for that is that on that same sheet?
5	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, yeah, the based on the
6	cases available for review from Savannah River,
7	there are like 1,600-plus cases available for
8	review from Savannah River. So at two and a
9	half percent, that would be a 41 target.
10	MS. MUNN: Yeah, so we're not bad.
11	MR. GRIFFON: Let's let's add that on.
12	DR. WADE: Okay, we're adding
13	MR. PRESLEY: Which one?
14	DR. WADE: 455.
15	MR. GRIFFON: 455.
16	MR. PRESLEY: Okay.
17	MS. MUNN: Here's another new site, Birdsboro,
18	480.
19	MR. GRIFFON: 480, Stu, Birdsboro Steel and
20	Foundry, site-wide model? I'm sure you don't
21	know all these off the top of your head, but
22	MR. HINNEFELD: I think it probably is. Some
23	of these
24	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
25	MR. HINNEFELD: Some of these places we have

1	almost complete like external dosimetry
2	records for, so some of these cases
3	MR. GRIFFON: Okay.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: you know, we'll have a model
5	from built from that data, and but we may
6	also look you know, we may actually have the
7	claimant's data, you know, just by chance, so -
8	-
9	MR. GRIFFON: Well, let's try it.
10	MR. HINNEFELD: I don't really know for sure on
11	Birdsboro
12	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, let's try it, 480. This'll
13	be a good reason to see those other parameters
14	that we asked for, you know, and
15	MS. MUNN: Yeah, besides, it's two years old so
16	
17	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, yeah.
18	MS. MUNN: Hmm.
19	MR. GRIFFON: I don't know how many we have,
20	but it's not close to 30.
21	DR. WADE: We got 13.
22	MR. GRIFFON: 13.
23	MS. MUNN: 490?
24	MR. GRIFFON: 490?
25	MS. MUNN: The site, low POC.

1 MR. PRESLEY: 28 years. 2 MR. GRIFFON: Yep, I can -- American Bearing 3 Company --4 MS. MUNN: Uh-huh. 5 MR. GRIFFON: -- we haven't done that --MS. MUNN: Huh-uh. 6 7 MR. GRIFFON: -- I'm sure of it. 8 DR. WADE: Okay. 9 MS. MUNN: Just below that's another Anaconda, 10 492. Did we have one earlier? 11 MR. GRIFFON: An Anaconda, no. If -- if these 12 ones are on this list, Stu, does it necessarily 13 mean that they would have a si-- at least a 14 site-specific model, or could they be a -- like 15 a TIB-4 or... Right -- right now I can't -- I 16 MR. HINNEFELD: 17 don't know why American Bearing Corp. and Anaconda Company are on this list. I don't 18 19 recall --20 MR. GRIFFON: That's what I'm saying. 21 MR. HINNEFELD: -- I don't know that we've 22 published a site profile for either of those. 23 MR. GRIFFON: Right. 24 MR. HINNEFELD: And so I don't know what would 25 have been done here. You know, it might be we

1	had the data for the claimant. I I'm just
2	guessing. I'm I don't know if that happened
3	or not, so I don't I don't really know why
4	those are on the list. I can't really explain
5	why they're on the list.
6	MR. GRIFFON: Okay.
7	MS. MUNN: Well, since we're trying a new
8	system anyway to find out whether that tells us
9	anything
10	MR. GRIFFON: Well, why don't we try one of
11	them?
12	MS. MUNN: Okay, fine.
13	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
14	MS. MUNN: Yeah.
15	DR. WADE: Which one?
16	MR. GRIFFON: The 490. All right?
17	DR. WADE: Okay, 490.
18	MR. GRIFFON: Is that okay
19	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh, yeah.
20	MR. GRIFFON: Wanda?
21	MS. MUNN: Right.
22	MR. GRIFFON: Let's try one and 'cause I
23	can't imagine there's a well, maybe there
24	is, but
25	(Pause)

