

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL
NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL
SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND
WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

WORK GROUP ON WORKER OUTREACH

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,
SEPTEMBER 29, 2009

+ + + + +

The Work Group meeting convened in the Zurich Room of the Cincinnati Airport Marriott Hotel, 2395 Progress Drive, Hebron, Kentucky at 9:30 a.m., Michael H. Gibson, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

MICHAEL H. GIBSON, Chairman
JOSIE BEACH, Member
WANDA I. MUNN, Member*
PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official
NANCY ADAMS, NIOSH Contractor*
TERRIE BARRIE, ANWAG*
ANTOINETTE BONSIGNORE, Linde Petitioner*
LAURIE BREYER, NIOSH OCAS*
LARRY ELLIOTT, NIOSH OCAS
MARY ELLIOTT, NIOSH Contractor
DONNA HAND, Public*
EMILY HOWELL, HHS
J.J. JOHNSON, NIOSH OCAS
MARK LEWIS, ATL
VERNON MCDUGALL, ATL
ROBERT MCGOLERICK, HHS
NANCY MAHR, Public*
ARJUN MAKHIJANI, SC&A
JOHN MAURO, SC&A*
KATHRYN ROBERTSON-DEMERS, SC&A

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

I-N-D-E-X

Welcome and Introductions..... 4

Discussion of Draft Implementation Plan.... 6

Worker/Advocates/Claimants Concerns
and Comments

Terry Barrie, ANWAG 169

Donna Hand 170

Antoinette Bonsignore 174

Nancy Mahr 201

Further Discussion of Draft
Implementation Plan 175

Adjourn

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

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

9:34 a.m.

MR. KATZ: Okay, this is an official good morning to everyone. Again, the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Worker Outreach Work Group, and we're going to do roll call and then get right to business beginning with board members in the room.

CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Mike Gibson, Chair of the Work Group.

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Phil Schofield, board member.

MEMBER BEACH: Josie Beach, board member.

MR. KATZ: And on the line?

MEMBER MUNN: Wanda Munn, board member.

MR. KATZ: Okay. And then going through the room, first NIOSH OCAS team?

MR. ELLIOTT: Larry Elliott, director of the Office of Compensation Analysis and Support.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: And contractors.

2 MR. LEWIS: I'm Mark Lewis,
3 Advanced Technical Laboratories, contractor
4 for NIOSH.

5 MR. MCDOUGALL: Vern McDougall,
6 ATL, contractor for NIOSH.

7 MR. JOHNSON: J.J. Johnson, OCAS.

8 MR. KATZ: And --

9 MS. ELLIOTT: Mary Elliott,
10 contractor for NIOSH.

11 MR. KATZ: On the line, OCAS or
12 ORAU or ATL or other contractors?

13 MS. BREYER: This is Laurie Breyer
14 and I'm with OCAS.

15 MS. ADAMS: This is Nancy Adams,
16 contractor with NIOSH.

17 MR. KATZ: Okay. How about
18 ombudsmen? Do we have Denise with us yet?
19 Brock? Okay. I think she hopes to join us.
20 Then SC&A team in the room.

21 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I'm Kathy
22 Robertson-DeMers, SC&A.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: I'm Arjun
2 Makhijani from SC&A.

3 MR. KATZ: And on the line, SC&A?

4 DR. MAURO: John Mauro, SC&A.

5 MR. KATZ: Welcome, John. Okay.
6 Then other federal employees in the room.

7 MS. HOWELL: Emily Howell, HHS.

8 MR. MCGOLERICK: Robert
9 McGolerick, HHS.

10 MR. KATZ: And on the line, other
11 federal employees? Okay. And then members of
12 the public who want to identify themselves on
13 the line. Any folks from the public?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. KATZ: Okay. Mike. Oh I
16 just, and I think everyone on the line knows
17 this, but please mute your phone except when
18 you're addressing the group, *6 if you don't
19 have a mute button, and then *6 again to come
20 back on. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. We've got
22 a pretty full agenda. Hopefully if we can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 stay on task here we can possibly shorten the
2 day a little bit, but I think it's important
3 that we get our draft plan finalized as much
4 as possible and then discussion of the
5 potential evaluation and communication
6 specialists I think are probably the two most
7 important things today. So with that we'll
8 move right into the draft implementation plan.

9 Does everyone have that, or have it available
10 to them?

11 MEMBER MUNN: Mike?

12 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes, Wanda?

13 MEMBER MUNN: I sent you very late
14 -- my apologies -- a request to take a look at
15 the wording in our mission statement to see if
16 we could un-garble the syntax on that. You
17 would have only received that message just in
18 the last few minutes, again, my apologies for
19 that. But as we address the implementation
20 plan, either before it or at some time during
21 that time it would be helpful perhaps for us
22 to take a look at the proposal, clarifying

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that wording. It's just breaking it up into
2 two sentences and making a couple of gerunds
3 out of nouns, other nouns that we've used in
4 the past which I think makes it read a little
5 better. But you might incorporate that into
6 your agenda at some point.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes, I just
8 pulled that up and I agree with Wanda, I
9 think, to start out with the mission
10 statement. Wanda has proposed that we, like
11 she said, just break up the mission statement
12 into a couple of sentences and it reads like
13 this. "The mission of the Advisory Board on
14 Radiation and Worker Health's Worker Outreach
15 Work Group is to evaluate the effectiveness of
16 NIOSH activities in obtaining and making use
17 of information from current and former workers
18 and their representatives," period. "The
19 mission also includes monitoring and
20 evaluating the effectiveness of NIOSH and
21 other sources of assistance to assure this
22 information is available to as many potential

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 EEOICPA claimants as possible." I think it
2 does a good job of breaking it up and making
3 it a little more easy to understand.

4 MEMBER BEACH: So the two changes
5 were adding a period after "representatives"
6 and making "obtain" "obtaining?" Is that the
7 only two changes?

8 MEMBER MUNN: No. The second
9 sentence then, "obtaining" and also "making
10 use of information" in the first sentence.

11 DR. MAKHIJANI: How would the
12 second sentence start?

13 MEMBER MUNN: "The mission also
14 includes monitoring and evaluating --

15 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Arjun, I can
16 forward it to you if you want me to.

17 MEMBER MUNN: -- "the
18 effectiveness of NIOSH and other sources of
19 assistance to assure this information is
20 available to as many potential EEOICPA
21 claimants as possible." I believe it says the
22 same thing, but with a little less redundancy.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Arjun, I sent
2 you a copy of it.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: Oh, thank you.

4 MR. KATZ: You scratched, "for
5 potential EEOICPA claimants," right?

6 MEMBER MUNN: No, I changed it. I
7 moved it so that instead of saying "assistance
8 for" I moved "potential EEOICPA claimants"
9 down to after "available to as many."

10 MR. KATZ: Oh okay, good.

11 MEMBER MUNN: And then scratched
12 "of these current and former workers."

13 MR. KATZ: Got it.

14 MEMBER MUNN: We said "current and
15 former workers" in the first sentence.

16 MR. KATZ: Yes. That sounds nice,
17 easier on the ear and eye.

18 MEMBER BEACH: I think that cleans
19 it up nicely. Thank you, Wanda.

20 MEMBER MUNN: You're most welcome.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, then we'll
22 do that, incorporate that on the next round of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 this. Thanks, Wanda.

2 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, sir.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, now if we
4 can move into the scope of the Worker Outreach
5 Work Group. Does anyone have any thoughts,
6 discussions, questions, concerns?

7 MEMBER MUNN: A couple of
8 comments. In the body of that statement, in
9 the sentence that references PR-012 the second
10 time it reads, "Detailed description of each
11 meeting is available in OCAS-PR-012."
12 Shouldn't that say "description of each
13 meeting type" because the procedure does not
14 describe each meeting, it describes each type
15 of meeting? Is that not correct?

16 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: That's
17 true.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So, instead of
19 "detailed description of each meeting" it
20 would be?

21 MEMBER MUNN: "Each meeting type."

22 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: "Each meeting

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 type."

2 MEMBER MUNN: And just as a matter
3 of form, two sentences later it's easy enough
4 to use the active voice rather than the
5 passive voice by saying, "OCAS provided input
6 to the working group," rather than, "input was
7 provided."

8 MEMBER BEACH: Can you repeat
9 that, Wanda?

10 MEMBER MUNN: That sentence, if
11 we're going to use the active voice which is
12 usually preferable should read, "OCAS provided
13 input to the working group on June 24," rather
14 than, "input was provided by OCAS."

15 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: All right. Any
16 other grammatical concerns?

17 MEMBER MUNN: Next to the last
18 sentence currently reads, "Some specific types
19 of meetings actually provide as well as
20 gather." I don't know, other eyes, but I had
21 to go back and reread that a second time to
22 understand what it says which isn't clear, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 had to reread it. I think we could avoid that
2 by saying, "Some specific types of meetings
3 both provide as well as gather" rather than
4 "actually." "Both provide as well as gather
5 information from workers."

6 MR. KATZ: Yes. You can drop
7 "specific" too which is redundant, really.

8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Drop what, Ted?

9 MR. KATZ: Drop "specific." I
10 mean, "some types of meetings both provide as
11 well as," however Wanda had it.

12 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, "both provide
13 as well as gather information."

14 MEMBER BEACH: Wanda, if we go
15 back up, Wanda, to your first correction under
16 "detailed description of each meeting type in
17 OCAS-PR-012," that needs something I think.

18 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

19 MEMBER BEACH: "A detailed
20 description" possibly, just add an "a" before
21 detailed? I'm not sure how to fix that, but
22 it's not correct the way it is.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: You could just say
2 "detailed descriptions" plural.

3 MEMBER BEACH: That would help.
4 Okay.

5 MR. KATZ: "Detailed descriptions
6 of meeting types are available" is one way to
7 do it. Right?

8 MEMBER BEACH: Sounds better.

9 MR. KATZ: That okay with you,
10 Wanda?

11 MEMBER MUNN: Sure.

12 MR. KATZ: Sure, okay.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. And then
14 as far as the types of meetings that are
15 outlined in the bullets with bullets, does
16 that look like it's a good description,
17 correct description, anything needs to be
18 changed?

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: I have a question
20 for Larry. Do you also have meetings when you
21 gather information for Technical Information
22 Bulletins or not?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. ELLIOTT: It's possible that
2 we could hold a focus group meeting.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. Should that
4 be added to the second bullet, or should that
5 be a third bullet there?

6 MR. ELLIOTT: I think "technical
7 basis document" covers TIB. I think under
8 Information-giving we should add a third
9 bullet for our workshop efforts.

10 MEMBER BEACH: It's on the second
11 page.

12 MR. ELLIOTT: Oh yes, dose
13 reconstruction. I see.

14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Is that better
15 under information-giving or is it a two-way
16 street?

17 MR. ELLIOTT: I think it's a two-
18 way. I think this is fine. I'm sorry, I
19 failed to read further on.

20 MEMBER BEACH: Well, and I just
21 wonder if under the information-giving if the
22 other outreach venues made the information-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 giving and -gathering, add that to the very
2 first and have all those bullets together, or
3 do they need to be separated like that?

4 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Do what now?
5 Say that again?

6 MEMBER BEACH: Well, where it says
7 information-giving and then it gives the two
8 bullets, SEC petition process and then the
9 town hall meetings to educate, and then we go
10 to other outreach venues. Do we need to keep
11 those separate, or can we add those together
12 and then the bullets all together?

13 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Well, the way
14 I'm reading it, it's like some of the meetings
15 are more intended to gather information, some
16 are more intended to give information, and
17 then there are some that are a mix.

18 MR. ELLIOTT: Yes, that's correct.

19 MEMBER MUNN: In the title "Other
20 Outreach Venues," do we actually mean may be
21 information-giving and gathering, or do we
22 mean may be information-giving or gathering?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 One would be just as correct as the other
2 depending upon the meaning.

3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I think
4 it's an and/or.

5 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Well, it would
6 seem to me that -- and maybe I'm wrong, but
7 the other outreach venues are intended for the
8 back and forth, whereas in the information-
9 gathering or giving there could be potential
10 input that would be used. Does that sound
11 right, Larry?

12 MR. ELLIOTT: I have no problem
13 how you phrase it here. To mean it's six of
14 one, half a dozen of the other.

15 MR. KATZ: You could even take out
16 the "may be" and just say "information-giving
17 and gathering" I think here. I just wonder
18 for completeness, it's not a meeting per se
19 but you do have other things, you have the
20 ombudsmen, you have the petition counselor.
21 Do you want these reflected here somehow?

22 MEMBER MUNN: It's my opinion they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 should be since we currently are concerned
2 with --

3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: -- the other
4 sources.

5 MR. KATZ: Could you address them
6 later -- in the plan they're addressed.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes, I agree.

8 MR. KATZ: Okay, so there's the
9 SEC petition counselor and the NIOSH EEOICPA
10 ombudsman.

11 MEMBER MUNN: They could very
12 easily be included in the paragraph --

13 MR. KATZ: What is the third
14 category?

15 MR. MCGOLERICK: Doesn't that come
16 under information-giving under SEC petition
17 process and education?

18 MR. KATZ: I think -- I mean, I
19 think I can speak more for the ombudsman than
20 the petition counselor. I know the ombudsman
21 does a bunch of both. She's not just giving
22 information, but she receives a lot of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 information that she provides on to OCAS and
2 the program. Larry could speak about that.

3 MR. ELLIOTT: That's true. I
4 guess my question is different. Is the
5 Ombudsman's Office subject to review.

6 MR. KATZ: Well, it's not an OCAS
7 -- to be clear, that's not an OCAS function,
8 that's a NIOSH function. But it is certainly
9 part of the portfolio of what gets done for
10 claimants in that respect. I think it's
11 proper for the Worker Outreach Group to be
12 looking at that to be sure.

13 MEMBER BEACH: I agree.

14 MEMBER MUNN: It appears that a
15 sentence just before the last sentence in the
16 following paragraph, the paragraph that
17 immediately follows the listing of the types
18 of meetings could be inserted. Just before
19 "tracking would focus on information provided
20 by site operations," et cetera. Where we're
21 listing CATI's --

22 MR. KATZ: Oh, right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER MUNN: -- DHA meetings,
2 close-out interviews. It seems an appropriate
3 place to add.

4 MR. KATZ: Yes, I agree Wanda, I
5 think that's another way to do it. And it
6 sort of -- it fits it in the sense that this
7 is sort of routine, ongoing service like the
8 CATIs.

9 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Wanda, could you
10 try to put a sentence together, an email to us
11 of how you'd want it to go in there?

12 MEMBER MUNN: Oh dear. Yes. You
13 want to include -- please give me the list of
14 what you want me to include in it.

15 MR. KATZ: So we're just -- we're
16 just talking about the NIOSH EEOICPA ombudsman
17 and the SEC petition counselor.

18 MS. BREYER: And Ted I'll just add
19 in here -- this is Laurie -- that it's similar
20 for me. I mostly educate. I would say the
21 majority of the work I do with individuals and
22 the public is to educate them about the SEC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 petitioning process, but if I do receive
2 information, you know, I do have a process to
3 make sure that gets to the right individuals
4 as well.

5 MEMBER MUNN: Okay, so the NIOSH
6 ombudsman and the SEC petition counselor are
7 the two that you want to include in this.

8 MR. KATZ: Yes. They may need a
9 separate sentence, looking at this.

10 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, it appears to
11 me that they may. And it will be a very
12 simple one, but yes, I'll put something
13 together for us later in the meeting.

14 MR. KATZ: Thanks, Wanda.

15 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. Does that
16 -- so that's all the changes we think we need
17 to make in the scope? Is everyone happy with
18 the content?

19 MEMBER MUNN: It certainly seems
20 to cover the scope.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: What did you
22 say, Wanda?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER MUNN: I said it certainly
2 seems to be an adequate scope.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. Bill, you
4 guys have any concerns?

5 MEMBER BEACH: I was just sitting
6 here trying -- I see on the last paragraph
7 that it talks about previous worker outreach
8 databases, TopHat, WISPR, I was just looking
9 to see where the current one, if it fits in.
10 Do we want that in our scope and not just in
11 our --

12 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, we
13 would have to get rid of "previous."

14 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I think maybe
15 we should do that.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So get rid of
17 the word "previous," right?

18 MEMBER BEACH: Does it need to be
19 in parentheses, or can it just be part of a
20 sentence?

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, any other
22 concerns with the scope?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER MUNN: I guess, I'm looking
2 at that first sentence there that we were just
3 discussing. It indicates what some of the
4 sources are, but it doesn't really state that
5 we're including these. It just lists these as
6 additional.

7 MR. KATZ: I think it could be re-
8 framed to say basically that, you know, in
9 addition to the various meetings, et cetera,
10 that are listed above, OCAS and NIOSH provide
11 and obtain information through a variety of
12 other means, and then list these things, you
13 know, and make clear that these will be
14 evaluated too.

15 MEMBER BEACH: To keep consistent,
16 maybe we should bulletize them in the way that
17 we've done the others, by Arjun specialties.
18 I don't know if it's necessary, but it would
19 make it clearer.

20 MR. KATZ: I think just the
21 English needs to be clear as to what the
22 relevance of these is for this Work Group, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I think that's a simple rewrite.

2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: It needs to be
3 clear that is within our scope.

4 MR. KATZ: Yes. I mean, I agree.

5 DR. MAKHIJANI: Am I being tasked
6 with something?

7 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

8 MR. KATZ: You know, I don't think
9 they have to be all bullets, but I think it
10 could be done nicely in a paragraph. Wanda,
11 maybe if you're going to add a sentence anyway
12 covering the two additional items, if you want
13 to take a crack at this today.

14 MEMBER MUNN: Okay.

15 MEMBER BEACH: Well and the only
16 other thing I have Mike is we've got basically
17 what our mission is. We don't ever say how
18 it's going to be accomplished or how it's
19 going to be tracked. And it may not belong in
20 this first section, but it's something we need
21 to think about.

22 MR. KATZ: Well, the framework for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 how is the evaluation question.

2 MEMBER BEACH: Correct.

3 MR. KATZ: Which follows. I mean,
4 that's just the broad framework for how and of
5 course down the road that'll get fleshed out,
6 but.

7 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. So we'll get
8 to that then.

9 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So would it be
10 better then after the scope section, before
11 the first evaluation objective if we add a
12 sentence or two that says, you know, this will
13 be accomplished by the following objectives?
14 To show that we're taking a second step. We
15 went from the scope to how we're going to do
16 it. Does that make any sense or is that just
17 adding needless words?

18 MR. KATZ: No, I think it's a good
19 idea to have an introductory sentence or two
20 that says in effect that the evaluation to be
21 conducted by the work group will be -- I'm not
22 going to say it in good English here, but will

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 be conducted under the following framework as
2 something to introduce that this is the
3 framework under which these elements will be
4 evaluated.

5 DR. MAKHIJANI: Maybe -- above the
6 list of objectives maybe there can be an
7 overall title that says objectives and then a
8 sentence like what you just said. And then go
9 to Objective Number 1, 2, and so on. Because
10 firstly there is the mission statement, then
11 there's Scope of Worker Outreach Working Group
12 as titled, and the third title can be
13 Objectives.

14 MR. KATZ: Yes and then an
15 introductory sentence or two.

16 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, right.

17 MR. KATZ: And then follow with
18 the actual objectives. That's good.

19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay.

20 MEMBER BEACH: Is that one you're
21 working on, Arjun?

22 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. The

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 evaluation will be conducted by the Work
2 Group. Well what I wrote down is the
3 evaluation will be conducted by the Work Group
4 in the follow-up framework as specified in the
5 following four objectives.

6 MEMBER MUNN: With the following
7 four objectives as a basis.

8 MEMBER BEACH: Did you say "as a
9 basis?"

10 MR. KATZ: I think if you just
11 say, "under the following framework" or
12 something like that. We don't need to say
13 much.

14 MEMBER MUNN: That's simpler.

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.

16 MR. KATZ: And then at some point
17 if you add an objective you don't have to
18 revise that sentence.

19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. So we are
20 ready to look at the objectives now. Start
21 with Number One, any comments or concerns? Is
22 there anything that needs to be cleared up or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 added?

2 MEMBER BEACH: Mike, before we go
3 there I just have one brief question, and this
4 might be a Larry question. In that -- under
5 Outreach Venues including giving and gathering
6 information, under the Dose Reconstruction
7 Workshop that we just went to, that was
8 considered an information-giving, or was it a
9 giving/gathering?

10 MR. ELLIOTT: It was primarily to
11 give information, but while we're there we
12 certainly collect information. We've had SEC
13 petition genesis occur at those workshop
14 meetings.

15 MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

16 MR. ELLIOTT: So I see it
17 primarily as a giving, but we do collect
18 information, we do welcome input as you heard
19 and I've already got three letters from last
20 week's workshop about things that we could do
21 better.

22 MEMBER BEACH: Right. So just for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 me, I just kind of wanted to know if we were
2 coming to audit or coming to look at it, you
3 know, how we would know if it was more giving
4 or gathering, or if it's just always going to
5 be a little bit of both under those titles?
6 So.

7 MR. ELLIOTT: Well, I don't know
8 that there's a strong distinction to make.
9 You know, I think there's -- it's recognized
10 that there's an opportunity in these forums to
11 not only give, but to take in information and
12 we want to address that opportunity both ways.

13 When you look at just the -- I think by
14 comparison the information-giving aspect of
15 these two bullets that are listed here, SEC
16 petition process education and town hall
17 meetings to educate about changes in site
18 profile, those are primarily directed at just
19 providing information. Certainly at those
20 venues we may walk away with some new
21 thoughts, ideas and inputs, but you know our
22 intended goal is to make sure that we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 communicate effectively about how to process a
2 petition, how to submit a petition, how the
3 site profile may have been changed and what
4 was changed, why it was changed.

5 MEMBER BEACH: Well, it's real
6 easy to see what you're giving. It's harder
7 to see what you're getting back and how you're
8 noting that and how you're documenting it so
9 that was where my question kind of came from
10 for us.

11 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Laurie, can I
12 ask you a quick question on these? When
13 you've done a lot of these workshops where
14 you're trying to educate people on the dose
15 reconstruction or SEC petition process, do you
16 receive a lot of feedback at that time?

17 MS. BREYER: Well, you did say
18 Laurie, right?

19 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes.

20 MS. BREYER: Okay. I receive
21 some. The workshops, the dose reconstruction
22 workshops, they usually request feedback from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the participants, and I think Larry and Mary
2 can also talk about that. As far as like the
3 SEC workshops that Denise and I have done in
4 the past, we don't have any kind of formal
5 process for receiving feedback. We do have
6 some informal conversations with people before
7 and after the meeting, and get a lot of people
8 that provide comments about things they did
9 understand or didn't understand, or you know,
10 typically they're positive. But we don't like
11 document the feedback in any kind of formal
12 process.

13 MR. KATZ: If I could make a
14 distinction here, there's -- when you ask for
15 feedback on a process that's a giving, for
16 giving information then you ask for feedback,
17 how well did I do this, that's really distinct
18 from what's being talked about in this
19 evaluation plan, meaning NIOSH getting
20 information related to its technical
21 documents, et cetera, versus giving
22 information. So I think it's a little bit --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 we're mixing apples and oranges here. And if
2 a dose reconstruction workshop is really just
3 to give them information about how we do dose
4 reconstructions, if we're just soliciting
5 information about how well we did that, that's
6 just part of still the giving process really
7 and the board then can evaluate how well we
8 did that, but OCAS is just doing its own due
9 diligence in evaluating how well are we doing
10 this. But if the dose reconstruction workshop
11 is also a venue in which people raise issues
12 about you know whether there needs to be an
13 SEC petition at a site for whatever technical
14 reasons, what have you, if it's intended to
15 address that sort of purpose then that's
16 something that would be evaluated for
17 information-gathering, under an information-
18 gathering mission. So again, so I guess it's
19 really up to OCAS to specify whether these
20 different venues -- what their objectives are
21 and then you evaluate them according to the
22 objectives that OCAS specifies. But just

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 taking in information as to how well OCAS --
2 OCAS taking information in about how well it's
3 doing its job, that's not information-
4 gathering in the sense that we have it in this
5 framework.

6 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So, do we need
7 to make that clear? I agree with you. So do
8 we need to make that clear in one of our
9 objectives?

10 MR. KATZ: So I think, I mean, for
11 this thing what I think, as long as OCAS is
12 comfortable with the categories that these are
13 placed in, I mean I think that's good enough
14 here, but then when you go into detailed
15 evaluation of these different venues, I mean
16 you know OCAS will lay out for you here are
17 objectives for this that you can be evaluating
18 and then you'll, you know, you'll evaluate it
19 against those objectives, against those
20 purposes. So you'll have very specifically
21 from OCAS what they were trying to obtain.
22 And then you can very specifically evaluate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 how well that's getting done and if there are
2 any ways to improve that.

3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: So the
4 workshop was presented as providing
5 individuals with information that they can
6 share with other claimants. Period. The end.

7 Okay? But there were comments invited in the
8 workshop that were pertinent to the site
9 profile and dose reconstruction, so kindly
10 clarify what you mean.

11 MR. KATZ: So, I mean that's an
12 argument that even though they had the
13 objective just of giving information, they
14 have an open forum where people can provide
15 that kind of input and so that's why you have
16 it now, and I guess Larry agreed that it
17 belongs under this giving and getting.

18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: But in
19 terms of evaluating we're only going to
20 evaluate them to the definition that they
21 presented to the participants.

22 MR. KATZ: No, but if they took in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 information at the venue that was related to
2 the technical content of their TBDs and what
3 have you, then you could still follow up as to
4 how did that information get incorporated, for
5 sure.

6 DR. MAKHIJANI: Josie raised that
7 earlier, you know, when information comes up
8 basically what documentation, follow-up, and
9 essentially what you would think.

10 MR. ELLIOTT: And there may not be
11 a formal process. Let's just be frank about
12 it. I mean, Andrew Evaskovich last week
13 reported that he thought dose reconstruction
14 reports were being produced for LANL claimants
15 using two technical information bulletins that
16 were not final, were still in draft form,
17 okay? Well that perks our ears up, that's a
18 flag that gets raised in our minds. What do
19 we do about that? Well, you know, I asked
20 Andrew to send an email to the OCAS inbox so
21 that we can have something from him in writing
22 documenting what his concern was. Then we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 took that and we provided an answer to him.
2 Before we got our answer developed fully he
3 realized that he was speaking in error and so
4 told us in a further email. So, I mean in
5 that instance, that example there may be a
6 documentation trail that could be followed.
7 You know, I think there were other things that
8 we could point to that were brought up in last
9 week's workshop that probably don't have that
10 level of formality associated with them.
11 Something might have been said that we've
12 already considered and we don't find it to be
13 something we're going to carry forward and do
14 anything with, and hopefully that person was
15 told that.

16 MR. KATZ: I mean, when someone's
17 doing an evaluation they could interview you
18 about that, they could find out what happened
19 there and they could lay the facts on the
20 table. And that may be perfectly appropriate
21 for that situation.

22 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: This is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Kathy. Can I ask you to kind of clarify
2 something? Is the OCAS inbox the same as the
3 docket?

4 MR. ELLIOTT: Things can be
5 submitted to the OCAS inbox for the docket.
6 In other words, somebody can write in and say
7 through the OCAS inbox I'd like to make
8 comment on NIOSH's technical bulletin or
9 whatever and they can either ask or we will
10 make a decision and it should be placed in the
11 docket associated with that technical
12 bulletin. I think if you look at our website
13 there is also a reference to how to submit
14 written comments to the docket office
15 directly. There's an address, there is a
16 docket officer mentioned, so it's handled both
17 ways. Formal comments can be submitted to the
18 docket office and comments can be submitted
19 through the OCAS inbox which we will then
20 place in the docket appropriate to that
21 document. Either way a response should be
22 crafted and developed and forwarded back to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the individual. The response may be nothing
2 more than, "We've received your input," by the
3 way. "We will consider it as we revise our
4 technical approach," or what have you.

5 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: This line of
6 discussion we're just having, that is
7 something that will be evaluated under
8 Objective 2, correct?

9 MR. KATZ: Yes.

10 DR. MAKHIJANI: Before we go to
11 Objective 2, under Objective 1 one of the
12 things that really impressed me with the
13 meeting that we went to was who was around the
14 table. I thought it was a really good
15 collection of people. They were obviously
16 experienced advocates. As a result there was
17 a lot of very good back and forth that
18 happened, a lot of lively questioning,
19 discussion, and so on. And so I think who
20 gets around the table and the process for that
21 seemed to be kind of pretty appropriate. I
22 don't know if you want to add a bullet because

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I don't see one. Maybe an elaboration of the
2 second bullet, how OCAS informed workers, or
3 how OCAS or ATL work together because I
4 understood that it was some kind of -- Larry
5 had a letter, I've seen that letter, and then
6 Mark also invited people. I don't know
7 whether you want to have a bullet for that
8 process or assessing that process for who gets
9 around the table or not.

