

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

+ + + + +

PACIFIC PROVING GROUNDS WORK GROUP

+ + + + +

FRIDAY
JANUARY 16, 2015

+ + + + +

The Work Group convened via teleconference at 1:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, James E. Lockey, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

JAMES E. LOCKEY, Chairman
HENRY A. ANDERSON, Member
LORETTA R. VALERIO, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official
BOB BARTON, SC&A
HANS BEHLING, SC&A
JOYCE FRANCIS, DCAS
DeKEELY HARTSFIELD, HHS
JOHN MAURO, SC&A
JIM NETON, DCAS
MARK ROLFES, DCAS
GENE ROLLINS, ORAU Team
MATTHEW SMITH, ORAU Team
JOHN STIVER, SC&A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

Welcome and Introductions 4

Discussion:

- Overview of SC&A Site Profile..... 6
- Finding Number 1..... 22
- Observation Number 1..... 25
- Finding Number 2..... 27
- Finding Number 3..... 44
- Finding Number 4..... 60
- Finding Number 5..... 63
- Finding Number 6..... 72
- Finding Number 7..... 79
- Finding Number 8..... 84
- Finding Number 9..... 96

Actions/Path Forward 107

Adjourn

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

1:34 p.m.

MR. KATZ: This is the Advisory Board on Radiation Worker Health, the Pacific Proving Ground Work Group.

We are meeting over a Site Profile Review that's been done by SC&A and the Work Group's taking that up.

The materials that we're discussing today are on the NIOSH website. If you go to the NIOSH website and you go to the Board section for meetings, today's date, you'll see all the papers that will be discussed here.

There's a matrix, there's the actual review from SC&A and both of those are useful to follow along with the discussion as well as the Agenda which is very simple.

MEMBER ANDERSON: Hi, it's Andy. I'm on now.

MR. KATZ: Oh, great. And so now I've heard from all my Board Members, they're all on but we need to speak to conflict of interest, so let's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 just go down the roster with the Board and address
2 whether you have a conflict with site.

3 (Roll call.)

4

5 Okay then, that takes care of matters.
6 Everybody, while you're listening, please keep
7 your phones on mute just to help the audio quality
8 and, Jim, it's your meeting.

9 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Why don't we get
10 started then?

11 Hans, are you going to present the SC&A
12 overview?

13 DR. BEHLING: Yes, I am.

14 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Are we ready to get
15 started on that?

16 DR. BEHLING: Yes, unless there's any
17 other issue that needs to be resolved before we
18 start.

19 I can only say that we do have a total
20 of hours for completing this conference call and
21 are there any scheduled breaks that we're looking
22 to introduce somewhere in between the four hours?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: Well, Hans, I think we're
2 hoping not to go for four hours, but I mean we'll
3 take breaks as people need comfort breaks.

4 DR. BEHLING: Okay.

5 MR. KATZ: Yes.

6 DR. BEHLING: Okay, let me start out by
7 saying that this is -- since this is the first
8 meeting over teleconference for the PPG Work Group,
9 I want to take a few minutes to discuss a few
10 historical pieces of information.

11 And first of all, NIOSH issued the
12 Summary Site Profile for the Pacific Proving
13 Grounds back in August of 2006. So, that's a
14 number of years ago.

15 SC&A was asked to review this document
16 in 2013 and issued its draft report in November
17 2013. Our review of the Site Profile identified
18 a total of nine findings and one observation which
19 is, at this point, the focus of my presentation here
20 that's coming.

21 And in order to really fully understand
22 the findings that we're about to discuss, it's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 important to address some of the conditions under
2 which personnel at the PPG were exposed to
3 radiation and that not only is different but very
4 unique from all the other DOE and AWE facilities
5 that are part of the Energy Employee Compensation
6 program.

7 And in Section 3 of the SC&A report
8 which is on page 14, and I'm going to ask John Stiver
9 to perhaps then go to the page that I identify so
10 that we can all look at some of the information that
11 I'm about to present.