1	I'm moving into the randomly selected list,
2	unless other people have found something on
3	that last page.
4	MR. PRESLEY: Question on that last page before
5	we go on.
6	MR. GRIFFON: Uh-huh?
7	MR. PRESLEY: 509, Argonne National West, oral
8	cavity and pharynx, have we done
9	MR. GRIFFON: Have we done or
10	MR. PRESLEY: a large number or any of those
11	for any of the sites?
12	MR. HINNEFELD: By my count we've got one at
13	Argonne West.
14	MR. PRESLEY: I mean I realize that's a low
15	POC, but still that's a that's something
16	that we haven't run up on is that
17	MS. MUNN: Oral cavity, yeah.
18	MR. PRESLEY: esophagus area.
19	MR. GRIFFON: I'm okay with that, 509's
20	DR. WADE: 509?
21	MR. GRIFFON: let's add that on, yeah.
22	DR. WADE: That's our 15th.
23	MR. GRIFFON: Okay, 15 more out of the random.
24	DR. WADE: Uh-huh.
25	MS. MUNN: How about 013?

1	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, that looks like an
2	interesting one, 013, Brookhaven.
3	MR. CLAWSON: Which number was it?
4	MR. GRIFFON: 013.
5	DR. WADE: On the random list.
6	MR. CLAWSON: Okay.
7	MR. GRIFFON: Page one of the random list,
8	right.
9	MS. MUNN: There's another interesting one.
10	There's another thyroid at PNL.
11	MR. GRIFFON: Was that a suggestion, Wanda, or
12	I didn't hear
13	MS. MUNN: No, it it's a you know, a
14	thought.
15	DR. WADE: Which one?
16	MS. MUNN: PNL, out the 015.
17	MR. GRIFFON: 015?
18	MS. MUNN: We were looking at a at a Hanford
19	thyroid on the other list, but this was
20	MR. GRIFFON: It is 38 years worked and it's an
21	underestimate with external and they got 59
22	percent.
23	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
24	MR. PRESLEY: On the next page, 017 is a lung
25	at PNL, was there 17 years and they've got a

1	low POC, an 18.29
2	MS. MUNN: Uh-huh, that might be a
3	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, that's a possibility, 17,
4	let's put 17 down.
5	DR. WADE: 017?
6	MS. MUNN: 17, it's a more diverse selection.
7	MR. GRIFFON: I guess 28, to me, possibly
8	interesting, K-25, X-10, 30 years worked in the
9	'50s.
10	MS. MUNN: Yeah.
11	DR. WADE: Okay.
12	MR. GRIFFON: Number 28.
13	MS. MUNN: Good.
14	MR. GRIFFON: Have we how many Los Alamos
15	National Lab cases have we had? This one's a
16	low POC, breast cancer, in the '80s, but
17	MS. MUNN: Really low, yeah.
18	MR. GRIFFON: it is Los Alamos. I don't
19	know that we've done
20	MR. HINNEFELD: I have two by my count.
21	MR. GRIFFON: Just two.
22	MR. HINNEFELD: (Unintelligible) two.
23	MS. MUNN: I think we'll fine more interesting
24	ones
25	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.

