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MR. KATZ: Let's begin with roll call. First of all, this is the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health; this is the Uranium Refining Atomic Weapons Employers Work Group, formerly called the TBD-6001 Work Group.

(Roll call.)

MR. KATZ: All right. So let me just remind everyone on the line, please mute your phone, except when you are addressing the group. If you don't have a mute button, press *6, that will mute your phone. Press *6 again to take your phone off of mute. And please, at no time put the call on hold. If you need to leave for a while, hang up and dial back in.

Thank you very much. And Andy,

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. The first on the agenda is Hooker Electrochemical
and I believe the main thing is the review by SC&A and the White Paper going through the surrogate data use criteria that the Board established.

MR. THURBER: John, do you want me to pick that up?

DR. MAURO: Yes, Bill, just by way of orientation it might be helpful. Did everyone receive Bill Thurber's e-mail dated August 15? It was our attempt, or SC&A's attempt to collect everything. As you know, there are a number of sites that fall under the AWE Work Group and various stages of maturization. Some of them have been very mature, such as Hooker and United Nuclear and Electro Met and others are in their infancy, such as Baker-Perkins and DuPont. Bill did a nice job in assembling the matrices for all of these and have a cover that sort of gives a status as we understand it as of today. And so, if you don't have that, let us know. Ted, did you receive a copy?
MR. KATZ: It was dated, you said, yesterday?

DR. MAURO: Yes, dated yesterday. So, yes, some of us may have been on travel. It was sent out. Quite frankly I asked Bill to do it, thinking that even though it wasn't really explicitly asked of us, I said "listen, there's so much here and it could get kind of confusing. It would be a good idea to get it all in one place." If you don't have it in front of you, don't worry about it. We will work our way through it. But you should have it and I think it will be useful in going forward because it puts everything in one place. But with that, and don't worry if you don't have it in front of you, I will ask Bill to kick it off with Hooker.

MR. KATZ: Let me just say, this is Ted -- oh, let me remind everyone to identify themselves when they speak, for the court reporter. So I have it and I see that
it was sent to all of the Board Members' CDC addresses as well as to related staff, I believe. So, yes. I think --

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: It is six pages?

DR. MAURO: That sounds about right.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, yes I got it.

MR. KATZ: I don't know if Dave Allen received it or not.

MR. ALLEN: Yes, we got it here.

MR. KATZ: I did, and Sam. So everyone seems to have it. And the other important document is, the one that John has mentioned, is back in July, I think on July 8, he sent out a review of Hooker and a matrix back then too.

MR. THURBER: This is Bill Thurber. Ted, that review is also included as the matrix for Hooker that is in this packet that you all got yesterday. Anyways,
with regard to Hooker, at the last Work Group meeting, SC&A was tasked to review the NIOSH White Paper on the use of surrogate data at Hooker. And prior to SC&A performing its review, NIOSH was asked to update their White Paper to include specific reference to the air samples that they had actually used in their analysis. And David Allen issued a revision of the White Paper shortly after the May 16 Work Group meeting, and we then reviewed that document and provided a White Paper dated July 7. And in that White Paper, we concluded, as you can read in the summary of the status report as follows: "Based on our review we believe that NIOSH has addressed the ABRWH surrogate data criteria in an appropriate manner and that the use of surrogate data at Hooker is consistent with the Board criteria. Use of the selected surrogate data will result in plausible bounding estimates for internal exposures at Hooker."
So, we felt that NIOSH had done a fine job in addressing the surrogate data question.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any questions? Bill, do you have any questions?

MEMBER FIELD: No.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

DR. MAURO: This is John. I believe that was the only open item. Everything else was closed at previous meetings.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right. Looking through the matrix, that seemed to be --

DR. MAURO: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: The only, as I recall -- does this relate just to the slag surrogate? Did we deal with the surrogate data that was used for the other exposures?

MR. THURBER: The exposures were only from slag.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. So do
we have anything else on Hooker then at all?

MR. THURBER: That's all we have from SC&A's standpoint.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. I have on the agenda here --

MR. KATZ: Oh, Andy?

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.

MR. KATZ: I'm sorry. This is Ted Katz. So, if you have closed all the issues, I mean, the next step to do before you leave Hooker is to come up with a Work Group recommendation and a plan for presenting. It is on the agenda for the Board meeting next week.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: It is?

Okay. I didn't see that.

MR. KATZ: It is, and so -- I believe it is. I hope I'm not confused about that, but it certainly should be. Hold on a second. Let me see what day it is on. Yes, it's on Wednesday and you were presenting.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
MR. KATZ: You are presenting for the Work Group.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

MR. KATZ: Reporting out for the Work Group on Hooker. And we'll need a presentation, whether you do it just orally, but it would be best if you actually come up with either a PowerPoint where there will be some slides or a written presentation. And the DCAS folks and the SC&A folks can assist you with that, to the degree that you want help, summarizing what the Work Group reviewed, found, and its recommendations.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

MR. KATZ: I think the first thing formally, I think you have all agreed with the Work Group on the individual findings and closing them but you haven't actually, I don't believe, but I didn't finish reviewing all of the transcripts of the last meeting. I don't believe you actually made, specified a recommendation for.
the Board, but it would be appropriate to do
that as a Work Group first, because then it
does up being a motion to the Board.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. There
is only two of us of the three, so I don't
know if --

MR. KATZ: There is only two or
three, that's true but two of three is a
majority already. And keep in mind that this
is really, it only ends up being a motion
before the Board, so it's not that critical
that you have everyone. It is always good
to, we prefer to, but Mark hasn't been able
to make these meetings and we don't want to
leave this live forever. Mark can certainly
weigh in at the Board meeting.

