The Work Group convened via teleconference at 2:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time, Mark Griffon, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

MARK GRIFFON, Chairman
PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member
This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Rocky Flats Work Group, has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and certified by the Chair of the Rocky Flats Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official
ISAF AL-NABULSI, DOE
TERRIE BARRIE, ANWAG
JOE FITZGERALD, SC&A
MARY GIRARDO
ADAM JONES, Senator Mark Udall's Office
JEFF KOTSCH, DOL
JENNY LIN, HHS
ARJUN MAHIJANI, SC&A
JAMES NETON, NIOSH DCAS
CHARLES SAUNDERS
MUTTY SHARFI, NIOSH ORAU
GREG SMITH
JAMES TURNER, Beryllium Support Group
BRANT ULSH, NIOSH DCAS
This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Rocky Flats Work Group, has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and certified by the Chair of the Rocky Flats Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Welcome and roll call 3
Discussion of DOL Bulletin 11-08 8
Status of Site Profile issues 29
Former petitioner concern - Site Profile 36
Action items/path forward 38
P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2:00 p.m.

MR. KATZ: So, this is the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Rocky Flats Work Group and it's convening after quite a long time in passive mode.

So we will begin with a roll call. And since we're speaking of a specific site for all the Agency-related personnel please speak to conflict of interest as well. And we will begin with Board Members, with the Chair.

(Roll Call.)

MR. KATZ: Okay. Well, Mark, I think you should just carry on. We don't have any other Work Group Members on the line but--

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. We don't have a Work Group but I think it would be important, you know, for the record, to start this discussion, especially about the bulletin.

MR. KATZ: Absolutely, right.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And then

MR. KATZ: Oh, and let me just -- oh yes, last mention, the agenda for the meeting is on the NIOSH website. You can find it under the Board Section. And the Board Section with Work Groups meeting today, this Work Group meeting today and it should be there.

And there's also a matrix of issues that were Site Profile, in effect, issues that were addressed up till when the SEC action was taken. That matrix is updated and that got to us quite late but it may show on the website now. I've sent it in there and they post, you know, periodically during the day. So you may be able to find that and follow along with that when we get to that portion of the agenda.

Okay, Mark, sorry about that.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: That's all
right.

MR. MAKHIJANI: Hi. This is Arjun. I've just joined.

MR. KATZ: Welcome, Arjun. And no conflict, right?

MR. MAKHIJANI: No conflict.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. This is Mark Griffon and I think for the Court Reporter's sake on these kind of phone calls, we should make sure we identify ourselves as we speak.

As Ted said, the agenda: it's a fairly brief agenda today. But I just wanted to get back to not only the Site Profile issues but also now that we have this last bulletin from Labor on implementing the Class, I think it's important that we at least, you know, get a report and have an understanding of what that means. And so that's the first item is that discussion.

And then looking back at the
matrix, I will say that I think that was the last matrix I could find but also one of the actions coming out of this meeting may be for Joe Fitzgerald to recover the first matrix. I think I found a date: 12/15/05.

SC&A submitted a report with an initial matrix that was a Site Profile matrix and then we evolved into SEC issues. So this last one I'm not sure, you know, if -- I don't want to miss some that early on we said were Site Profile issues and therefore not relevant to the SEC discussion. So anyway we that may be one of the action items from this meeting.

But if we could start, I think it'd be useful to -- I don't know if, Jeff, if you're willing to give us an overview of this last bulletin that came out so some of us can digest and understand what it means. Could you do that for us?

MR. KOTSCH: Yes. It's been a while so let me just read through this --
CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: You weren't expected to be called on? I didn't put your name on the agenda.

MR. KOTSCH: Yes. I just was reminded that we had this call today.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.

MR. KOTSCH: Basically this Bulletin has to do with, the Bulletin 11-08 has to do with the use of the Ruttenber database as far as, you know, evidence to basically implement the Class at Rocky Flats. And just looking through it, obviously if the conditions in the other bulletins are met, you know, concerning the 250 days and the building and things, this one basically supplements that by adding if there's information contained in the database, with respect to neutron dose of 100 millirem or more in any particular year. That basically fulfills the criterion of, you know, whether there was neutron exposure, you know,
which is one of the basic criteria of the Class.