1	MS. MUNN: than that.
2	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, I think we should hold off
3	on that.
4	MS. MUNN: Hmm, 41's interesting.
5	DR. WADE: Number, Wanda? Did you say
6	MS. MUNN: I just said 041 was interesting.
7	DR. WADE: 041?
8	MS. MUNN: Duplicate sites. Very
9	MR. PRESLEY: Two sites.
10	MS. MUNN: a fractional POC.
11	MR. GRIFFON: Again, I don't know how fruitful
12	it's going to be with a underestimate on
13	external for two sites, unless we think they
14	overestimated the underestimate.
15	MS. MUNN: Yeah.
16	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. That's you know. I
17	would say that's not worth it right now, but
18	MS. MUNN: Okay.
19	MR. PRESLEY: 054 for bone at Bridgeport Brass,
20	how do how do
21	MR. GRIFFON: That's Bridgeport Bridgeport
22	Brass in Michigan, too.
23	MR. PRESLEY: Right, uh-huh.
24	MR. GRIFFON: That's a different Bridgeport
25	Brass. That might be

```
1
              MR. PRESLEY: That's a different one.
2
              MS. MUNN: Interesting.
3
              DR. WADE:
                          054?
4
              MR. GRIFFON:
                             054.
5
              MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
              MR. GRIFFON: Little more interesting Los
6
              Alamos one, yeah.
7
8
              MS. MUNN:
                        There's another Los Alamos.
9
              MR. PRESLEY: Yeah.
10
              MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, 56.
11
              MR. PRESLEY: Uh-huh.
12
              MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
13
              MR. GRIFFON: You can put that down.
14
              DR. WADE:
                        That's 20.
15
                             We're getting there.
              MR. GRIFFON:
16
              MS. MUNN: Okay. Here's another Pinellas,
17
              surprisingly. Superior Steel, 92 percent.
18
              MR. PRESLEY: I don't want to suggest it, but -
19
               - because I have a conflict of interest, but --
20
              MR. GRIFFON:
                             63?
21
              MR. PRESLEY: -- look at 063.
22
              MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, 63, I -- I'll suggest it.
23
              Yeah, that's a interesting one.
24
              MR. PRESLEY: Yes, very interesting.
25
              MR. GRIFFON: We don't -- we haven't seen many
```

```
1
              liver cancers, either.
2
              MR. PRESLEY: Right.
3
              DR. WADE: Okay, it's down.
4
              MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. Couple pages left, what do
5
              we need, nine more?
              DR. WADE: Need nine more.
6
                             Nine more.
7
              MR. GRIFFON:
8
              MR. CLAWSON: What about 076?
9
              MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
10
              MR. PRESLEY: Esophagus.
11
              MR. GRIFFON: Pinellas.
12
              MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
13
              MR. PRESLEY: Pinellas.
14
              MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, that's a good one -- 76?
                             Close.
15
              MR. PRESLEY:
16
              MS. MUNN: Yeah, let's take it. There's
17
              another interesting Los Alamos --
18
              MR. GRIFFON: Yeah --
19
              MS. MUNN: -- 079.
20
              MR. GRIFFON: -- 79.
21
              MR. PRESLEY:
                             Yep.
22
              DR. WADE: Okay.
23
              MR. PRESLEY: 81 at Idaho --
24
              MS. MUNN: Uh-huh.
25
              MR. PRESLEY: -- bladder. That's two -- two
```

```
1
              cancers, 11 years -- almost 12 years in the
2
               1970s, POC of 34.
3
              MR. GRIFFON: I don't think we've done many --
4
              many Idahos, but -- yeah, let's -- I think
5
               that's reasonable.
              DR. WADE: Okay, put it down, 81.
6
7
              MR. GRIFFON:
                             81?
8
              MS. MUNN: Uh-huh. And what about 91, new
9
               site.
10
              MR. GRIFFON: What is B&T Metals?
11
              MR. PRESLEY:
                             I don't know where that is.
12
              MS. MUNN: Brand new to me.
13
              MR. HINNEFELD: I don't know.
14
              MR. GRIFFON: And does that belong on the list?
15
              MR. PRESLEY: Look at the date, 1940.
16
              MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
17
              MR. HINNEFELD: It's an overestimate.
18
              guessing that's a TIB-4 case.
                                              That B&T Metals
19
               is probably a uranium metal forming place --
20
              MR. GRIFFON: Right.
21
              MR. HINNEFELD: -- and -- and so I'm -- I'm
22
               thinking that was a AWE -- you know,
23
              overestimating, TIB-4 --
24
              MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
25
              MR. HINNEFELD: -- case.
```