MEMBER FIELD: Ted, this is Bill.
I think that Mark can easily review maybe
what Andy puts together in the minutes from
the last meeting to see if he is in
agreement.

MR. KATZ: Absolutely. So Andy,
I know we are very short on time, but the thing we normally do is, and I would send around the transcripts of the meetings to all of the Board Members, not just to Mark. But if you have time to get a brief presentation together, you would circulate it to your fellow Work Group Members so that they could say I agree or give you any suggestions if they have suggestions for the presentation.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Sure. So, Bill, I don't know if the Chair can make a motion or not. But it seems to me that after our review and we've closed things out that the motion would be to accept the NIOSH recommendation, which was to -- wasn't it NIOSH's position that they could do dose reconstruction?

MR. ALLEN: Yes, this is Dave Allen. That was our recommendation in the Evaluation Report.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Right.

DR. MAURO: And SC&A's
findings, as a result of this process, is that we concur.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. So that would seem to be the motion from the committee would be that we will accept NIOSH's proposal that they are able to do dose reconstruction that would be claimant-favorable and therefore it would be to deny the petition? Bill?

MEMBER FIELD: Yes, I am just trying to get off mute here -- yes, I think that's correct, Andy.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

DR. MAURO: If I may help, this is John. One of the issues always, as you know, is surrogate data and we will be more than happy to help out in any way we can, if you need help. I'm sure David is the same, in putting together the slides that summarize the large number of issues that were entertained, the number of changes that occurred in the process. And of course
always the matter of surrogate data is always
of great concern to the Board and how that
was, came to resolution and why. Why we felt
that it met the five criteria the Board has
developed -- those are always of great
interest to the Board. So any way we can
help, we will be glad to help out.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: What I was
going to -- let's first do the -- I guess if
Bill and I are both in agreement on that for
the proposal, then we will move forward with
the recommendation and then I will need to
have the assistance on the presentation. I
don't know if I have it. I may, but I'm sure
one of you probably has it more handy than I.
If you have the first presentation, slides
from the first presentation that were made by
NIOSH on their recommendation, that set of
slides, I could probably pick from that. And
then, John, if you folks are willing to do
that, if you could put together some slides
from the matrix.
DR. MAURO:   Sure.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON:   And I think we will circulate to the full Board your July 7 White Paper review, as well as the NIOSH summary that they did -- or that you reviewed actually.

DR. MAURO:   Sure.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON:   So those seem to be the key documents. So John, maybe, if you could put together a couple of slides from your White Paper review of the surrogate data issue. That seems to me to be the real issue here, and of all of the surrogate data issues that the Board has addressed, this one, to me anyway, seems to be a little more straightforward than usual because it just deals with the slag and the slag handling at the various surrogate facilities and really very similar to what was done here.

MEMBER FIELD: And Andy, this is Bill. I think it would be helpful too if we
could just find a few minutes Tuesday to talk about the issues with Mark.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. We will try to do that.

MEMBER FIELD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I don't know if he is going to be out there or not. But we can maybe touch base with him by phone.

MR. KATZ: Mark gets out there, I believe, Tuesday night.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

MR. KATZ: Wait. The Board meeting starts Tuesday. No, no. So he gets out there, I believe, Monday night, and he will be there Tuesday and Wednesday.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Oh, good. Then we can get together with him on Tuesday.

MR. KATZ: Yes. John, is that clear for you, to summarize the matrix so that people know what issues are where and how they were resolved and then address the surrogate data in a series of slides that
Andy can use?

DR. MAURO: Glad to do it. We will try to turn it into something giving it more of a -- not just itemize the issues but sort of tell the story of the issues.

MR. KATZ: Absolutely.

DR. MAURO: Yes, and how they were resolved. Yes, we'll do the way we've done these kind of things before.

MR. KATZ: Yes. That would be very helpful. In terms of timeline here, I know it's very late today. We are already here on Tuesday. Zaida will need the presentation for the Board meeting and so on at the very latest by Friday. So that is sort of the framework we are dealing with for timing.

DR. MAURO: We'll get on this right away and certainly circulate it with David and Jim. In effect, what we will be trying to do is capture the sense that emerged from the whole process in a story
that is balanced and it is probably a good idea that, if it is okay with everyone else, that when I sent a draft out to the Work Group, I'll simultaneously send it to Jim and David for their consideration and Sam. See if there is anything else or rewording. This way we're sort of all on the same page. I think that's appropriate to make sure that it catches the whole story.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I will be around all week. So if you can get that to me by Thursday, we can finalize it and get it to Zaida.

DR. MAURO: I will try to do better than that.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I was just looking at it. If I was going to do it, it was going to be this weekend.