And I'm trying to see, I'm just trying to remember if there was one other thing in here or not.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I think it's the building listed too, right?

MR. KOTSCH: Yes. Yes. Let me see. I'm trying to remember back how this thing played out as far as buildings go. Because we had a number of other bulletins that --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. It shows any buildings that matches one of the locations identified in Bulletin 08-01 and Circular 08-03, they'll use that as confirmation that the person could have been exposed to neutrons, basically.

MR. KOTSCH: Right. Okay, so --

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, who is this speaking? This is the Court Reporter.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Oh, that was Mark Griffon. I'm sorry, I violated my own rule.

COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. KOTSCH: Right. Yes. This is Jeff Kotsch here.

Yes. So it uses information from the database as to both the building with it matches against the other criteria and a neutron value if it's greater than 100 millirem in any particular year. Then those would be used to fulfill those other criteria that's within, you know, implementation of the Class.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. So this is Mark Griffon.

I think the first question I have is on the neutron, it says the field in the database is called neu_recpen, neutron something penetrating, I assume. But it says, you know, that you only include them if it
goes above 100 millirem in any one year. And I understand the basis of the 100 millirem, the question is what's the basis of this number generated by the Ruttenber research? Because if it's derived from the very same data that we said we could not use for dose reconstruction, I have some problems with this approach.

MR. KOTSCH: Yes. And I think it's been a while and I'm not familiar with all the background of those. Obviously, they just liked the Neutron Dose Reconstruction Project, you know, imputed doses from obviously from Rocky Flats basically raw data or dosimetry data. And this was our understanding after talking to Margaret Ruttenber, of at least which value would be perhaps representative of a neutron dose for any particular individual.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. Mark Griffon again.
I mean, do you see the obvious dilemma I have here? How do we trust the 100 millirem value if it's derived from the very data that we've said we can't use?

In other words if you take the case of a non-listed cancer, someone has a non-listed cancer from '52 through '66, I assume NIOSH is not going to calculate neutron doses. We basically said we can't calculate neutron doses during that time period. But on the other hand, in this case we're using, you know, the neutron doses to make a determination if -- you know, estimated values to make a determination, rather than saying anyone identified as potential neutron exposure.

MR. KOTSCHE: Again, we were just applying this. This is just, you know, one of the tools that we use to place individuals in Classes, or into these two Classes essentially and, you know, -- what do I want to say? It's
just trying to fulfill the, you know, the one criterion which we've established as being, you know, 100 or greater millirem for any particular year. So we were just trying to quantitatively, you know, use a number from this.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. And I guess I'm questioning the ability to use quantitative data when it's based on the very data that we've challenged in the SEC as not being useful or usable.

MR. KOTSCH: I mean, I understand what you're saying. You know, this is just the way the Bulletin was written. I understand where you're coming from.


I just think -- well, it surprised me a bit after two years that this is where it came down.

But do others have thoughts on
MR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. Mark this is Arjun.

Actually, I think the initial Bulletin of the Department of Labor did not have a dose threshold with it when the SEC first went into effect in 2007. And then a subsequent Bulletin in 2008 amended that and added 100-millirem threshold to all the other criteria: buildings, NDRP and so on.

And the thing that surprised me in that was in that Bulletin from 2008 was it said that if in any year -- the dose reconstruction said neutron dose not -- I don't have my computer in front of me. I'm not at home. But it said that if a dose reconstruction shows 100 millirem or more neutron dose in any year, then they would be in the Class.

So I think the 100 millirem got
carried over from that amendment, probably.

But I couldn't figure out where that amendment came from or what the rationale for using the dose-reconstructed figure was in an SEC for the same thing when we said, you know, you've extended what we said, or the Board has said you don't have the data to do neutron/photon ratios and so on for this period. And then there's a fresh, sort of a bright line threshold of 100 millirem for the same thing.