1 MR. PRESLEY: Looking at that date, I'd say 2 you're right there. 3 MS. MUNN: Uh-huh. 4 MR. HINNEFELD: Now that's the date the 5 employee was first employed. MR. PRESLEY: Right. 6 7 MR. HINNEFELD: So the covered date may 8 actually be later than that. 9 MR. PRESLEY: Well, you can look at the years. 10 MS. MUNN: Uh-huh. 11 MR. PRESLEY: Twenty-seven, they go through --12 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 13 MR. PRESLEY: -- '67. 14 MR. GRIFFON: So here's where our -- our -- our 15 dates are important -- John, I'm turning to you 16 on this, this -- this one was done in 2/9/05. 17 The TIB-4 that we've looked at -- TIB-4 was not 18 modified till recently or when -- when was the 19 recent -- see, I think part of the reason we 20 wanted this date was to avoid --21 DR. WADE: Right. 22 MR. GRIFFON: -- last year. 23 DR. WADE: Yeah, '06. MR. GRIFFON: So this would still fall into the 24 25 old TIB-4 model, probably. Right? So for that

1 reason I don't think we -- this is exactly why 2 we wanted the date in there. 3 MR. HINNEFELD: Yeah. 4 MR. GRIFFON: We're getting to the older dates 5 here, too. 6 MR. PRESLEY: Look at -- look at 099. It's 7 different. 8 MS. MUNN: Ah --9 MR. GRIFFON: It sure is. 10 MS. MUNN: -- that -- yeah. 11 MR. PRESLEY: I think that would be a good one. 12 MS. MUNN: Uh-huh, I do, too. 13 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, let's add that. 14 DR. WADE: 099. Twenty-five. 15 MS. MUNN: We're getting there. Probably back 16 to 2004 now. Hmm. 17 MR. GRIFFON: 102 is sort of interesting. I 18 don't know how many X-10s we've had, but --19 MS. MUNN: A few. 20 MR. GRIFFON: -- definitely in the fif-- it's 21 from the 1950s. 22 MS. MUNN: Yeah. 23 **DR. WADE:** Okay, 102? **MR. GRIFFON:** 102? 24 25 DR. WADE: Okay.

1 MS. MUNN: Well --2 MR. PRESLEY: Look --3 MS. MUNN: -- well --4 MR. PRESLEY: -- look at 104. It's different. 5 MS. MUNN: Yeah --6 MR. PRESLEY: But the number of years is -- I don't know whether it'd be worth going through 7 8 it or not. 9 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, .3 years. 10 MR. PRESLEY: Just got .3, so I -- and we 11 haven't done anything about the 100 or the --12 UNIDENTIFIED: 250. MR. PRESLEY: -- 250 days yet, so I don't know 13 14 whether that'd be worth going through it or 15 not. 16 MR. GRIFFON: What do people think on that one? 17 I -- I --18 MS. MUNN: Oh, gosh. 19 MR. PRESLEY: That's a lot of -- a lot of work 20 for -- till we get --21 MS. MUNN: Yeah. 22 MR. PRESLEY: -- until we get that thing on 23 that 80-day point out and see if -- this is not 24 even -- we don't even know for sure that's 80 25 days. It may not qualify at all.

1	MS. MUNN: Yeah.
2	MR. PRESLEY: As much as I'd like to see some
3	for the Lab I mean for the Test Site.
4	MR. CLAWSON: What's all digestive? What
5	just stomach (unintelligible).
6	MS. MUNN: Well, let's put it on the list for
7	the moment.
8	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, all digestive, I I don't
9	know exactly how that's
10	MS. MUNN: Yeah, we don't know what's going to
11	happen with it.
12	MR. PRESLEY: Connective tissue?
13	DR. WADE: What number now?
14	MS. MUNN: 104.
15	DR. WADE: Do you want it on the list?
16	MS. MUNN: Well, I just marked it, I
17	MR. GRIFFON: 104?
18	MR. PRESLEY: No, he's talking about 100. 104,
19	I don't know whether that's going to be worth
20	it or not. If there's something else from the
21	Test Site there, I'd like to see it on there
22	rather than than 104, but I don't see
23	anything else.
24	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, I'd just as soon skip 104.
25	MR. PRESLEY: Yeah.