DR. MAURO: No, well, today's Tuesday, yes, we should be able to get something out by Thursday.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, great.
MR. KATZ: That is great. That is much appreciated, John. Thank you.

DR. MAURO: That is the only one we have. I am making promises like that guy in that commercial.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.

(Laughter.)

DR. MAURO: Never mind.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. So I think we've got that. Any other comments on Hooker people have?

MR. KATZ: Andy, can I just check on the line? This is Ted Katz again. Do we have the petitioner for Hooker on now? No, okay. Okay, carry on, Andy. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. I didn't hear them up front. So let's move on to an update on Electro Metallurgical.

MR. THURBER: Okay, this is Bill Thurber. We provided in the status report, which you received yesterday, an update on the Electro Metallurgical company matrix,
which you all have and there were a number of findings of which -- I'm sorry. I'm looking at the wrong matrix.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I don't think you sent out that.

MR. THURBER: Yes, everyone should have it. It comes after the Hooker matrix in the package.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, because I only got six pages.

MR. THURBER: There are actually 18 pages. Does everyone else have 18 pages?

DR. NETON: We do here in NIOSH for the whole transmittal on yesterday's transmittal.

MR. THURBER: Yes, right.

MS. GIRARDO: Excuse me, this is Mary Girardo in Niagara Falls. Sorry for interrupting, but apparently something got hooked up on this phone conference.

DR. MAURO: Mary -- am I the only one that can hear Mary? Hello?
MS. GIRARDO: Yes, I'm on.

DR. MAURO: I hear you, Mary, and this is John Mauro. I'm not sure if everyone else does.

MR. KATZ: I do.

DR. NETON: This is NIOSH in Cincinnati. We hear her.

DR. MAURO: Okay.

MS. GIRARDO: Yes. Something got hooked up here because you weren't hearing me so I had to re-call in. So is this the end of Hooker Chemical as far as you people are concerned?

MR. KATZ: Mary, this is Ted Katz.

MS. GIRARDO: Yes.

MR. KATZ: I'm sorry. Are you the petitioner for Hooker?

MS. GIRARDO: Yes, I am.

MR. KATZ: Thank you. That's why I asked if there was a petitioner for Hooker on the phone.
MS. GIRARDO: Yes, I tried to respond but you weren't hearing me.

MR. KATZ: Yes, I'm sorry about that. But you certainly have an opportunity if you want to comment to the group. I assume you heard the discussion. I know you were on the previous teleconference -- or actually it was a face-to-face.

MS. GIRARDO: Yes, but this seems to be like a closed group. The petitioner is kept in the dark. The minutes have not been put on the website. So there's nothing from the last meeting to counteract this thing about surrogate data. There is questions about that. There has been no opportunity to speak. It has just been closed session for SC&A and NIOSH. So, I really don't know what you guys have been doing. Don't know what you are talking about. The White Paper deal, the petitioner hasn't received anything dealing with White Paper. So we don't really know what in the
world you are doing. So, in other words, it's like a closed session and we're not to know. So that's my complaint.

MR. KATZ: I'm sorry about that, Mary, but the transcript is on the website actually, for the last meeting. The White Papers -- I really don't keep track of whether, for example, the NIOSH White Papers have been PA, Privacy Act, cleared or not. But certainly you can --

MS. GIRARDO: But you are making these decisions, folks, based on what you know and what nobody else knows and that's not fair. We have nothing to look at, whether we understand it or not, we have nothing in front of us to see what in the world you are talking about to even make a stab at it. This is wrong.

MR. KATZ: David, do you know if the DCAS White Papers are Privacy Act cleared?

MR. ALLEN: No, Ted, I don't
know off the top of my head.

MR. KATZ: Okay. Well, one thing we can do in the meanwhile is check on that. Get them cleared. You can have copies of those White Papers that have come since the NIOSH Evaluation Report. And likewise, we will do the same thing with the SC&A White Papers on Hooker, if they are not already cleared. And I believe I've asked for those to be cleared but I couldn't be certain that they are out and available already because there is a process in reviewing them.

MS. GIRARDO: Well, if you were in my position, wouldn't you think that this was a fixed-up job, that it was all planned? Because it's very suspicious, this whole way that you are doing things. And if a person is suppose to speak in front of the Board, you've got to know exactly what in the world you are talking about to some degree, don't you?

MR. KATZ: I actually agree, and
that's why we have these meetings in public, on the phone, with a phone line and that's why we do put out transcripts for these meetings.

MS. GIRARDO: But, first, the petitioner is told that they don't speak unless you people give the go-ahead. We aren't even allowed to speak. So, I'm surprised that you are even listening to me. I've been told more than once that this meeting, the petitioners are not allowed to speak. So now, here I am speaking. So you see, I don't understand this whole routine. I really don't. And this part about surrogate data and slag, you guys just don't make sense at all. You have to talk to the common people. You have to talk in plain English. And you've got to make it clear to people what in the world you are dealing with. And you can't just say slag surrogate data, everything's fine. Well, it may be fine with you but it is sure not fine with
the rest of us. So I thank you, and I'm going to exit this meeting because I see no point in continuing in on it. Thank you very much for the opportunity. Goodbye.