MR. KOTSCH: Well this is Jeff Kotsch.

And somebody will have to remind me, I thought the definition of the Class was monitored or should have been monitored?

DR. ULSH: Yes. This is Brant Ulsh.

I can perhaps answer a couple of the questions that are being discussed.

First of all, what the Ruttenber number how it was arrived upon. Basically if
I recall correctly, I think there's a field in there called total recorded penetrating, tot-rec-pen, or something like that. And the way it was split up into neutron and photon was by job-category-based rules of thumb.

I don't remember what the ratios were but it was some ratio that was applied to split that number into neutron and photon dose. So that's where that number comes from in the Ruttenber database.

Now in terms of the genesis of the 100-millirem number, that is a result of the interpretation of the phrase, should have been monitored. You know, the Class definition is, was or should have been monitored for neutron. And the corollary onto that definition is kind of, by today's standards. And that's where that 100 millirem in any year comes from.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And Brant, this is Mark Griffon again.
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Brant, can you refresh my memory on the -- that is the correct description of the monitored, should have been monitored, you know, sort of under current standards.

DR. ULSH: Okay.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Under current standards the 100-millirem threshold is derived how? I thought it was based on total penetrating actually?

DR. NETON: No. No. Well, this is Jim Neton.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.

DR. NETON: I haven't worked with the 10 CFR 835 for a while but originally --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Me neither.

DR. NETON: -- those were independent source terms. Neutron, internal, external, they were all independent source terms.

MR. MAKHIJANI: Jim, are we applying -- this is Arjun.
Are we applying the 100 millirem like at Y-12 thorium? You said you can't reconstruct dose for Y-12 thorium. Is there 100-millirem threshold per organ for internal dose, and what data are used for that?

DR. NETON: Y-12, I think we just removed the should have been monitored. I don't know they had that in there. And really, it was Labor's determination as to what should have been monitored means. I mean, that's in the definition but it was 100 millirem for that particular source term. If you take 100 millirem per internal dose, it would have been 100 millirem internal exposure not combined with external.

Again, I have not worked with 10 CFR 835 for some time, but the way it was interpreted by the contractors at least was that the 100-millirem monitored threshold applied strictly to the internal dose.

Now it could be a combination of
nuclides that would have to add up to 100 millirem, but you would not add the external to that.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I agree with the non-external and internal. But I thought the external was the limit. So it could be gamma neutron, you know --

DR. NETON: My recollection was that neutron was a separate source term.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Really. I don't remember it that way, but it's been a while for me, as well.

DR. NETON: I wouldn't swear that is true but I recall in dealing with neutrons at another facility that I had worked that we were treating it and it was -- I believe it was correct as a separate source term. But you know things could have changed in the last -- it's been a while.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Can somebody check that while we're on the call? That
should be an easy thing to resolve.

DR. NETON: I'm not sure --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. Okay.

DR. NETON: -- about certain regulations.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Well I don't know. This is Mark Griffon again.

I'm not sure, you know, where to move this. My concern is that, again, trying to use that threshold value from -- which is at least in part derived by the total recorded dose. I believe Brandt is correct. But then how that's fractioned out, I'm not -- that was by job category but then the job categories -- well, I think they made some assumptions on the neutron/photon split for different job categories. Is that correct, Brant?

DR. ULSH: Yes, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: So that split would still be derived from the NDRP research, I believe?
DR. ULSH: Well, I don't know. I guess we should be explicit when we're talking about that. The job categories -- sorry, the splits were recommended by Roger Falk to the Ruttenber team. Roger was concurrently working on the NDRP but as you know at the time of the Ruttenber study, the NDRP was not finished. So yes, I mean, the source is the same.