1	DR. WADE: Okay.
2	MS. MUNN: Okay. Los Alamos, which hmm,
3	yeah, 125 is something new.
4	MR. GRIFFON: 125? Bethlehem Steel, though,
5	it's
6	MS. MUNN: I know we've done a lot of them.
7	MR. PRESLEY: Beat them to death.
8	MR. HINNEFELD: That would have been done
9	probably with the old Bethlehem Steel model,
10	too.
11	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
12	MS. MUNN: Yeah.
13	MR. GRIFFON: The old Bethlehem Steel model. I
14	mean one to me, 124 might be interesting,
15	Blockson Chemical.
16	DR. WADE: Building 55.
17	MR. GRIFFON: It's a low POC.
18	MR. PRESLEY: Uh-huh, 32 years.
19	MR. GRIFFON: But it is 32 years.
20	MR. HINNEFELD: Blockson Chemical's been
21	revised since then as well the site profile
22	and model for (unintelligible)
23	MR. GRIFFON: So that's being re-evaluated
24	anyway.
25	MR. HINNEFELD: Yeah.

1	MR. PRESLEY: Okay.
2	MR. GRIFFON: Forget that one. 126, X-10,
3	pancreatic cancer, do we ha we just picked an
4	X-10, I think it was a liver cancer.
5	DR. WADE: Yeah, it was.
6	MR. GRIFFON: 126, people?
7	MS. MUNN: You want it?
8	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
9	DR. WADE: Okay.
10	MR. PRESLEY: 131's different. The POC's super
11	low.
12	MR. GRIFFON: How many more do we need there?
13	DR. WADE: Three.
14	MR. GRIFFON: Three?
15	MS. MUNN: Yeah.
16	MR. PRESLEY: Y'all may want to look at
17	something else other than that one.
18	MR. GRIFFON: What was that one, I'm sorry,
19	Bob, one
20	MR. PRESLEY: 131 is an ovary.
21	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
22	MR. PRESLEY: I don't think we've done anything
23	like that, but the POC on it's .01, so you
24	know, it's that's super low.
25	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.

1	MS. MUNN: I'd rather see 132, personally.
2	MR. PRESLEY: Yeah.
3	MR. GRIFFON: I agree, 132, yeah.
4	DR. WADE: Okay.
5	MR. PRESLEY: How many have we done for
6	Livermore?
7	MS. MUNN: Huh?
8	MR. GRIFFON: What number are you looking at?
9	MR. PRESLEY: 154 is a pancreas cancer at
10	Livermore with the POC's 26.6 and they
11	worked there 17.2 years.
12	MR. HINNEFELD: By my count there've been
13	there were three from Livermore in the first
14	120.
15	MR. PRESLEY: And I'm sorry?
16	MR. HINNEFELD: Out of the first 120 cases
17	reviewed, three of them were from Livermore
18	MR. PRESLEY: Okay.
19	MR. HINNEFELD: by my count.
20	MS. MUNN: Yeah.
21	MR. PRESLEY: Okay.
22	MS. MUNN: That's (unintelligible).
23	MR. GRIFFON: You want to add that one?
24	DR. WADE: 154?
25	MR. GRIFFON: And how about 141?

1	MS. MUNN: Yeah.
2	DR. WADE: Okay, that's 30.
3	MR. PRESLEY: Now, there's a there's a
4	158, there's one more on there from the Nevada
5	Test Site, POC is very low, the years are low,
6	starts in 1970, but it's a lymphoma
7	MR. GRIFFON: Do we have any
8	MR. PRESLEY: and multiple myeloma.
9	MR. GRIFFON: Do we have any Nevada Test Sites
10	that we've looked at
11	MS. MUNN: We only
12	MR. GRIFFON: (unintelligible)?
13	MS. MUNN: We only had one on this list.
14	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. No, I mean in the past.
15	MR. HINNEFELD: We've we've done five by my
16	count
17	MR. GRIFFON: Oh, okay.
18	MR. HINNEFELD: out of the first 120.
19	MR. PRESLEY: All right.
20	MR. GRIFFON: I'm not sure this would be much
21	different from those, yeah.
22	MR. PRESLEY: No, not from that.
23	DR. WADE: Okay.
24	MR. GRIFFON: I don't know that we want to
25	do we want to select one or two more in case