MR. KATZ: Okay, Andy?

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.

MR. KATZ: Okay, I think we can proceed from there. And we will work on getting Mary at least the White Papers.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Is the matrix an available item or not?

MR. KATZ: We can -- well, the matrix itself -- we can PA clear anything, yes. So we will get this latest matrix on Hooker PA cleared. We really just need that section PA cleared. And like I said, I believe I've asked for the Hooker White Paper to be PA cleared, so I believe your SC&A part is probably done by now, cleared and ready to go to her. And I would ask if we could do the same for its White Paper.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes, those
seem to be the two key documents that apparently she hasn't seen, so if we can get those to her.

MR. KATZ: Right. I think that would be good.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And we need to be able to arrange, I assume she won't be -- or maybe she will be out in Pasco but at least have her be able to be on --

MR. KATZ: Yes, that is already arranged. I mean, someone from NIOSH contacts each of the petitioners and informs them about what's on the agenda and finds out whether they are interested in speaking to the Board, either in person or by phone. So that should already be taken care of.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. Because she didn't know that, maybe she didn't know that we were this close to just having the one issue.

MR. KATZ: Well, yes. I mean, frankly, I thought that the discussion at the
last meeting was very clear and sort of systematic in going through the issues and closing the issues. I can understand though, you know, folks in the public, the petitioners, they have a hard time following along on these technical issues.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.

MR. KATZ: And you know in some Work Groups, they've asked for things made in a sort of simplified form for them produced and we've been able to do that in some cases. We did some of that for Linde, I think. But it is very tough for them to follow the technical issues, which is not their bag, particularly if they are not someone who worked at DOE or worked in these processes at DOE, trying to understand what is being discussed is hard.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, well let's then, as long as you are going to be taking care of getting what information is cleared to her, that would be helpful.
MR. KATZ: Yes. I will follow through on that.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, and I found the 18 pages. I had somehow or other only six printed for me. So go ahead, I got it up.

MR. THURBER: Okay, good. This is Bill Thurber again. Do you want to go through these findings item by item or how would you like to proceed on this? In a lot of cases, when these findings were discussed at the May 16 Work Group meeting, NIOSH said that they were still waiting on information from DOE, and without this additional input from DOE, there were many of the findings that were in abeyance because they couldn't come up with a good source term calculation. So, however you would like to proceed. We can go through them item by item or whatever.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Well, if we could just --

DR. GLOVER: I just want to make a
suggestion. This is Sam Glover at NIOSH. We finally received the letter from Department of Labor so I thought maybe -- so we really hadn't had a chance to proceed on that because we needed our source term information. Maybe we could just go over some of the things that we have been able to cover because we really, until we got that information, couldn't proceed.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

DR. GLOVER: It's up to you.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: That sounds good.

DR. GLOVER: I certainly, if SC&A, Bill, if you still had action items. I think most of the things were in our court though.

MR. THURBER: They were all in your court, Sam, I believe. Trying to make it easy.

DR. GLOVER: There you go. Make it easy that way. So here's what we've made
progress on.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: That's what I thought we were just going to hear about today is if anything has transpired, and it sounds like it has. So if you want to just give a quick update on that.

DR. GLOVER: So really the thing, last week we finally received a letter from the Department of Energy regarding ore operations and thorium operations at Electro Met and I'm just going to paraphrase. Ted, I apologize. I was on travel a lot and didn't get to forward -- I had forgotten to forward that to you guys. So Ted, you should have a copy of that now, if you don't mind forwarding that to the appropriate folks. So I did include Ted on that letter. Basically, they said that they looked at our information. They can't really put a timeframe of when ore operations were there nor really what the scope is. Dave Allen and I went through the operations very thoroughly.
and back to the letters. And everything we can tell, with the information we have, shows that it was probably a laboratory level 25/50 pound kind of operation conducted earlyish in the `44, `45 time frame at Electro Met. So DOE doesn't give any additional information. They didn't find anything additional to what we had. They do concur that there was some ore there. They couldn't put time scopes to it. They did also say that they were going to remove thorium from the listing that they had included because they had no information thorium had been included. They have no information that shows thorium was ever at the facility. So, you now have a copy of that letter. So that -- we thought there might have been several tons that were shipped. That may not be the case. It looks like a more modest amount, as we review the records more carefully in the overall set, but at least what we understand. I think where that leaves us, however, is the back-
extrapolation timeframe where we are looking at back-extrapolating using that `48 data to go back to `43. So where I am, as I talk to Jim and Dave and Stu, is that we are currently reviewing our data as it supports dose reconstruction and we are focusing on concentrating on that back-extrapolation timeframe. So that's really the focus where we are at, what data we have and whether that's going to support that timeframe for dose reconstruction, mostly regarding the uranium data and not concentrating on this ore component.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We don't know -- we are not going to find out how much ore was processed, it sounds like. I mean, you have a sense that it might not have been very much, but we really don't know.

DR. GLOVER: DOE was hesitant to -- I can read -- let's see. I will read a little more carefully here. "This document confirms that Electro Met received varying
grades of uranium ore from the Belgian Congo. The facility supported the beneficiation program which involved assessing different ore leaching methods to determine the best approach to larger-scale mill operations to recover uranium. They were unable to find any additional documents relevant to our request."