MR. MAKHIJANI: This is Arjun. Also in the 1950s, you know, we discussed -- this is from memory now, most people like in the 700 building were not monitored for neutrons, at least in a part of the 1950s, up to '57, I think. And in all those cases the attributed doses, now this goes beyond the Ruttenber database. The attributed doses would be from neutron to photon ratios in that case, by building, which was done in the NDRP, but it's still the same thing. I mean, the dose wouldn't be
attributed for a non-SEC cancer.

And also the SEC said that -- I mean, I'm very confused as to how you can do two different things for the same dose. In one case say we're not going to attribute it because we can't calculate it. The other case, use a 100-millirem threshold because it does go back to 2008.

As I read the Circular, the amendment came out of a discussion with NIOSH. At least that's what the Circular says.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. And I don't know who's on the line for NIOSH, but you might want to look at 835-402, Section A.

You know, I still stand by the way I read this is it says, it should be monitored if they have an effective dose equivalent to the whole body of .1 rem. That's just for external radiation; that doesn't say, you know, by source or anything like that.

DR. NETON: Right. I think that
is true but I recall there was guidance -- I recall -- this is Jim Neton. I recall and again, this was years ago --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.

DR. NETON: -- there was guidance that broke that out. But again you could be totally right. I don't know. I guess I shouldn't comment anymore because my information is somewhat dated. But I do agree that it says for external in the regulation, but there may be further guidance in that as to source terms.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Well, obviously we -- this is Mark Griffon, again. I'm sorry.

Obviously, I don't think we can resolve anything today. What I offer is that I want to bring this back to the Board in my Work Group Report at the next full Board meeting. And maybe NIOSH and SC&A can just be prepared to answer some of these questions a little further. You know, especially the one
on the threshold amount but also the way that
Ruttenber value -- I think Brant described it
pretty well, but maybe just make sure of how
that value is derived and what the different
fields. I think it is total recorded versus --
total recorded penetrating versus neutron
recorded penetrating. But I would just ask if
you could be prepared for maybe a little, some
questions from the full Board.

But I want to bring the issue to
the full Board of, you know, whether -- if
there's any concerns from the Board as far as
this threshold quantity. And in part, I will
say this is one of our early SEC rulings and
maybe, you know, the monitor should have been
monitored. We've struggled with this on some
of these issues. So maybe in part, it's our -
the way we defined this was a problem.

DR. NETON: Mark, this is Jim.

I think the central issue really
doesn't seem to be whether -- I mean, there is
an issue as to whether it's neutrons or combined or not. But it really seems to me that your central issue is any dose that one would impute might be questioned, and that's a different issue that we don't really have any stake in. I mean --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes, I know. Right. Right. Right.

DR. NETON: Whether it's a 100 millirem combined or not I think is probably not going to address your central concern, is my point.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. This is Mark again.

That is probably true, yes. If there was some middle ground, I would be interested, you know, in that, possibly.

And I don't even know, you know, I'm sure that Labor looked at the full Ruttenber database, but I don't know how they laid it out. If they identified people that
had potential neutron exposure, you know, is there a 90 percent of them that fall under this 100 millirem thing or is there -- you know, I don't have a sense of what impact it would have as far as inclusion or exclusion. But, you know, I think when we're trying to use that line to distinguish, I've got concerns on that because of the underlying data. So I guess we'll leave it at that unless SC&A, Joe or Arjun, do you have anything to add?

MR. FITZGERALD: On that issue, I don't. Certainly, I think those are the two issues.

MR. MAKHIJANI: No. No I don't have any desire to --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. I mean I'll just describe the issue and, you know, Jim Neton and Brant, you know, certainly at the full Board discussion, I want you to -- you know, if I mischaracterize anything,
certainly be there prepared to discuss this. But I think I'd just rather bring it back to the full Board and see, you know, what if anything -- how we want to weigh in.

DR. ULSH: So the issues you want us to be prepared to talk about, Mark, are CFR 835 and whether it's total external dose or whether it's neutrons that are supposed to be 100 millirem a year, that kind of an issue, and then also the issue of how the Ruttenber team partitioned the total penetrating dose into neutron and gamma. Is that correct?