10 MEMBER BEACH: I guess my question
11 is does it change. Is there a different
12 process at each meeting, or?

13 MR. ELLIOTT: Well, I think you're
14 attempting to look into something that is
15 perhaps not very well formalized, not
16 documented in any procedure of any sort. As
17 we approach the commitment to put on one of
18 these workshops we through ATL's good offices
19 they identify the organized labor reps that
20 have not attended one of these in the past, or
21 have attended but feel that they could benefit
22 from a refresher, or they want to bring

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 somebody else with them. So there's an effort
2 that ATL performs in that regard and they
3 certainly -- or Mark or Mary could talk about
4 that at length. The former worker screening
5 programs, this is the second workshop. We
6 really tried to include them and so, you know,
7 we're operating with a list there and
8 availability comes there, those individuals,
9 when they can attend, when they can't attend,
10 you know. They may get an invitation and they
11 can't, so we just go down on the list.
12 Advocates in the same way. I think we've had
13 advocates in this workshop audience probably
14 from the second workshop on and so, you know,
15 as we encounter advocates that we feel could
16 benefit from participating in the workshop and
17 could aid claimants and have the right -- I
18 need to be careful in my choice of words here,
19 but have the ability to get the information
20 across to the claimants too. Quite frankly,
21 some advocates don't, you know, won't benefit
22 from our workshop because they're not going to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 come in and take away what we hope that they
2 will take away. So that doesn't mean we won't
3 invite them, but we tried to identify those
4 individual advocates that have a constituency
5 out there that they're really trying to help
6 and they could benefit from having this
7 information that we can impart to them. And
8 so we're limited by the space available in the
9 venue that ATL has the logistical arrangement
10 that they have arrived at with -- I'm not --
11 ICWUC. And so you know, you can only pack so
12 many people into that space according to the
13 fire code. And we're trying to do this on the
14 cheap to a certain extent. We could certainly
15 rent a bigger space, a bigger hotel, but we
16 find that that can be problematic too. The
17 more people you pack into the room perhaps the
18 less effective we are, the less efficient we
19 are. And so we really tried to target these
20 to 24 or so people because that's what that
21 room will hold and that's what we feel that we
22 can get around the tables and work with in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 exercises with enough staff there to help
2 individual groups from that 24 work through
3 the exercises, et cetera. So I don't know.
4 Does that help your understanding of how we
5 come up with these folks? I mean, you know we
6 had three or four people drop out of this one.
7 After they got the invitation they couldn't
8 attend, so we went on down the list and
9 continued to invite till we got to 24. Vern,
10 you want to?

11 MR. MCDOUGALL: Yes, a couple of
12 things. One, the ICWUC is in the process of
13 getting newer somewhat upgraded space, but I
14 don't want you to think we're stuck in that
15 room for the wrong reasons. One, especially
16 with the people that have traditionally come
17 to these things it creates a nice -- it
18 creates a good atmosphere for worker
19 education. If we had a bigger venue, a tenet
20 of sound worker safety and health training is
21 you don't want to get much bigger than 25.

22 MEMBER BEACH: I don't think we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 were concerned with the space or the size. I
2 think the size was perfect. I think ours was
3 just how do you get the people there, and we
4 know that Mark contacted some people, we know
5 that Larry sent out a letter to --

6 MR. ELLIOTT: I sent a letter to
7 all participants.

8 MR. MCDUGALL: Yes, but let me
9 address that just for a second because it's a
10 little richer and more structured than that.
11 Larry's letter went to people that we
12 identified, okay? We do the groundwork first.
13 We're talking with all of these people with
14 the exception of a couple of advocates that I
15 think Denise talked to. Everybody else was
16 there because we reached out to them,
17 explained what the workshop was about,
18 discussed it, who should attend, and the list
19 of people that should get Larry's letter came
20 out of those discussions, okay? There were
21 people who run medical screening programs who
22 did not get Larry's letter because they told

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 me up front they -- because they were not
2 interested up front, or one that got Larry's
3 letter then decided they weren't interested.
4 But it's a process. And the letter from ATL
5 is basically providing more information to
6 people who have already basically accepted
7 Larry's kind of formal invitation. So it's
8 all a process. Nobody is sending out letters
9 cold just to people on a mailing list saying
10 hey, do you want to come to our workshop,
11 okay? We spend a good amount of effort and I
12 think skill in working that through.

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: Just so my comment
14 wasn't misunderstood. I was actually -- we
15 do, in my other hat, my institute hat, we do
16 annual workshops that are teaching workshops
17 basically, about a variety of technical things
18 to community advocates and leaders, and we
19 have also found with the staff that we have
20 which is several staff people that if you have
21 more than two dozen you can't do it right.
22 And because the interchange -- you can have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 30, we experimented with 30, and I know 30
2 pushes the limit. So it wasn't a comment that
3 there were too few people --

4 MR. ELLIOTT: No, we didn't take
5 it as that.

6 DR. MAKHIJANI: -- or the room was
7 too small or anything like that. It was just
8 that I was impressed with who was around the
9 table.

10 MR. ELLIOTT: And you wanted to
11 know how we arrived at that.

12 DR. MAKHIJANI: And so, you know,
13 is there a process to make that a repeatable
14 result, is that typical, is there something
15 the work group can learn, and so on.

16 MR. ELLIOTT: So this workshop
17 that you observed last week, we wanted it to
18 have a diverse audience so that's why we
19 invited folks from organized labor, advocates
20 and the former worker screening program folks
21 that you saw. We also had and we invited
22 Department of Labor's Ombudsman's Office

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 because we had heard in a previous workshop it
2 would be beneficial to have somebody from DOL
3 there to talk about Part E. And quite frankly
4 we thought that Ombudsman's Office could
5 benefit from what we provided as information
6 as well, and I think they did. We also have
7 had workshops and will have I think a workshop
8 in the future where the audience is
9 substantially different. It can be the whole
10 -- it can be devoted just to resource center
11 and Department of Labor claims examiners.
12 We've done one of those in the past where it
13 was dedicated just to those. We didn't have
14 claimants in the room, we didn't have
15 advocates in the room, we didn't have
16 organized labor folks in the room. It was to
17 inform DOL, the claims examiners and resource
18 centers, what NIOSH's responsibilities are and
19 how we go about performing those so that
20 they're better educated in dealing with the
21 claimant population. And we've already heard
22 that DOL would like to have us hold one of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 those workshops in the future because they've
2 had a number of new claims examiners come
3 onboard.

4 MEMBER BEACH: So you have a
5 tentative April meeting scheduled. When will
6 you decide who's going to be in attendance at
7 that, or is it just a process?

8 MR. ELLIOTT: We haven't decided
9 if that will be dedicated to the resource
10 center DOL folks. Or you know I think Mark
11 and Vern have got to run their trap lines and
12 determine have they got a cadre of folks that
13 didn't get to go to this last one that are
14 anticipating the next one because that'll
15 help. We may put on two real close. This is
16 a lot of work. There's a lot of effort that
17 goes into one of these things behind the
18 scenes and it's like getting ready for a board
19 meeting almost. But they do a fine job and I
20 think it pays dividends to us and so we
21 haven't decided at this point, you know, other
22 than in April we're going to try to schedule

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 one. Now whether it'll be DOL or it'll be
2 labor and advocates and who else, we don't
3 know that yet.

4 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Is there any
5 thoughts to looking into like outside of
6 labor, other professional organizations,
7 Society of Engineers or known retiree groups
8 or something you know?

9 MR. MCDUGALL: We don't
10 consciously exclude retiree groups, for
11 example, but first of all let me tell you Mike
12 that a lot of these folks, the folks who come
13 to these things don't really draw the
14 distinctions between their roles in the way
15 that we are around the table here. For
16 example, the people from Oak Ridge were both
17 from Y12 and ORNL. That four people were both
18 the leadership of the medical screening
19 program and the leadership of the ATLC, and
20 the head of the medical screening program used
21 to be the head of the ATLC. And the core
22 group. And a lot of these people who run

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 medical screening programs may see themselves
2 as advocates. I'm not sure, if you look at
3 Andrew, because Andrew was there with the
4 president of his union. Is he there as a
5 Labor guy or is he there as an advocate?
6 Well, you may define him, but I'm not sure
7 that he needs to define himself that
8 precisely. So this is some of the -- you
9 know, there's a certain amount of art
10 involved.

11 MR. ELLIOTT: I would draw you
12 back to our purpose in holding these workshops
13 and that is to assist, inform, subsidize, help
14 people who are out there helping the
15 population at large that are affected by this
16 program. So if somebody said to us hey, the
17 Painter's Guild, you know, there's a guy there
18 that really is out there reaching out to folks
19 and trying to help folks and he would benefit
20 from your workshop certainly we would sick
21 Mark on him and let him go. We realize at
22 certain sites there isn't an organized labor

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 group that might be appropriate for us to
2 tackle and so they talked with retired folks,
3 they talked with, you know, who's out there
4 helping these folks, who can we benefit in
5 their work. That's the purpose.

6 MEMBER MUNN: Well there continues
7 to be concern and adequate concern --

8 MR. KATZ: Wait, hold on a sec
9 Wanda. You guys are talking over each other
10 and it's impossible for the recorder to
11 capture both.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Go ahead.

13 MR. KATZ: Okay, go ahead Wanda.

14 MEMBER MUNN: It remains a quite
15 valid concern that certainly by appearance
16 many of the special meetings that are
17 organized are organized specifically by and
18 for organized labor members or people who are
19 associated with organized labor's activities.

20 Whether, as in the case quoted, one of those
21 individuals may or may not serve some function
22 outside a specific union function, that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 doesn't change the fact that there's a real
2 concern and it is quite obvious to those who
3 are not members of organized labor that the
4 same attention is not paid to other not
5 organized groups and individuals as is paid to
6 organized labor in setting up these kinds of
7 activities. There's no way that is obvious at
8 first glance to change anything that's been
9 done in the past so that the same kind of
10 requests are received and the same kind of
11 unified effort is made because most of the
12 non-organized units are by definition not
13 organized. It is worthwhile for this board
14 certainly to keep in mind that despite common
15 understanding, the work "worker" does not by
16 definition mean a union member.

17 MR. MCDOUGALL: Wanda, if I may,
18 part of it I think you nailed it when you said
19 something about organized. If people aren't
20 organized in groups in some fashion it's real
21 hard to deal with them. Where we've found
22 organized groups we've dealt with them. An

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 example that I think I might have mentioned
2 before is Pinellas where the -- and that was a
3 non-union group down there, and the retiree
4 group that we started with several years ago
5 has at least in part morphed into whatever
6 that advocacy group is called in Florida now.

7 At least some of the leadership of that
8 original retiree group went into there. There
9 are retiree groups at some of these other
10 sites that we have reached out to and
11 basically they have not been, the ones that
12 we've identified have not been that
13 interested. So --

14 MEMBER MUNN: That's always the
15 case if the information doesn't get to the
16 specific person involved and that of course is
17 something that may not be doable under any
18 circumstances.

19 MR. MCDUGALL: Well, we deal with
20 the people who have been identified as the
21 president --

22 MEMBER MUNN: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. MCDUGALL: -- the president
2 of the retire group and frankly it's the same
3 with the unions, Wanda. You start with the
4 leadership and you kind of depend on the
5 leadership of any of these organizations to be
6 willing to identify the folks that are going
7 to be interested and are going to be
8 contributors.

9 DR. MAURO: This is John Mauro.
10 Good morning everyone. I'm listening to the
11 conversation and I just thought I would offer
12 up a perspective that might be helpful. It
13 appears that there are two different missions
14 that we have today and we're discussing them
15 together in a confounding way. Stay with me
16 for a minute. One is to come to some
17 sensibility regarding of course the mission
18 statement and the implementation plan, and the
19 other is to implement that plan. The
20 conversations that we are having right now are
21 almost a form of implementing the plan. What
22 I mean by that is to discuss what is going on,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 how it's being done, who are we reaching, how
2 we're reaching them. In other words, we're
3 into what I would say the actual
4 implementation and doing the job. But it was
5 also my understanding that we may want to do a
6 little bit of that, but more importantly we
7 want to do a little bit of that so that we can
8 get a richer understanding of our
9 implementation plan and whether or not the
10 language we have, the scope and how we've
11 defined ourselves in terms of the
12 implementation plan is what we want and what
13 we want to bring to the full Board for their
14 blessing. So I just wanted to say that it
15 sounds like these conversations are very
16 useful, but only at this point in the process
17 to the extent that they enrich our
18 understanding of what our implementation plan
19 should look like.

20 MEMBER MUNN: Thank you, John.
21 You are correct from my perspective. I
22 believe we're ahead of the curve. We haven't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 gotten through our implementation plan yet and
2 we're discussing whether or not the
3 implementation plan that we're trying to put
4 together is working now.

5 DR. MAURO: But it's good. As I
6 mentioned, it's good that you talk about the
7 real world, that we've participated in two
8 meetings and there's an enormous amount of
9 experience and going to that place and then
10 coming back again and asking ourselves some
11 probing questions regarding the implementation
12 plan is a good way to do this.

13 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: May I say
14 something? I think what Arjun was proposing
15 was to add another question that says how do
16 you determine who you invite to worker
17 outreach meetings. And it's not just the
18 workshop. It's even more important with the
19 information-gathering.

20 MR. KATZ: Yes, Arjun mentioned --
21 I concur with everything you said, John, but I
22 thought it was great actually. I was very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 pleased to hear the work group actually doing
2 some of the evaluation now. I think that's
3 great for the reason you said, but also
4 because this has to be -- these questions have
5 to be asked as part of the evaluation itself.

6 So I think that's great. On Kathy's point
7 just now, Arjun had said well, the second
8 bullet probably needs to be revised. I think
9 he said something along those lines anyway. I
10 mean you could revise it just to say how OCAS
11 identifies and informs as opposed to how OCAS
12 informs and that then covers this point.

13 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Well I've got a
14 question for Mark. He years ago came out to
15 New Mexico from PACE Union and gave a
16 presentation. Very professional, it was very
17 useful, but what I want to know is how did
18 PACE -- I mean, just using this as an example
19 -- how did he get identified. How you're
20 going to present this and who you're coming
21 for -- I mean, looking at?

22 MR. LEWIS: I was invited there by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what are called the POWs. They asked me to
2 come out and as far as how I was going to
3 present it I just winged it. I only had a
4 little bit of information and what I could
5 find out about how -- I just went by how --
6 what I did, what we did as the PACE Union as
7 far as empower people and doing outreach for
8 the retiree group like some of the stuff we're
9 talking here. I just went out and just was
10 myself.

11 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: So the union
12 didn't have a formal --

13 MR. LEWIS: No.

14 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Okay. That's
15 what I was getting at.

16 MR. LEWIS: That was me just doing
17 a request from someone from Los Alamos and I
18 went to the international, blessed it, took my
19 little boy with me and away we went.

20 MEMBER BEACH: So if we get back
21 to Objective 1. The first sentence after the
22 objective says, "Examine procedures by which

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 OCAS solicits worker involvement." Do we need
2 to list the procedure or procedures? Are
3 there more than one procedure? Because I know
4 we've got OCAS-PR-012.

5 MEMBER MUNN: I would suggest we
6 not list procedures simply because we change,
7 add to and delete procedures from time to
8 time. And we can very easily get caught in
9 the trap of having to follow a thread of a
10 change like that through multiple documents.

11 MEMBER BEACH: What if we say
12 "process?"

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: That's actually
14 what we're doing.

15 MEMBER BEACH: Yes. But I hate to
16 say "procedures" and then, well what
17 procedures are we supposed to be looking at
18 and it's not clear.

19 MR. KATZ: Well, some procedures
20 aren't written, but processes, procedures and
21 processes if you want to. That sounds like a
22 good idea because you just basically

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 interviewed Larry and ATL about process, you
2 know, as part of this.

3 MEMBER BEACH: Yes. And do we
4 need to add ATL to the OCAS, or do we need to
5 leave it as OCAS? Understanding that you're
6 quite a big part of this.

7 MR. KATZ: I'm sorry.

8 MEMBER BEACH: Oh that's fine.

9 MR. ELLIOTT: I don't think you
10 should name contractors because contractors
11 can change over time. I don't want them to
12 change, but --

13 MEMBER BEACH: That's fine, I was
14 just asking the question.

15 MEMBER MUNN: One comment with
16 respect to the structure of our evaluation
17 Objective Number 1 as well, that the bullets
18 probably would be clearer if they all followed
19 the questions format rather than making a
20 statement and putting a question after it.
21 That first word, I mean that first sentence
22 underneath the evaluation where we say,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 "Examine the procedure by which OCAS solicits
2 worker involvement," we might want to add, "by
3 reviewing:" and then listing those bullets.
4 That first bullet would probably read more
5 properly if it said, "How does OCAS determine
6 whether an outreach meeting is to be conducted
7 for a facility? How does OCAS identify and
8 inform workers of the opportunities for
9 input?" The others are all appropriate
10 questions. Those first two are statements
11 followed by a question mark.

12 MEMBER BEACH: Well, I guess
13 Arjun, are you making all the changes that
14 we're doing here?

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, I'm
16 following along to the extent that, you know,
17 the kind of different words that are being
18 said by different people. So I have my
19 version that I can send around so you all can
20 look at it and see if I captured the
21 discussion. I am making notes.

22 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I was just

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 curious if there was just one official version
2 that.

3 MR. KATZ: I think it would be a
4 good idea for everyone to take notes for the
5 review process.

6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well,
7 Arjun's doing the electronic note-taking.

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: For us.

9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I'm doing
10 the handwritten.

11 MEMBER BEACH: Okay, so the very
12 first statement, "Examine the." We changed it
13 to "process," got rid of "procedures," I
14 thought, "by which OCAS solicits workers'
15 involvement." And then Wanda added "by
16 reviewing" and that was all I got, Wanda.

17 MR. KATZ: Yes. We want it to be
18 plural, whatever, "processes" because
19 obviously there are many, many approaches to
20 this depending on what's needed.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Are we leaving
22 "procedures" and adding "processes" or? I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 thought that's what she suggested.

2 MEMBER BEACH: We are leaving
3 "procedures" and adding -- okay. That's fine.

4 MR. KATZ: Processes and
5 procedures.

6 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay.
7 Evaluation 1. Is there any other changes that
8 need to be made? Is there anything missing
9 that we may have identified with our
10 discussions here?

11 MEMBER MUNN: In that final
12 bullet, again just grammatical I think. "Are
13 arrangements made to participate for those
14 interested but unable to travel to the
15 outreach meeting" rather than the current
16 wording with the gerund in it. "Are
17 arrangements made to participate for those
18 interested but unable to travel to the
19 outreach meeting?"

20 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I think
21 that we're still missing the question of how
22 do you determine who's invited?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: I thought we added
2 that.

3 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, we added that.

4 DR. MAKHIJANI: Should I read it
5 back, the first three things as I have them
6 and then you can change them, just so? Okay.

7 So I have at the top, "Examine the procedures
8 and processes by which OCAS solicits worker
9 involvement by reviewing the following," and
10 then there's a set of bullets. And the first
11 bullet is "How does OCAS determine whether an
12 outreach meeting is to be conducted for a
13 facility?" The second bullet is "How does
14 OCAS identify and inform workers of the
15 opportunities for input and follow-up to
16 secure participation?" Those are the only
17 changes I have so far in the first set of
18 bullets.

19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: And Wanda just
20 suggested the last bullet, to add "to
21 participate" after the word "made."

22 DR. MAKHIJANI: I didn't follow

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 exactly.

2 MEMBER MUNN: Okay. Arjun, would
3 you like me to read the sentence as I read it
4 earlier?

5 DR. MAKHIJANI: Sure.

6 MEMBER MUNN: "Are arrangements
7 made to participate for those interested but
8 unable to travel to the outreach meeting?" I
9 just moved the "participation" up to follow
10 "made."

11 DR. MAKHIJANI: I'd like to
12 suggest a friendly amendment to that, Wanda --

13 MEMBER MUNN: Go ahead.

14 DR. MAKHIJANI: -- which is to the
15 idea really here which is just to participate
16 in outreach meetings. If you make it plural,
17 I gather some of these meetings are not really
18 set up to have people connected by phone, that
19 they won't necessarily all be the right forum
20 to have someone, but I guess the question is
21 valid whether there are means taken to allow
22 participation for people who can't travel to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 one meeting or another, not necessarily a
2 specific meeting. But are there arrangements
3 made for people who can't travel is sort of
4 the question, right?

5 MEMBER MUNN: That's the bottom
6 line.

7 MR. KATZ: So arrangements made to
8 participate for those interested but unable to
9 travel to outreach meetings, just to make it
10 plural. Then what's clear is that these
11 people can't travel to meetings we hold far.

12 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, agreed.

13 DR. MAURO: This is John. I have
14 one more thought along this sequence. It
15 seems that at the end of each piece there
16 should be a question where we solicit. It may
17 already be there. I don't have what you have
18 in front of you, but solicit from the
19 participants whether or not the approach that
20 was used at that particular get-together was
21 effective in reaching out to the right people.
22 Did they get the material in a timely

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 fashion. In other words, seeking feedback on
2 that aspect of the program, namely how it was
3 all arranged and who we reached out to and the
4 other elements that make up that particular
5 step in the process. So we have what I call a
6 self-improving process where we're always
7 getting feedback from the parties that we're
8 interested in and then captured that and make
9 sure that the next time we do it we take those
10 new things and recommendations into
11 consideration.

12 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, John. Those
13 kinds of questions crop up in this second
14 objective.

15 DR. MAURO: They do? Okay.

16 MEMBER MUNN: What information was
17 obtained, was it communicated to participants,
18 did the participants have the opportunity to
19 comment. That's captured in the second
20 objective.

21 DR. MAURO: Okay.

22 MEMBER MUNN: I think.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: There's also
2 evaluation stuff in the fourth objective.

3 MEMBER BEACH: So I'm having a
4 little trouble with the sentence, "Examine
5 several examples of OCAS solicitations and
6 follow-up associated with several particular
7 work products." What are we looking for
8 there, or am I just missing?

9 MR. KATZ: So, the first series of
10 bullets is looking at processes and
11 procedures, and the second arena is to
12 actually take some examples sort of -- so
13 there was some discussion earlier about some
14 specific examples, but to take some examples
15 and examine them in detail what happened. So
16 versus looking at generic processes and
17 procedures and understanding what are they and
18 do they make sense and so on. Then it's in
19 real life looking at a few examples, narrow
20 our focus, held meetings, how were those
21 meetings held, how do they compare, the
22 reality compares to the processes and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 procedures.

2 MEMBER BEACH: That helps, thank
3 you.

4 MR. ELLIOTT: I'd like to offer a
5 suggestion. I don't want to lose the word
6 "worker" but I think that it would benefit
7 from adding "worker and stakeholder
8 involvement."

9 DR. MAKHIJANI: Where are we,
10 Larry?

11 MR. ELLIOTT: Well, I think if you
12 look at the first, right under Evaluation
13 Objective 1, that first sentence that you
14 worked on, "Examine the procedures," la, la,
15 la. I think if you insert "and stakeholder
16 involvement" it becomes a little broader and
17 perhaps more encompassing and appropriate. I
18 think there are some other areas here that
19 you've got just "workers," maybe that's okay,
20 maybe you want to add "and stakeholder," but
21 just a suggestion.

22 MEMBER MUNN: I don't know whether

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 "stakeholder" -- it's such a broad term.
2 "Worker representatives" possibly? It's a
3 grammatical thing.

4 MR. ELLIOTT: Well, I think - I'm
5 proposing this or suggesting this because we
6 want to talk to workers, we do talk to
7 workers, but we also talk to claimants who are
8 not workers. We talk to petitioners, who are
9 not necessarily workers. We talk to advocates
10 who in their own right have a job and they are
11 working, but they're not a worker as we would
12 define it in the context of this document,
13 this program. And I think all of those folks
14 are a stakeholder.

15 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: I tend to agree
16 with that.

17 MR. KATZ: Workers, claimants and
18 their representatives would probably cover the
19 waterfront.

20 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Ted, if I could
21 take a second here. I just got an email from
22 Terrie Barrie that said she's trying to call

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 in and she just gets a busy signal. So I'm
2 not sure the phones are working.

3 MR. KATZ: Well, we're listening
4 to Wanda and John and to the folk, right? We
5 still have you all?

6 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, you sure do.

7 MR. KATZ: So the phone line is
8 working. I'm wondering if Terrie, if you want
9 to send her the phone number again, maybe
10 she's dialing the wrong number.

11 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I've sent her a
12 copy of the agenda.

13 MR. KATZ: And we don't have many
14 people on this phone line. It's probably
15 automatically at least 50 people can join and
16 we have something like seven.

17 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, there were only
18 six when I dialed in.

19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Could you ask
20 and see if she's on the line?

21 MR. KATZ: Terrie, have you joined
22 us now?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I'll just tell
2 her to try to dial again.

3 MR. KATZ: Yes, I would try to
4 dial again because we wouldn't have John and
5 Wanda if the phone line weren't working.

6 MR. ELLIOTT: I would also like to
7 go back and make a distinction on this
8 discussion about evaluation of did we meet the
9 target, did we hit the target. There's an
10 evaluation that we should be performing at the
11 end of these workshops or at the end of these
12 outreach events ourselves trying to gain a
13 perspective from the attendees and the
14 participants as to whether or not they found
15 it to be helpful and official or productive.
16 But you know, I think last week in the
17 workshop it was suggested that maybe each of
18 the participants be touched by SC&A or the
19 board member present to see what their
20 thoughts were. And I think that's problematic
21 in that if you use a questionnaire approach
22 you run up against the Paperwork Reduction Act

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and you need OMB clearance to touch more than
2 10 people that way. So you need to be
3 cognizant of that concern, that issue.
4 Certainly any of the evaluation sheets that we
5 would provide at the end of a session should
6 be loaded up in the database for that event so
7 that, you know, the reviewers could see what
8 was commented upon what was said.

9 DR. MAURO: Larry, this is John.
10 I want to second that. I feel it's very
11 important that SC&A or the Board's contractor
12 that's sitting in on these meetings is doing
13 so in a passive mode, collecting information,
14 trying to make intelligent observations, but
15 we should not be intrusive. Our role is after
16 the meeting doing the things we're doing right
17 now, namely feeding back to the Work Group
18 some of our observations, maybe some
19 suggestions, but I don't - right now at least,
20 unless things - I think that at least we
21 should not be thinking in terms of SC&A as
22 being part of trying to gather data ourselves

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 on part of the board unless the Work Group
2 wants that, but my suggestion would be no, we
3 have a passive role.

4 MEMBER BEACH: Well, can we
5 evaluate the questions that are asked at the
6 end of the workshop? Would that be something
7 we could do then?

8 DR. MAURO: I would argue that
9 yes, we certainly should do that, but only at
10 the meeting when we regroup here. In other
11 words, you know, one of our roles would be
12 let's say, as Larry just pointed out, there
13 may be a lot of give and take and seeking
14 information from the participants on the
15 effectiveness of the meeting, and that
16 information is going to be acquired and we
17 should be there taking notes, listening to
18 what people say, but I don't think we should
19 become part of that. I think then we later
20 during the post-meeting activities when the
21 SC&A and the Work Group reconvene in some
22 capacity, it's at that time that we feedback

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 our information, rather than becoming active
2 participants in these meetings unless for some
3 reason Work Group members or Larry and the
4 folks want to elicit anything from SC&A during
5 the meeting. I would assume that that would
6 be unusual, but certainly I mean if such an
7 event occurs where a question may be asked of
8 the Work Group representatives related to some
9 matter in real time during the meeting, well
10 fine. But other than that I think the ground
11 rules at least for now should be a passive
12 role.

13 MEMBER BEACH: I agree.

14 MEMBER MUNN: I would strongly
15 suggest that we follow Josie's suggestion. As
16 a matter of fact, it never occurred to me that
17 we would expect our contractor to take an
18 active role in these meetings unless they were
19 specifically directed to do so by the Board.
20 Au contraire.

21 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: This is
22 Kathy. One of the things that I did after

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 observing the workshop was to walk through the
2 evaluation criteria and what I found is that
3 some of the questions I needed to go back to
4 NIOSH to get clarification, and some of the
5 questions I couldn't answer merely by
6 observation.

7 MEMBER MUNN: We wouldn't
8 anticipate that anyone would be able to answer
9 all the questions. All the questions should
10 not be applicable to any given meeting or to
11 any given process. What this document is that
12 we're supposedly working on now is a broad
13 scope document which would cover, we would
14 hope, almost any conceivable type of outreach
15 that we might be involved in. A specific
16 meeting in itself should -- cannot possibly be
17 viewed in the context of every single one of
18 the aspects that we're attempting to cover
19 here I shouldn't think.

20 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I realize
21 that, but there are some items that are
22 applicable to this type of meeting that you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 just need to be aware you may not be able to
2 answer that question by observation.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, I think what
4 John and Kathy are saying are two different
5 things. One is we have ground rules for
6 participating as observers as the charter that
7 was given to us by the working group. And so
8 it's changed. I think that's what it should
9 be. This is NIOSH's show and ATL's show and
10 we should observe that. And there's a report-
11 back process that you know the Work Group can
12 set up if you want verbal reports, if you want
13 written reports. I think what Kathy is saying
14 which I would support, we discussed and the
15 context in which sending the question came up
16 is if we want to know what the participants
17 got out of it, it may be necessary to call up
18 a couple of them and say okay, you know, you
19 heard about dose reconstruction, do you
20 understand more now than before, do you know -
21 - are you stuck on something, are you able to
22 help advocate better to have our own

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 evaluation at the Work Group as to whether the
2 process is working. But that's clearly a
3 post-meeting function.