And that's pretty much where they left it. So that is --

DR. NETON: This is Jim. DOE is not able to tell us how much was there. All records that we have, as Sam said, indicate small quantities. But we, as Sam indicated, are refocusing our efforts on looking at the dose reconstruction process for the earlier years, in light of, frankly, SC&A's findings, and our looking at it a lot closer. And we feel that is the place to look right now to see if we can actually continue to do dose reconstructions and will come to some determination in the near future on that.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: So that's really finding number two is still on hold while you look at things.

DR. NETON: Right. We think if something comes up where we feel that maybe dose reconstruction is not possible, I'm not saying we've reached that determination, but saying we did, it would be on a uranium basis, and that would sort of make the ore situation, I don't want to say irrelevant, but --

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. Okay.

DR. MAURO: Jim, this is John. Now my recollection is that when I think back of many of these different sites we work on. Really the only thing I am able to keep in my mind is the 30-second sound bite until I actually go into it. But I remember there were two aspects of this particular site that remained with me. One is, back-extrapolating from '47/'48 data when you did have data on uranium and then back-extrapolating to the
earlier ‘40s, which is what you just mentioned. And the other one had to do with -- and I remember Bill explaining to me that Electro Met is a very, very large site. And the place where the operations took place that are under discussion was -- the way I keep it in my head, a postage stamp on this large envelope and there was some questions on whether or not, when the issues are being aired, whether or not we are able to confine our concerns to just this localized area that perhaps was under tight security control, access control where we knew who was going in and going out and therefore the issue is just the smaller area where the work was going on or whether there was, as we ran into, I guess in GE, more of a difficult problem in defining the size of the area that's under consideration. Is that still a matter before us?

DR. NETON: Well, we examined that and I think that relates to issue number
DR. MAURO: Okay.

DR. NETON: No, where was that? I'm on the wrong --

MR. THURBER: Yes, that is finding one, that is correct.

DR. NETON: Finding one, and Sam I can speak to that but we did follow up on that with, was it Energy?

DR. GLOVER: With Department of Labor.

DR. NETON: Labor rather. Go ahead, Sam. Tell them what we found.

DR. GLOVER: So we spoke with Department of Labor regarding this and based on their records, they cannot differentiate the people. They just simply do not have the ability to do it. Yes it is, there is not differentiation between Electro Met and Electro Met little in the middle. It is Electro Met. So they don't say the little building here, they call Electro Met Electro
Met. And when they go do employee verification they simply do not have the records. We've got that documented and DOL puts people in places. Whether we try to make that distinguished, you try to distinguish that or not, they can't put them in place. That's how they are going to treat them. That's what they've told me. There's nothing I can do.

DR. MAURO: Okay, that helps, because I remember that was important because the number of people changes dramatically in terms of the issue, depending on how you draw those boundaries.

DR. GLOVER: So I apologize that I haven't gotten farther for you on this but we had to wait until we got the ore discussion.

DR. MAURO: No, I understand.

DR. GLOVER: So that's, we will proceed with due haste and get some additional follow-up on these action items.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, others?

MEMBER FIELD: Yes, this is Bill. I just had a question. Does anyone know what the original source was to indicate that there may have been thorium used at the site?

DR. GLOVER: We have no idea. That was just put into -- they used thorium at the facility in the `60s or `50s, late `50s, outside the covered period. So the facility had some specific, some other things that they cleaned up and so I think it got drug in from the clean-up documents, some of the descriptions they had. That, as I started to think about it more, I think it came from some different documentation but not from the DOE process that occurred in the early `40s, to the beginning of the `50s.

MEMBER FIELD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: What about finding number six on the air?

DR. NETON: I think these are
all related to the general issue of our going back and looking at our ability to reconstruct uranium.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.

DR. NETON: There is a lot of things we need to consider such as: what kind of work processes were there? Was this mechanical, shuffling, that sort of thing, and we are rethinking our position on this right now.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: So all of these things kind of roll into that.

DR. NETON: All of the internal issues that are there kind of roll into that one.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. So then it is kind of what's your timeline, do you think, Jim?

DR. NETON: I would say that we will have a position here well in advance of the December Board meeting.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
DR. NETON: Easy to say now since it is only August, but I think this will go fairly quickly on our side.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, great.

Any other questions on Electro Met? Bill? Do we have the petitioners on? Okay. Either people are on mute and they are talking. Should we move on to United Nuclear?

DR. MAURO: How would you like to proceed?

MR. THURBER: I can pick it up if you want, John.

DR. MAURO: Yes. I know Hans also, the both of you worked pretty closely on this. Why don't you get it started?

MR. RUTHERFORD: This is LaVon with NIOSH. I do want to point out the fact that we haven't issued any White Papers in resolution to the issues that SC&A has previously identified from the last Work Group meeting. We are working towards resolutions to those issues and actually we
can provide the Board -- or the Work Group
some better dates on completion of those
issues within the next week or two. We
should be able to finalize some good dates
based on the resources that are available.