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: That's correct. That's the two fundamental ones I can think of, yes.

DR. ULSH: All right.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I mean I can't anticipate what other questions the Board Members might have, but yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: Joe Fitzgerald.

Mark, you just mentioned something
that I think we had kicked around a little bit. We really don't have a good feel for what the implication of applying any threshold is to the database in terms of what impact that would have in terms of workers included or excluded.

I'm not sure how hard that would be just to give the Board some sense of how significant a 100-millirem threshold is. I certainly don't have any feel for what that would do.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Perhaps, Jeff, you know, I don't know if you can be prepared to answer that question. I don't know who that question could go to.

MR. FITZGERALD: I'm just guessing that, you know, that might be a question from the Board. You know, how significant is that, I mean quite apart from the conceptual issue is okay, you know, what impact would that have. I think Jim's quite right. Certainly
the issue is not so much what the particular threshold is; any threshold's going to have the same issue. But I'm not sure what the impact would be.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. I agree. Jeff, is that something -- this is Mark Griffon.

Jeff, is that something you could be prepared to address if called on at the meeting?

MR. KOTSCH: Yes, we can look into it.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. At least generally numbers, you know. Okay. Is there anything else on that issue?

All right. Having heard nothing, I think we'll move on. And two items really remaining and the one is the existing issues on the Site Profile. And I did circulate a matrix, and as I said in the introduction, it was an early -- or it was the last version of
the matrix that I could find. But I also noticed that, even when you look down the numbering, it starts with number two and it goes like two, four, eight, something like that. So I don't know if we combined, I do have sort of a memory that we combined some issues and folded them into one broader issue. But I'm not sure that I'm ready to try to make a distinction of the remaining Site Profile issues on that matrix today.

I would ask at least that SC&A go back and try to pull out the original. Joe, I mean, you should probably have this somewhere. The date I find is December 15, 2005 that you submitted your Site Profile Review Report to the Board. So that predated the SEC qualification and the SEC discussion.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. This is Joe Fitzgerald.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: But I think we started from that matrix.
MR. FITZGERALD: Right. I think that would probably be very useful. This is, as I recall, a very dynamic situation with the matrices and I think we went through probably nine or ten. So I think the first order of business is to try to go back and at least go back to the original and sort of make sure that we've captured all the Site Profile issues as well as what may have been left or determined to be a Site Profile from the later SEC list, and just make sure we have a complete treatment of that.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. That sounds like the best path forward right now is to use the first one and look at the last one. And if I can task SC&A with modifying that matrix to bring back to us with the remaining Site Profile matrix issues, I think that would be the best path forward. And the next meeting --

MR. KATZ: Mark?
CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.

MR. KATZ: It's Ted. I was just thinking, if you just go from the first to the last, though, you may miss issues that got closed. So I think Joe will want to look and see if he can find records on what might have been closed as well.

MR. FITZGERALD: This is Joe. Ted, you're right. I think this is going to be a bit of an archeological dig. And I will go through transcripts as well because I think things were moving fairly fast. And I think just ascertaining what got closed, what got pushed from SEC to Site Profile, what may have been left behind as a Site Profile in the beginning. I mean, I think all of the above would be necessary to come up with an updated list.

MR. MAKHIJANI: This is Arjun. I think there are also issues that came up during the SEC discussion where we
said, that issue is resolved for SEC purposes but it's a Site Profile issue. And I'm not sure that all of the issues that came up during that hectic period in the first half of 2007 are in the original. So I think Joe's plan to go through the transcripts is a good plan because we need really to develop a new matrix starting with the old one and saying which issues are closed and which new issues came up and so on.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.

MR. MAKHIJANI: That's what I would suggest.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: This is Mark Griffon again.

That's fine. I just thought that the last matrix, at least the last one that we find, you know, I did look through and a lot of them say, this issue closed.

I don't usually see the terminology this issue closed, but remains a
Site Profile issue. So that's a valid point.