4 DR. MAURO: Arjun, this is John.
5 I would argue strongly that certainly that is
6 a matter of great interest, but that's
7 something that is within the purview of NIOSH
8 whereby -- and OCAS, whereby they would be the
9 ones on the front lines who would be very
10 interested in finding that out, and so
11 something that we -- now if that's not done,
12 we as assistants to the Work Group might want
13 to discuss this matter at one of our meetings
14 saying that we noticed that there really was
15 no effort made to do X, Y and Z. We might
16 want to suggest you want to consider that, but
17 we don't do that. I don't see it, at least at
18 this stage in the development of the program
19 that we would go in and start to perform our
20 own surveys of the effectiveness of the
21 program. I think surveys of the effectiveness
22 of the program in whatever form it takes is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 certainly and entirely within the purview of
2 OCAS.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: You're not
4 understanding. We're developing -- maybe I
5 didn't say what I meant to say. We've got all
6 of these exhortations, evaluate this, examine
7 that, review the other as part of the
8 procedure the Work Group is setting up for
9 itself. And in the course of doing that --
10 NIOSH of course, we know NIOSH and ATL are
11 doing evaluations of the workshop. They hand
12 out an evaluation form and workers fill them
13 out and they give us copies of the form and
14 they do their own evaluation, but if the Work
15 Group wants to do this and sees a function for
16 SC&A, then it may be necessary to contact some
17 participants within the restrictions of NIOSH
18 and the law and so on. Someone actually
19 brought this up with Larry informally and
20 that's how this whole thing came up is because
21 I was concerned that we shouldn't be sending
22 out interview questionnaires without informing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 NIOSH as to what the proper procedure should
2 be.

3 DR. MAURO: I understand what
4 you're saying, Arjun. Well, this is certainly
5 a very, very important question that needs to
6 be discussed by the Work Group, that is, the
7 degree to which the Work Group and its
8 contractor should independently evaluate and
9 test the waters on effectiveness. I have to
10 say in my mind that was not at least initially
11 going to be something that we would be doing.

12 But if that's something -- in other words, in
13 the process of assessing, my mind was
14 assessing was more in the passive role as
15 opposed to an active role.

16 MR. KATZ: Just my thoughts on
17 this. I mean I -- I think you would want --
18 in an evaluation you would want to start by
19 looking at the data that's available. So I
20 mean, if you go through the data that's
21 available through the evaluations that OCAS
22 does itself pertinent to a question, an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 evaluation question, and that data is
2 sufficient, then certainly you don't need to -
3 - there's no point in duplicating OCAS
4 efforts. If you go through the data that's
5 available and you find that it's not
6 sufficient for you to answer the question,
7 then you have to think about collecting data.

8 MR. ELLIOTT: Or you can make that
9 as a comment.

10 MR. KATZ: What have you, either
11 way. But I mean, it really is -- you can only
12 make decisions about this as you get to the
13 point where you find you don't have sufficient
14 information.

15 MR. ELLIOTT: I think there's a
16 lot of churning here, but I'm not sure to what
17 degree of benefit the churning is going to
18 result in. You have to recognize that,
19 whether it's a workshop or it's an SEC town
20 hall meeting, and quite frankly some of the
21 meetings that we hold we don't have an
22 evaluation tool at the end of the meeting. We

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 have never seen the need to have one. Maybe
2 that's a fault, maybe that's misplaced, I
3 don't know. Maybe that's a finding you all
4 could come in and talk to us about. But these
5 people that we invite to a workshop, that we
6 invite to a focus group to talk about a site
7 profile or to -- five workers around a table
8 to talk to us about an SEC petition and
9 elaborate on what the work practices and work
10 experience was like, you know, I'm not sure
11 that in every instance we know what those
12 people's motivations are, what they hope to
13 get out of it, what they expect to get out of
14 it, whether it's a workshop or they understand
15 they're being asked to participate to help us
16 better understand their working conditions.
17 You know, so I just want to lay that out
18 there. I don't think you can go into this
19 with a mind set that if you ask three or four
20 people from the workshop last week whether or
21 not they understood dose reconstruction better
22 or they got what they thought they needed to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 get out of it if that's going to be very
2 telling.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: That can be a very
4 good point. I think some of this comes, in my
5 mind at least, from a prior review we did of
6 CGR 97 which is now being replaced. And at
7 that time we were reviewing only the
8 information that NIOSH was getting from
9 workers, and how NIOSH was documenting and
10 using that. And in that context I think this
11 particular thing is much more important.
12 Because I agree, I mean, when you do workshops
13 for 25 people let alone a town hall meeting
14 with 50 or 100, what people get out of it is
15 going to vary a great deal. And yes, so the
16 Work Group needs to consider, you know,
17 exactly you know, how information-giving
18 workshops -- I think it's much more important
19 to follow the trail in information-getting
20 workshops where NIOSH is soliciting input to
21 TBDs or SECs or developing its own matrix and
22 so on, whether that was thorough and what

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 happened to that information.

2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I tell you what.

3 Why don't we take a 10-minute break and when
4 we come back just try to focus back on the
5 written words and make sure that everything is
6 covered.

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I think we
8 lost the trail somewhere off the written thing
9 here. I lost the trail. We were --

10 MR. KATZ: Let me just check
11 before I put the phone on mute whether Terrie
12 has joined us? Terrie?

13 MS. BARRIE: Yes, Terrie's here.

14 MR. KATZ: Okay, great.

15 MS. BARRIE: Yes, I don't know
16 what the problem was. And I had to hang up
17 and then call back in. Then I got immediate
18 busy signal, but then I redialed and I'm back
19 on.

20 MR. KATZ: Oh good, okay. Well
21 I'm sorry you had trouble.

22 MS. BARRIE: Okay, thanks.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 (Whereupon, the above-entitled
2 matter went off the record at 11:04 a.m. and
3 resumed at 11:18 a.m.)

4 MR. KATZ: Okay. We're getting
5 restarted. Folks, do we have you on the
6 phone, Wanda?

7 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, you do.

8 MR. KATZ: Great.

9 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, so we
10 looked at Evaluation Objective Number 1. Are
11 we satisfied with it? Anymore discussion we
12 need on it?

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: Should I just read
14 back what I wrote in place of workers in
15 response to what Larry was saying?

16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.

17 DR. MAKHIJANI: "Examine
18 procedures and processes by which OCAS
19 solicits the involvement of workers, claimants
20 and their representatives by reviewing the
21 following." So instead of -- in place of
22 "worker" was the involvement of workers,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 claimants and their representatives. Because
2 Wanda thought that was too broad. Those are
3 the words somebody said.

4 MR. KATZ: I did.

5 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, I think that's
6 what we agreed to earlier.

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay, fine.

8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. Are we
9 ready to move on to Evaluation Objective
10 Number 2?

11 MEMBER MUNN: We didn't finish,
12 did we, with -- once we had gotten through
13 that first set of bullets we didn't cover the
14 "Examine several examples," did we?

15 MEMBER BEACH: Not really.

16 MEMBER MUNN: I didn't think we
17 did. Those, from my perspective appear to be
18 the correct questions. It isn't clear to me
19 whether we anticipate in each case that we as
20 a Work Group are going to do this examination,
21 or whether we're anticipating that our
22 contractor will essentially do most of this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and report to us. But in either case, in that
2 second bullet under "Examine several examples"
3 we have the question "Did OCAS make an
4 appropriately extensive effort to obtain
5 elicit," my suggestion would be to eliminate
6 the word "obtain" there because whether or not
7 one makes an effort to obtain something is
8 different than whether one makes an effort to
9 elicit it. It is probably wise for us to
10 remember that one can only elicit
11 participation and information. One can't
12 really force that participation or obtain it
13 in any way other than through eliciting it.
14 So my suggestion would be to eliminate the
15 word "elicit" there. In either case, if we
16 retain it then it needs to be "obtain and/or
17 elicit" whichever. One of those two words
18 needs to go.

19 MR. KATZ: My English sense is I
20 would dump "elicit" but the emphasis is on the
21 effort, not on you know obviously you make the
22 effort, but what you get in response is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 another question. But anyway, I don't --
2 either one will work. But I agree, both
3 aren't needed.

4 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. What do
5 you want to keep Bill, any?

6 MEMBER BEACH: I don't care. I
7 already marked off "obtain" so I don't care
8 either way. Whatever's best.

9 MR. KATZ: Sounds good.

10 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Let's just leave
11 it as "elicit" for now. When we get all our
12 different versions in we may change it to
13 "obtain." Okay, any other concerns under the
14 last three bullets Wanda or Josie?

15 MEMBER MUNN: No, none at all. I
16 still do have a concern though over whether we
17 are setting these requirements or proposed
18 requirements for ourselves, or whether we're
19 setting them out for our contractor. But
20 that's not -- this may not be the time to
21 discuss that. Just something to keep in mind
22 I think as we're going through these

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 questions.

2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. Okay.
3 Evaluation Objective Number 2, obtaining and
4 documenting input from workers.

5 MEMBER MUNN: Now, that's --
6 there's a question. Are we appropriately
7 couching our objectives as questions? Should
8 we not be couching our objectives as
9 statements? We have the same problem of
10 course, the same question, the same issue with
11 each of the objectives. Number 1 is also
12 couched as a question.

13 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I think they
14 should be statements myself, not questions.

15 MEMBER MUNN: Objective Number 1
16 perhaps, determine whether OCAS is taking
17 appropriate measures, et cetera. And in
18 Number 2 it would be determine whether OCAS is
19 obtaining and documenting input from workers.

20 MR. ELLIOTT: I suggest that you
21 can drop it three letters up. I think it's
22 OCAS and contractors. We don't have some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 contractors.

2 MR. KATZ: And is this, well, is
3 this all procedures or are there actually
4 processes that -- are there processes that
5 aren't proceduralized as well? Okay, so we
6 probably need to make that change too here.
7 Well, it's just you're going to be looking at
8 processes and procedures, rather than just
9 procedures because I gather there will be
10 processes that aren't documented in a formal
11 procedure.

12 DR. MAKHIJANI: I have a question
13 about these three bullets. The way they are
14 written right now doesn't fully correspond to
15 the objective. Because all the questions
16 relate to whether OCAS has a procedure to do
17 this or that, it doesn't actually --

18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: The
19 original intention was to assess the program
20 against the procedure.

21 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, but it
22 doesn't actually say that we're going to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 assess the program, or you know, is OCAS
2 adequately documenting worker -- you know, how
3 is OCAS -- if you follow the first set you
4 would say how is OCAS documenting the input
5 and is it following the procedure. So I
6 presume the existence of a procedure, and Ted
7 was saying it may be more of that.

8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well and
9 that's -- originally it was targeted at the
10 procedure. Now we just change the words. So
11 now -- now we need to modify it because the
12 questions were directed at the procedure.

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.

14 MEMBER BEACH: Well, we didn't
15 take out procedures, we just added "and
16 processes" right?

17 DR. MAKHIJANI: And my question
18 was to the three bullets under that. They
19 seem to not correspond to the breadth of the
20 objective, that in the objective we say we
21 want to determine whether OCAS is obtaining
22 and documenting, and so you want bullets that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 will go to how we're going to do that, the
2 questions that relate to that. Like the first
3 question might be how does OCAS document the
4 input that it gets from workers, whatever. I
5 mean, I'm just raising the question. Those
6 bullets seem very narrow.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Did you have any
8 suggestions for language?

9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: You can say
10 processes or procedures and then take out --
11 you can put in "processes and procedures" and
12 then take out "as defined in the OCAS-012."

13 MEMBER BEACH: So we're not really
14 asking if they have a procedure because they
15 do, 012 is the procedure, correct? So are
16 they effectively gathering information based
17 on that procedure and their processes?

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: I would --

19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: We just
20 changed the intent of the first statement by
21 adding "processes." Now we have to modify the
22 bullets underneath to reflect that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 modification.

2 DR. MAKHIJANI: What I might
3 suggest for the first one would be "How does
4 OCAS document worker input from information-
5 gathering meetings."

6 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

7 MR. KATZ: Yes. I think maybe
8 some of Arjun's discomfort or mine is at least
9 that what he's saying has some resonance is
10 the way these are stated right now it's as if,
11 if you answer these three questions you've
12 covered the topic and these are very -- some
13 of them, like particularly the third bullet is
14 a very narrow sort of question that you can
15 ask. So I sort of agree with the direction
16 Arjun's going in and just broadening this so
17 that it's -- I don't think -- my guess is that
18 people don't have all the questions at this
19 point right now at the table that you'd want
20 to ask. But if you have a very broad question
21 like Arjun suggested or several broad
22 questions, then you sort of fill in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 details as you go along, but we don't have
2 those questions right now at the table.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: And that's
4 something --

5 DR. MAURO: This is John. I might
6 be repeating what I heard. I wasn't able to
7 hear everyone clearly, but there seems to be a
8 disconnect between the statement of Objective
9 2 which is a very broad statement: is OCAS
10 obtaining and documenting input? Well, the
11 three bullets really don't go that broadly.
12 They go only, well, they only talk about the
13 procedures. Perhaps the problem is the
14 definition of the objective. It could be
15 broadened to include, you know, the degree to
16 which there are procedures and second, the
17 degree to which those procedures are
18 effective.

19 MR. KATZ: I mean John, the thing
20 that you're missing is that there's sort of a
21 set of looking at procedures and processes.

22 DR. MAURO: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: And then there's a set
2 of questions that -- actually them in
3 progress, the effectiveness of them in
4 practice. So it is covered, but the first set
5 is sort of looking at, well, first you look at
6 the processes and procedures and then you look
7 at how effective are they in practice.

8 DR. MAURO: Okay.

9 MR. KATZ: So it gets to --

10 DR. MAURO: It gets there. You're
11 saying that it's structured that way, so it's
12 a two-tier process that does both.

13 MR. KATZ: Yes. Right.

14 DR. MAURO: As long as everyone is
15 comfortable with that, I'm fine.

16 MR. KATZ: Because you would
17 probably want to know the processes and
18 procedures, understand them well before you
19 start evaluating how well they're working.

20 DR. MAURO: And I agree, I agree.
21 I just looked at the first three bullets as
22 being the heart of the matter and those three

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 bullets didn't seem to get to the heart of the
2 matter.

3 MR. KATZ: Right. But all I was
4 saying here about these first three bullets is
5 I think they're a narrow construction and
6 you'd want it more open-ended so that more
7 detailed evaluation questions could be asked
8 once more is understood about these processes
9 and procedures.

10 MEMBER MUNN: This starts getting
11 much broader in the bullets in the second part
12 of that.

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: Because the review
14 of the procedures is in the preamble to these
15 questions. Before you get into the
16 effectiveness you're actually saying yes,
17 okay, we reviewed PR-012. Now we're going to
18 look at is it working.

19 DR. MAURO: Yes, right.

20 DR. MAKHIJANI: So then in that
21 light it changes all the questions.

22 MR. KATZ: So Arjun, do you want

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to sort of?

2 DR. MAKHIJANI: So, the suggested
3 wording for the first question to follow on
4 this line of thinking would be how does OCAS
5 document worker input from information-
6 gathering meetings and the second one would be
7 is the procedure that OCAS has for documenting
8 site expert interviews effective.

9 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

10 DR. MAKHIJANI: And I think the
11 third question would then be -- or maybe it
12 can be left.

13 MR. KATZ: The third bullet, you
14 mean?

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, the third
16 bullet.

17 MR. KATZ: To me that's just a
18 detailed question, but there could be any
19 number of detailed questions. It makes it --
20 it's sort of strange just to have that one
21 there.

22 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: Is there a reason that
2 one's there, Kathy?

3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, there
4 was the outreach meeting, there's the site
5 expert interviews and then there is the other
6 venue type items.

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Oh, I see what
8 you're getting at. There are issues that
9 occur at other venues that could be useful to
10 NIOSH in their own work, like what we were
11 just talking about and what Larry was
12 mentioning happens in information-gathering
13 meetings and so on. Is that what the part
14 was? Because I'm not clear.

15 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes, and I
16 think Wanda coined the term "reoccurring" in
17 the last meeting.

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes.

19 MR. KATZ: I'm not quibbling at
20 all. I think the issue of reoccurring issues
21 is a good one. I'm just saying that that's
22 one narrow question among probably many that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 you can ask once you look at the processes and
2 procedures. So you may want to retain that
3 somewhere as a possible detail, but it's more
4 an "e.g." than really sort of filling out the
5 scope of these questions about processes and
6 procedures.

7 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, it
8 goes back to the paragraph under Other
9 Outreach Venues on Page 2, and all we're
10 trying to say is, is there a procedure or
11 process in place to document what you get out
12 of these.

13 MR. KATZ: Okay. That's not what
14 this says though.

15 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I know.

16 DR. MAKHIJANI: It's a detail of
17 the first bullet, really. Because the first
18 bullet is very broad as written now, how does
19 OCAS document. So before I think it was
20 probably necessary for it to be called out
21 because you had this specific thing in mind.
22 Now we're saying okay, they've got procedures,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 we're going to review them and then we're
2 going to evaluate how does OCAS document
3 worker input from information-gathering
4 meetings. And nothing prevents the Work Group
5 from evaluating whether recurring issues are
6 documented or whether something -- the workers
7 at any particular meeting wasn't followed up
8 on even though it was kind of very important
9 for a TBD.

10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Then we
11 need to drop the word "meetings" from the
12 first bullet because some of these things are
13 not meetings.

14 DR. MAKHIJANI: Information-
15 gathering meetings or other venues?

16 MEMBER MUNN: Or other various --
17 "other" probably would be simpler. What I
18 have reworded here is "Does OCAS have a method
19 for noting reoccurring issues associated with
20 worker communication from other venues?"

21 MR. KATZ: Okay. So Arjun has
22 rewritten the first bullet here, "How does

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 OCAS document worker input from information-
2 gathering meetings" and other venues probably,
3 right? Or in other venues? So that covers
4 the scope. And then the Bullet 3 is really a
5 detail under that, but there are many details
6 that are unspecified so I would just leave it
7 out.

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: So is that the
9 third bullet?

10 MR. KATZ: Well it's up to the
11 Work Group, but if it was up to me I'd change
12 it.

13 MEMBER MUNN: I'm sorry Ted, I
14 didn't get your recommendation. What were you
15 thinking?

16 MR. KATZ: So I was recommending
17 that you just drop the third bullet entirely
18 because it's a detail under the first bullet
19 of which there would be many details.

20 MEMBER MUNN: But the issue of
21 recurring concerns though is probably the
22 outstanding detail, and I think Kathy is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 probably correct in segregating it into an
2 elevated position of noting on its own.
3 There's -- as a Board we've even attempted to
4 set up what we've called overarching issues,
5 the things that go from one site to another or
6 from one group to another. And this is -- if
7 we're looking at communications with workers
8 at outreach and we're saying that if OCAS
9 documents all of this appropriately that these
10 issues will crop out, I'm not at all sure that
11 that's exactly what we should be attempting to
12 convey. In my mind what we should be
13 attempting to convey for this question is
14 whether a method exists for noting that those
15 issues reoccur. I don't know that there is
16 such a method and it's an open question I
17 think for all of us.

18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, for
19 identifying.

20 MEMBER MUNN: Well, I had
21 "noting," but "identifying." Identifying it
22 is different than documenting it necessarily.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 It's important --

2 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, it
3 could be identifying and documenting.

4 MEMBER MUNN: Yes. The
5 documenting makes it possible for us to
6 identify that it's been done, but it's more
7 important firstly on a purely operational
8 point of view that it be noted, that the
9 gathering agency is aware that these issues
10 are recurring. But it's a difficult question.

11 MR. KATZ: So Wanda, if you want
12 to not lose it and you want to put it in there
13 as an "e.g." under the first bullet, all I'm
14 saying is it is properly sort of a sub-
15 component of that first bullet in my view.
16 But if you want to call it out as its own
17 bullet you can, it's just -- it's sort of a,
18 you know, you're just sort of having apples
19 and oranges as bullets then in terms of levels
20 of evaluations. Because it's a sub-element of
21 the first bullet.

22 MEMBER MUNN: I understand. I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 understand what you're saying.

2 MR. KATZ: But you can do it any
3 way you want.

4 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I agree with
5 Wanda. I mean, the Board as a whole has
6 looked hard at all kinds of areas where
7 there's been repeated occurrences of
8 something, whether it's in a dose
9 reconstruction, whether it's in everything
10 else. So I'd feel better leaving it as a
11 separate issue. You know, that's just
12 something we'd want to stay away from is
13 reoccurring issues. So it's a subset, but I
14 think it's worth calling out separately.
15 Josie, Bill?

16 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: I think yes,
17 it's something that certain items are going to
18 come up over and over and over. Are these
19 being identified and addressed?

20 MEMBER BEACH: I'm okay either
21 way. I already scratched it off and added it
22 to the first, but if you'd rather have it as a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 bullet I'm okay with that too. Either way.

2 MEMBER MUNN: The wording that I
3 used was, "Does OCAS have a method for noting
4 reoccurring issues associated with worker
5 communication from other venues?"

6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Can you
7 slow down?

8 MEMBER BEACH: Can you say that
9 one more time, Wanda?

10 MEMBER MUNN: Yes. "Does OCAS
11 have a method for noting reoccurring issues
12 associated with worker communication from
13 other venues?"

14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: And I don't know
15 that I'd leave "other" in there. I mean,
16 we're going to go back to look at all of it
17 for reoccurring issues, not just the other.

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: Various venues
19 including CATI and so on? Otherwise it's just
20 --

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: It's all forms
22 of worker communication. I mean, it's --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER MUNN: "Various" is fine
2 with me.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: Various venues,
4 e.g. You want to leave the "e.g." in?

5 MEMBER MUNN: That's probably
6 simpler than "including."

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Do we really to
8 leave the examples in there? That's taking --
9 it's like we're only looking for reoccurring
10 issues in other forms of communication.

11 MEMBER MUNN: It doesn't seem
12 necessary to me, but it's a preference. From
13 the point of view the question stands alone
14 without that.

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: What is your
16 pleasure?

17 MR. KATZ: No "e.g.s."

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: No "e.g.s."

19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, anything
20 else on the first of what was three sets of
21 bullets? I believe this would be four, right?

22 MEMBER BEACH: We didn't do

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 anything with the second bullet, did we?

2 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, we did.

3 MEMBER BEACH: We did, okay.

4 DR. MAKHIJANI: We changed the
5 second bullet to "Is the procedure that OCAS
6 has for documenting site expert interviews
7 effective?"

8 MEMBER BEACH: Thank you.

9 DR. MAKHIJANI: Because the review
10 of the procedure is already up before the
11 bullets. That's what I thought Ted's
12 suggestion was. Because that's what I have.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay.

14 MEMBER MUNN: And then we get down
15 to reviewing the sampling.

16 DR. MAKHIJANI: Do you like that
17 second bullet or do you want to change it?

18 MR. KATZ: Well, let me just ask a
19 question about it because we're done with
20 processes and procedures. Now we're down to a
21 question about one procedure and once you get
22 below those little paragraphs to the separate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 set of bullets, they're all about looking at
2 effectiveness. So I wonder if this isn't just
3 sort of a preface for this whole next section,
4 or maybe it's already covered by "review a
5 sampling of interviews and meetings," et
6 cetera.

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, that's just
8 a sampling.

9 MR. KATZ: No, but you're looking
10 at a sample to see whether the processes and
11 procedures are effective, right? That's the
12 purpose of all the bullets that come after, I
13 think.

14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So what you're
15 suggesting, Ted, is that the bullets under the
16 paragraph that starts with, "Review" --

17 MR. KATZ: Are all approaches at
18 looking at the effectiveness of --

19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Including site
20 experts.

21 MR. KATZ: -- processes and
22 procedures, yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: Oh yes, because it
2 says that actually.

3 MR. KATZ: It's sort of redundant
4 to have it when it doesn't really belong up
5 here is all I'm saying.

6 MEMBER BEACH: That probably just
7 needed to be a paragraph up there. Not
8 necessarily questions, but.

9 MR. KATZ: So that would leave
10 just two bullets above the line, above, and
11 then you get into effectiveness.

12 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, because it
13 does say that.

14 MEMBER MUNN: We're taking out
15 Bullet 2.

16 MR. KATZ: So yes, taking out
17 Bullet 2 from.

18 MEMBER MUNN: Okay.

19 MR. KATZ: And then you walk right
20 into effectiveness questions.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, is
22 everyone good with that?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER MUNN: No, I have a problem
2 with how one even goes about answering the
3 first question. What information was
4 obtained. You're going to have an awful lot
5 of data if you're going to answer that
6 question very thoroughly.

7 MEMBER BEACH: Well, let's --
8 Wanda, before you get there, is that first
9 sentence, "Reviewing a sampling of interviews
10 and meetings where the above-referenced
11 procedures were implemented by OCAS and its
12 contractor to determine whether the procedures
13 were followed and effective in practice." Is
14 that okay the way it's written?

15 MEMBER MUNN: I don't see any
16 problem with that.

17 MR. KATZ: Well Wanda, I agree.
18 What information was obtained is not an
19 evaluation question.

20 MEMBER MUNN: No. What you want
21 to know is was the desired information
22 obtained.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: Right, exactly.

2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Just one second.

3 Back to what Josie was talking about. In
4 that lead-in sentence there we just referenced
5 procedures. We need to add the processes.

6 MR. KATZ: Yes, processes and
7 procedures.

8 MEMBER BEACH: In both. There's
9 two places where it says "procedures" in that
10 sentence.

11 DR. MAKHIJANI: Maybe "they" were
12 followed? Repeating it?

13 MEMBER MUNN: And then the first
14 bullet becomes "was the desired information
15 obtained."

16 DR. MAKHIJANI: Larry's not here.

17 MEMBER BEACH: No, he stepped out.

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: Is there -- in
19 these sessions, does NIOSH have a kind of a
20 specified target just in types of information
21 its seeking or is it open-ended? I'm not
22 clear.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. JOHNSON: You're talking about
2 the meetings?

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Sure. Typically in
5 some of the information-gathering we have
6 questions. We put the focus on those
7 questions in information-gathering.

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: So then
9 appropriate questions.

10 MEMBER MUNN: Are we talking about
11 giving as well? If so, then the question
12 needs to be "obtained or disseminated."

13 MR. KATZ: No, no. I think this
14 whole --

15 MEMBER MUNN: This is only
16 obtained. Okay.

17 MR. KATZ: Right. This is --

18 MEMBER MUNN: Just checking.

19 MR. KATZ: Yes.

20 MEMBER MUNN: In Item 2, would it
21 be how is it documented, or is it simply was
22 it documented.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: You can actually lap
2 Bullet 1 and 2 together because the only way
3 you're going to ascertain if it's obtained is
4 if it's documented somewhere anyway.

5 MEMBER MUNN: If it's documented,
6 yes.

7 MR. KATZ: Obtained and
8 documented. And then it doesn't really matter
9 where. That's something you'll get to.

10 MEMBER MUNN: Right.

11 MEMBER BEACH: Some of those
12 meetings are very broad and some of them are
13 very specific in nature. Would that first
14 question kind of capture that, or?

15 MEMBER MUNN: I think so because
16 it would matter what the focus of the meeting
17 was. What was the desired information.

18 MEMBER BEACH: Then that's the way
19 we needed to ask that question.

20 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So it should
21 read something like, "Was the desired
22 information obtained and documented."

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER BEACH: Correct.

2 DR. MAKHIJANI: And then delete
3 the second bullet?

4 MR. KATZ: Yes.

5 DR. MAKHIJANI: I'm puzzled by
6 this --

7 MEMBER BEACH: Third question?

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes.

9 MEMBER MUNN: That one needs work.

10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Can I give
11 you kind of a concrete example?

12 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

13 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. We
14 went or we attended the Weldon Spring worker
15 outreach meeting which was designed to present
16 the site profile and solicit comments. So
17 when we're -- one of the things that we still
18 have to do for that evaluation is to wait till
19 the meeting has come out and evaluate the
20 meeting minutes compared to what was captured
21 in the meeting, what was said in the meeting.

22 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. Because

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this question doesn't say that.

2 MR. KATZ: You could just say what
3 the information recorded by NIOSH accurately
4 and completely, or something along those
5 lines.

6 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes.

7 MEMBER MUNN: Was the
8 documentation of the meeting complete and
9 reflective of what the presenters said.

10 MEMBER BEACH: So it's not NIOSH
11 actually, or is it?

12 MR. KATZ: Well, OCAS.

13 MEMBER BEACH: Right, sorry.

14 MEMBER MUNN: Documentation
15 regardless of who it is. Was the
16 documentation of participants' comments
17 reflective --

18 MR. KATZ: Accurate and complete.

19 MEMBER MUNN: Yes. Correct.

20 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. Was the
21 documentation of participants' comments made
22 at the meeting accurate and complete.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: Is.

2 DR. MAKHIJANI: Sorry?

3 MR. KATZ: Well we can say is, is
4 the documentation.

5 MEMBER BEACH: Arjun, can you
6 repeat that please?

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Is the
8 documentation of participants' comments made
9 at the meeting accurate and complete? That's
10 it.

11 MEMBER MUNN: And do we want to
12 actually say "made at the meeting" or --

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: We can delete
14 that.

15 MEMBER MUNN: I would delete that
16 because we want the comments where they're
17 written and spoken or whatever.

18 MR. KATZ: That's true too.

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.

20 MEMBER BEACH: Anything on the
21 fourth bullet?

22 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: You

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 understand what it's asking?