I just wanted to point that out
instead of going through each of the issues
where we are going to end up coming back to
stating that we are working on those issues
at this time. And, again, we can give you
some better dates here within the next week
or two. I can send that out to the Work
Group as soon as those are available.

DR. NETON: Which site is this
we're talking about?

MR. RUTHERFORD: United Nuclear.

DR. NETON: Oh, we are skipping
over DuPont?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

DR. NETON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We had
started talking briefly about United Nuclear
but you are still working on that?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, the actual matrix that was provided with the grouping that Bill Thurber provided, I appreciate that because it does actually identify the issues that are closed and the issues that are open and the issues focused around the internal, we are working at, that were previously identified. And all the issues that are open, we have action items and we are working to resolve those issues. Again, I anticipate having good dates for the Work Group within the next week or two weeks.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

MR. RUTHERFORD: That we can identify future Work Group meetings.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. Do we want to go talk about the other sites that are listed here? I don't know, is there anything to --

MR. THURBER: Neither of, the other two sites -- this is Bill Thurber.
Neither Baker-Perkins or DuPont Deepwater have been on the Work Group agenda. We provided just for informational purposes the Baker-Perkins matrix at last Work Group -- or in some of the material we supplied for the last Work Group meeting. But the matrix was not reviewed. We just recently, I think in the last week or so, got DOE clearance and issued our report on DuPont Deepwater and have, based on that report, also supplied a findings matrix. Again, this has never been discussed. These are kind of just for the group's information at the moment.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And both of these are just Site Profiles, right?

MR. THURBER: Yes. They are both Site Profile reviews, not SEC.

DR. MAURO: And I don't believe there are any SECs active on either Baker or DuPont.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

DR. MAURO: So these are pure
Site Profile issues.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: This is Dave Allen from NIOSH. I've got one suggestion. As far as DuPont, as Bill said, we just got this like last week so we haven't had a chance to really digest that one yet. But the Baker-Perkins, Bill, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe all of these findings are associated with the original Appendix P.

MR. THURBER: Yes, they are, Dave.

I'm pretty they are, yes.

MR. ALLEN: Yes. And since that time, we revised that appendix into a standalone TBD and when that happened, we did have these findings alongside of us and we tried to address these findings and the TBD because the original TBD was based on some of the defaults in TBD-6001 and we had to go away from that.

MR. THURBER: Right.

MR. ALLEN: So, my personal
opinion, I'm thinking this might warrant, I guess, what would you call it? A focused review of the TBD compared to these findings. I mean, several of these just seem like they are moot now.

MR. THURBER: That could well be. And if the Work Group wants us to do it -- help me, John, here. I think that we could certainly undertake a focused review of the standalone TBD and come up with a revised matrix.

DR. MAURO: Yes. It may turn out a lot of these go away, as they have in the past, because you are absolutely right. I didn't think of that. Because I think the Baker-Perkins has been, you have reissued, as your cover memo indicate, I believe the original Baker-Perkins was withdrawn. I'm not sure. Yes, it was. Let's see, I'm looking down at the front. Yes, it was canceled on February 17. Now -- and I am presuming there is a revised Baker-Perkins
active now and perhaps -- I don't know, Bill, do you know whether our review was done --

MR. THURBER: No, our review was back in September of last year.

DR. MAURO: Okay. So, that means that our review is dated.

MR. THURBER: That's right.

DR. MAURO: And so I think it would not serve the Work Group well for us to review issues given that the -- we probably should take a quick look. I don't think it's a big deal. I think these are not big matrices and just to see how you step back away from TBD-6001 defaults and have adopted other strategies for dealing with these matters. I will leave it up to, of course, you folks, if you like us to go back and revisit and update our report, revise the matrix to reflect these changes and then maybe we will be on better standing.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I think that would be a good -- rather than try to go
through something that's not dated and support document as changed. I think if you could redo the matrix, look at your initial points, see if they are still relevant or not.

MR. THURBER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And where's the new TBD? Is that on the website?

MR. THURBER: Yes, it is. It is covered in the front page of the status report.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

MR. THURBER: Down there somewhere. It was formerly Appendix P. There is a link there.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

MR. THURBER: Which we lifted from the NIOSH website.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. I see them now. And 6001 is not there anymore. I want to be sure I can get it. Okay.

DR. MAURO: Now that's not,
that's not the case of DuPont. DuPont, unlike Baker, was in fact released recently and does reflect -- I don't even think DuPont is part -- is DuPont part of 6001?

MR. THURBER: Oh, yes.

DR. MAURO: Oh, it was, okay.

MR. THURBER: It was Appendix whatever, P.

DR. MAURO: It was one of the appendices. Well, anyway, that was done only recently and does reflect the latest version of DuPont. So it doesn't suffer from the same problem as Baker.

MR. THURBER: No, it was the Site Profile that we reviewed.

DR. MAURO: We reviewed the Site Profile. So of course it was only issued last week, so certainly NIOSH didn't have a chance to look over these. If you would like to quickly go -- there are seven findings, these are pretty straightforward. If you want to go through them quickly, or
would NIOSH care to wait until you have a chance to look it over, read the report and then fill in, I guess, column two in the matrix?