12 And so, page 12 is the beginning of
13 Section 3.

14 DR. MAURO: Ted, I assume that we're
15 not on Live Meeting, so we just should do this
16 independently on our own.

17 MR. KATZ: We have Live Meeting, but
18 you're welcome to do this. I mean you have the
19 documents.

20 DR. MAURO: I do.

21 MR. KATZ: So, you can do it either way.

22 DR. MAURO: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: I'll forward you, if you
2 don't have that, I'll forward you the address for
3 the Live Meeting.

4 DR. MAURO: Oh, I have --

5 MR. STIVER: John, I did send you the
6 link earlier today, so it should be on both your
7 SC&A and NIOSH email accounts.

8 DR. MAURO: Yes, the only problem I ran
9 into, it requires some kind of Java update which
10 I don't have. But I'm fine, I'm following it on
11 the --

12 MR. KATZ: Okay.

13 DR. MAURO: Yes, I'm fine.

14 MR. KATZ: Thanks, John. Go ahead,
15 Hans.

16 DR. BEHLING: Okay. John, can you
17 scroll -- I'm on page 12, but you're at the bottom
18 of page 12. Okay?

19 MR. STIVER: Okay, hang on just a
20 second. You want page 13 or --

21 DR. BEHLING: No, no, you're on page 12
22 and on the upper right hand side, you'll see the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 page 12, the individual --

2 MR. STIVER: All right.

3 DR. BEHLING: Anyway, I want to briefly
4 discuss some of the comparisons because there's
5 really -- there's only one comparison to any of the
6 other facilities that we have been dealing with in
7 the past and that's the Nevada Test Site which also
8 tested nuclear weapons.

9 But, there are some great differences
10 between those two sites and then I'm about to show
11 you just what some of those differences are that
12 I've identified.

13 Between 1946 and 1962, the US AEC
14 conducted a total of 105 atmospheric and underwater
15 nuclear weapons tests at several locations which
16 I identified in the top of Table 3-1. They involve
17 Bikini Atoll and Enewetak Atoll, both of those
18 Atolls are part of the Marshall Islands.

19 Also, the third area was Christmas
20 Island and Johnson Atoll and there's a couple of
21 other tests that were done in the middle of the
22 ocean.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And important to note when you look at
2 those numbers that follow, not only just the number
3 of tests at each of those sites, but the explosive
4 yield. And below that, you have minimum, maximum,
5 mean and median and total.

6 And then a point to note is that the
7 total yields for, for instance, at Bikini Atoll,
8 the total yield of nuclear weapons that were tested
9 there. There were 24 tests with 763,838 kilotons
10 of explosive yield

11 And you can look down the bottom of the
12 other ones and Enewetak, that was the second most,
13 31,653 and so forth.

14 And what it really -- if you look at them
15 in Table 3, you see that for the 105 nuclear tests
16 in the PPG, they had the equivalent of 151.5
17 megatons of TNT. And again, if you segregate them
18 out between Bikini Atoll and Enewetak Atoll and the
19 Marshall Islands, there were 108.5 megatons of
20 explosive yield tested there.

21 And when you then compare that to what
22 was done at the Nevada Test Site which is defined

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in Table 3-2 below, you will see obviously that even
2 though the U.S. tested quite a number of weapons,
3 107 at the test site, their combined explosive
4 yield only represented 1.3 megatons. And compare
5 that to the 155.6 megatons yield, understand why
6 these tests were done not in the continental United
7 States, but somewhere where it was safe to do so
8 and that turned out to be the Pacific Proving
9 Grounds.

10 When you go back up to Table 3-1 above,
11 you'll see that the maximum weapons that were
12 tested, the yields were two nuclear devices that
13 had the yield of 15 megatons and that was the Bravo
14 test that was done in March of 1954 and the Mike
15 test that was done earlier in '52.

16 Those two tests, like I said, when you
17 look at the yields of those tests for the Bravo
18 test, it's 15 megatons. That's a thousand times
19 greater than the explosive yield of the two bombs
20 that were dropped and devastated Hiroshima and
21 Nagasaki at 15 kilotons.

22 So, it gives you an understanding of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 just how much of the differences exist between the
2 nuclear tests that were conducted at the Nevada
3 Test Site versus those that were conducted at the
4 Pacific Proving Grounds.