2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Go ahead and
3 explain it.

4 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. What
5 we're saying is that there's a process where
6 meeting minutes are sent out to the
7 participants and they're allowed to comment.
8 And the question is whether everyone at that
9 meeting is allowed that opportunity.

10 MEMBER BEACH: That's not really
11 what it says though.

12 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, my question is
13 that the process? Do we in fact send copies
14 of meeting minutes to everyone who attended or
15 who signed up?

16 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, I
17 believe in the past NIOSH has sent the primary
18 union contract, but they'll have to elaborate
19 on that.

20 MR. MCDUGALL: Yes. Usually if
21 it's at an organization we send it to the
22 leader of that organization and they get to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 dispose of the comments or the minutes as they
2 please. They can share it with everybody,
3 they can comment themselves.

4 MEMBER MUNN: We do post them,
5 don't we?

6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: This is
7 before they get posted. This is kind of a
8 review to make sure that NIOSH captured the
9 comments from the workers adequately from
10 their perspective, from the workers'
11 perspective.

12 MEMBER MUNN: If we want this to
13 be a question of how this is done prior to the
14 public dissemination we probably ought to say
15 that.

16 DR. MAKHIJANI: On the draft
17 minutes or something.

18 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: Not the record of
20 the meeting, but a draft.

21 MEMBER BEACH: So, "Did all
22 participants have the opportunity to review

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and comment on the draft meeting minutes." Is
2 that what we're looking for?

3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes.

4 DR. MAKHIJANI: Then we are
5 including meeting minutes.

6 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: So this could
8 include the union contact actually. It
9 wouldn't have to be you contacting everyone,
10 but the union contact.

11 MR. MCDOUGALL: If they choose.
12 Understand, we don't collect contact
13 information on everybody who's in the meeting.

14 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: Oh, I see.

16 MR. KATZ: Can I make a
17 distinction here, maybe it'll be helpful? I
18 mean, the way this is stated, sort of the
19 assumption implicit in this question is that
20 the ideal is that all participants would have
21 an opportunity to review and comment on the
22 capture of information. So that's sort of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 ideal that's implicit in this evaluation
2 question. You know, and then, depending on
3 what OCAS processes are, you may find they're
4 whatever distance from that ideal. But if the
5 Work Group feels that that's the ideal, that
6 every participant has an opportunity to do it,
7 to in other words see what a draft of what was
8 captured from that meeting and have a chance
9 to comment on it, then that is sort of your --
10 that's your measure, that's your ideal and
11 then you go and you look and you see what
12 procedures were used to get their feedback on
13 what you captured and how close it is to that
14 ideal. If you don't think that's necessary as
15 the ideal then you change your evaluation
16 framework.

17 MEMBER MUNN: It may be the
18 philosophical ideal, but it may not be a
19 realistic ideal. They're very different to an
20 extreme. This type of objective could lead us
21 to a kind of Wikipedia dilemma with respect to
22 what was said as opposed to what was meant.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 This is a tough one.

2 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, there's a
3 prior question. I mean, if NIOSH is not
4 collecting the information on the participant
5 then this is moot. And so it may be -- I
6 mean, I'm a little puzzled.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: What if we have
8 something like "review how the draft comments
9 are disseminated," whatever, and then if we
10 see we don't like the process then we can make
11 a recommendation to that effect.

12 MR. KATZ: I mean, the "how" comes
13 up above under process. But I mean, a way you
14 could make this sort of a more one-size-fits-
15 all question is you could say, instead of this
16 very specific sort of ideal that you have here
17 to fit all situations, you might say, "Did
18 OCAS take appropriate steps to obtain
19 participant comments on the minutes?" And
20 then in a situation where OCAS only has a
21 contact for the union, you know, the leaders
22 of this meeting, but they don't have the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 individual contact information it probably is
2 appropriate, I'm not going to judge that, but
3 I mean, to go to those contacts and ask them
4 to do the job. In a case where OCAS has a
5 workshop where it has invited all the
6 individuals who have the contacts you might
7 think it's appropriate for them to go back to
8 all those individuals specifically. So it
9 would sort of fit all the different
10 possibilities for these various meetings.
11 Does that make sense?

12 MEMBER MUNN: Then is the
13 appropriate question whether the draft of
14 meeting minutes is made available for
15 participants to comment?

16 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes.

17 MEMBER MUNN: That's the real
18 question, isn't it?

19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Going back
20 to something, now I remember why we put the
21 record of the meeting, because not all worker
22 outreach meetings have meeting minutes. In

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the case of your site expert interviews it's
2 going to be a different type of product.

3 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, but in a
4 realistic sense unless you have only invited
5 participants there's no way that you can
6 assure that all participants have a draft in
7 their hands, and in many especially town hall
8 meetings one can't force participants to note
9 their presence and their contact information.

10 I shouldn't say many, but some don't want to
11 do that. So making it available for people
12 who want to is probably the criterion we're
13 searching for. It is in my mind, but I don't
14 know whether it is in the rest of the Work
15 Group's mind.

16 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well you know,
17 part of the problem I think has arisen from
18 how we do our reviews because we always just -
19 - sorry. This is my perspective, it may not
20 be Kathy's perspective. We generally do not
21 interview more than three or four people at a
22 time because we have this list of questions

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and NIOSH does a lot of different type of
2 meetings to obtain info. And you've got these
3 open meetings with 50 people you'll actually
4 never finalize minutes you know, when you have
5 a lot of people to go back to. So I think
6 there may be different appropriate steps for
7 different types of meetings and that might be
8 something that we could flesh out when you
9 evaluate those different types of meetings as
10 to what's appropriate and what's not
11 appropriate. Maybe -- I'm just thinking out
12 loud. I may be off base here.

13 MEMBER MUNN: Then would the
14 question be -- and I'm typing as I'm thinking
15 here -- would the question be, "Are the draft
16 of meeting minutes available for appropriate
17 participant review?"

18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Wanda,
19 that's why I'm trying to get away from the
20 meeting minutes because that's what I was
21 trying to say that's why we use the record of
22 the meeting because there may not be meeting

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 minutes. It may be documented communications
2 in the case of site expert interviews.

3 MEMBER MUNN: Well, but would --
4 we can't really use record instead of minutes.

5 DR. MAKHIJANI: Draft record?

6 MEMBER MUNN: The draft of the
7 meeting record?

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: That sounds good.

9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I think
10 we're on the same page.

11 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: I think that's
12 the only logical way we can go on some of
13 these because I've been in meetings where
14 Larry came down to New Mexico and presented
15 this information. We had maybe a hundred
16 people in that room. There's no way you can
17 know everybody in there and every word that
18 was said so you kind of have to distill it
19 down to what the general record of the meeting
20 was and I don't think you can get actual
21 meeting minutes out of something like that.

22 MEMBER MUNN: No, I don't think

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 you can. The question then becomes is the
2 draft of the meeting record available for
3 appropriate participant review. Does that get
4 to where we're going?

5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes.

6 MR. KATZ: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I think we're
8 all in agreement on the issue so once we put
9 that to words.

10 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.

11 MEMBER MUNN: Then the next
12 question, the next bullet then would change
13 "minutes" to "record," all right? And would
14 be all right as is.

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. Just "draft
16 meeting record."

17 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, so that
18 was pretty easy. Everyone's agreeing with
19 that, correct? Okay. "Were comments
20 incorporated into meeting minutes?"

21 MEMBER MUNN: "Meeting document"
22 or "record" whichever. "Were comments

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 incorporated into the final meeting document"
2 or "record" whichever you prefer.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. "Were
4 finalized meeting minutes made available to
5 participants requesting copies in a timely
6 manner?"

7 MEMBER MUNN: "Was the finalized
8 meeting document made available in a timely
9 manner to participants requesting it?"

10 MR. KATZ: Let's use "record" just
11 to be consistent.

12 MEMBER MUNN: Okay. "Made
13 available in a timely manner," move that up.

14 DR. MAKHIJANI: "In a timely
15 manner" comes after "available."

16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: We're good with
17 that one. Okay. Let's see if we can go ahead
18 and try to finish up Evaluation 3 before we
19 take lunch if possible, unless we get into
20 some long, drawn-out discussion on one of
21 these bullets. Evaluate the conduct of
22 outreach meetings. First bullet. Required

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 instructor statements made at the beginning of
2 the meeting.

3 MR. KATZ: I think this probably
4 needs some sort of re-framing. I'm not sure
5 what the required introductory statements are.

6 I see the "e.g." there but I mean, I think
7 this is a more general question with respect
8 to was appropriate sort of introduction given
9 on the purposes of the meeting and what have
10 you.

11 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Is there any
12 reason why it was worded this way originally?

13 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: The "e.g."
14 was just an example. There are other things
15 that have to be covered at the beginning of a
16 meeting, so it's not just to classify
17 information. Some IOs are outlined in the
18 procedure.

19 MEMBER MUNN: Well then,
20 introductory statements at the beginning of
21 meetings vary widely. What's the type of
22 meeting? "Were appropriate introductory

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 statements made at the beginning of the
2 meeting" probably would be adequate.

3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: There's
4 some generic statements which should be made,
5 like about the intent of the audiotape, the
6 fact that if you're in a non-secured facility
7 you can't disclose classified information, the
8 discussions of how the Privacy Act will
9 influence the meeting minutes.

10 MEMBER BEACH: So can you just ask
11 the question what introductory statements were
12 made at the beginning of the meeting and then
13 leave it up to the auditor to put down what
14 was said? Otherwise you're going to have to
15 have examples.

16 MR. KATZ: Yes, I just -- what
17 Wanda is saying, "Were appropriate
18 introductory statements made at the beginning
19 of the meeting," would cover Kathy's examples.

20 Some of those may be mandatory, but there may
21 be other appropriate introductory statements
22 that also needed to be said depending on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 nature of the meeting, and some of the
2 required sort of what Kathy's laid out as
3 required statements may not be required in
4 every kind of venue. So if you lay it out
5 here just generally the question -- I mean,
6 then when you actually are doing your
7 evaluation you can dig into what the
8 particulars are that are relevant for that
9 scenario.

10 MEMBER MUNN: For example, a
11 meeting of survivors of Blockson workers would
12 be quite different than a meeting of retired
13 Savannah River workers, entirely different
14 setup.

15 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Let's just take
16 the first bullet and say "Were appropriate
17 introductory statements made at the beginning
18 of the meeting" period.

19 MEMBER MUNN: Yes. Question mark
20 is better.

21 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. I had
22 something longer, but we could do that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I think that
2 leaves it open to what we need to do, what we
3 want to do. Did the participants feel that
4 the meeting achieved the stated purpose?

5 MEMBER MUNN: And I don't think we
6 can identify what anybody feels. We could be
7 able to ask did the participants indicate that
8 the meeting achieved its stated purpose. If
9 they did not indicate it, then we have no way
10 of evaluating what they felt.

11 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Is everyone good
12 with that?

13 MEMBER BEACH: Are we going to
14 change it or strike it? Because I guess I'm
15 wondering how we're going -- are we going to
16 ask the participants?

17 MEMBER MUNN: Well, certainly in
18 open meetings, most of the worker meetings
19 that I've been to, the questions are usually
20 asked at the tail end. This would be a good
21 question I think for Laurie. She does these
22 things all the time and it's my observation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that she has lots of verbal feedback over
2 whether or not the people got the information
3 that they thought they got, or whether the
4 meeting was what they wanted it to be, whether
5 they wanted some other kind of meeting other
6 than the one they got. Laurie, are you there?

7 She's gone.

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: You know, if I
9 might comment on this bullet. It seems to be
10 more appropriate for a giving information
11 meeting, where this objective is for getting
12 information. So a participant won't be able
13 to -- it's for NIOSH has an objective going
14 into it of getting information meeting. And
15 so it really -- did NIOSH get the information
16 it was seeking is sort of -- and I think we
17 covered that, I'm not sure.

18 MR. KATZ: If you go to Bullet 4,
19 Bullet 4 is "Were participants allowed
20 adequate time to provide comments?" I mean,
21 you could broaden that a little bit maybe as
22 to whether the circumstances, not just time,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 may not be the only factor for whether they
2 were able to give their input. But that's
3 really the question there I think, right? So
4 we could probably strike the second bullet and
5 maybe somehow amend the fourth bullet and you
6 would be getting the question that you're
7 asking.

8 MEMBER MUNN: And use
9 "opportunity" rather than "time."

10 DR. MAURO: This is John. I
11 believe one of the dilemmas we run into as
12 we're reading these is that some of these
13 questions are raised as if these were
14 questions that the Work Group would like to
15 ask and find out more about, and they
16 shouldn't be crafted in that form. If you're
17 interested in the subject, that is if we want
18 feedback that the participants didn't feel
19 that the meeting achieved its stated purpose,
20 this has to be one of the I guess parts of
21 NIOSH's procedures. That is, basically
22 embedded in their procedure would be a query

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 regarding at the end of the meeting posing
2 that question so that on the record as part of
3 the questions posed by NIOSH regarding the
4 effectiveness of the meeting the participants
5 have an opportunity to put that material on
6 the record, and that's the material that's
7 important to get on the record and then of
8 course later on we all can sit around and
9 discuss the record to -- and decide for
10 ourselves whether we feel the record reveals
11 to us that the participants felt this way or
12 that way. So I think we have, you know, I
13 guess this goes toward crafting the question
14 in a way that we have to be sure that NIOSH in
15 fact raises these issues during the course of
16 the meeting so that we can create a record
17 regarding material that we're interested in.

18 MR. KATZ: So John, the question
19 that's been re-framed with Wanda and all, was,
20 so "Were participants" the fourth bullet now
21 would read "Were participants allowed adequate
22 opportunity to provide comments" or their

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 input, comments. Then when you want to go
2 about evaluating that, if OCAS has a procedure
3 for getting that kind of feedback at the end
4 of the meeting that'll be one of your sources.

5 DR. MAURO: Yes. We're on the
6 same page.

7 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Can I
8 propose a modification to the second bullet?
9 Did the meeting achieve its stated purpose,
10 period.

11 DR. MAURO: I don't agree that
12 that statement should be here. I think what
13 Ted said earlier go towards the NIOSH create
14 the opportunity to put material on the record
15 that will later allow us to make some
16 judgments related to this matter. The way
17 it's worded now it's almost as if it's a
18 question that the Work Group is going to
19 directly ask the participants and we're not
20 going to do that.

21 DR. MAKHIJANI: Actually, in the
22 information-gathering meeting we have what

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Kathy was saying in the prior set of bullets
2 was the desired information obtained and
3 documented. Essentially it says, you know,
4 there's a purpose to the meeting. Was the
5 purpose achieved?

6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes.

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: And that directly
8 goes to an information-gathering approach.

9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, it
10 goes to all meetings because what we've heard
11 in the past NIOSH say that, you know, there is
12 a purpose to each meeting. That's why they're
13 a little bit different. And the question is
14 was that purpose met. And it's not just
15 information-giving or gathering, all of them.

16 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, maybe that's
17 in a separate place because this whole
18 objective is about information-gathering.
19 That's why I'm a little confused.

20 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, this
21 particular area is about the content of the
22 meeting.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, but an
2 information-gathering meeting. This whole
3 Objective Number 2 is information-gathering.

4 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, the
5 way it's set up is you've got before the
6 meeting, during the meeting, after the meeting
7 and then information-gathering.

8 MEMBER MUNN: And our overall
9 objective here is whether OCAS is obtaining
10 and documenting input from workers. So.

11 MEMBER BEACH: I think we need to
12 be very clear on what we're doing in each one
13 of our evaluation bullets so that it's
14 understood completely. So this one should be
15 gathering and if we need to capture that in
16 another bullet I think we should make sure we
17 capture it. That's just my thought.
18 Otherwise this is going to be so confusing.

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: You know Kathy, I
20 think what you're talking about maybe we
21 should revisit under Objective 4.

22 MEMBER BEACH: I agree.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: If I am not
2 misremembering. I'm not sure.

3 MEMBER MUNN: It would appear to
4 fit somewhere else better than here.

5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: What I'm
6 trying to explain is that the way that these
7 are laid out is the actions before the
8 meeting, the actions during the meeting, the
9 actions after the meeting, and then
10 information-gathering.

11 DR. MAKHIJANI: But that's not how
12 the objectives read currently because
13 Evaluation Objective 2 says "Determine whether
14 OCAS is obtaining and documenting input from
15 workers." And so this is just -- the way it
16 reads, I don't know how it should be or what
17 the intent was. The way it reads right now is
18 it's just this objective is about gathering.

19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: It's not
20 intended to be just about gathering.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Well, what's
22 intended?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: It's
2 intended to be about the conduct of the
3 meeting. What happens during the meeting? Is
4 there a procedure for the meeting? Is the
5 documentation captured? Were the comments?
6 How did they conduct the meeting?

7 DR. MAURO: You see, to me the
8 problem has to do with the definition of
9 Objective 2. It's very simple, you know. Is
10 OCAS obtaining and documenting input from
11 workers? It doesn't say are the workers happy
12 with the way the meeting went. You know, even
13 though all the bullets are -- a lot of the
14 bullets go toward issues like that, but that's
15 not what this is trying to do. I mean, I
16 think we've got a little bit of a problem and
17 that is we define an objective, but then when
18 we go with the bullets it opens up on us into
19 areas that go beyond the scope of the
20 definition of the objective, and that's fine.
21 Then we can do one of two things, narrow down
22 the bullets beneath it or expand the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 definition of the objective. But right now I
2 see an incongruity between the statement of
3 the objective, Number 2 in this case, and the
4 long list of things that we - questions that
5 we're hoping to answer under Objective 2. So
6 I'm very conscious of these kinds of
7 structural things. I feel that there's a
8 breakdown in parallel structure, at least in
9 this case.

10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Can I just
11 - do any of you have PR-012 with you?

12 MEMBER BEACH: I do.

13 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. Can
14 you turn to Page 17? I'll pass this around.
15 Maybe this is a better way to think about what
16 I'm trying to say. They go through in their
17 procedure and define pre-meeting activities,
18 meeting activities and post-meeting
19 activities.

20 MEMBER BEACH: Maybe it's a good
21 time for a break and we can make a copy of
22 this for everybody.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Well, we'll have
2 to decide. We've got quite a bit to do here
3 and 2 o'clock is worker comments. That's
4 going to stay on track so if we're going to
5 get out of here, you know, we might have to
6 delay talking about this program
7 evaluation/communication specialist to another
8 meeting. So if you want to make some copies
9 we can go ahead and take lunch now and when we
10 come back try to stay as honed in as possible
11 so we can get through this and have some time
12 to talk about this communication specialist.

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: Just as a comment,
14 I have no opinion about how, you know, one way
15 or another, just from a documentation point of
16 view. Everything that is now under Objective
17 2 is structured to an information-gathering
18 meeting. So if we revisit that to what Kathy
19 is saying with the original intent then we
20 change Objective 2 and restructure everything
21 under it. Because not necessarily -- we'll
22 have to change Objective 2 and add things to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 it that would make it appropriate to that
2 objective.

3 MEMBER MUNN: My preference is not
4 to change Objective 2, but to -- and to not
5 lose this thought, but to place the thought in
6 a different spot even though it was originated
7 by the structure to which Kathy refers when
8 she was putting this together.

9 DR. MAKHIJANI: But maybe conduct
10 of meeting.

11 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, the conduct of
12 meeting from my perspective does not include
13 evaluation of what the participants' reaction
14 was. It's the conduct of the meeting itself.
15 Did the agency that was performing the
16 meeting, regardless of who they were, perform
17 that meeting in the proper way. The results
18 of that meeting are another set of issues to
19 be addressed with other and what came out of
20 the meeting, questions. And as far as lunch
21 is concerned, Wanda always votes for lunch.

22 MR. KATZ: So, are we going to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 abandon the effort on these bullets, the set
2 of bullets before we wrap it up?

3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes, let's do
4 that and just kind of maybe think about it a
5 little bit at lunch. But you know, unless I'm
6 strongly overruled we're not going to change
7 the structure of this. We might move some
8 bullets around, but we're going to get through
9 it, get a rough draft out and then if we just
10 don't like the whole product that's another
11 day.

12 MR. KATZ: I think it's actually
13 going okay.

14 DR. MAKHIJANI: I agree.

15 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: It's a lot more
16 to do.

17 MR. KATZ: Five minutes for lunch
18 Wanda.

19 MEMBER MUNN: How about an hour
20 and five minutes for lunch.

21 MR. KATZ: So it is now 12:25.
22 You want an hour?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I'd like 45, but
2 it's probably more likely going to be an hour.

3 MR. KATZ: Okay. So 1:30
4 reconvening Eastern time. Is that good for
5 everyone on the phone?

6 MEMBER MUNN: Thank you. Bye.

7 MR. KATZ: Thanks, bye.

8 (Whereupon, the above-entitled
9 matter went off the record at 12:27 p.m. and
10 resumed at 1:33 p.m.)

11 MR. KATZ: Hello, this is Ted
12 Katz, Advisory Board on Radiation Worker
13 Health, Worker Outreach Work Group. I'm the
14 DFO and we're reconvening after a lunch break
15 and we are still on the agenda item of
16 reviewing the evaluation plan charge and the
17 evaluation plan for the Work Group. And we
18 broke off mid-sentence almost.

19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Mid-sentence.
20 We're under "Evaluate the conduct of outreach
21 meetings" and we were discussing the bullets
22 underneath that. I think that perhaps Arjun

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and Kathy discussed a little bit during lunch.

2 Do you want to go ahead?

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I emailed
4 this to Mike and Josie and Phil, and I think
5 Wanda, Josie's emailing you the --

6 MEMBER BEACH: It's already -- it
7 should be to her.

8 MR. KATZ: It may take a moment,
9 Wanda, for it to actually arrive in your
10 inbox.

11 DR. MAKHIJANI: So let me just
12 read through what Kathy wrote at lunch break.
13 We are at the place that says "Evaluate the
14 conduct of outreach meetings" under Objective
15 2, the second set of bullets. And the first
16 question that Kathy wrote was "Were the proper
17 participants included in meetings where
18 information-gathering is the stated goal of
19 the meeting?" Do you want me to run through
20 all of these? "Are presentations developed at
21 the appropriate level for the participants at
22 the meeting? Are sign-in sheets utilized for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 outreach meetings so that the attendees can be
2 contacted if needed with follow-up information
3 or questions? Was the meeting held in an
4 adequate facility such that individuals were
5 not limited from providing substantive input
6 based on security restrictions applicable to
7 NNSA sites in some cases? Are appropriate
8 introductory statements made at the beginning
9 of the meeting? Are questions appropriate to
10 solicit the desired information? Is adequate
11 time allotted for presentation and participant
12 comments? Is technical staff present at
13 information outreach meetings where
14 appropriate?" So that can -- I think some of
15 these are already there in the section we're
16 talking about, but others are not.

17 MR. KATZ: So should we just go
18 through these?

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. So we had
20 "Were appropriate introductory statements made
21 at the beginning of the meeting?" We already
22 have that one. So that one I think is a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 duplicate. Then the second one we already
2 have is "Was the meeting approach open enough
3 to enable workers to provide input to the
4 extent that they wanted?" We haven't
5 discussed that before lunch. And there's a
6 corresponding question I think that Kathy
7 wrote.

8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I did it
9 from scratch, so the intent was almost to
10 replace what was there.

11 MR. KATZ: What we had there
12 before lunch that Wanda had revised, "Were
13 participants allowed adequate opportunity to
14 provide comments?"

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: Sorry, I did not
16 get that.

17 MR. KATZ: And I think that covers
18 the question.

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: To provide
20 comment.

21 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And that
22 was the one where I added "adequate time for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 presentations" to it. I just added the
2 presentation part.

3 MR. KATZ: The front end part,
4 what's presented. Okay, that's a separate
5 question, the presentations.

6 DR. MAKHIJANI: Was there adequate
7 time for presentations?

8 MR. KATZ: But that's by -- you
9 mean OCAS?

10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: By OCAS.

11 DR. MAKHIJANI: Then there's "Were
12 proper participants included in meetings where
13 information-gathering is the stated goal of
14 the meeting?"

15 MR. KATZ: My question about that
16 is it seems like we already addressed that
17 question about identifying appropriate
18 participants under Objective 1.

19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: We don't
20 need it.

21 MEMBER BEACH: Which one are we
22 not needing?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: "Were the proper
2 participants included in meetings?" Because
3 we already covered that. Then, "Was the
4 meeting held in an adequate facility such that
5 individuals were not limited from providing
6 substantive input based on security
7 restrictions applicable to NNSA sites?" So
8 that's already --

9 MEMBER BEACH: That's covered on
10 the next page, last bullet in that section.

11 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, so I'm
12 reading the bullets we already have, not the
13 bullets that Kathy sent, some of which she
14 seemed to have a fantastic ability to
15 reproduce and have a very clear vision.

16 MR. KATZ: I just wonder if you
17 want to generalize that thought, which I think
18 is a good one, but I mean the question is are
19 provisions available, you know, as
20 appropriate. It's not necessarily true that
21 you'll always need to hold a meeting with that
22 kind of -- with those facilities, resources.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Larry can speak to it --

2 MR. ELLIOTT: I don't understand
3 the question and the need for the question
4 because we would not hold a meeting, any of
5 our meetings are held with the intent that
6 we're not having classified discussions. If
7 we need to have a discussion of classified
8 information, then that is scheduled with that
9 individual separately and properly, the
10 cleared folks are there and the secured
11 setting is identified, and we do so under some
12 control from DOE because they have to review
13 what is produced as a product from that
14 interaction before it can be released for
15 public display or public consumption. So none
16 of our outreach meetings go to this, you know.
17 If we hear something that is raised in a
18 board meeting in public comment, or we hear
19 something that's raised in one of our
20 interactions with workers, we use our own
21 judgment as to how to intervene. At some
22 times our judgment says don't do anything,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 leave it alone, don't say anything, don't
2 continue -- you know, if the discussion stops,
3 that's good. If the discussion continues and
4 these things continue to be brought up, then
5 we need to have some kind of intervention
6 where we stop that discussion and we would
7 schedule a separate secure meeting for that.

8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: So what
9 you're saying is you're replacing in that
10 situation worker outreach with site expert
11 interviews?

12 MR. ELLIOTT: If we have a need to
13 interview a site expert and we feel that
14 that's going to take us into a situation where
15 sensitive information is going to be
16 discussed, we would do so in a secure setting
17 with the properly cleared people available for
18 it.

19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And I guess
20 there are certain requirements that are being
21 put on us by DOE at least with our site expert
22 interviews that if we come to a site like

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Pantex, even if we tell them not to tell us
2 classified information, they're still
3 requiring that we do it onsite in a secure
4 location. And I'm just a little confused
5 about how this might differ from that.

6 MR. KATZ: Well I was just
7 suggesting, and I think Larry sort of fleshed
8 it out for us, that you want a more
9 generalized question, but that are provisions
10 being made as appropriate to handle classified
11 information, something along those lines,
12 because that's what you're trying to get at,
13 not imply that it generally is needed.

14 MR. ELLIOTT: Right. I agree with
15 that.

16 MR. KATZ: When the situation
17 arises.

18 MEMBER MUNN: And we are not
19 including in our definition of "further
20 outreach" the other kinds of activities that
21 we require from our contractor in their other
22 duties. I'm a little concerned about how this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 particular issue will be likely to arise in a
2 worker outreach meeting, unless as was
3 mentioned earlier it might be possible that --
4 although seemingly unlikely to me -- that a
5 worker would begin to move into potentially
6 classified material in public discussion. Is
7 it just -- am I the only person who's confused
8 about this delineation between what we are
9 calling worker outreach and what we are
10 calling required interviews and activities by
11 our contractor in other regards?

12 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, this
13 is a matter of what's in the Security Plan and
14 how things are changing as far as basically
15 activities with workers at certain sites. And
16 all I'm saying is at a site like Pantex we
17 were not given -- DOE wants us to do it onsite
18 just in case something comes out.

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, it may be a
20 prior question here, does this procedure cover
21 NIOSH site experts or not, and are we
22 reviewing that -- because that's a kind of a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 worker outreach or site expert outreach. SC&A
2 doesn't distinguish between those two things
3 in our interviews. We kind of almost use the
4 terms interchangeably, although site expert is
5 broader than worker -- or interview workers
6 sort of for the purpose of eliciting
7 information. I mean, our goals are very
8 narrow as compared to NIOSH. NIOSH has a
9 broader, more complicated set of
10 responsibilities.

11 MEMBER MUNN: That's exactly what
12 I was asking, Arjun. What I hear you saying
13 is that from your perspective our worker
14 interview is a worker interview, whether it is
15 in the process of identifying specific
16 information for a TBD or whether it is in
17 reference to a claim. And I guess that's what
18 I'm asking of the rest of the Work Group. Is
19 that your definition of worker outreach?

20 DR. MAKHIJANI: That's not what I
21 meant, Wanda. So just, I might have not made
22 myself clear, but that's not what I meant. In

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 any case, it's not for me to say.

2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Is there any
3 instances that we know of where workers or
4 claimants have been stymied in their efforts
5 to talk about stuff classified? I mean, has
6 there ever been a time where a classified
7 setting was not provided to them when
8 necessary?

9 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: I can think of
10 many occasions and many people that even
11 include my career, there are certain areas I
12 would not go into unless I was in a secured
13 facility with the proper people. I mean,
14 because you can cross that line real easy
15 depending on what your background is.