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: My preference would be, I think we are going to want to have another meeting before the December meeting. So, unless NIOSH has some thoughts on it, rather than have you go through your comments and NIOSH say, well, we'll --

DR. MAURO: Right.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We'll look at them, and so I would like to see the matrix filled in.

DR. MAURO: And I agree.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Then we can focus on that discussion.

DR. MAURO: Yes. And there's nothing that nuanced about these that require development in a conversation like now. I think when NIOSH reads it, it will say, oh,
yes, I can see what this is all about. The Putzier effect, things like that. Things that everyone has seen before. So it's not that there will be any ambiguity about the points we are making.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Jim, is that okay with you?

DR. NETON: Sounds good with us.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. We don't need a -- any other issues related to this? So basically DuPont, that matrix is really still current, where the Perkins one is now a standalone TBD.

MR. THURBER: And we will revise that and for Baker-Perkins we will revise our report and provide an updated matrix.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

DR. MAURO: So SC&A has two action items: help out the Hooker slides and re-review Baker-Perkins.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Right.

MR. THURBER: That is what I have
on my list, John, yes.

DR. MAURO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

MR. KATZ: Andy, this is Ted Katz. I just -- and I was dealing with one of these, Mary's issues for a second, so I didn't have my ears on for all of the United Nuclear discussion but do we have a timeframe, folks, Jim, Dave, for when it makes sense? I mean, the SECs being a priority, Electro Met and United Nuclear as to when we should be meeting next?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Ted, this is LaVon. I'm the POC on United Nuclear and what I had committed to the Work Group was that we would be able to provide some good dates for completing the -- or for producing some White Papers and stuff on the issues that were previously identified. I can give good dates on that probably within the next week or two weeks. As soon as I get those good dates, I will get them immediately to
the Work Group and that will help them identify a date that we could have our next Work Group meeting.

MR. KATZ: Thank you, LaVon. And Electro Met, what's the date frame for that?

DR. NETON: Electro Met, it's going to take a matter of a few weeks or more, probably within a month.

MR. KATZ: Okay. So that one is certainly realistic to address in the next Work Group meeting before the next Board meeting?

DR. NETON: That is what I said earlier. I thought we could provide them the information well in advance of the December meeting.

MR. KATZ: Great. I'm sorry. It is my fault for having missed those points.

DR. NETON: I'm just trying to be consistent, remember what I said.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: That is what
you said. You said well before the December meeting.

(Laughter.)

MR. KATZ: Okay. So we will certainly then wait on you, Lavon, before we try to schedule the next Work Group meeting.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Probably going to have to be some time in November.

MR. KATZ: Right, that's my guess.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. Okay. So we pretty well out of assignments here?

MR. KATZ: We do. One other thing. This is Ted again. One of the things I was looking to is that the transcript from the last meeting, because I was concerned about Mary's point she was making that she doesn't feel like the petitioners have been given an opportunity to speak for the Work Group. That wasn't the case at the last Work Group meeting because another petitioner -- I assume she was a petitioner, but she was
speaking for the petitioners, did ask about this and we did say certainly, petitioners can speak to the group, and she did speak to the group at the last meeting.

But I do think, to Mary's point, we probably could be more systematic and conscientious about asking for petitioners' comments to make them welcome to speak up in these meetings. I know we try to do that, but then we get tangled up in technical things and just carry on.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.

MR. THURBER: Ted, this is Bill Thurber.

MR. KATZ: Yes.

MR. THURBER: I happened to notice on the website, the agenda website that it said this meeting is open to the public but without a public comment period. So I think that was probably one of the things she was referring to as well.

MR. KATZ: That is interesting.
I mean, I didn't even know they made that notice. We don't have a public comment period, none of the Work Group do, because they're really intended for the Board to do its work. In the rest of the Federal Advisory Committee world, they are not even open to the public. But we've always, in all of these Work Groups, invited the public to comment, particularly dealing with petitions.

And most Work Groups, there are many Work Groups that there are petitioners who actually participate heavily with comments during the session even though there is not a public comment session. But they raise their questions and they make their comments as we go along, as most of you know who sit on other Work Groups.

So, I know Denise Brock, who's ombudsman, has been consulting with Mary or Mary has been consulting with her to help her along. I think she's maybe not so acquainted
with how things go, although the other petitioners commented at the last meeting, maybe she felt a little intimidated or what have you about speaking up. But we certainly can always try to do better on this front.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: It seems, and certainly on the phone, I would say it is even for us difficult to follow unless you have the matrices in front of you. It would seem to me being able to clear matrices at some point would -- those are a nice capsulized summary of what the issues and the discussion has been, and then I think that's a little easier for them to respond to than trying to listen as we go forward. And we have documents in front of us that they don't.

MR. KATZ: Yes. And the difficulty is, matrices are typically just in time. PA clearing them has been practically impossible in time for the meetings.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes, I know.
Okay.

MR. KATZ: I have asked for this one to be PA cleared for Mary, to be sent to Mary, dealing with the Hooker part of it and it shouldn't take too long to clear that piece of it. So, yes, when we can, we PA clear matrices when we know someone wants them and when we know, when we get them early enough, but typically get them just ahead of a meeting and then it's literally impossible to do that.