1 our other colleagues on the Board cross off 2 some on this list? 3 DR. WADE: Well, they'll have the list, they 4 could --MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, yeah, we can always 5 generate a few new ones if we need --6 7 DR. WADE: Okay. 8 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, okay. 9 DR. WADE: You've done hard work. I mean I 10 think if you're ready, I'll have a record of 11 these. I can read them to the Board. 12 MR. GRIFFON: The only thing -- the only -before we adjourn, the only thing I wanted to 13 say -- we got 30, we have these new parameters 14 15 we'll discuss. The fourth set, I -- I will summarize what we've done in our last workgroup 16 17 meeting at the full Board meeting, which is basically that we've met with NIOSH, we've --18 19 we had NIOSH's response and we -- I -- I still 20 have to complete the items, bu-- or the -- the 21 respon-- or the -- the re-- the Board action, I 22 guess is the column, but you know, we've moved 23 -- moved along and had our first meeting as far 24 as the fourth set. We certainly have -- and

I'll try to summarize -- I'll work with Stu on

25

1 -- on summarizing -- not going through every 2 case, but there are some cases that NIOSH has 3 agreed to re-evaluate, you know, several items 4 that we've come to closure on. I'll try to 5 summarize it that way, in a statistical 6 fashion, not line item by line item. MS. MUNN: Much better. 7 8 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 9 MS. MUNN: Much better. 10 DR. WADE: John, a brief comment? 11 DR. MAURO: Yes, very brief. In listening and 12 -- and culling through, there are a couple of 13 perspectives I'd like to put on the table, is 14 one having to do with Nevada Test Site. We're 15 very much involved right now in looking at 16 scenarios where people could have been exposed 17 for a relatively short period of time. 18 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 19 DR. MAURO: The -- I see -- I see cross-20 pollination here. If we do have some cases --21 MS. MUNN: Yeah. 22 DR. MAURO: -- that need to be reconstructed 23 and they are from people who are less than --24 well, 80 days, that would be a scenario. 25 MR. GRIFFON: No, I -- I was thinking of that,

1 too, John, but --2 DR. MAURO: Right. 3 MR. GRIFFON: -- I -- I'm thinking is that .3 4 years in the right area that we're interested 5 in, but --DR. MAURO: Oh, I understand, that's --6 7 MR. GRIFFON: -- we might be able to find that 8 out --9 DR. MAURO: We're --10 MR. GRIFFON: -- through -- yeah. 11 DR. MAURO: -- we're -- yeah, we're in a step-12 wise process --13 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 14 DR. MAURO: -- where first we're looking for 15 scenarios that -- whereby people could have 16 been exposed. All I -- all I'm getting at is 17 I'm trying to cross-pollinate between tasks to 18 see how they could help. 19 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 20 DR. MAURO: And the other -- the other point is 21 SECs, now there are -- you realize that one of 22 the steps we do when we review an SEC is -- is 23 -- what I think would be very beneficial is if 24 we had a couple of cases -- realistic cases, 25 not the min/max cases -- that were -- that

1 we're auditing as part of Task IV that's --2 that is a pending, either it's been qualified 3 or may be qualified SEC, we're -- that's an 4 efficiency step. What I mean by that is we'll 5 have that under our belt. We will have reviewed and audited a realistic case, then 6 7 later on, if it turns out that that's an SEC 8 that you'd like us to look at, we're going to 9 reap the benefits from that. Do you -- so I 10 think that that might be just a consideration 11 when you go into a --12 MR. GRIFFON: Yeah. 13 DR. WADE: Thank you, John. 14 Along those lines, I think we MR. GRIFFON: 15 might want to add that one Nevada Test Site 16 case that Bob was talking about, the .3 years -17 - I'll find the number --MS. MUNN: 18 Uh-huh. 19 MR. GRIFFON: -- and -- and submit 31. 20 people be agreeable to that? 21 MS. MUNN: I'd certainly be agreeable to it. 22 MR. GRIFFON: 'Cause I -- it -- it would be 23 useful to at least see --24 MS. MUNN: Yeah.