16 MEMBER MUNN: But is this -- I'm
17 not concerned about whether or not secure
18 areas are necessary for certain types of
19 interviews, my concern is specifically that we
20 define very clearly the difference between
21 worker outreach and worker interviews that are
22 used for other purposes. Whether it is a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 worker interview that is used for the purpose
2 of producing an evaluation report, or a
3 technical basis document in my mind is not
4 worker outreach and that's what I'm trying to
5 clarify here when we start talking about these
6 secure facilities and who we are interviewing
7 and for what.

8 MR. ELLIOTT: I think we would say
9 that is outreach in our minds when we want to
10 seek out certain individuals to gain
11 information or input on our dose
12 reconstruction approach for a given site, our
13 site profile, an evaluation report. We start
14 from a place that says we don't necessarily
15 need to have a classified discussion, but we
16 will arrange and welcome such a conversation
17 if the interviewee feels it's necessary and
18 appropriate.

19 MEMBER MUNN: Ah. I had been
20 under a misapprehension for lo these many
21 years. There was never any expectation from
22 me that worker outreach as such included

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 interviews in establishing base operational
2 documents.

3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Can I
4 interrupt? This is more of a DOE issue and an
5 issue where we're putting people in an area
6 where they're comfortable talking versus out
7 in the public.

8 MEMBER MUNN: I understand what
9 you're talking about, Kathy, that's very clear
10 in my mind. I just obviously had been
11 confused for many years. I had no idea that
12 worker outreach included interviewing the site
13 experts to establish base documents like TBDs.

14 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: There are a
15 number of people, a number of processes and
16 stuff that you -- there's kind of a fine line
17 between what you can discuss out in the open
18 and where you probably would be better off in
19 a secure facility with the proper people.
20 That way if you say something you haven't
21 crossed over that line, or if you did, you
22 know. You basically you can work around this,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 but given the fact that many people who are
2 still in the business or who recently retired,
3 you know, you can cross over that line so fast
4 when you get into -- and some of this
5 information is definitely relevant for people
6 doing dose reconstructions, for understanding
7 the health physics of an area, you know, and
8 yet you're right on that border.

9 MEMBER MUNN: Most of the time
10 it's pretty tough, Phil. Most of us know
11 what is sensitive information and what isn't.

12 But it's now a non-issue from my point of
13 view. If all contacts with workers are
14 considered worker outreach then I've got it.

15 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. So it
16 sounds like the general approach is we need to
17 leave some kind of statement in there. So how
18 do we want to word this statement?

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, here's what
20 I wrote Ted as saying. "Are provisions made
21 that are appropriate for interviews in a
22 classified setting should the need arise?"

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, so the
2 rest of the bullets in this section.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: There were three
4 bullets that Kathy added at lunch in the prior
5 list. "Are presentations developed at the
6 appropriate level?" You have that, right?
7 You got that, right, from my email?

8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes

9 DR. MAKHIJANI: "Are sign-in
10 sheets utilized and are questions appropriate
11 to solicit the desired information?" You want
12 to insert those three in this list?

13 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: That's fine with
14 me. What's everyone else think?

15 MEMBER BEACH: Fine.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Add value?
17 Okay. Put it in there.

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay, we'll put
19 them at the bottom of the list that we were
20 just discussing.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, is there
22 anything else under that section? If not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 we'll move on to evaluate the completeness and
2 adequacy of the outreach tracking system.
3 "Does OTS reflect the breadth and depth of the
4 information provided by workers at the
5 meetings?" Is everyone okay with that,
6 understand the meaning? Going once, going
7 twice, okay. "Did the OTS integrate action
8 items accepted by OCAS or its contractors
9 during the course of the meeting?" Any
10 discussion on that or questions? Okay, what
11 about the next one? "Were participant
12 comments provided at information-gathering
13 meetings included in OTS?" Okay, fourth
14 bullet. "Is OTS an adequate method for
15 documenting and tracking worker comments?"
16 Everyone satisfied with those? Okay.

17 MEMBER MUNN: Will we need to
18 answer that last bullet more than one time?

19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Sorry, what do
20 you mean Wanda?

21 MEMBER MUNN: Will we need to
22 answer that last bullet more than one time?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER BEACH: Once OTS has
2 evaluated it we shouldn't, should we? Once
3 that's done?

4 MEMBER MUNN: And if we're only
5 going to open -- if we're only going to need
6 to do it one time, then could it not be
7 incorporated in the basis of the overriding
8 question?

9 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Well, once we
10 evaluate it once it could be that we
11 periodically go back and just make sure that
12 it continued to be maintained.

13 MR. ELLIOTT: I might offer here
14 that the different types of meetings that we
15 would hold may result in different
16 contributions to the OTS, different things get
17 put there, so maybe that warrants looking at
18 those things separately.

19 MEMBER MUNN: And does it need to
20 add for the type of meeting under scrutiny?

21 DR. MAKHIJANI: For the various
22 types of meetings.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: It's not just meetings
2 though. I mean, there's input that comes in
3 without meetings. I think when you actually
4 do this evaluation you can go and you can look
5 at the many venues by which information comes
6 in and examine it against all of those.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So it's probably
8 okay like it is.

9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I had one
10 question though. Are we going to limit it to
11 OTS or are we going to do some evaluations of
12 how NIOSH has responded to comments in
13 historical databases?

14 MEMBER BEACH: Well, we said at
15 the beginning that we were going to look at
16 historical databases, didn't we?

17 MR. KATZ: What are historical?
18 I'm sorry.

19 MEMBER BEACH: WISPR.

20 MR. KATZ: How long has WISPR been
21 out of --

22 MEMBER BEACH: Since about 2006?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. ELLIOTT: I don't know, but we
2 don't use it anymore and you can look at it
3 all you want if you can look at it. I don't
4 know that you can even look at it. I mean, I
5 don't think - is WISPR in a platform --

6 MEMBER BEACH: I looked at it a
7 few months ago just because I wanted to see
8 the last time you put something in, but it's
9 been awhile. And I have never looked at
10 TopHat.

11 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: We need
12 printouts available from TopHat.

13 MEMBER BEACH: But on Page 2 we
14 said outreach databases, so if we're not going
15 to look at them then we ought to take them out
16 of there as well. I mean, we have to decide
17 as a Work Group.

18 MR. KATZ: I would think you'd
19 want to know how things are being done now.
20 And really historically how things were being
21 done three years ago, I'm not sure that that's
22 -- in terms of thinking about improving the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 program, I don't know that that is the place
2 to start. I would want to start with current
3 practice if you want to make comments about
4 improving.

5 MEMBER BEACH: I think we
6 definitely want to start with current
7 practices.

8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: And it may be
9 good to go back and take a look at the old one
10 just to see maybe there was some progress
11 made, you know, how it's been made. But you
12 know, reviewing the old databases wouldn't be
13 one of these ongoing things.

14 MR. KATZ: No. I guess my point
15 is that, for example, if we're going to go in
16 and evaluate how good WISPR was, it seems like
17 that's really an academic point. If they're
18 using OTS now, then whatever flaws it might
19 have had, I'm not sure how it matters.

20 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: OTS is not
21 an all-encompassing database of all of the
22 comments provided since the beginning of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 program. And we do have an interest in
2 earlier comments that were provided to NIOSH
3 and how they ended up influencing the dose
4 reconstructions and site profiles.

5 DR. MAKHIJANI: Could I ask Larry
6 a question? Larry, the WISPR/TopHat comments,
7 are they going to be transitioned into a new
8 database, or gone, or how does that sort of
9 historical document weigh currently? See what
10 I mean?

11 MR. ELLIOTT: Yes, I don't -- J.J.
12 and Mary help me out here. I don't think we
13 had a plan to incorporate TopHat and WISPR
14 into this database.

15 MR. JOHNSON: TopHat is something
16 that you can't even use. It was started and
17 it was almost dead before it got going. The
18 WISPR program is something that you can look
19 at, but you can't necessarily take the
20 information and move it into the Outreach
21 Tracking System. We're going to be looking at
22 it to see what might be out there, but for any

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 other purposes other than seeing if we can put
2 it into OTS I don't know what's there, what
3 exactly the purpose of looking at it, other
4 than maybe missing something and that's
5 something that would be of interest, but not
6 necessarily --

7 MR. ELLIOTT: TopHat was in a
8 proprietary software program that we couldn't
9 transfer or something, is that correct?

10 MR. JOHNSON: It was --

11 MR. ELLIOTT: It was not something
12 we were asking for as a deliverable from the
13 original contract.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

15 MR. ELLIOTT: Something they were
16 ginning up and here again we got into a
17 situation where a contractor should not be
18 developing a software program that's used for
19 the government because, you know, it doesn't
20 have utility and life expectancy that we need,
21 nor did we ask for it. And then -- I mean,
22 you all can look at what you can see there. I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 think there are other ways to get at this
2 question of whether or not we heard input and
3 we reacted to it. You can go, for example,
4 you can check out the second or third page in
5 our Technical Basis Documents at the revision
6 page, and usually we hope that's where it is
7 captured that we heard worker input, or we
8 heard Board commentary, or we heard -- what
9 forced us to change that particular section of
10 that document and what was the change. So
11 there's that avenue that you might use.

12 MR. KATZ: Let me clarify my point
13 because we're getting into really issues that
14 are in the next evaluation objective with
15 respect to this. My point, just to be clear,
16 is whether OTS is a good method. Again, we're
17 under Objective 2, the conduct of meetings, et
18 cetera, and under Objective 2 you're asking
19 the question is OTS an adequate method that
20 they're using now to document and track worker
21 comments. But Kathy raises the point you may
22 want to know, you know, how comments received

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 prior to this, how they were addressed.
2 You're going to get to that under Objective 3,
3 but the question of whether that previous
4 tracking method was a good method doesn't
5 matter really. You need the information from
6 there, absolutely, to be able to -- but you
7 don't need the objective, evaluation
8 objective, because who cares whether the old
9 method was a good method of tracking. You
10 just want to know what comments were received
11 and how were they handled, and those are
12 addressed then under Evaluation Objective
13 Number 3.

14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: And we're not
15 precluded from going back and looking up that
16 information.

17 MR. KATZ: No.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So we're okay.

19 MR. KATZ: All I'm saying is we
20 don't need to broaden this from is OTS an
21 adequate method to what about the historical
22 ones, were they adequate methods. That was my

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 point.

2 MEMBER MUNN: This entire
3 discussion emanates from our failure to having
4 answered one prior basic question at the
5 outset, and that is once we have done these
6 evaluations that we are asking ourselves and
7 our contractors to do, to what end will that
8 information be used. In other words, why do
9 we do this in the first place? If the reason
10 we are doing what we are doing is to provide
11 assurance to ourselves and to others that this
12 is being done in the best way we can, then
13 reviewing a great deal of past material has no
14 relevance. If there is some other reason
15 we're doing this, then we need to clarify for
16 ourselves why we are doing the evaluations
17 that we are doing.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. I'm going
19 to have to suspend this discussion at this
20 point in the agenda right now. It's time for
21 the workers, worker advocates and claimants
22 have time now to make comments to the Work

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Group here. So if anyone's on the line and
2 you'd like to identify yourself to the court
3 reporter and go ahead and make a comment.

4 MS. BARRIE: This is Terrie Barrie
5 with ANWAG.

6 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Hi Terrie, go
7 ahead.

8 MS. BARRIE: I wasn't able to
9 listen to the entire call this morning, but I
10 was very interested in this recent discussion
11 about the information given prior to the OTS
12 database. And I am concerned that -- how
13 these comments, you know, especially for the
14 Rocky Flats where the public comment period
15 for those Board meetings -- if NIOSH had
16 addressed those concerns, I'm thinking in
17 particular of a physician who had made a
18 presentation on the IREP model, if that was --
19 this is just an example -- if that was ever,
20 if NIOSH ever addressed those concerns to the
21 physicians that presented. So the information
22 that is in the WISPR database is important to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 a degree if they were not addressed. And I
2 think that, granted that looking back at the
3 process is not important, but the information
4 that is in that database obviously might be.
5 And I thank you for allowing this time for the
6 advocates and claimants to make comments.
7 Thank you.

8 MR. KATZ: Thanks, Terrie. And I
9 think what we just discussed is we totally
10 concur with what you just said.

11 MS. BARRIE: Okay, good.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, any other
13 workers or advocates, representatives on the
14 phone? Anyone else that wants to make a
15 public comment?

16 MS. HAND: Can you hear me? This
17 is Donna Hand.

18 MR. KATZ: Hello Donna Hand.

19 MS. HAND: Okay. I am a worker
20 advocate. I'd like to make some comments.
21 It's that I understand this is supposed to be
22 like the outreach everything work group, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 is that you know, the meetings and the
2 transcripts that I am reading of the previous
3 outreach, there's a lot of contingencies upon
4 the workers that the information that they're
5 giving to these people, to NIOSH and OTS
6 representatives are being ignored. Even with
7 a follow-up, you know, they're still, the
8 information is being ignored. And again,
9 whenever they come into the claimant interview
10 section on a claim, they again address the
11 dose reconstruction as evidence that was there
12 in the Technical Basis Document as well as
13 what was presented before the Technical Basis
14 final draft was emitted and is still being
15 ignored. As to the classified areas, the very
16 first thing that these people come into from
17 NIOSH, they say okay workers, tell us what you
18 did at this facility, but don't tell us
19 anything classified. Well these people have
20 already been taught and their subconscious has
21 been told to them everything you did at this
22 plant was classified. You cannot tell us

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 anything. And so therefore they're saying
2 well, you know, I can't tell you anything you
3 should know because it's all classified. You
4 have to address that type of mind set with
5 these workers, especially the elderly workers
6 when they have for these years been told and
7 told again that this was classified
8 information. Do not even tell your wives. I
9 address it when I have my meetings is that I
10 know it's classified, but you had a name for
11 the project. You know, just tell me basically
12 what type did you do with that project. Don't
13 tell me, you know, the circumstances, but what
14 did you do.

15 Pinellas Plant has classified
16 product at this time. It was a whole building
17 and area that is still classified and you just
18 had a problem with that. However, the dose
19 reconstruction does not even adhere to that,
20 that building or that area, to any of the
21 workers. And they keep on telling you guys,
22 you know, this is what's happening. And then

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the Technical Basis Document for Pinellas
2 Plant which was done -- a rough draft in 2004,
3 2005, 2006, two of them, they omitted certain
4 things and then added on others but yet
5 completely ignored some of the highly
6 radioactive substances that were used in that
7 facility. When you go to your claimant
8 interviews and they do their interviews they
9 tell you again this is what we did at Pinellas
10 Plant, and then you ignore the processes and
11 the products and the radiation material that
12 they handled. So something needs to be
13 addressed to assure these people that when you
14 do these base reports or you do these
15 interviews that you did acknowledge that they
16 mentioned this to them, and why you did or did
17 not address it into the Technical Basis
18 Document or into the dose reconstruction for
19 the people. Because they are very, very
20 frustrated that what they're telling you guys
21 you're not listening to. Thank you very much.

22 MR. KATZ: Thank you, Donna.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Anyone else?
2 Public comment? Advocates, workers,
3 claimants?

4 MS. BONSIGNORE: Yes, this is
5 Antoinette Bonsignore.

6 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Hi Antoinette,
7 go ahead.

8 MS. BONSIGNORE: Hi. I just
9 wanted to raise an issue and I don't know if
10 this was discussed earlier in the meeting, but
11 regarding providing technical assistance to
12 workers to better understand dose
13 reconstruction reports with respect to the
14 fact that since the Department of Labor and
15 NIOSH do provide assistance to claimants
16 regarding disputed medical issues -- they
17 provide medical experts at DOL expense -- that
18 NIOSH consider providing that type of
19 assistance in terms of providing an expert
20 advisor that a claimant can contact and speak
21 with to better understand the substance of the
22 dose reconstruction report, particularly when

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 a claim is being recommended for denial.

2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay.
3 Antoinette?

4 MS. BONSIGNORE: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Larry Elliott
6 had to leave the room so I don't know that
7 NIOSH will have an answer for you today, but
8 we'll sure take that question down and give it
9 to them.

10 MS. BONSIGNORE: Okay. Thank you
11 very much.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Thanks. Any
13 other public comments from anyone? Any other
14 public comments? Okay. Hearing none I think
15 maybe we'll just go back to our discussion we
16 were having previously and then within the
17 next 45 minutes if anyone from the public
18 comes on the line they can make a comment.
19 Okay, so you were discussing the need to go
20 back essentially through some of the older
21 databases and I think we heard some public
22 comment as to why there's certain areas that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that would be available. I think this
2 document leaves us the latitude to do that so
3 do we need to discuss that any further? If
4 not we can move on to Evaluation Objective
5 Number 3, is OCAS giving thorough
6 consideration to information received from
7 workers through the worker outreach efforts
8 appropriating consideration of that material
9 into its work products as appropriate and
10 adequately communicating the impact of
11 substantive comments to workers. Okay, does
12 anyone want to start this discussion or any
13 questions about the first bullet?

14 DR. MAKHIJANI: Did you want to
15 put the question?

16 MEMBER MUNN: I'm sorry, Mark. I
17 didn't hear you begin your reading of that
18 evaluation objective. You did change that
19 into a statement, right? Determine whether
20 OCAS is giving?

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I had not done
22 that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER MUNN: I thought we had
2 agreed that we would.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: We did, I just
4 hadn't done it yet. Thanks, Wanda.

5 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Depending on you
7 to keep us in line.

8 MEMBER MUNN: Just already done it
9 myself. Wanted to make it sure it was on the
10 record.

11 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. How does
12 OCAS catalogue and consider worker input for
13 inclusion into its technical documents, such
14 as the site profiles and SEC evaluation
15 reports? That's pretty straightforward, right
16 everyone? Any questions with that or
17 anything? Okay. What criteria are used to
18 determine whether comments are substantive?

19 MEMBER MUNN: That question and
20 the following one probably could be combined.
21 What criteria is used by whom to determine
22 whether comments are substantive.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: I have a couple of
2 questions about this. I mean, whether -- I'm
3 not sure whether "substantive," I understand
4 what it means to say whether comments are
5 substantive. Are we asking whether the
6 criteria used to determine whether the
7 comments should result in a change? Or I'm
8 not really understanding what we're meaning by
9 "substantive."

10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: It should
11 result in an action. Or a response.

12 MR. KATZ: In other words, should
13 be evaluated?

14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Right.

15 MEMBER BEACH: So we're asking to
16 look at OCAS's criteria of what they're using
17 to decide what creates the change or an
18 action?

19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, let
20 me kind of clarify. "Substantive" is not my
21 word, it's a word that NIOSH has commonly
22 used.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: Okay. But what does
2 NIOSH mean when it uses it?

3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well,
4 that's a good question.

5 MEMBER MUNN: Perhaps
6 "substantive" means to be expanded upon just
7 with a couple of explanatory words,
8 substantive enough to require action.

9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I think
10 we're trying to make that determination of
11 whether a comment deserves action or not. I
12 don't know. For example, if someone comes in
13 and says my Part E claim is not going through
14 fast enough, that's not appropriate for NIOSH
15 to respond to. They might forward it to DOL,
16 but.

17 MR. KATZ: Well, just my thoughts
18 here, but I think the key issue is you want to
19 know whether -- right, we're trying to get at
20 whether comments that might have a real impact
21 on procedures, whether they were duly
22 considered, right? That's what we want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 know, is that right? So you want to know what
2 criteria are used to identify those comments
3 that require technical consideration or
4 something along those lines, require -- I'm
5 just trying to.

6 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I like "require"
7 because some comments --

8 MR. KATZ: "Deserve," whatever.
9 So what criteria are used to identify a
10 comment that deserves consideration for
11 possible changes in technical documents,
12 right? That's it? Is that it?

13 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I don't
14 know if I'd add the technical documents
15 because some of the departments are not
16 specific to a particular technical document.
17 They're more generic in nature.

18 MEMBER MUNN: And we're looking
19 for something that requires a response or an
20 action from the agency?

21 MR. KATZ: Right. And then the
22 second bullet, the who, I don't -- I mean, my

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 opinion is it doesn't really matter who. You
2 want to know that this is being done, but I'm
3 not sure why you'd want to identify -- why
4 evaluating this -- well maybe you do just to
5 understand the process.

6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, it
7 needs to be done by a technical person versus
8 an administrative person in some cases. For
9 example --

10 MR. KATZ: Are the appropriate
11 personnel evaluating the input that's
12 received. Is that the question you're trying
13 to get at, Kathy?

14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Right.

15 MR. KATZ: I think that's a good
16 question.

17 MEMBER BEACH: So are the
18 appropriate personnel evaluating or
19 determining that comments are subjective?

20 MR. KATZ: Just evaluating the
21 input. Comments received.

22 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Are we good on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 those two now, then?

2 MEMBER BEACH: Are we changing the
3 second bullet, or are we going to leave it
4 with the criteria are used to determine?

5 MEMBER MUNN: I thought your
6 suggestion for incorporating the two was good,
7 Josie.

8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Either way is
9 fine with me, just what do we want to do? Do
10 we want to make it into one, or do you want to
11 leave it separate?

12 MR. KATZ: Well, if you make the
13 two into one you just have a compound
14 sentence. You might as well have two bullets
15 in my view.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. Let's
17 leave it two separate bullets.

18 MEMBER MUNN: Well, as long as one
19 of them identifies what "substantive" means to
20 this group.

21 MR. KATZ: So Wanda had suggested
22 a change, but I don't know that anyone

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 recorded it or that I can remember it. But I
2 mean -- because it's totally unclear what's
3 meant by "comments are substantive." So we
4 talked about what criteria are used -- that's
5 Bullet Number 2, yes.

6 DR. MAKHIJANI: So I did record
7 what she said for Bullet Number 2. I didn't
8 see anything in Bullet Number 1.

9 MR. KATZ: Bullet Number 1 I
10 thought we were okay with.

11 DR. MAKHIJANI: So I didn't have
12 any change in that. What I wrote down for
13 Bullet Number 2 was what criteria are used to
14 identify comments that deserve consideration
15 for inclusion in NIOSH and contractor
16 documents. I wasn't clear -- inclusion in
17 something.

18 MR. KATZ: It was for
19 consideration --

20 DR. MAKHIJANI: For inclusion in -
21 -

22 MR. KATZ: To be NIOSH documents

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 or by NIOSH documents or actions I think is
2 what Wanda said.

3 MEMBER MUNN: I had "require
4 response or action."

5 MR. KATZ: Okay. Do you want to
6 repeat that, Wanda, please?

7 MEMBER MUNN: I had said -- I
8 can't remember the first part of the sentence,
9 but what comments are -- what word did we use?

10 DR. MAKHIJANI: I have it, Wanda.
11 What criteria are used to identify comments
12 that deserve consideration for a response or
13 action by NIOSH.

14 MEMBER MUNN: Correct.

15 MR. KATZ: Yes, that sounds good.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: We agreed to
17 change the third one to something to the
18 effect of are the appropriate personnel making
19 these determinations.

20 MR. KATZ: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. Are we
22 ready for the fourth bullet? What procedures

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 are in place to determine input for action
2 items in OTS?

3 MEMBER BEACH: And do we need to
4 say procedures and processes? Go ahead.

5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: No, go
6 ahead.

7 MEMBER BEACH: I was just going to
8 say do we need to add processes as we have
9 throughout the rest of this document so far?

10 MR. KATZ: I agree, Josie, about
11 processes and procedures because not
12 everything may be proceduralized, but I don't
13 understand this. I don't understand what we
14 mean by "in place to determine input for
15 action items." I just don't understand that.

16 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. In
17 the OTS database NIOSH has changed their way
18 of responding to comments versus, you know,
19 how they responded to them with WISPR and they
20 have created a field called Action Items based
21 upon comments and that's why we see OTS there
22 and not the other databases. So that's a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 reference to the action items they take on in
2 response to the comments.

3 MEMBER BEACH: So I guess my
4 question is what is "Determine input for
5 action items." What are you trying to get at?

6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: We want to
7 know how they determine what action they're
8 going to take.

9 MEMBER BEACH: Okay, so determine
10 - does that work? Get rid of the --

11 MR. KATZ: So, how does NIOSH
12 determine appropriate actions?

13 MEMBER BEACH: For items in OTS.

14 MR. KATZ: Yes.

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: How does NIOSH
16 determine action items to be included in OTS?
17 Is that what people are saying?

18 MEMBER BEACH: No. Determine what
19 --

20 MR. KATZ: What actions to take in
21 response to the comments received.

22 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: How does

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NIOSH determine appropriate actions for
2 comments provided in OTS. That's what I got.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: It seems to be
4 specific to OTS.

5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And it is -
6 -

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: So that's why I'm
8 asking.

9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: In WISPR
10 they put in a response to every comment that
11 was received and they didn't have something
12 called Action Items, nor did they with TopHat.

13 MEMBER MUNN: How can you answer a
14 question like that, how you determine -- that
15 would seem to be different for every type of
16 action that you can think of.

17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: What
18 they're doing is they're putting in a comment
19 that a worker provided and then there is an
20 action field and the action for that comment
21 can be no action or the action could be
22 further investigate releases of UF6 from the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Cascades. And what we're trying to determine
2 is if that action item is appropriate to
3 adequately address the concerns.

4 MEMBER MUNN: You may ask five
5 people that question and get three different
6 answers as to why they made that decision or
7 what process was used to conclude that no
8 action was necessary or that some action was
9 necessary, which action should be taken.

10 MR. KATZ: I wonder if we're not
11 already getting at this. If we have what
12 criteria are used to evaluate the comments
13 received for action or changes in documents,
14 whatever, we have that already. I mean isn't
15 that really getting at the question?

16 MEMBER BEACH: But it's a twofold
17 question because the front end of it is
18 talking about what procedures and processes
19 are in place and then it talks about determine
20 what action. So are we wanting to look at the
21 procedures that are in place or are we
22 actually looking at the actions that were

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 determined. I guess Kathy, why did you put
2 procedures and processes or procedures in the
3 front.

4 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: OTS is part
5 of the PR-012 so it is included in the PR-012
6 review of PR-012. It is an extension of the
7 procedure.

8 MEMBER BEACH: So are we looking
9 at the procedures that the rest of that
10 sentence takes care of, or are you looking at
11 the action you've taken because of the
12 comment? It's very confusing.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I see these two
14 questions as are we going to review the
15 procedure that tells him what to do, how to
16 put actions in as one thing and then if we do
17 that are we also going to look at OTS, the
18 action that was recorded, is it appropriate
19 for the comments. There's two different.

20 DR. MAURO: Mike, this is John. I
21 agree. I think that this is the first bullet
22 where we return to the procedures. It seems

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to me the more fundamental question
2 notwithstanding the procedures is that what
3 action -- in other words, once an item has
4 been recorded wherever it is, let's say it's
5 in OTS, and it has been judged to be
6 substantive to the extent that it needs to be
7 recorded, then the question really becomes
8 okay, we've identified something that is of
9 interest and concern, what do we do about it?

10 What are we going to do about it and I think
11 that's what the real issue here is. Whether
12 or not it's in the procedure, I think we've
13 got it in the procedures elsewhere because
14 this is the first place where we are asking a
15 question in terms -- in the context of does
16 the procedure provide for this. It seems to
17 me the "procedure" word is out of place in
18 this bullet. Not that it should not be
19 addressed in a procedure review, but this
20 particular evaluation objective doesn't seem
21 to be a subset of any type of procedure. It's
22 really functional. We functionally want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 know listen, if you've found something that
2 you think is important what are you going to
3 do about it?

4 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well
5 there's that, and then there's whether NIOSH
6 is following their own guidance within the
7 procedure and doing that.

8 DR. MAURO: But this does not seem
9 to be the place where we're doing a procedure
10 review, right? I mean, Evaluation Objective 3
11 is not couched in terms of procedure review.
12 It almost transcends procedures.

13 MEMBER BEACH: Kathy, it seems to
14 me you're trying to get at something and maybe
15 you just need to reword it to what exactly --

16 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I'll give
17 you an example, okay? I'm going to use the
18 coworker interviews as an example. In the
19 CATI procedure there's an outline for when
20 they do those type of interviews and there's
21 kind of two things here. NIOSH has got in
22 their mind how they determine what the action

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 items are. They've got a process for that.
2 In that process we need to ask ourselves the
3 question is that process complete.

4 MEMBER MUNN: The point I was
5 trying to make --

6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: The
7 criteria that they use to derive their action
8 items.