I don't know, but it may happen, I mean, I was thinking the in-between ones, I tended to carry these matrices through but I may have inadvertently dropped Site Profile issues along the way since we were focused on the SEC, so --

MR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. It was moving awfully fast, Mark, and I don't know whether Joe was doing that or Ron or me, but I think we were really focused on which issues were open for the SEC or closed for the SEC. But I might be mistaken.

MR. FITZGERALD: This is Joe.

I think you're right. I think the last four or five months it was SEC-focused in order to deliver something to the Board. And so certainly, we need to go back and just make sure -- QA the record and just make sure nothing slipped through. But I agree with you, Mark. I mean, a lot of these look like
they were closed out without an issue being -- a Site Profile issue. So I think the transcripts might help us make sure that nothing got parked as a Site Profile issue in the discussion.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. And what I'll do, I think tasking SC&A to do that and, you know, I'll just keep track of that with you, Joe. And when it makes sense to schedule a face-to-face Work Group, I think that should be our next goal is a face-to-face Work Group to go through that matrix. But I think that might take a little time for you to sort through that.

In addition, I've had some additional information from the petitioner and there's -- I summarized them down to -- I guess I get them down to about nine issues in addition to what hadn't been put on the table before that I think we should add to the matrix. And some of them are more significant
than others but I think -- and I have a
document that Terrie Barrie actually provided
us, and I have it in a Word document so I can
forward that to everyone but also forward it
to Joe for inclusion in the modified matrix,
if that makes sense.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. And what we
would do is just pretty standard practice.
We'll do a first draft and make sure that we
circulate this to the Work Group and NIOSH --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: -- and elicit
any input, validation so that everybody's on
the same page by the time we go to issue it.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.

Absolutely, I certainly want, you know, Brant
will probably have to look back at some of the
old matrices too and try to remember what we
closed and didn't close and things like that
so that makes sense to circulate a draft
first. And I will forward these issues. You
know, several of them are building-specific issues but there are some broader issues such as thorium on the list that Terrie Barrie provided. So I will circulate the document to everyone and ask Joe to add it onto the matrix. And you can identify them as petitioner issues.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. As petitioner-originated. We actually do have --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: -- a category for that in the matrix.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. Right. All right. I think that's as far as we can go with this today. I just wanted mainly to have this call to get a path forward on this and make sure we keep moving. So just for Terrie Barrie and others in the public that are on the phone, others from the site, you know, we'll have this on the agenda at the next Board meeting.
As far as the Bulletin goes, I will raise this question and ask for input from the Board on it. So we certainly will have some dialogue about that. And then we will keep you informed on the next scheduled meeting where we'll get more into the meat of the matrix and these additional Site Profile issues.

We don't normally do formal public comments at the Work Group meetings, but I would offer any comments from the petitioners on what we went over today.

Anyone have any comments or we'll certainly have time at the main Board meeting if you want to make --

MS. BARRIE: Mark, this is Terrie Barrie.

And first, I just want to thank everyone for holding this meeting and progressing with the issues with the Rocky Flats facility.
I would just like to emphasize that it's been four or five years now since these issues have been kind of put by the side and I realize everyone is busy. But there's people whose claims are affected by this and I would encourage a swift but thorough investigation to all of these issues. And again, I thank everyone.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Thank you, Terrie. And we appreciate your continued involvement with this and appreciate your raising issues that we hadn't thought of. And thanks for your effort.

MS. BARRIE: It's for the Rocky Flats workers. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Anyone else?

MR. SAUNDERS: This is Charles Saunders.

You made a mistake, I think. I'm not Jerry Saunders. I am Charles Saunders and I'd appreciate if that's corrected, please.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Oh, sure.

Thank you. Thank you.

And if that's it I think we can close for today.

We have those actions, and I'll work closely with Ted Katz to keep this Work Group moving and schedule our one face-to-face where we can get into the specifics of the remaining issues.

So anything else before I close?

Board Members? NIOSH, Ted, anything?

Okay. Meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:39 p.m.)