5 One of the other things that I wanted
6 to point out is the fact that when you look at the
7 nuclear tests that were done, they were not equally
8 spaced. Early on with the very first few tests,
9 they were done at significant intervals.

10 And also, in addition to that, they were
11 -- explosive yields were very, very low compared
12 to the what was to come, especially with the
13 beginning of the Castle series where we had thermal
14 nuclear devices in the megaton range.

15 John, can you go to the next page? Page
16 14 -- 13 I mean, 13.

17 And there, I'll just briefly make
18 mention of some of the things that happened and why
19 some of these things became a very significant
20 problem for the rad-safe personnel that were
21 expected to protect the workers and safeguard them
22 from radiation exposures.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And one of the things you realize is
2 that the first series of tests, there was enough
3 spacing in between to provide at least some
4 adequacy in presenting some kind of program for
5 safeguarding personnel and monitoring them.

6 And that became increasingly more
7 difficult and so, when you go into the next few
8 years, we had instances where there were two
9 nuclear tests done on the same day. There were six
10 days where two tests were done simultaneously.

11 And what it really comes down to is that
12 both the frequency and the severity of the nuclear
13 tests posed serious constraints on the rad-safe
14 personnel who were there to protect the workers
15 from radiation exposure.

16 And when you look at their program, they
17 worked under the worst of conditions that one can
18 imagine for a number of reasons, whether it was the
19 remote facilities that they were working at out in
20 the middle of the Pacific Ocean -- when we're
21 talking about the Marshall Islands, they are 2,300
22 miles southeast of Honolulu and 1,600 miles removed

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 from Guam.

2 And this was, I would say, a very
3 difficult thing to get personnel in there and for
4 many of these tests, for instance, in the case of
5 Operation Crossroads which was the first series
6 that involved Able and Baker, there were a total
7 of 42,000 people that had to be obviously guarded
8 against exposures.

9 And, therefore, you had large numbers
10 of people, you had a remote location for this to
11 take place, you had no infrastructure within the
12 Marshall Islands or the other areas where they were
13 tested.

14 And so, one has to really appreciate
15 what the difficulties that existed for rad-safe to
16 protect people.

17 So, in the last statement when I -- and
18 on the page where I said undoubtedly impact by
19 unexpected events, limited resources and adverse
20 operating conditions for rad-safe personnel who
21 were obviously in charge of protecting the workers
22 that included obviously private citizens as well

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 as military personnel.

2 So, with regard to that last statement,
3 I just want to say that our findings that we are
4 identifying today should by no means be viewed as
5 a criticism of the effort by the rad-safe to protect
6 personnel in the PPG but simply I want everyone to
7 realize -- I want to acknowledge the difficulties
8 that NIOSH faces in the reconstruction of credible
9 doses on behalf of claimants.

10 So, this is really -- the objective here
11 is to identify some of the difficulties that are
12 being looked at in our findings that we want to
13 discuss today.

14 Among the limitations that prevent us
15 from a complete dose reconstruction at the PPG for
16 workers was the issue that we do not have any kind
17 of internal monitoring at the time of the PPG. And
18 therefore, this inability to assign internal dose
19 from inhalation, ingestion of fallout that
20 personnel were exposed to, and that includes
21 obviously, fission products as well as unfission
22 weapon-grade fuel, uranium, plutonium.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And as a result of that inability to
2 assess or by any means any potential internal
3 exposure, it was acknowledged early on that the
4 people at -- the workers exposed to it could not
5 be adjusted for internal exposure and, therefore,
6 an SEC was declared.

7 And that brings me up to Finding Number
8 1. So, John, if you want to go to page 14, this
9 is the Review of the Introduction PPG Site Profile
10 and it shows that in Section 1 of the ORAU Site
11 Profile for PPG, it describes that there was an SEC
12 petition and that SEC petition obviously pertains
13 to the fact that internal exposures could not be
14 reconstructed.

15 And it identifies in the first
16 paragraph that these inclusion of non-SEC cancers
17 were based on 250 days of employment and that turned
18 out to be an issue that was the source of our first
19 finding.

20 And it's important to note, as I said,
21 that the PPG Site Profile that NIOSH developed in
22 2006 pre-dates any discussions that we had about

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the issue of 250 workdays.