DR. MAURO: Ted, I have a suggestion that might be helpful, because it benefits me very often when I prepare for these. The matrices serve their purpose well. They keep it organized and keep the work moving and the team, everyone is involved, is tracking it, and all the history of it is here. But I could almost envision a person listening in who may not have been tracking it. And usually there is a story. As you go back to the history, a very complex one, United
Nuclear, for example, which has, I don't even know how many meetings. But it turns out, the way I always look at this is: it always really boils down to a simple story. The way we talked about Hooker. Well, when we're all said and done, it's really, you've got some data in the later years but you don't really have too much data in the early years. And now there is some question regarding whether there was how much and whether or not there was any ore. And all of a sudden it becomes a very simple story. Rather than 25 different issues that are cryptically identified in a matrix which would make a person's head spin.

If we could start off, especially a Work Group like this that really has its work cut out, we're dealing with five or six different sites. A little bit of, a few minutes in the front end, to sort of regroup, might be helpful as much to us as it is certainly to any of the interested parties that might be listening in.
MR. KATZ: John, I couldn't agree with you more. And I actually, this is something you have a good talent for too, for sort of just reminding everybody of the story before we delve into it. And I think that is something that might help at the head of these meetings where when we begin to speak about a site, to just have a brief recap orienting the public. In some Work Group meetings we do that. We think of that and actually --

DR. MAURO: Right, right.

MR. KATZ: When we start to -- we did that, I think, yesterday, when we starting marching into a detail and then we step back and say, wait, let's just, for the sake people listening, start at the beginning of it. So I think that is a good suggestion.

DR. BEHLING: Ted and John, this is Hans Behling. I do want to make a comment exactly to this issue here because I've been involved in so many instances with reviewing
an AWE or a Site Profile or a PER and initially we go to great lengths to explain what our concerns may be. And then, of course, a document that may be 10, 15, 20 pages get condensed to a handful of comments that enter a matrix and oftentimes there will be subsequent meetings that will occur months or even years later, and no one remembers exactly what the detailed information was that was initial trigger for these comments that ended up being reduced to a single sentence or two in the matrix.

I think it would be very helpful if in the matrix we identify the date and the title of the document that preceded these matrix comments so that somebody might could go back and again refresh themselves as to what the initial discussions were that gave rise to the matrix. Because sometimes, after months or years we somehow lose sight of the complexity of some of the issues that are overly simplified in the matrix and somehow
MR. KATZ: Yes, Hans, I think your case is particularly true in a site that’s gone through a lot of review and a lot of White Papers and so on. Sometimes the matrices all represent one review, in which case it is not such a problem. But I agree with what you are saying, Hans, with some of these more complex, long reviews, it gets to be labyrinthine and it's all, like you say, condensed into a very brief sound bite in a matrix.

Anyway, this is something worth discussing offline. I don't know that we need to do it all for this Work Group because it's really a general issue, but a good one for trying to make these Work Group meetings as understandable as possible for people listening.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Now that we have a much larger number of Work Groups, I think to have some kind of systematic format
would also help.

MR. KATZ: Yes.

DR. MAURO: Well, one of the things -- not to prolong this. But one of the things we often try to do, at one time we had to, for example, when we were in the midst of a number of really big ones, Nevada Test Site, Rocky, Fernald, at least one of the things we try to do to help the Board, is -- so much work has gone in over years. And to try to capture the essence of it for the Board now in a two- or three-pager, which says okay, listen, this is what transpired.

So that does, I can't tell you how much it helps me, when I'm the one who, for example, on Fernald on a couple of occasions I found myself trying to write all of this down, pull it all together and get it into my head. That kind of thing every so often is probably a really good idea to do that. Because they can easily get away from you and you lose sight of it. I'm thinking
out loud now. I'm doing a little musing, Ted. But I think a little bit more of that goes into it, because the richness of this program is off the charts, in terms of some of these sites. And regrouping every so often for everyone's purposes. I can almost envision the Board Members listening in on a vote where something that has a history that goes back for five years. In any event, just another thought.

MR. KATZ: Okay. Back to where we are with this. Andy, I will be sending then to the full Board the White Papers and background so that they have more context for your presentation as well. So you don't need to worry about that. I will take care of that just as I have earlier this week for other sites that are going to be discussed at the Board meeting.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I've seen those coming through.

MR. KATZ: They won't have your
presentation. They will get your presentation when it's done, but they will have these background papers that will help them orient themselves and have a deeper understanding.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Send them the matrix as well?

MR. KATZ: Yes. I will give them the matrix but I will give them the White Papers as well.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: White Papers, I think are probably the most --

MR. KATZ: I will give them the transcripts where we've discussed this.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

MR. KATZ: So anyone who wants to delve deeper can delve deeper.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. Any other issues we have? Bill, do you have any parting thoughts?

MEMBER FIELD: No, Andy, I think everything is pretty much covered.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, with
that I'll accept a motion to adjourn, if there's no other comment. Or do we have others on the phone that want to make a comment? Okay, hearing none, if someone was talking, we didn't hear you, so think about mute. So with that, I'll adjourn the Work Group meeting.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was concluded at 10:13 a.m.)