Subj: **Texas City SEC-88 worker petition**
Date: Thursday, January 7, 2010 4:50:54 PM
From: danmckeel2@aol.com
To: melius@nysliuna.org, josiebeach@charter.net, griffonm@comcast.net, james.lockey@uc.edu, wimunn@aol.com, pl.ziemer@comcast.net, tmk1@cdc.gov, stuart.hinnefeld@cdc.hhs.gov, jmauro@scainc.com
cc: danmckeel2@aol.com, rdarne@netzero.com

Members of the Board and Surrogate Data work group
OCAS/NIOSH and SC&A, Ted Katz (DFO)

I write on behalf of a number of Texas City claimants and potential SEC-88 class members. Attached is a petition requesting that OCAS/NIOSH, the Board and Surrogate Data work group, and SC&A reexamine how SEC-88 is being handled. We strongly believe that NIOSH's intent to rewrite its evaluation report is inappropriate. Our position is that DOE transmitted uranium ore source information in Jan. 2008 but has NOT to date changed its Facilities Database. Nor has DOL altered the covered period. A new evaluation report will incorporate an adapted new Blockson radon model that has not been approved by the Blockson work group. SC&A's review of OCAS-IG-004 has not been resolved with NIOSH, and the Board's draft criteria have not been approved by the full Board. SC&A questioned that two of four draft surrogate data criteria had been fulfilled by NIOSH in its evaluation report. NIOSH has made no progress on completing DRs at Texas City in two years (2 of 17 completed even though NIOSH claims the DR can be done). NIOSH offers no explanation for this exceedingly slow progress.

In light of these findings, we ask that the cover letter and underlying issues that led to the petition be acknowledged and addressed.

Sincerely,

-- Dan McKeel 1/7/2010

Daniel W. McKeel, Jr., MD
SEC-88 co-petitioner
Southern Illinois Nuclear Workers (SINEW)
Phone: 573-323-8897
Fax: 573-323-0043
E-mail: danmckeel2@aol.com
US Mail: P.O. Box 15, Van Buren, MO 63965-0015