9 DR. MAURO: Let me try again. In
10 other words, in the second bullet, just for an
11 example, what criteria are used to determine
12 something substantive. I realize there's some
13 wording changes. It's not couched in terms of
14 due to procedures contained criteria. In my
15 mind, this is an overarching important
16 question the answer to which when this
17 question is posed may very well be yes,
18 Procedure Number XYZ explicitly states these
19 are the criteria we will use to determine when
20 we're going to put a particular piece of
21 information into OTS. That would be the
22 answer to the question, but that's not the way

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 this is couched. This is couched transcendent
2 to the procedure and I like the idea, quite
3 frankly, that these series of bullets are
4 attempting to transcend procedures because
5 quite frankly procedures come, procedures go,
6 they're improved, they're revised, but the
7 fundamental essence of our concern is listen,
8 when you find out there's something important,
9 you write it down and you make sure some
10 action is taken to correct it or to do
11 whatever needs to be done and that's why I
12 think this particular Objective Number 3 is by
13 far the one of greatest interest to me. When
14 you find out there's something that needs to
15 be fixed we have to make sure it's recorded
16 and that action is taken to fix it. In fact,
17 when we all started all this many, many months
18 ago, this is what triggered everything we were
19 talking about. The concern, if you remember,
20 we repeatedly ran into circumstances where
21 workers and people we interviewed were giving
22 us information and it never made its way home

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 into -- not never, but we often found that
2 that material was not explicitly captured and
3 incorporated into the site profile. So I mean
4 this to me is something that transcends the
5 procedures, it goes to the heart of why we are
6 doing what we're doing in terms of from the
7 technical side. See, I see this as from a
8 technical point of view if there's a point
9 that's being made that is important to dose
10 reconstruction and that we didn't know about
11 before but we do now because someone just
12 informed us of it, we need to capture it and
13 make sure it's reflected in how we go about
14 doing our business. So I mean, I guess I feel
15 strongly that we keep it in that vein and not
16 make it a procedure review.

17 MR. KATZ: John, I think that's
18 good, but I don't know, it's hard to get away
19 from the word "procedures" but I think we're
20 still asking the question what procedures are
21 in place to ensure that comments are responded
22 to appropriately, whatever, acted on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 appropriately.

2 MEMBER MUNN: But no matter how
3 many procedures are written, no matter how
4 many written processes are followed, sooner or
5 later you come to a point where many of these
6 items are in fact by necessity a result of an
7 informed judgment call.

8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Can I kind
9 of ask a question here? If I have two people
10 or three people who are looking at a comment,
11 is there a consistent criteria by which that
12 comment is going to be judged by those three
13 people?

14 MEMBER MUNN: And my point is the
15 comment itself is likely to be viewed in a
16 different light depending upon the
17 circumstances of that employee's site, that
18 employee's work and any other number of
19 variables that might be involved. That's why
20 I said informed review.

21 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay, now
22 these are three people at NIOSH who are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 looking at the comments, okay? And are we
2 saying that it's okay to be subjective, or do
3 you want criteria there, at least guidelines
4 on what is a substantive comment?

5 MEMBER MUNN: Guidelines are
6 always necessary, but seldom sufficient when
7 one's attempting to move through such a wide
8 variety of activities and such a wide variety
9 of circumstances that have been encountered by
10 our claimants.

11 MR. KATZ: Let me go at this
12 again, Wanda, and see if I can't help here.
13 We have criteria. What criteria are there to
14 identify comments that deserve response,
15 right? And then the next step really when you
16 think about it, what procedure is in place to
17 make sure that when you identify, if you're
18 correctly identifying those items, to make
19 sure those items get sent to the right people
20 to give it consideration, in effect. I mean,
21 you can't lay out the criteria for every
22 different kind of comment, there's just no

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 way. I mean, that universe is huge so you
2 can't -- I don't think you could expect to
3 find in procedures here's how you do -- here's
4 what you do for a comment of this nature,
5 here's what you do for a comment of that
6 nature. I guess you could do some categorical
7 general procedures, but I don't know that they
8 exist. But you certainly want to know once
9 someone, whoever is on the front end -- the
10 receiving end of the comments, once they
11 receive this comment and it says XYZ about
12 some process at some site, whatever, you want
13 to be sure that there's a procedure to make
14 sure that comment, as John was saying, doesn't
15 get sort of lost between the cracks somewhere,
16 but that it gets to the appropriate experts
17 and whatever to give it consideration. Right?
18 So that's sort of a procedure for ensuring
19 that items that deserve some action or
20 response get such an action and response.

21 DR. MAURO: You see, and I agree
22 with everything you're saying. I'm sort of a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 purist. I look at the evaluation criteria.
2 If you want to make Evaluation Objective 3 a
3 procedure review to make sure that there's a
4 procedure in place that does all these
5 important things, that's one thing. If you
6 want Evaluation 3 to be something which is
7 functional, that is I don't care about your
8 procedures, I don't care if you have a
9 thousand procedures. In the end I want to
10 make sure that these things are happening. So
11 I mean, it's two different --

12 MR. KATZ: John, I understand
13 that, but the issue is that there's two parts
14 to this, like with all the other objectives
15 before. We have the parts of let's see what
16 the procedures are to make sure things are
17 handled correctly and this is falling under
18 that because this is all under examine the
19 process by which OCAS and its contractors
20 evaluate worker input, and then there's the,
21 again, the how is it working for us which is
22 what you're talking about. That comes under

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 conduct a systematic review. So that's where
2 you get to okay, we have these procedures to
3 make sure for example that a substantive
4 comment got to the right people and was given
5 consideration. Now let's go look at some
6 examples and see how it's working. So we take
7 whatever, some Savannah River site profile,
8 what have you, so and so SEC evaluation and we
9 then track those actual items where comments
10 were received. Did those comments actually
11 get sent to the right people to give it
12 consideration and so on. Does that make
13 sense?

14 DR. MAURO: So right under the
15 bold part of this Objective 3 there's a
16 statement that says, "Examine the process by
17 which."

18 MR. KATZ: Right.

19 DR. MAURO: Am I correct that this
20 is going to be revised to say, "Examine the
21 procedures and processes?"

22 MR. KATZ: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. MAURO: Okay. My apologies.
2 I must have missed that. Once you've
3 incorporated the word "procedure," then
4 everything from there on in is basically let's
5 look at the procedure you're using to make
6 sure that there is a procedure that provides
7 for this. And then later on, the last part is
8 okay, now we're going to audit it to see if in
9 fact the procedure is being followed. I
10 missed the part where you changed the process
11 word. I'm okay.

12 MEMBER BEACH: Does someone want
13 to take a stab at that sentence?

14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Before we do
15 that, let me just deviate here a little bit.
16 We're still in the hour that was supposed to
17 be public comment so let me just check and see
18 if any other workers, advocates or claimants
19 have gotten on the line and are waiting to
20 make public comment. If so, go ahead and
21 identify yourself and make your comments.

22 MS. MAHR: This is Nancy Mahr.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. Go ahead,
2 Nancy.

3 MS. MAHR: What's unclear to me is
4 how these substantive technical worker
5 comments from let's say a labor union, how do
6 they get transferred from the database into
7 their technical documents like these site
8 profiles? How does that happen?

9 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: J.J., do you
10 want to take a stab at it?

11 MR. JOHNSON: The question is how
12 do statements in a meeting get into the
13 Technical Basis Document. What they do is
14 that you have an HP at the meeting and the
15 information is recorded, it's taken back and
16 worked with the Technical Basis Document owner
17 to determine its credibility when it comes to
18 needing to change the Technical Basis
19 Document. If it's found that it needs to
20 change the Technical Basis Document it's
21 incorporated into the Technical Basis Document
22 through a procedure review and incorporation.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Does that answer
2 your question, Nancy?

3 MS. MAHR: It does, but how do the
4 workers know when these changes are made?

5 MR. JOHNSON: In the front of the
6 Technical Basis Document there's a change
7 process and in there it'll indicate whether
8 the change was made based upon a reviewer
9 comment or through another technical review
10 process.

11 MR. MCDOUGALL: And if I might
12 add, the -- when we identify a Technical Basis
13 Document that has such a notation in the front
14 when it's issued, we as a general rule go back
15 to the labor organization from whence that
16 comment originated and notify them of that
17 change and ask if they want to, you know, ask
18 them to look at it, ask them if they want to
19 have any further input.

20 MS. MAHR: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, thank you.
22 Are there any other workers, advocates, or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 workers' reps on the phone that would like to
2 make public comment at this time? Any other
3 comments at this time? Okay, if not we're
4 going to get back into the agenda. Maybe
5 right around 3:00 we'll ask one more time.
6 So, back to the discussion on I believe it is
7 the fourth bullet. It started out saying
8 "What procedures are in place to determine
9 input for action items in OTS?" and we've had
10 quite a bit of discussion about that. So,
11 concerns, Kathy?

12 DR. MAKHIJANI: Do you want me to
13 read what I picked up from what was being
14 said?

15 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Go ahead.

16 DR. MAKHIJANI: "What processes
17 and procedures are in place to ensure that
18 NIOSH is following up on the response and
19 action items in OTS?" "In OTS" or leave that
20 out?

21 MEMBER BEACH: I think that was an
22 important part of it, the OTS.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: Unless -- if everything
2 is captured in OTS then that works. If
3 there's a broader universe than OTS, then you
4 wouldn't want to limit it to OTS.

5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: The only
6 reason OTS is in there is because that action
7 item comment portion is in there.

8 MR. KATZ: I know, but now we're
9 not talking about action items.

10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And that
11 relates to OTS.

12 MR. KATZ: So does OTS cover the
13 universe for all input that comes in by all
14 means?

15 MR. JOHNSON: It covers the issues
16 that are addressed and identified by the HP at
17 their respective meeting, and those are
18 documented in OTS.

19 MR. KATZ: So it would also, like
20 individual interviews, would those be captured
21 in OTS?

22 MR. JOHNSON: They have not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 necessarily happened probably because of the
2 technical nature of them. That's why they
3 would be --

4 MR. KATZ: May or may not be in
5 there.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

7 MR. KATZ: I mean, I just think
8 you'd want to leave it broad. You can do OTS,
9 you can have OTS as a subset.

10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I don't
11 have a problem with taking it out.

12 MR. KATZ: But you don't want to
13 limit yourself to OTS.

14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I think we ought
15 to take it out, but I think that part we take
16 out should be probably put down for the next
17 section about what we talked about to make
18 sure the appropriate action items are being
19 reported in OTS.

20 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I think
21 that's right. In the next section you do have
22 a review of the database.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay.

2 DR. MAURO: This is John. I've
3 got a question that just struck me when Ted
4 raised the question of OTS. I realize we're
5 discussing outreach and making sure that
6 important information that occurs through that
7 process makes it into the final product and
8 procedures the way in which work is being
9 done. I'm going to ask a question that says
10 what about all of the comments that are
11 contained in the site profile reviews,
12 procedure reviews, et cetera that are provided
13 by SC&A to the board as being feedstock to the
14 process? Because in a lot of respects, what
15 we offer up by way of observations, comments,
16 et cetera, are not unlike the kinds of things
17 that are fed back to NIOSH through its
18 outreach program.

19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Are you
20 referring to the site expert interview
21 summary?

22 DR. MAURO: I think the site

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 expert interview summary is captured by OTS
2 under the new procedures. However, what's not
3 -- and this is kind of a broader question, the
4 list of findings that we have and we provide
5 in our report in effect are on record, they've
6 been filed, they're sitting in an electronic
7 database, but I don't think that they're
8 necessarily taken into consideration when the
9 next version of a site profile is issued.

10 DR. MAKHIJANI: You mean when
11 there's no working group.

12 DR. MAURO: When there's no
13 working group. And I guess I just took this
14 as an opportunity to point out that to a
15 degree the boundary between feedback obtained
16 through outreach from interviewing workers and
17 feedback obtained from the Board's contractor
18 as a result of assignments that the Board's
19 contractor is given, you know, I don't see
20 them as that different.

21 MR. KATZ: John, I think they're
22 apples and oranges. I think it's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 exceptionally important, the point what
2 happens to SC&A input that hasn't gone through
3 a Board process. I think that's really
4 important. We've talked about that, I concur
5 100 percent, but I don't think that's part of
6 the worker outreach.

7 DR. MAURO: Okay, yes. And just -
8 - the thought struck me when you defined OTS
9 as is that the boundary. In other words,
10 basically are we really saying that really the
11 pot that we keep all these comments in and
12 action items is in OTS, and everything really
13 orbits around that, and that got me thinking
14 about the broader context.

15 MR. KATZ: Because the answer
16 actually to OTS is that it's limited. It
17 doesn't even cover all of the worker input.

18 DR. MAURO: Okay. Thank you for
19 your answer and I appreciate the fact that
20 perhaps the subject would be a matter for
21 another venue.

22 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. So we're

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 clear on the fourth bullet and then we'll take
2 out the second half of that somewhere in the
3 next section. The last bullet was "Feedback
4 provided to workers on the impact of
5 substantive comments on OCAS technical
6 documents."

7 MEMBER BEACH: Are we just looking
8 for feedback provided to the workers? Because
9 I was thinking it needed to be shortened to
10 "Was feedback provided to the workers on the
11 comments on the OCAS technical documents?" Or
12 is there more and I'm missing that?

13 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: It's
14 getting to what Nancy was bringing up in her
15 question.

16 MEMBER BEACH: Right.

17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: How do the
18 workers know what's being done with their
19 comments.

20 MR. KATZ: You might just frame
21 this a little more broadly. How is feedback
22 provided to workers on their comments because

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 there's different feedback depending on the
2 nature of their comments. Some of their
3 comments have substantive, you know, have
4 potential impact and will change some
5 documents. Some, you know, as you mentioned
6 some are really comments that deserve to be
7 considered by DOL or another agency. Some are
8 comments that don't have a response I'm sure.

9 MEMBER BEACH: Broad, very broad.

10 MR. KATZ: Yes, they're just all
11 over the place, but if you just frame it
12 broadly then you can pursue it in its details
13 and different ways.

14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Does everyone
15 agree with that? We'll drop the, "on the OCAS
16 technical documents."

17 MEMBER BEACH: And just say "Was
18 feedback provided to the workers on their
19 comments."

20 MR. KATZ: I said how is feedback
21 --

22 MEMBER BEACH: Or how.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: -- rather than was.

2 MEMBER BEACH: How is feedback
3 provided.

4 MR. KATZ: And the impact of their
5 comments. Well I didn't even limit it to --

6 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I got rid of
7 that substantive. That was just me though.

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: How is feedback
9 provided to the workers --

10 MEMBER BEACH: On their comments.

11 DR. MAKHIJANI: On the impact of
12 their comments.

13 MR. KATZ: On their comments.

14 DR. MAKHIJANI: On their comments?
15 Or the impact of it?

16 MR. KATZ: Or the response to
17 their comments I guess, whatever. And then it
18 really depends on the nature of their comments
19 for what feedback you're going to find I
20 imagine.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, that does
22 it for that section, correct?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, let me one
3 more time before the top of the hour here just
4 go back and ask if there's any workers, worker
5 advocates or claimants on the phone that want
6 to make public comment during this period.
7 Any public comments at this time? Okay. So
8 we want to take maybe a 10-minute break and
9 then come back and discuss this. Okay? Come
10 back about 3 o'clock.

11 MR. KATZ: I'm just putting the
12 phone on mute.

13 (Whereupon, the above-entitled
14 matter went off the record at 2:52 p.m. and
15 resumed at 3:03 p.m.)

16 MR. KATZ: Okay, we're back
17 online. This is the Worker Outreach Work
18 Group. We just had a 10-minute break and
19 Mike?

20 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. We're
21 still on Evaluation Objective Number 3. We're
22 down to the second set of bullets under "Adopt

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 a systematic review of worker outreach
2 databases at a point in time in relation to
3 its impact on technical documents." First
4 bullet, "Select a sample of site profiles and
5 SEC evaluation reports for worker outreach
6 meetings have been done to document whether
7 and how worker equipment has been considered
8 and included and evaluate if exclusions were
9 appropriate." Any questions, concerns about
10 that? If not, second bullet for follow-up
11 discussions held with participants providing
12 substantive comments.

13 MR. KATZ: I have a question about
14 that.

15 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay.

16 MR. KATZ: I'm not sure, sort of
17 the assumption -- again, the assumption is
18 there should be follow-up discussions with
19 participants always, or I don't know? I mean,
20 someone may provide substantive comments that
21 are fully adequate and you go and you do what
22 you need to do with it and it's done. I mean,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I just don't know.

2 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: It's not
3 all the time that's what happens.

4 DR. MAKHIJANI: If necessary,
5 maybe?

6 MR. KATZ: Yes, that would explain
7 it I guess. Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Or would you
9 rather have the question phrased in a
10 different way to remove the illusion that they
11 aren't expected to be held? Is that your
12 concern, Ted?

13 MR. KATZ: Yes. So Arjun
14 suggested, you know, when necessary or would
15 be added to that.

16 MEMBER MUNN: Well, how does this
17 differ from the last bullet at the bottom?

18 MR. KATZ: So I would just -- this
19 may need clarification. When I was reading
20 this I was thinking well someone's provided
21 comments, but you need more detail than what
22 you got, do you go back to the well, versus

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 responding and letting people know how their
2 feedback was used.

3 MEMBER MUNN: Well, it's hard not
4 to consider follow-up discussion as feedback.

5 MR. KATZ: But I guess now that
6 I'm thinking about this anyway, I mean, it
7 seems like this belongs above -- with the
8 other bullets anyway. This is more a process,
9 procedures question than how are things
10 working in reality, how are the processes and
11 procedures working for us. So it seems like
12 if it's not already covered by the other it
13 belongs up above with the other bullets.

14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Can I throw
15 an example out there? If a worker comes to
16 NIOSH and says there was fermium used at such
17 and such a site, the first thing that at least
18 I would ask is where. You go back to that
19 person to ask that, and if he didn't have the
20 answer, go to the documentation.

21 MR. KATZ: Right. So I think I
22 understood you perfectly there. I understand

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that you may need to do follow-up work on
2 comments that are received, but that seems
3 like that's part of the processes and
4 procedures for evaluating input up above
5 versus the systematic review in relation to
6 its impact on technical documents.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Perhaps like
8 under the third bullet up above?

9 MR. KATZ: Yes. Sure.

10 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Does everyone
11 else agree with that?

12 DR. MAKHIJANI: So you're moving
13 the second bullet up.

14 MR. KATZ: To be the fourth bullet
15 in the list immediately above.

16 MEMBER BEACH: And then did you
17 change the wording on that a bit too?

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: If necessary, yes.
19 Isn't that what you had?

20 MR. KATZ: Yes. If, when.

21 DR. MAKHIJANI: When?

22 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. Now, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 third bullet which is our second bullet, "OCAS
2 conduct research to determine the impact of
3 substantive comments on the dose
4 reconstruction process."

5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: So in other
6 words, going back to my comment or my example,
7 we handled fermium at such and such a site.
8 Well, they may have to go back and pull
9 documentation to validate that.

10 DR. MAKHIJANI: I don't believe
11 they do that in terms of their criteria,
12 whether to -- the comment or not, right?

13 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I don't
14 know what the criteria is.

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: But that's sort of
16 what we're seeking to find out, right? This
17 is part of, you know, how do they decide
18 whether something is relevant.

19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: It could be
20 a subcategory to that.

21 MR. KATZ: Yes. I mean, I think
22 it's another detail. It goes above with the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 other bullets. It's more of the process and
2 procedures by which OCAS is responding to
3 comments received.

4 DR. MAKHIJANI: What's your
5 pleasure, Mike? You want to move it up?

6 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes, let's move
7 it up. Try to keep it consistent.

8 MEMBER BEACH: The last bullet
9 kind of goes with it also.

10 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I think both
11 of the last bullets are in the same spirit.
12 Should I put them at the end of that bullet
13 above?

14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: There was
15 something that Mike wanted to make sure that
16 we captured which was kind of the second half
17 of the fourth bullet up top.

18 MEMBER BEACH: The new fourth
19 bullet?

20 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: No, the
21 original.

22 MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: The second part
2 of that question is something to the effect
3 that we were going to look at the action items
4 that are actually in OTS to see if they're
5 appropriate based on the appropriate actions
6 are being taken. We had talked about moving
7 it down to this next section.

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: Now I'm really
9 confused. Are we in the worker input list and
10 transferring stuff there? Do you want me to
11 read you what I have in that list now?

12 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: Because we've kind
14 of moved stuff around a fair amount. I'm not
15 sure that I did everything right, but at least
16 let me tell you what I've got. So the first
17 bullet in that worker input list in how does
18 OCAS catalogue and consider worker input, et
19 cetera, that hasn't been changed. And the
20 second bullet is "What criteria are used to
21 identify comments that deserve consideration
22 or responses, or for a response or action by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 NIOSH? Are appropriate personnel evaluating
2 the comments received," that's the third
3 bullet. Now we added, we moved the bullet
4 just now which is now the fourth bullet, "Were
5 follow-up discussions held with participants
6 providing substantive comments as necessary?"

7 Then, "What processes and procedures are in
8 place to ensure that NIOSH is following up on
9 response and action items?" "How is feedback
10 provided to workers in response to their
11 comment?" And then the two bullets that were
12 moved from the next list up, "Did OCAS conduct
13 research to determine the impact of
14 substantive comments on the dose
15 reconstruction process?" "When substantive
16 comments were provided was supporting
17 documentation obtained to validate the
18 statements by participants?" So that's the
19 list that I have under worker input.

20 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Read Bullet
21 Number 5 that you have now.

22 DR. MAKHIJANI: Current Bullet

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Number 5 is "What processes and procedures are
2 in place to ensure that NIOSH is following up
3 on the response and action items?"

4 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And now
5 we're asking are the action items appropriate.
6 It's a different question.

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, isn't that in
8 the one bullet that now remains which is
9 sample selection, determine and document
10 whether or not worker input has been
11 considered and improved and evaluate if
12 exclusion were appropriate.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: No.

14 DR. MAKHIJANI: No. So you want
15 to add a bullet there?

16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: We had talked
17 about under the section "Examine the process
18 by which OCAS has contractors evaluate worker
19 input." The original fourth bullet originally
20 read "What procedures are in place to
21 determine input for action items in OTS."

22 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, that was the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 original.

2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: And when we
3 started assessing that question I thought we
4 had broken it down into two. One was
5 basically a procedure process question and the
6 other, the tail end of it was more of a
7 practical to where -- to look at some of the
8 actions that are entered in OTS."

9 DR. MAKHIJANI: I'm very sorry. I
10 entirely missed that. So we need to add that
11 in the next list. So what were the action
12 items determined appropriate or how did you
13 want?

14 MR. KATZ: Handled appropriately
15 in a sense is what he's saying.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.

17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Are
18 appropriate to the comments provided.

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: Were the action
20 items --

21 MR. KATZ: It's really not the
22 items. It's were the actions appropriate to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the comments is what you're saying, right? In
2 OTS, is that right?

3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Kathy, didn't
4 you say they're entered as action items?

5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes,
6 they're entered as action items.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: That's why they
8 were called that. So once the procedure and
9 process is taken, it walks people to that
10 database and the other one is actually going
11 to the database and just. We talked about
12 that tail end coming down.

13 MR. KATZ: So, were the action
14 items appropriate to the comments received.
15 Is that what you want to say?

16 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: In OTS.

17 MR. KATZ: Okay. So that makes
18 sense because you have one going at it by
19 looking at site profiles and SEC evaluation
20 reports, and you have another going at it by
21 looking at OTS, right? That's sort of two
22 different approaches to looking at how

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 comments are actually handled. Is that good?

2 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Now, can I
3 throw a monkey wrench in here?

4 MR. KATZ: We love monkey
5 wrenches.

6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: They're not
7 called action items in WISPR.

8 MR. KATZ: Well, that doesn't
9 matter.

10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: So if we're
11 doing anything from a historical, if we're
12 pulling data from that and evaluating their
13 response, that's not going to be covered.

14 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, then we can
15 add that.

16 MR. KATZ: What is it called in
17 WISPR?

18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: They have a
19 comment and then they have a response.

20 DR. MAKHIJANI: Were action items
21 and response appropriate to the comment?

22 MR. KATZ: Or you can say -- put

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in parentheses, "or were responses in WISPR,"
2 whatever. If you need to outline them on
3 each, and if you really want to go back into -
4 - that's fine. You can say, you know, "or
5 responses in WISPR" in parentheses. If you
6 just do that then that explains what you mean.

7 However it's framed you're still asking the
8 same question, is the action appropriate to
9 the comment.

10 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. So what I
11 have now is "Were the action items in OTS or
12 responses in WISPR appropriate to the comments
13 received."

14 MR. KATZ: That sounds good.

15 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I think
16 TopHat's was the same way as WISPR.

17 DR. MAKHIJANI: TopHat is no
18 longer -

19 MR. KATZ: TopHat, I gather
20 there's not much there.

21 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: We have a
22 hard copy.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: I have a comment then
2 for the other bullet. The bullet that has
3 about validating statements, wherever that's
4 been moved. Where are we? The bullet as it
5 read was "When substantive comments were
6 provided" --

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.

8 MR. KATZ: -- "was supporting
9 documentation obtained." I mean, one, I think
10 you need to ask the question to determine did
11 OCAS attempt to obtain supporting
12 documentation because there wouldn't
13 necessarily be supporting documentation. And
14 then the question is to verify statements, not
15 necessarily validate because you don't --
16 you're not -- a priori you're not trying to
17 validate their statement, you're trying to
18 verify it.

19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Maybe we
20 should rephrase it "Did NIOSH verify the
21 comments through either additional document
22 research or further interview with the comment

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 provider?"

2 MR. KATZ: Yes. But again --

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: We did that.
4 Going back to the worker is a separate thing
5 we already did.

6 MEMBER BEACH: That's the one we
7 moved down.

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. And now
9 we're talking just -- when substantive
10 comments were provided was supporting document
11 -- how is that different than, "OCAS conducts
12 research to determine the impact of
13 substantive comments on the dose
14 reconstruction process?" I don't know. I
15 think we've got a lot of overlapping questions
16 that can be put into a more general question,
17 Kathy.

18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, I
19 just have written up here about, so.

20 DR. MAKHIJANI: No, it's the same
21 -- the question that you asked before -- they
22 are just being moved, they're not being

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 changed. Yes, I'm just struggling.

2 MR. KATZ: I think these questions
3 are more or less the same.

4 DR. MAKHIJANI: How do you want
5 them rephrased, if you want them rephrased?
6 Because I'm not -- and I'm a little bit in
7 deep water. I just want to write down
8 whatever is appropriate so people have a good
9 text.

10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: We can
11 combine them because the purpose of that is to
12 follow through on the comment.

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. "Did OCAS
14 conduct research to verify substantive
15 comment?"

16 MEMBER MUNN: Just statements I
17 thought we said.

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: Statements?

19 MEMBER MUNN: That's what we had
20 said originally when we were talking about it
21 earlier.

22 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. To verify

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 substantive statements.

2 MEMBER MUNN: Made by
3 participants.

4 DR. MAKHIJANI: By participants
5 and assess their impact on the dose
6 reconstruction process. That's how those two
7 ideas would be combined as I read them.

8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: That's the
9 general --

10 MR. KATZ: Yes, and I guess --

11 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: -- area
12 where we're trying to go.

13 MR. KATZ: I would then even just
14 say "evaluate," and I'm not sure how we got
15 this "statement" because everything else is
16 "comments" everywhere. There's not any
17 "statements" written anywhere in these
18 bullets. It's sort of confusing to switch to
19 "statements."

20 MEMBER MUNN: Go back to
21 "comments" then. Easy enough.

22 DR. MAKHIJANI: Your word is my

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 command here, literally.

2 MR. KATZ: "Evaluate" and
3 "comment."

4 MEMBER MUNN: "Evaluate" instead
5 of "verify?"

6 MR. KATZ: Yes, "evaluate" because
7 --

8 MEMBER MUNN: I thought I was
9 using your term when I said "verify."

10 MR. KATZ: You did, you did. I
11 said "verify" based on the original statement,
12 but now that we have this sort of wholly
13 reformulated it reads, "Did OCAS conduct
14 research to evaluate substantive comments by
15 participants and assess their" -- you're
16 missing a word -- "impact on the dose
17 reconstruction process." Their impact on --
18 but it's not just dose reconstruction. We
19 need something more general because it's their
20 impact on procedures because it could be dose
21 reconstruction, it could be SEC, what have
22 you, evaluation.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: So their impact on
2 NIOSH --

3 MEMBER MUNN: "Processes," isn't
4 it?

5 MR. KATZ: Yes, processes,
6 procedures, documents. It could be any of
7 those I suppose.

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.

9 MR. KATZ: Does that make sense,
10 Wanda?

11 MEMBER MUNN: I think so. I can't
12 tell from what I have written here.

13 MR. KATZ: Let me read it again.
14 "Did OCAS conduct research to evaluate
15 substantive comments by participants and
16 assess their impact on NIOSH documents,
17 processes and procedures?"

18 MEMBER MUNN: Okay.

19 MR. KATZ: Does that sound good?
20 Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, now under
22 the section "Conduct a systematic review of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 worker outreach" yada, yada, we still have the
2 original first bullet and we've added a second
3 at the tail end of the question from above.
4 Is there any other questions or bullets that
5 we want to put in this section? If not, then
6 we can move on to the next section of bullets
7 under Objective 3 which is "Evaluate OCAS
8 tracking system for identifying trends in
9 worker comments." First bullet, "Has OCAS
10 documented repetitive or reoccurring issues on
11 a site-wide or program-wide basis?"

12 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I think
13 maybe I'll just put this into context. If you
14 have a hundred CATI interviews and an issue
15 comes up like we worked with curium in such
16 and such a place and it keeps coming up, that
17 recurring issue is a generic issue and needs
18 to be captured and responded to. And we're a
19 little bit outside of what J.J. says is in
20 OTS.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: And by that you
22 mean?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, on
2 Page 3 on the original we have a statement
3 that we kept that OCAS have a particular
4 document reoccurring that is associated with
5 forms of worker communication and then there
6 were examples there. And these recurring
7 issues would actually come out of those other
8 venues. So this is the -- the first question
9 is asking, okay, have you been tracking all
10 those recurring issues.