MR. GRIFFON: -- you know, where that work was

25

1	done and where it might be an interesting
2	case to look at for that 250-day reason, you
3	know.
4	MS. MUNN: And there's there's one other
5	Mike called my attention to, random selection
6	number 166. Again, it's a diagnosis that we
7	don't ordinarily see
8	MR. GRIFFON: Right.
9	MS. MUNN: and perhaps that might be worth
10	just looking at simply because of the
11	diagnosis.
12	DR. WADE: Do I have that?
13	MS. MUNN: I noticed that it it is a long-
14	time and employer (sic) from from back in
15	the '40s with a very short date
16	MR. GRIFFON: 166, .7 years, though.
17	MS. MUNN: Yeah.
18	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
19	MS. MUNN: Yeah, but was back when.
20	MR. GRIFFON: Yeah.
21	DR. WADE: Yes or no?
22	MR. GRIFFON: Let's add those two. Let's add
23	those two and and
24	DR. WADE: Okay, so that's what number?
25	MR. GRIFFON: total at 32. That's

```
1
              DR. WADE: So yours, Wanda, is 166 and Robert,
2
              your --
3
              MS. MUNN: That was Mike's.
              MR. GRIFFON:
4
                             That was 168, right?
5
              UNIDENTIFIED: (Off microphone) 168, I think.
              MR. GRIFFON: Yeah, 168.
6
7
              DR. WADE:
                        Okay, so now we've got 32.
8
              MR. GRIFFON:
                            Yeah.
9
              DR. WADE: Okay, I think we need to -- 168?
10
              MR. GRIFFON:
                            Yeah.
11
              DR. WADE: On the full list?
12
              MR. GRIFFON: That random list.
13
              DR. WADE:
                        168 then.
14
              MR. HINNEFELD: 168's a Rocky Flats case.
15
              DR. WADE: 168's a Rocky Flats.
16
              MS. MUNN:
                          No.
17
              MR. GRIFFON: Oh, I saw .3 years and I thought
18
               I had the right one, I'm sorry.
                                                158.
19
              MR. HINNEFELD: No, that's not the right number
20
              of years.
21
              DR. WADE: Well, we'll find it.
22
              MR. GRIFFON: We'll find it.
23
              DR. WADE: I'll find it and I'll -- I'll read
24
               it all.
25
              MR. GRIFFON: I'm sorry, I saw the .3 years and
```

1	I thought I had it.
2	MS. MUNN: No.
3	MR. HINNEFELD: It's 104.
4	MR. PRESLEY: Yeah, 104.
5	DR. WADE: Okay. So I've got it, so 104, so
6	there's 32 we'll read.
7	MR. GRIFFON: Yep.
8	DR. WADE: Okay, you guys need to go to lunch.
9	You've worked hard. So we'll adjourn the
10	subcommittee. Thank you. It's on the agenda
11	for the full Board this afternoon.
12	(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 12:25
13	p.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	

## CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

## STATE OF GEORGIA COUNTY OF FULTON

I, Steven Ray Green, Certified Merit Court Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported the above and foregoing on the day of December 11, 2006; and it is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony captioned herein.

I further certify that I am neither kin nor counsel to any of the parties herein, nor have any interest in the cause named herein.

WITNESS my hand and official seal this the 2nd day of February, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_

STEVEN RAY GREEN, CCR

CERTIFIED MERIT COURT REPORTER

CERTIFICATE NUMBER: A-2102