11 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: And one of which
12 would have been this bullet that's up on Page
13 3, correct?

14 MR. KATZ: So Page 3 is do you
15 have a process and over here is, is it
16 happening, are they doing it, right Kathy?

17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Right.

18 MR. KATZ: So just, is OCAS
19 documenting recurring issues on a site-wide or
20 program-wide basis.

21 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: The reason
22 we added "site-wide or program-wide" was to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 delineate comments that individuals provided
2 on their own claim versus generic comments
3 that are applicable to the site profile review
4 or a site profile.

5 MR. KATZ: Can I just say, I know
6 this is under something called "Evaluate
7 OCAS's tracking system to identify trends,"
8 but it seems like the important question you
9 want to ask that you don't get to then -- you
10 have is there a procedure, and then you ask
11 here is OCAS doing it in effect, is it
12 tracking these, but really the important
13 question you want to ask is: how is OCAS
14 responding to these recurring issues which is
15 -- it's sort of lost, it doesn't show up.
16 Right?

17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: There is
18 that question. However, we need to ask these
19 first questions because we don't know if the
20 answer to them is yes.

21 MR. KATZ: No, that's fine. I
22 mean, it's fine to have this question is OCAS

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 documenting these, but then you still need --
2 you're missing the follow-up question which is
3 the most important question is how is OCAS
4 responding to these recurring issues. Yes, so
5 I think that's something that you need to add.

6 It doesn't really fall under, you know, the
7 way this is framed, the section "Evaluate
8 OCAS's tracking system for identifying
9 trends," this goes beyond evaluating the
10 tracking system. You want to know -- either
11 the whole purpose of tracking these is being
12 able to identify these trends so that you're
13 acting on them when there's a wealth of
14 information indicating there may be an issue.

15 So it seems to me this is another -- it's
16 sort of out of place I think, this "Evaluate
17 the tracking system," because it's coming --
18 here it's coming in the document after the
19 impact evaluation which is above it. Once
20 you've evaluated impact you're done with the
21 evaluation. So it seems like you need to move
22 this "Evaluate the OCAS tracking system" above

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 this whole section, "Conduct a systematic
2 review." And then you can have under
3 "Evaluate the tracking system," these two
4 questions, "Has OCAS documented repetitive or
5 recurring issues," or just that one question.

6 DR. MAKHIJANI: We have at the end
7 of Objective 2, "and evaluate the completeness
8 and adequacy of the outreach tracking system."

9 MR. KATZ: Yes, and this is --

10 DR. MAKHIJANI: Sorry?

11 MR. KATZ: Yes. This is an
12 element of that.

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: So should this be
14 moved over there, is that what you're saying?

15 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, let
16 me give you an example, okay? When you
17 collect an air sample you compare it against
18 the requirement, okay? And it's either above
19 that level or below that level. So that's the
20 first step, but over a period of time you
21 tracked that same air sample position and
22 you're seeing a trend then an action needs to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 be taken if you want to discontinue that trend
2 and prevent it.

3 MEMBER BEACH: So I wonder if you
4 put it -- because this is tracking system
5 underneath that but trending. Because you're
6 already asking some of those questions in the
7 tracking on Page 4 and then you want to trend
8 what you're tracking, correct? I mean, is
9 that the more logical way to put it?

10 MR. KATZ: I thought Arjun had a
11 solution for this that he mentioned earlier?
12 Should we move it up and see how it works?

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: At the bottom of
14 2, Mike?

15 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Tell us what
16 you've got, what you're suggesting.

17 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, what I
18 noticed was that at the bottom of 2, just
19 above Objective 3 we have an item that says
20 "Evaluate the completeness and adequacy of the
21 outreach tracking system" you've got bullets
22 under there that in my notes at least were not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 modified. And it must have been immediately
2 after lunch I think. Sorry.

3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. Does
4 it specify OTS in there?

5 DR. MAKHIJANI: It does, yes. And
6 then what I'm suggesting is that the existing
7 section that we're discussing be transferred
8 whole, including the preamble sentence,
9 "Evaluate OCAS's tracking system for
10 identifying trends in worker comments," under
11 the set of bullets and now you have a new set
12 of bullets. So you transfer the whole thing
13 there.

14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And then
15 you add the "Is NIOSH responding to those
16 trends" under the last one.

17 MR. KATZ: The responding to the
18 trends is -- we have already two bullets.
19 This would be a third bullet.

20 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes.

21 MR. KATZ: So yes. Does that make
22 sense to you? Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: The three bullets
2 you have would be put under a new preamble
3 sentence. I just moved the whole thing
4 physically, I lifted both the sentence and the
5 three bullets under it and put it at the
6 bottom of Objective 2.

7 MR. KATZ: But we haven't actually
8 talked about Bullet 2 and Bullet 3.

9 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, now you can
10 edit. If you want it there then we can edit
11 those and leave it there.

12 MEMBER BEACH: And then before you
13 go too far, does it fit under Objective 3, the
14 definition of Objective 3 -- 2, I mean?

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I think it
16 does.

17 MEMBER BEACH: Obtaining and
18 implementing input from workers.

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes.

20 MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

21 MR. KATZ: So Bullet 2, Bullet 2,
22 "Are recurring comments provided from worker

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 input and nontraditional worker and
2 representative methods of communication
3 tracked and trended?" That's hard to get your
4 mind around that statement, but seems like the
5 first bullet says all you need to say. "Is
6 OCAS documenting repetitive and recurring
7 issues on a site-wide and program-wide basis?"
8 but Kathy, is something missed that's captured
9 in the second bullet?

10 MEMBER MUNN: It sounds redundant.

11 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. One
12 of the questions we might have, and maybe we
13 don't, is are they tracking and trending
14 comments.

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: That's the first
16 one, right? Is OCAS documenting repetitive
17 and recurring issues on a site-wide basis,
18 right?

19 MR. KATZ: Site-wide or program-
20 wide.

21 DR. MAKHIJANI: And the whole
22 thing involves evaluate OCAS's tracking system

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 for identifying trends in worker comments.
2 That's the whole thing, right?

3 MEMBER BEACH: Nontraditional
4 worker. Was there something else?

5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: CATIs,
6 PHAs, comments provided like from, for
7 example, the individual at Nevada.

8 MR. KATZ: That's --

9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. One
10 question is are you documenting, and then the
11 other question is are you evaluating the
12 trends. If a hundred workers say "I don't
13 understand the dose reconstruction report,"
14 then maybe something should be done.

15 MR. KATZ: That gets the impact.
16 Again, we're going to have another bullet
17 under Impact about evaluating how NIOSH
18 handles then these trends.

19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Then we
20 would have a total of two bullets.

21 MR. KATZ: But that comes under
22 the Impact, not under this section which is --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that comes under -- we have two bullets under
2 Impact later and that would come down there.
3 That's an impact evaluation when you're saying
4 what is -- but that doesn't come up here.
5 This is process questions. So we have the
6 process question of whether OCAS is
7 documenting repetitive and recurring issues,
8 and that seems like that's it. The next one
9 just in effect repeats that.

10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, do
11 they have to observe the trends? Do they have
12 to --

13 MR. KATZ: Well, I mean if you're
14 documenting the trend, I mean in effect,
15 that's what you are. If you're not
16 recognizing a trend, then you haven't -- if
17 you don't recognize a trend then there's
18 nothing documented. You would only -- I mean,
19 it's sort of inherent. If you've documented a
20 trend you've recognized it. So then the
21 question is if you appropriately respond to
22 that trend.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: You're
2 documenting the recurring issues, okay, so I
3 don't know.

4 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Ted, you had
5 mentioned earlier something I believe about
6 adding a second question, something to the
7 effect how is OCAS responding to the
8 repetitive --

9 MR. KATZ: Yes. And that would go
10 down to the Impact section. That just
11 wouldn't come here, but absolutely.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: But wouldn't
13 that answer what the concern is in Bullet 3
14 would it not?

15 MEMBER BEACH: Bullet 2 is what we
16 were talking about, wasn't it?

17 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Oh yes, Bullet
18 2.

19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: In Bullet
20 2, between what's above and then the new
21 statement.

22 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay, here's a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 little suggestion to move us off the impasse
2 here. I think I understand where Kathy is
3 coming from. So the first question could be
4 extended a little. Has OCAS documented
5 repetitive or recurring issues on a site-wide
6 or program-wide basis from various venues.

7 MEMBER MUNN: It doesn't matter
8 where it comes from.

9 MR. KATZ: Doesn't matter where it
10 comes from.

11 MEMBER MUNN: It really doesn't
12 matter where it comes from. You don't have to
13 say where it comes from. If you say
14 documented, repetitive or recurring issues,
15 that means repetitive and recurring issues
16 regardless of their origin.

17 DR. MAKHIJANI: We can say that.
18 Brilliant.

19 MR. KATZ: Wanda, Arjun is writing
20 in the regardless comment you just made. But
21 regardless of their origin. I don't think you
22 need to say that, Arjun. I really think you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 do fine --

2 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well --

3 MR. KATZ: I know, but I think
4 it's fine that she said it. You can take out
5 the regardless.

6 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, I think so.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Site-wide or
8 program-wide covers it.

9 MR. KATZ: Yes, it covers the
10 waterfront. And then we're going to get to
11 the impact question.

12 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: As long as
13 we have a mechanism in place where if a
14 hundred times a person says I replace -- or
15 this guy had me replace my badge with a pocket
16 dosimeter, then that, you know, if you have a
17 hundred of those comments then you really need
18 to respond to it versus having --

19 MR. KATZ: So, again, you have the
20 question. Is there in place. So you're going
21 to look at, okay, you have this question now,
22 are recurring issues being documented. So if

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 you go and look and you see that, one, you
2 know that this issue has been raised 75 times
3 and two, you go and you look at this and you
4 see that OCAS, there's nowhere that's
5 captured, you've answered that question, okay?

6 Here was an issue where there were 75 of the
7 same comments made, but nowhere in OCAS's
8 processes and so on is that actually captured.

9 Okay, so that answers that question. Then
10 you have when you go and you look at the data
11 OCAS has on repetitive comments, recurring
12 themes, however you want to frame it, you go
13 look and you say okay, here is one that's
14 identified in the OCAS system, recurring
15 theme. Now let's see what OCAS did about it.

16 That's the next question. And that would
17 come down under -- we have two questions
18 already. Let me get to it. It's the one --
19 one has to do with Objective 4. Where is
20 that? Oh yes. We have select a sample of
21 site profiles, blah, blah, we have then the
22 second bullet is were action items in OTS

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 appropriate to the comments received. So here
2 would be a third bullet on recurrent themes,
3 were recurrent themes appropriately responded
4 to, recurrent whatever the phraseology is.

5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: So what
6 you're saying is the fact that they showed up
7 75 times is the documentation?

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: So, whether they
9 have documented recurrent issues and then we
10 see whether they've done something about it.

11 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: So it's
12 happening before the documentation.

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: No.

14 MR. KATZ: You're answering both
15 questions. You're answering the question of
16 whether it's being documented and you're
17 answering the question for when it is
18 documented is it being handled appropriately.

19 And that seems like the whole waterfront of
20 questions you could have about that.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Or if we put is
22 it documented and trended? Is that?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER MUNN: How is it responding
2 to it? It either is or isn't documenting and
3 trending it.

4 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: It just seems
5 like there's something of a concern here and
6 I'm just trying to get it on the table so we
7 can.

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, yes, yes.
9 No, I think it is in here in what Kathy had
10 written because we have a separate title for
11 those two bullets that are there now we have
12 discussed. The preamble sentence is clear
13 that it's about trends. "Evaluate OCAS's
14 tracking system for identifying trends and
15 worker comments." And so now the first bullet
16 is "Has OCAS documented repetitive or
17 recurring issues" and so that clearly refers
18 to trends. I don't think any -- because
19 trends is the theme of the whole thing, I
20 think. Right? No, it's the very first
21 question that you had.

22 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: No, it's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 under --

2 MEMBER BEACH: We moved it.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: Now moved under
4 Objective 2.

5 MR. KATZ: Right.

6 DR. MAKHIJANI: So it's at the
7 very end of Objective 2. This thing about
8 trends.

9 MEMBER BEACH: Okay, so we didn't
10 settle the last bullet.

11 DR. MAKHIJANI: No, we have not
12 talked about the last bullet. "Are comments
13 applicable to the DOL portion?" That we have
14 not discussed.

15 MR. KATZ: And I don't understand
16 how that relates to trends for repetitive,
17 recurring issues.

18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Because
19 they happen frequently.

20 MR. KATZ: No, but I mean are
21 comments applicable to the DOL portion of the
22 process -- but again, that seems like a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 totally separate issue from recurring issues.

2 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: It's one --
3 it can fall under the item under Number 2.

4 DR. MAKHIJANI: You mean recurring
5 comments about DOL? Then maybe we should just
6 say this. "Are recurring comments applicable
7 to DOL portion of the process forwarded to
8 DOL?"

9 MR. KATZ: But I think you want to
10 know that any comments that are applicable to
11 DOL would be forwarded to DOL when they're the
12 -- regardless of whether they're recurrent or
13 they're made one time.

14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And I guess
15 what I'm saying is it would fall under the
16 item under Objective 2.

17 MR. KATZ: I see.

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: It's already under
19 Objective 2. It's a question of whether you
20 want it under the --

21 (Simultaneous speakers.)

22 MR. KATZ: Right --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: -- or someplace
2 else.

3 MR. KATZ: Someplace else.

4 DR. MAKHIJANI: So let's find
5 another home for it.

6 MR. KATZ: It's actually an
7 action, so it goes beyond Number 2.

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: It should be under
9 Number 3.

10 MR. KATZ: Yes.

11 DR. MAKHIJANI: So is NIOSH
12 forwarding --

13 MR. KATZ: This is the fourth
14 bullet, actually. This is the fourth bullet
15 under 3, the material that goes to DOL, does
16 it get to DOL.

17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay.

18 MR. KATZ: Because that's one of
19 the actions, right?

20 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. Now I can
21 tell you everything that I have. Under
22 Objective 2 we now have this new item that has

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 only one bullet, "Evaluate OCAS's tracking
2 system for identifying trends in worker
3 comments," and the one bullet is "Has OCAS
4 documented repetitive or recurring issues on a
5 site-wide or program-wide basis?" That's
6 what's there. And then there are two new
7 bullets under -- at the bottom of Objective 3.

8 The heading is "Conduct a systematic review
9 of worker outreach databases at a point in
10 time in relation to its impact on technical
11 documents," and the two new bullets on that
12 are, "Were recurrent issues appropriately
13 responded to?" and "Are comments applicable to
14 the DOL portion of the process forwarded to
15 DOL for consideration?" Does that sound good?

16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.

17 MR. KATZ: Sounds good to me.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. Ready to
19 move to Objective 4. "OCAS effectively
20 informs workers in relationship with various
21 responsibilities related to EEOICPA including
22 explaining dose reconstruction, the SEC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 petition process," et cetera.

2 MEMBER BEACH: And Mike, just for
3 the record we changed it to "determine whether
4 OCAS is effectively."

5 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Thank you.

6 MEMBER BEACH: You're welcome.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. "Examine
8 communication vehicles that OCAS has developed
9 to communicate with claimants." One bullet.
10 Are we happy with that?

11 MEMBER MUNN: Do we really want to
12 know how to, or do we want to know whether
13 they do so effectively, adequately?

14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I think that
15 sounds good. Instead of how do pamphlets, et
16 cetera, do they adequately. Okay, let's make
17 those changes.

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: So do pamphlets,
19 et cetera, effectively inform the claimant
20 population, et cetera? Is that how you want
21 it?

22 MR. KATZ: The bullets further

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 down get to effectively really. Do
2 participants understand, et cetera, all those
3 are really effectiveness questions. So --

4 DR. MAKHIJANI: So one's opinion
5 of how do --

6 MEMBER MUNN: Depends on how you
7 respond to how to. They responded and they
8 communicated in writing, they could
9 communicate in photographs, they could
10 communicate in graphs.

11 MR. KATZ: So Wanda, what I was
12 going to suggest is the question we might be
13 asking if we want to be parallel with the
14 structure and everything else, all the other
15 objectives, I mean first we ask about the
16 processes and then we ask about effectiveness
17 or impact. So the question you might ask up
18 here is in effect are -- is -- let me just say
19 this in a crude way first and then we can
20 figure out how to say it if we want to say it,
21 is sort of a universe of information that
22 should be given to claimants in the dose

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 reconstruction process and SEC petitioners,
2 it's not just claimants, but is that
3 information covered by all these different
4 venues?

5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: This was
6 not my comment. It came out at the last
7 meeting.

8 MR. KATZ: No, but all I'm saying
9 is you could ask the question does OCAS in
10 effect have vehicles for communicating all the
11 breadth of matters that it should be
12 communicating and then you ask the question
13 how effective is that, right? So the front
14 end process question, does OCAS. You know,
15 you might find a gap well OCAS doesn't even
16 tell anybody about too many of these venues,
17 about X, Y, or Z. So you may want to know
18 does OCAS have a means for communicating
19 appropriately, and appropriate means for
20 communicating its claimant information and its
21 SEC information.

22 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So are we asking

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 are the types of media they're using covering
2 the whole gamut? Or are we asking does the
3 media that's out there have all the
4 information in it. I mean, that's kind of to
5 your question, so.

6 MR. KATZ: Yes. I guess you might
7 ask -- again, I'm just posing this to try to -
8 - but you might ask, you know, are the issues
9 completely covered by the different media and
10 are these media appropriate for the content
11 that they're delivering? So you might do
12 that. Those would be the process questions up
13 front.

14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: That's good.

15 MR. KATZ: And then down below we
16 get into the effectiveness questions. So
17 Arjun has written here, "Are the various
18 instruments of communication, such as" blah,
19 blah, blah, to say that, "suitable for
20 informing the claimant population about dose
21 reconstruction, SEC petition processes," and I
22 would say all that sounds good to me, I just

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 would say it's not just claimant population
2 because.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.

4 MR. KATZ: Because it -- SEC
5 petitions could be submitted by others than
6 claimants too.

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: You had something
8 else?

9 MR. KATZ: Claimant and
10 petitioning populations you could say. But
11 yes, we do have this other -- we can go back
12 and look at how we had it. So does that?

13 MEMBER MUNN: I think you said it
14 more clearly earlier, before you got to that
15 tail end part. When we were considering it as
16 two separate questions really, two separate,
17 more simple questions. One, does OCAS
18 currently have the material and information
19 publicly available to properly cover the facts
20 that need to be disseminated. And the second
21 question then is are these materials in the
22 proper format to meet the needs of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 population covered.

2 MR. KATZ: Let me try to simplify,
3 Wanda, that. What you said is difficult to
4 grasp.

5 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, it is.

6 MR. KATZ: Does OCAS communicate
7 the information needed by claimants and
8 petitioners, and that covers, you know,
9 through all these means. So, does it
10 communicate and then the second question is
11 are the means of -- are the instruments or
12 whatever, means of communication for this
13 information appropriate. Does that make
14 sense?

15 MEMBER MUNN: Yes. One is are
16 they the right things, and the second is are
17 they in the right format.

18 MR. KATZ: So, the first is does
19 OCAS communicate the right information. Does
20 OCAS communicate the information that
21 claimants and petitioners need.

22 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: And then second, is
2 this information communicated appropriately.

3 MEMBER MUNN: Is it available and
4 communicated appropriately.

5 MR. KATZ: That's down. That's
6 simple.

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: We have currently
8 some in the reverse order. The first thing is
9 examine the communication means is one bullet.

10 MR. KATZ: So just get rid of that
11 bullet and I'll say it again. Does OCAS
12 communicate the information needed by
13 claimants and petitioners. And then the
14 second question is, is this information
15 communicated through appropriate means.

16 DR. MAKHIJANI: And this is to go
17 under what heading?

18 MR. KATZ: And this is under --

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: Examine the
20 communication vehicles that OCAS has developed
21 and their effectiveness?

22 MR. KATZ: Right. No, no, no.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 For the effectiveness we get to down here. So
2 this is just process at this point we're
3 examining. So that covers process, and then
4 down here now we get to effectiveness issues.
5 You have, "Evaluate whether OCAS
6 communications result in understanding," you
7 know. That's the effectiveness question.

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: Shall I read out
9 what Ted has been doing here?

10 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: That sounds
11 good.

12 DR. MAKHIJANI: I don't need to
13 read it?

14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Go ahead.

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: "Examine the
16 communication vehicles that OCAS has developed
17 to communicate with claimants," so that was
18 the original heading. And now we have two new
19 bullets to replace whatever was there. I
20 think it was just one bullet. "Does OCAS
21 communicate the information needed by
22 claimants and petitioners?" And second

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 bullet, "Is this information communicated
2 through appropriate means?"

3 MEMBER MUNN: I would suggest that
4 in the heading we add the word "potential"
5 before "claimants."

6 DR. MAKHIJANI: "Potential
7 claimants." We have been using "claimants"
8 throughout.

9 MR. KATZ: We have. And it's
10 claimants and petitioners though. I think
11 it's important.

12 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, but when we're
13 in the process here of asking the question
14 whether the information is available, is the
15 information good, we want to make sure that we
16 do cover those that are potentials, not just -
17 - we want the general public to have their
18 bite of this. The other material we're
19 talking about once claims and SEC petitions
20 are made, how we go about dealing with them.
21 Here we're asking whether the material that
22 has been produced specifically to elucidate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 for everyone what's transpiring, whether or
2 not that material is what we want it to be.
3 Is that not correct?

4 DR. MAURO: I have a question.
5 This is John. So is Objective 4 focused on
6 workers, claimants, or all interested parties?

7 MR. KATZ: It's the same, you
8 know, we've corrected this elsewhere. It's
9 whatever we said earlier today in the several
10 places. I forget exactly how we framed it,
11 but I think we said workers, claimants, what
12 did we say? Claimants, petitioners, workers.
13 Workers, claimants and their representatives.

14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, so are we
15 good on that one? We can jump down to the
16 second set of bullets. "Evaluate whether
17 OCAS's communications result in an
18 understanding among claimants for their rights
19 in the process such as their right to file a
20 petition, how it might be done, etc."

21 MR. KATZ: I would just amend. I
22 mean, it's not just about rights, right? I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 mean that makes it sound like it's just a
2 legalistic thing. But they need to
3 understand, "rights in the process, such as
4 right to file a petition, etc." Okay.

5 MEMBER BEACH: That whole sentence
6 is kind of wordy.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: "Are there
8 results and an understanding among claimants
9 and the reps," yada, yada, "of EEOICPA the
10 process?"

11 MEMBER BEACH: Well, their rights
12 in the process probably can go away, can't
13 they? Because we want to evaluate whether
14 OCAS is communicating and that the claimants
15 understand.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: They understand
17 the whole program, right?

18 MEMBER BEACH: Right.

19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So just put like
20 a PR or something and just take out the rights
21 in the process, rights to file.

22 MR. KATZ: Yes, to understand -- I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 mean, it's not the whole program. It's
2 really, we want -- I mean, the objective is
3 for them to understand dose reconstruction and
4 SEC petitioning processes, right?

5 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Claims and SECs,
6 yes.

7 MR. KATZ: Yes.

8 DR. MAURO: And it's to their
9 satisfaction, not in other words -- this is
10 John. In other words, is our goal here to
11 make sure that when you walk away from these
12 communications that the claimants and workers
13 feel that they understand the material to
14 their own personal satisfaction? Yes, I'm
15 walking away from this feeling I do understand
16 this as opposed to let's say, making sure they
17 understand all the different elements and
18 aspects of the program. It's really more that
19 they walk away with a sense of satisfaction.

20 MR. KATZ: I think John, I think
21 you want an objective, not a subjective. I
22 mean, for any number of reasons, people may

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 not feel satisfied, I think you want an
2 objective evaluation of whether people
3 understand what they need to understand at the
4 end of the communications with OCAS.

5 DR. MAURO: Okay. So I just want
6 to make sure I understand. So really, OCAS is
7 the agency that determines what is the
8 information that these people need to
9 understand and make sure that they understand
10 it.

11 MR. KATZ: For the dose
12 reconstruction and the SEC petitioning
13 process.

14 DR. MAURO: And that's important,
15 as opposed to, you know, I guess in a way I
16 flipped it. Okay, that's helpful.

17 MR. KATZ: That's my take.

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: I haven't written
19 anything. I'm not quite clear on what to
20 write.

21 MR. KATZ: So what I was
22 suggesting is that "Evaluate whether OCAS's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 communications result in adequate
2 understanding of" -- well, skip that for a
3 second -- "adequate understanding of the dose
4 reconstruction and SEC petitioning processes."

5 And then when you get into that you're going
6 to get into do they understand their rights in
7 the system, do they understand how to do what
8 they need to do, do they understand enough
9 about how NIOSH will be responding to what
10 they do, all that.

11 DR. MAKHIJANI: That's already
12 there in the question.

13 MR. KATZ: Yes, right.

14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Larry, is there
15 anything else in OCAS's communications? We
16 had mentioned the dose reconstruction, SEC
17 filings. Is there other big items that you
18 try to get across in communications? I mean,
19 I know you educate a lot of things, but just
20 for this particular objective.

21 MR. LEWIS: So this is the
22 resource center? That may be explained there,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 but we always explain to them where the
2 closest Department of Labor Resource Center is
3 to them. That goes in the file of the claim,
4 but you don't have to file a claim through
5 your local Resource Center, but we always have
6 that information with us so that they can see
7 where the DOL Resource Center is closest to
8 their location for people that can help them
9 through the process with that. So it's a
10 little different --

11 MR. ELLIOTT: I'm sorry, I can't
12 identify anything else right off.

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: So Mark, are you
14 saying understanding of the claims, dose
15 reconstruction and SEC petitioning processes?

16 MR. LEWIS: No, I'm saying if we
17 wanted to file a claim. Like let's say we're
18 someplace and we're talking to somebody and he
19 says oh yes, my dad worked there, or somebody
20 worked there and I had to file a claim, we
21 always have an information -- Mary put
22 together a few handouts which is on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 website and through the DOL the closest
2 Resource Center. We go to the DOL website and
3 give their contact information and stuff to
4 them. So we're in near Kentucky, we make sure
5 they've got the Paducah Resource Center, you
6 know? We're in Portsmouth, we make sure
7 they've got the Portsmouth or the closest one
8 to the site. If we're in Sandia we make sure
9 they know about the one up north, you know,
10 where they go.

11 MR. KATZ: There are lots of bits
12 and pieces that sort of exceed the boundaries
13 of just the dose reconstruction, SEC process,
14 because I could tell you that Denise Brock
15 gives a lot of help out that's really related
16 to Part E, but she makes a real difference for
17 people for that. But that's not really the
18 core function. The core functions are to make
19 sure that folks -- OCAS's core function is to
20 make sure that people understand the dose
21 reconstruction and SEC processes. You know,
22 these other things of helping people find

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 their way through the DOL labyrinth and so on
2 is sort of additional work that gets done
3 that's good, important work, but it's not
4 core.

5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Can I ask a
6 question? At a workshop you cover IREP.
7 Would that fall under the dose reconstruction
8 process?

9 MR. ELLIOTT: Yes. Well, it's
10 applicable. It is something that the dose
11 reconstruction reports feed into the IREP. We
12 take it on as a responsibility to explain to
13 users of the IREP, either casual or repeated
14 users how to use IREP. So we have a user's
15 guide on the website, we welcome calls, we
16 have staff who walk people through how to do
17 inputs into IREP. Does that answer your
18 question? I mean, I don't know that I
19 consider that outreach as much as I consider
20 it just a resource to those folks who may want
21 to avail themselves of the free IREP online.

22 MEMBER MUNN: But that's internal

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 technical information, not outreach.

2 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Wanda, what
3 I'm talking about is they had a presentation
4 at the workshop on the IREP code.

5 MEMBER MUNN: But those are not
6 presentations that you make to workers and
7 claimants and their families.

8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: In this
9 case yes, they made a presentation on IREP.

10 MR. ELLIOTT: We find that these
11 people who serve to help folks in the claimant
12 population struggle with the back end of the
13 dose reconstruction reports and the IREP input
14 sheets, and you know, many people go online
15 because our website says you can use IREP
16 online and so many people try it and then come
17 back to us and say we don't understand how to
18 do this, how to put the inputs in. So we have
19 chosen to include IREP in our workshops so
20 that we can explain how IREP functions and how
21 one may interact with that software.

22 DR. MAURO: This is John. I have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 an observation. I would say of all of the
2 things that the public at large needs to
3 appreciate and understand in order to feel a
4 degree of comfort that the process is working
5 for them, the biggest challenge is the
6 probability of causation. I think that
7 explaining dose reconstruction but the problem
8 I believe you probably have encountered and
9 will encounter is understanding the
10 probability of causation and the 99th
11 percentile because in the end it's the PoC
12 that people complain about. That is, you
13 know, and understanding why -- I mean, we know
14 why they're really given a tremendous benefit
15 of the doubt by building in the 99th
16 percentile that takes into consideration
17 individual variability. In other words, so I
18 would say that there are scientific elements
19 to the probability of causation and how it's
20 implemented that are going to be extremely
21 difficult to communicate, and my guess is
22 that's your most challenging communication

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 part. I don't know if you've seen that.

2 MR. ELLIOTT: We have seen that,
3 John. I don't think it's our most
4 challenging, I think it's in the top one or
5 two.

6 DR. MAURO: Okay.

7 MR. ELLIOTT: Of the hundred that
8 we have. Certainly dose reconstruction is
9 hard to get across. It's difficult to explain
10 to laypeople, but you're right, when we talk
11 about the probability of causation as Kathy
12 and Arjun can attest to and Josie can attest
13 to, you know, we tried our level best I think
14 to provide real-time examples. And they
15 didn't come from our presenter, they came from
16 one of our contractors in the room and I
17 jumped up and tried to give some help too.
18 It's a difficult concept to explain, a
19 difficult concept to grasp as to what we're
20 talking about when we say the 50th percent of
21 the 99 percent credibility limit. Everyone
22 just glazes over at that point.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 DR. MAURO: Yes, it's over. Once
2 you go there. Arjun and I were talking a bit
3 about this the other day and he had some ideas
4 because I was thinking about how would I
5 explain -- I try to explain this to my wife
6 and I can't.

7 MEMBER BEACH: John, can we not go
8 there now?

9 DR. MAURO: Okay.

10 DR. MAKHIJANI: I think -- the
11 substantive part of this meeting.

12 DR. MAURO: I'm sorry. This is
13 important. Anyway, I'll stop, I'm sorry.

14 MR. ELLIOTT: This is a subject
15 for another meeting.

16 MR. KATZ: So we could say dose
17 reconstruction, SEC petitions, IREP and
18 related DOL processes or something. No?
19 That's fine.

20 MR. ELLIOTT: We're reluctant to
21 talk about DOL processes other than the use of
22 IREP because --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: Okay. The use of IREP,
2 that's good.

3 MR. ELLIOTT: Sounds good. I've
4 got enough on my plate to try to explain that,
5 try to explain why DOL does something or
6 doesn't do something.

7 MR. KATZ: Yes, okay, that's fine.

8 MR. ELLIOTT: How they do
9 something.

10 MEMBER MUNN: You don't feel that
11 that -- well, never mind.

12 MR. ELLIOTT: Okay, read what
13 you've got, Arjun.

14 DR. MAKHIJANI: Evaluate whether
15 OCAS's communications result in adequate
16 understanding of the dose reconstructions, the
17 use of IREP and SEC petitioning process.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. Is
19 everyone good with that?

20 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: We'll get into
22 the details of that another day. Okay, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 bullets under that. "Do the participants
2 understand how to file a claim and what to
3 expect in the process?"

4 MR. KATZ: To file a claim is a
5 DOL business.

6 DR. MAKHIJANI: Do you want to
7 delete that?

8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: How about
9 what to explain in the dose reconstruction
10 process?

11 MEMBER BEACH: I didn't catch
12 that, Kathy.

13 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Do
14 participants understand what to expect in the
15 dose reconstruction process. Or petition
16 process.

17 MR. KATZ: Right. I mean, this is
18 just then repeating the general sentence,
19 breaking it up into its constituent parts,
20 really. That's good.

21 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: There might
22 be some overlap with the item at the bottom of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the page in the next section.

2 MR. KATZ: Okay. Why don't we
3 just go down these in order.

4 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, the second
5 bullet. We're done with the first one,
6 correct? "Do the participants understand the
7 requirements for submitting a qualifying SEC
8 petition?" Okay with that? Third bullet.
9 "Do the participants understand the time
10 requirements for qualifying and evaluating a
11 petition, i.e., the 180-day petition
12 evaluation requirement."

13 MR. KATZ: I would just -- I think
14 this needs to be broadened because that's just
15 one tiny thing, the time element. But I think
16 you want just to know that do the participants
17 understand the process for qualifying -- well,
18 you already have qualifying above, for
19 evaluating an SEC petition, and that's the
20 whole process. That includes the deadlines,
21 but it includes everything else, their
22 involvement in the Board meetings, you know,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 all of the opportunities for their involvement
2 all the way through the point where they may
3 appeal a decision and so on, and Congress acts
4 on a decision.

5 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay, so "Do
6 participants understand the process for
7 evaluating an SEC petition and how it may be
8 approved or denied?"

9 MEMBER MUNN: I swore I wasn't
10 going to say anything else, but so help me I
11 have to say this. How is anyone of you going
12 to identify whether someone understands
13 something? What criterion are you going to
14 use for that, any more than the criterion you
15 can use to determine how someone feels about
16 something?

17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Can we
18 reword it something along the lines of --

19 MEMBER MUNN: Have they been
20 informed how to file a claim. Have they been
21 informed of the requirements. Unless --

22 MR. KATZ: Wanda, that's process

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 questions, has someone been informed, but if
2 you actually want to get at effectiveness you
3 want to know, well, the ways you're informing
4 them, are they working? And as to how you get
5 that information, the only way you get that
6 information is by actually somehow surveying,
7 interviewing people to gather what they
8 actually understand at the end of the process.

9 MEMBER MUNN: Are we going to have
10 a test on this.

11 MR. ELLIOTT: A test.

12 MR. KATZ: So I'm not even raising
13 the question of can we do this, can we
14 actually do this evaluation, but that again,
15 if you want to get at effectiveness for any
16 kind of training or informational work you
17 have to go back to the people who were trained
18 and informed and figure out whether they
19 understood.

20 MEMBER BEACH: Okay, so you talked
21 about rewording, Kathy? What were you
22 thinking of rewording? Which bullet? Were

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 you back up to the top?

2 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I'm trying
3 to find a way to phrase it so that we're
4 evaluating what they understand. And us
5 asking it.

6 MR. KATZ: Well above, in the two
7 bullets process questions you have already,
8 you have, you know, is the right information
9 being communicated and is it being
10 communicated through the right means. So
11 you've already asked those questions, those
12 are process questions. Now, I mean you could
13 decide as a Work Group that you really can't
14 get at effectiveness because the only way to
15 do that is to actually interview people and
16 make an assessment of their knowledge based on
17 this training that they've received and
18 communications they've received. That's -- I
19 mean, you have to wrestle with that
20 feasibility question, but if you're going to
21 get at effectiveness that's the only way you
22 can do it. Otherwise, you're just evaluating

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 processes. You can make judgments as to how
2 good the OCAS materials are and so on, but
3 then it's just -- that's just your judgment as
4 to whether -- how well they communicate versus
5 how effective they actually are. I mean, you
6 can't make that judgment as an expert.

7 MR. ELLIOTT: There's permutations
8 to that. You could sit down with a focus
9 group and lay out the written communication
10 materials that we use which are on our website
11 and determine whether or not those
12 communication materials are effective in
13 informing that focus group. That's another
14 way of going about it.

15 MR. KATZ: That's like
16 interviewing. I mean, whether you do a big
17 survey, whether you do focus groups, I mean
18 there are a whole number of ways, but they all
19 -- you have to speak to the people who were
20 supposedly educated, informed to get at that.

21 So I mean, you have to at some point wrestle
22 with is it feasible to get at that information

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 or not. I don't think you need to decide that
2 today. So I think you can have this on your
3 plate as an evaluation objective and down the
4 road if you decide you don't have the
5 resources or you can't get at that, then you
6 can re-frame and just stick with process
7 questions. But I think it's a good place to
8 start to have that on your plate and worry
9 about how you're going to implement it.
10 Again, all of these, if you go through
11 everything we've done today there's lots of
12 how do you actually do that. All that has to
13 be worked out still. We've just laid out a
14 framework for what kind of questions we want
15 to ask, not how do you get the good answers to
16 the questions.

17 MR. ELLIOTT: We heard last week
18 in the workshop that many of the people that
19 these folks were dealing with didn't read
20 through all the material that they were given.
21 You heard that, you heard that, right? You
22 heard that? They did not read through

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 everything. So we took that back and I talked
2 to my health communications specialist, I
3 said, here's a comment for you to try to dig
4 into. They're telling me that all the stuff
5 we send out, half the folks or about half the
6 time many of the folks don't even read through
7 it. They get to the first paragraph or they
8 try to find the bottom line and they don't
9 understand it, or they just -- they don't want
10 to understand it. So there's your challenge.

11 We've got to come up with something that is
12 readable and understandable.

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, just from my
14 experience outside of this framework, you know
15 we've done for 15 years lots and lots of work
16 outside this context obviously. And you can't
17 actually get even the most motivated people to
18 read material beforehand. Some of them will
19 read it and some of them will not read it.
20 And it's also true of me. You know, you go to
21 a meeting, you get materials, you're busy and
22 you're on a plane and you know, you get

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 through what you get through and sometimes you
2 know if it's important you get through
3 everything.

4 MR. ELLIOTT: I offer that as a
5 practice for your understanding. How would
6 you even evaluate that now? Because you know,
7 I took back, I have one of the letters that I
8 spoke about which gives us some input on how
9 to reword, re-frame our documents on this kind
10 of a concern that was raised, you know, make
11 them more readable. Well that's good, so I've
12 tasked -- given that to my health
13 communications specialist. But other than
14 that, you know, I think you guys are hard
15 pressed to come in and point to these kind of
16 sentinel events that happen like that and be
17 able to track them. You know, we don't have -
18 - we can make a full bureaucracy around what
19 you guys have discussed today. We could make
20 a very costly set of research projects on
21 effectiveness on what guys have talked about
22 today and what we've thought about with regard

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to how we're doing in our communication
2 efforts.

3 MEMBER BEACH: And I kind of
4 thought about part of what we wanted to do and
5 maybe I missed it, was we were going to
6 actually look at the material that NIOSH is
7 sending out and evaluating the material as
8 opposed to did the participants understand it.
9 So I guess that piece is kind of missing.

10 MR. KATZ: That's already covered.
11 I mean, the process questions.

12 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, but the
13 effectiveness part of it I guess.

14 MR. KATZ: Well, that's my point.
15 You can look at materials and say you like
16 them or you don't, but you cannot judge their
17 effectiveness because you read them and have
18 an opinion about that.

19 MEMBER BEACH: That's true.

20 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Given the hour,
21 let's just get back to the plan and we'll
22 leave the evaluation steps in there. Once we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 get this done and we go try to figure out how
2 we're going to do it we may figure out we
3 can't do it. But for now let's, for today
4 let's concentrate on getting this finished up.
5 Is that all right?

6 MR. ELLIOTT: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. So we are
8 at the fourth bullet. "Are claimants notified
9 that an Ombudsman's Office exists and what
10 services it provides?" I think that's
11 straightforward enough. Did you have a
12 comment, Arjun?

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: No, I had some
14 notes on the third bullet and I'm wondering
15 whether they were appropriately put in there
16 now.

17 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Oh okay, so we
18 just left --

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I think we
20 left the third bullet then. What I have is
21 "Do the participants understand the process
22 for evaluating an SEC petition and how it may

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 be approved or denied," and I don't know
2 whether that was what you wanted, or the --
3 the original words were thought to be too
4 narrow, the 180 days. Is this okay? That's
5 what I have.

6 MEMBER BEACH: That's what we
7 said.

8 DR. MAKHIJANI: All right. I just
9 wasn't sure.

10 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: We'll be looking
11 to OCAS's documents ourselves up above so all
12 these things down here under the evaluation,
13 it's just, you know, we're going to have to
14 see how that works.

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, so is
17 there anything else under the third bullet,
18 Arjun?

19 DR. MAKHIJANI: No, no, I just
20 want to make sure that I add the notes as
21 people wanted them. I'm going to send them
22 around.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So we read the
2 fourth bullet. Is there anything that needs
3 to be changed in that? And associated with
4 that fifth one. "Is the Ombudsman's Office
5 responding to worker communications and
6 forwarding the comments received to
7 appropriate subgroups of OCAS and its
8 contractors?"

9 DR. MAKHIJANI: Does Ombudsman's
10 Office communicate with contractors or only
11 with NIOSH?

12 MR. KATZ: Well actually, you
13 know, Denise communicates with everybody.

14 MR. ELLIOTT: Whoever she needs to
15 touch, she touches.

16 MR. KATZ: Beyond NIOSH too. She
17 does a lot with DOL and she does a lot with
18 the regional offices of DOL and so on.

19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. I think
20 those five bullets are going to give us enough
21 to try to figure out what to evaluate or how
22 to evaluate when we get to it. Is there

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 anything else we want to add to that section,
2 or? Probably going to be difficult.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: Did you want to
4 add an item along the lines of what Josie was
5 talking about which would be the working
6 group's evaluation of the material independent
7 of whether anybody learned anything from it or
8 not?

9 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Wasn't that in
10 our --

11 MR. KATZ: I thought the first two
12 bullets --

13 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay, fine.
14 Sorry.

15 MR. KATZ: Working group and
16 whatever help it needs from SC&A will be
17 addressing --

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: Sorry, sorry.
19 Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. And then
21 the final set of bullets. "Determine if the
22 claimants understand the dose reconstruction

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 process, its results and the differences
2 between the dose reconstruction and SEC
3 processes."

4 MR. KATZ: Some of this is
5 redundant because we've already asked do they
6 understand dose reconstruction, do they
7 understand the SEC processes. I don't know,
8 the compare and contrast probably isn't
9 needed.

10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: That's what
11 I was saying earlier.

12 MR. KATZ: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So you think we
14 have all of these bullets adequately covered?
15 Then we'll just delete them.

16 MR. KATZ: The end.

17 DR. MAKHIJANI: The end. Well,
18 there was -- Wanda, you were going to make a
19 bullet out of one paragraph at the top.

20 MEMBER MUNN: I have not rewritten
21 it. I will send it to you by mail.

22 DR. MAKHIJANI: So, okay. So I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 just have that paragraph highlighted that
2 Wanda will send sentence and Wanda will
3 convert it.

4 MEMBER MUNN: That's correct. I
5 have a note to that effect. I will rewrite
6 that one paragraph up in Item Number 1.

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. So that's
8 in my notes and I'll send that.

9 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Now we'll move
10 to the discussion --

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. ELLIOTT: You're trying to get
13 the Mark Griffon award for task master. The
14 Wanda award.

15 MR. KATZ: Actually, I'm kind of
16 impressed, Mike.

17 MR. ELLIOTT: You've done a very
18 good job, Mike. So what is it that you want
19 to discuss now?

20 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Action items and
21 adjournment. Arjun, how long do you think it
22 would take to give you adequate time to put

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 this in a finalized type form so you could
2 mail it out?

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: I can give it to
4 you right now.

5 MEMBER BEACH: Perfect, we can
6 work another hour.

7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Actually, I'm
8 writing the email to send you the document.
9 It's in edit mode. I should probably spell-
10 check it before sending it to you. But I'll
11 send it before I leave.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Here's what I
13 was thinking. If we get it out to the Work
14 Group members and Ted and everyone and maybe
15 give us two or three days to look it over.
16 Would it be possible for us to have a
17 conference call before the Board meeting to
18 just finalize this? Because I'd like us to
19 adopt something and have it ready, prepared to
20 present to the Board.

21 MR. KATZ: I'm just wondering if
22 you can't do this by email without it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Because everybody has sort of agreed on
2 everything that we've talked about. Now all
3 we're talking about probably is copy editing
4 which is not substantive, you don't need a
5 working meeting to do copy editing.

6 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So then, like in
7 the next few days if Arjun gave that to me,
8 I'll look it over first and I'll send it out
9 to the Work Group members and everyone.
10 Unless there are any objections then we'll
11 consider that our product. Sound good?

12 MR. KATZ: It doesn't have to be -
13 - I mean, really, I'm sure it will more than -
14 - represent the idea, the basic ideas for the
15 Board to give it consideration. I mean,
16 everything doesn't have to be perfect.

17 DR. MAKHIJANI: Mike, do you want
18 me to go and everywhere where we have
19 "workers" kind of fix? Because I haven't done
20 that. I haven't gone and checked for
21 consistency where we talk. I can send -- do
22 you want me to fix that? If I send it now --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: No, don't send it out
2 now. Give it a good read-through.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: I'll read through
4 it.

5 MR. KATZ: You may find other
6 gaps.

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes, we can get
8 this the first of next week or so. We still
9 have plenty of time to distribute it.

10 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.

11 MEMBER BEACH: Excuse me. This
12 requires a vote by the Board, correct?

13 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: For them to
14 adopt that.

15 MEMBER BEACH: And the new mission
16 statement. So I'm wondering if you wouldn't
17 want to send it out to the Board members ahead
18 of the meeting also to give people a chance?

19 MR. KATZ: Can I just say, I mean
20 the Board -- I mean, I think you want their
21 approval of the mission statement, but as far
22 as the Work Plan, I mean I don't know whether

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 they have to actually vote on your Work Plan.
2 You may want to change your Work Plan as you
3 go along, you may find some things are not
4 feasible to actually evaluate once you get
5 into the nitty-gritty of it and so on. I
6 think it's enough to provide it for their
7 comment and so on, but I don't think the Board
8 -- I just don't imagine the Board actually
9 voting on -- putting a stamp on this is the
10 plan.

11 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes. I didn't
12 think -- I haven't talked to them, but okay.

13 MR. KATZ: Yes, yes. So then the
14 Board can discuss and give any input it wants
15 but without really.

16 MEMBER BEACH: So we just need to
17 amend the statement.

18 MR. KATZ: The charge, yes. Now,
19 that part is a Board vote.

20 MEMBER BEACH: And then do we need
21 to start thinking about how we're going to do
22 this, or are we going to save that for another

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 day? Like for thinking about just how we're
2 going to actually do this work. Because we've
3 already started, I mean, we've already started
4 attending meetings and so those things are
5 kind of left hanging in a way, in a sense.

6 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: We need to do
7 that and we need to think about another
8 meeting to get back to these other issues that
9 we didn't have time for today.

10 MR. KATZ: I think we need to
11 schedule another meeting.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Do we want to
13 look at some dates now, or do you want to
14 wait?

15 MR. KATZ: Whatever your pleasure
16 is. I can get my BlackBerry out and turn it
17 on.

18 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay, let's do
19 that.

20 MR. KATZ: If people have their
21 calendars. We don't have Phil so we may have
22 to just tentatively do something.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER BEACH: Phil told me he's
2 always available.

3 MR. JOHNSON: While we're
4 pondering on that, what was the question that
5 Antoinette had? Clarification of dose
6 reconstructions?

7 MR. KATZ: Can I get that to you?
8 I mean, I have it in my -- I wrote notes down.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Larry's here and you
10 know he wanted to see if he could respond to.

11 MR. KATZ: Oh, I see what you're
12 saying. Hold on.

13 MR. JOHNSON: I think it required
14 an additional individual.

15 MR. KATZ: So Antoinette's
16 question. Antoinette, if you're on the phone,
17 I don't mean to ask a question that you can
18 ask directly. Are you there? I don't think
19 she is. But was what technical assistance --
20 well, her question was sort of should NIOSH be
21 providing some sort of expert advisor to help
22 claimants understand the dose reconstruction

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 report. I think that captures her question.

2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Similar to some
3 of the other --

4 MR. KATZ: How should OCAS be
5 helping the claimants understand their dose
6 reconstruction reports. That was her
7 question.

8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I just told her
9 we would pass the question on to you.

10 MR. ELLIOTT: She knows how to get
11 a hold of me and she can write me an email,
12 but essentially you know we have discussed,
13 debated and conferred about this issue over
14 the course of time. You can go back and read
15 the preamble of the regulation and see some of
16 the thoughts that were offered there about
17 providing assistance to claimants in
18 understanding dose reconstruction. We have
19 chosen to -- with the resources that we have
20 to offer many ways for the claimants to
21 contact us and many opportunities for
22 claimants to ask us questions or to follow up

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 with us on whatever they might find confusing
2 or poorly communicated. That's been our
3 approach. Every piece of correspondence,
4 every interaction we have with claimants or
5 petitioners we offer our contact information.

6 Our website provides the opportunity and the
7 ability for claimants and petitioners to
8 contact us through that mechanism. We have an
9 800 number. We welcome comments on our
10 technical documents through our docket or
11 through our website. We stand ready and
12 willing to help anybody who wants to ask us a
13 question.

14 MR. JOHNSON: I'd like to add two
15 other issues or elements to that. One is that
16 we've added increased explanation in the dose
17 reconstruction as to why it is the way it is
18 and if it changed, why it changed. Secondly,
19 we also have the closeout interview which we
20 have experts that understand the dose
21 reconstruction process, been involved in
22 radiological situations and are able to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 attempt to explain the issues that these folks
2 have in the final closeout. So we have those
3 two aspects, one we've improved on and the
4 other one we've always had.

5 MR. ELLIOTT: And that's very
6 good. Thank you for pointing that out, J.J.
7 Let me take that one step further. In our
8 effort to continuously improve our
9 communication efforts we have changed -- we're
10 in the process of changing our dose
11 reconstruction report format to be more
12 readable and more understandable to the
13 claimant audience and not lose -- at the same
14 time not lose the technical aspects and the
15 nature that are relevant to the report and
16 that could serve to inform an expert or a
17 knowledgeable health physicist on how we did
18 our work. So that is forthcoming, ORAU our
19 contractor is tooling up to start delivering
20 those modified, revised new dose
21 reconstruction reports, and I'm anxious to see
22 that happen soon.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: Just to do justice to
2 the comment she made, I just recall sort of
3 another aspect of it. What she said as
4 preface to the comment was that DOL has some
5 sort of experts on hand with respect to cancer
6 diagnosis or something that when a claimant
7 needs they can speak to some medical expert
8 about their condition or something like that.

9 So she had I think very specifically in mind,
10 you know, whether OCAS would have some expert
11 available and I think your answer just now was
12 the person who does the closeout interview
13 with the person is an expert to speak
14 specifically to the -- what's in the dose
15 reconstruction.

16 MR. ELLIOTT: And that's just one
17 opportunity. The closeout interview is just
18 one opportunity where an expert can be brought
19 to bear on a question that's raised. And
20 certainly we could point to other ample
21 opportunities that are there. Any time a
22 claimant calls us we can put them in touch

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 with somebody that has knowledge of the site
2 and has the ability, we hope, to explain
3 effectively what we've done in reconstructing
4 their dose.

5 MR. KATZ: Thanks for bringing
6 that back up.

7 MR. JOHNSON: I didn't want it
8 hanging over my head.

9 MR. ELLIOTT: It's on the record,
10 it's on the transcript now, so.

11 MR. KATZ: I've got my calendar
12 up, but give me a scope for where we're
13 thinking.

14 DR. MAURO: Ted, this is John.
15 I'm sorry to interrupt, I know you're coming
16 to closure. Could I get a quick feedback from
17 the Work Group whether I or SC&A should
18 continue to pursue the possibility of bringing
19 the aboard this fellow David Bidwell to help
20 us do the things that we've all been talking
21 about today.

22 MR. KATZ: John, Mike had

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 suggested that that would be an item for the
2 next time the Work Group meets.

3 DR. MAURO: That's fine.

4 MR. KATZ: I think we're out of
5 gas.

6 DR. MAURO: I understand, I just
7 wanted to make sure that I mentioned that.

8 MR. KATZ: Yes. So that's not
9 forgotten, to be sure, but that -- we'll
10 address that at the next Work Group meeting.

11 DR. MAURO: That's fine.

12 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: There's a Dose
13 Reconstruction Subcommittee meeting the fifth.

14 MEMBER BEACH: There's a Linde on
15 the fourth.

16 MR. KATZ: That week is
17 slaughtered. That's November 3rd, 4th, 5th.

18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: If you want
19 me to be able to attend you're going to be out
20 to --

21 MR. KATZ: To what?

22 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: If you want

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Abe to attend, you're going to have to push it
2 out to the second week.

3 MEMBER BEACH: I'm not available
4 the second week. And did you say you were
5 not, Arjun?

6 DR. MAKHIJANI: I am not, but you
7 know, I don't have to be here. There are two
8 of us here. Unless you want me here.

9 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: What about the
10 third week of November? Wanda's Procedures
11 group is the 17th, right?

12 MEMBER MUNN: Yes and INL is the
13 16th. We could do it on the 18th.

14 MS. HOWELL: That's the week we're
15 out.

16 MEMBER MUNN: I didn't hear that.

17 MR. KATZ: I think just people
18 were talking about their own particular
19 schedules. So the 16th and 17th are booked,
20 the 18th and 19th are out of -- can't be done.

21 So the only day that week, the remaining day
22 that week would be the 20th and that's the day

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 before Thanksgiving week. So that's the
2 Friday before Thanksgiving week.

3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: It's up to all
4 you guys who have to travel.

5 DR. MAKHIJANI: How about the
6 second or third or something like that?

7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: The third is
8 selection day.

9 MR. ELLIOTT: OCAS can't
10 participate on the third.

11 MR. KATZ: Can't do it on the
12 third. Is that new, Larry?

13 MR. ELLIOTT: Yes.

14 MR. KATZ: I never saw it on my
15 calendar.

16 MR. ELLIOTT: Just here this
17 morning.

18 MR. KATZ: Okay, but what is the
19 second?

20 MEMBER BEACH: So I'm gone on the
21 fifth. Well, the second we'd have to travel
22 on Sunday.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: No, we're talking about
2 December now. December. I thought you
3 suggested. So December, Wednesday the second.
4 How would that work for people?

5 MEMBER BEACH: That's fine for me.

6 MR. KATZ: How is that for you
7 Mike, Kathy?

8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.

9 MEMBER MUNN: Okay here.

10 MR. KATZ: Does that work for you,
11 Emily?

12 MS. HOWELL: Yes.

13 MR. KATZ: So you want to --
14 should we do it? December 2?

15 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.

16 MR. KATZ: Great. December 2,
17 Outreach Work Group. Done.

18 MEMBER BEACH: Ted, I've noticed
19 that the Linde Work Group meeting hasn't gone
20 out yet and it was going to go out this week,
21 the notification. It hasn't come out.

22 MR. KATZ: Oh, I hadn't looked,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 but I can check on that. Let me check on
2 that. Linde notification. That's for
3 November 4. Let me check, thank you.

4 MS. HOWELL: And the INL Work
5 Group meeting is November 16.

6 MEMBER MUNN: What are you saying
7 about the INL meeting? Cancelled on the 16th?

8 MEMBER BEACH: For Phil's Work
9 Group?

10 MR. KATZ: Oh, right.

11 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I think there
12 was an email that that wouldn't be ready until
13 April.

14 MR. KATZ: No, you're right.
15 There was an email, I forgot. Larry sent out
16 an email saying --

17 MR. ELLIOTT: I said that NIOSH
18 wouldn't be able to, you know, have our
19 reactions, our position fully developed to the
20 profile review.

21 MR. KATZ: Till the new year, you
22 said, right? Not April.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I had heard
2 after the first. Phil said today till April,
3 so that's why I said April.

4 MR. ELLIOTT: There's a portion --
5 I proportioned out what we're targeting as --
6 there's the internal and external dose that
7 should be done by the first of the year. Then
8 the rest of the site profiles later in the
9 year, like in April. That doesn't mean there
10 couldn't be a meeting if you all have
11 something to discuss, it's just that we're not
12 going to be able to put on the table our
13 reactions.

14 MR. KATZ: Well, yes. Okay, so
15 INL, I need to get notice out that INL is off
16 for that date. So then there's just the
17 Procedures. Okay.

18 MEMBER MUNN: Well, now I know
19 we've already established a date in December,
20 but I was going to see if INL is not meeting
21 on the 16th could Worker Outreach meet on the
22 16th? But that's not here nor there.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KATZ: No, I mean that's a
2 reasonable question. November 16, does that
3 work for people?

4 MEMBER BEACH: So what was wrong
5 with the 17th?

6 MR. KATZ: The 17th is Procedures.

7 MEMBER MUNN: Procedures.

8 MEMBER BEACH: Oh, okay. That's
9 another weekend.

10 MR. KATZ: That would mean you
11 traveling on Sunday, which is not great. So
12 why don't we stick with December then. Stick
13 with December. Josie doesn't need to lose a
14 Sunday.

15 MEMBER BEACH: Or Kathy.

16 MR. KATZ: Or Kathy. Or me.

17 DR. MAKHIJANI: Can I follow up on
18 something Josie said? She was, you know, we
19 were talking about how to implement some of
20 this stuff and the fact that we already have
21 attended one meeting. Mike, I just wanted to
22 look for some direction from you as to where

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we go with that. You know, Kathy has her
2 notes, I have my notes, Josie was there too.
3 You know, there are some ideas about what we
4 might do with that. You know, not the
5 specific notes from that meeting because it
6 might be premature to kind of send out reports
7 without an agreed format, but we could think
8 about that and maybe SC&A could, if you want,
9 Kathy and I could put our heads together with
10 Abe or John and suggest something to you at
11 least so far as we have come in that meeting
12 and the Weldon Spring meeting that Kathy went
13 to, if you want, or not.

14 MEMBER BEACH: Well, Mike attended
15 the meeting also.

16 DR. MAKHIJANI: Mike. Oh you were
17 at Weldon Spring? Santa Susana? Between us
18 all we've three different meetings so we could
19 possibly begin the process -- because this is
20 going to be pretty complicated. If you want
21 we could.

22 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: If you want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 discuss some ideas to get at stuff we should
2 have time on the next agenda.

3 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.

4 MR. KATZ: But think about a
5 framework for reporting out this information,
6 keeping in mind, you know, what its purpose
7 is, to inform the evaluation project.

8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Right. Anything
9 else? We're done.

10 MR. KATZ: We're adjourned. Thank
11 you everyone.

12 (Whereupon, the above-entitled
13 matter went off the record at 4:44 p.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com