2 And as a result of that, we identified
3 in the finding, even though we knew that there had
4 already been an adjustment made in the 250 day
5 criteria on behalf of the NTS. And that was
6 clarified when we looked at our Bulletin No. 06-15
7 that's summarized on the next page, 15.

8 What that bulletin by and large then
9 allowed us to do is to say, okay, we don't need to
10 have 250 days for non-presumptive cancers to be
11 included if we can at least demonstrate that they
12 were at least 83 days given the fact that when
13 you're on site for 24 hours that really represents
14 three 8-hour workdays so the 250 day criteria was
15 in fact reduced down to 83 days.

16 But, the other thing that the Bulletin
17 No. 06-15 states, and that's in the second -- the
18 last paragraph on page 15, that by and large says
19 that in determining the actual employment period,
20 the CE must have clear and convincing evidence of
21 a beginning date (hire) and end date (termination)
22 of employment at the PPG.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And it goes on further, where the
2 evidence is not clear and convincing or consists
3 only of film badge data, without the beginning date
4 or the end date he must wait for the policy guidance
5 before proceeding with the verification of covered
6 SEC employment at the site.

7 Now, that poses obviously a problem for
8 most of the people who were obviously at the PPG
9 and who were military, that posed not a major
10 problem. But it does pose problems for people who
11 were non-military, who were civilians and who
12 oftentimes worked for a private company and there,
13 the employment dates are not necessarily
14 available.

15 And so, it goes on in this particular
16 bulletin, it says the National Office of DEEOIC
17 continues to explore methods by which confirmation
18 of employment can occur for workers alleging
19 employment at the PPG.

20 And that gave rise to the next bulletin
21 which is on -- cited on a summary of status site
22 on page 16. And that's Bulletin No. 07-05.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And it once again talks about what this
2 problem concerns and then offers a solution and
3 that solution was considered to be one that was
4 viable for establishing employment dates in the
5 sense that this involves dosimetry assignment.

6 And the bulletin states that the
7 individual film badges were generally issued on one
8 day, one week or one month, depending on potential
9 exposure to the individual. And it goes on
10 typically film badges records would include the
11 issue date and the end date which can be used to
12 account employment periods at the PPG.

13 Now, we will talk about later on what
14 that really infers.

15 MR. KATZ: Excuse me, Hans, this is
16 Ted.

17 I mean, I'm sorry to interrupt on this,
18 but I had a lot of exchanges with SC&A about this
19 topic. This is really a DOL issue. We've already
20 agreed we're going to send a memo to DOL about
21 issues related to how they administer this matter
22 and our information related to that.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 But, it really is not a good use of the
2 Work Group's time to be spending a lot of discussion
3 about this matter. It's not related really to the
4 Site Profile Review.

5 DR. BEHLING: Well, I realize that,
6 Ted. I'm sorry. I wasn't going to spend any time.
7 I just wanted to make mention of the fact that this
8 issue that will be resolved separately involves
9 mission badges and that's all I wanted to say.

10 MR. KATZ: Right.

11 DR. BEHLING: And the only thing I want
12 to say is that mission badges do not represent the
13 conventional form of dosimeters which are usually
14 assigned to a person either on a monthly basis or
15 quarterly basis or any other time.

16 And whenever a person is in an area
17 where there's the potential for exposures, that
18 badge as we know it today will in fact fully under
19 -- provide a measure of not only the employment
20 period but also the full duration of exposure.

21 And that's all I wanted to do here.

22 MR. KATZ: Okay. Thanks.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. BEHLING: And in contrast with that,
2 I'll just add one more statement. This issue that
3 where we just now addressed with the badges that
4 are oftentimes referred to as mission badges, cease
5 to be used in, let's say, this was May 25, 1956 that
6 we introduced a new badging system which involved
7 assigning any person who came on to the PPG site
8 a dosimeter and that was continued to either be
9 replaced or maintained by that person 24 hours a
10 day and until he left.

11 So, starting with the Operation Redwing
12 that commenced in 1956, that issue goes by the way.
13 And I just wanted to bring that to everyone's
14 attention.

15 So, Finding Number 1 is, again,
16 restricted to the issue of changing the Site
17 Profile for the PPG to address the revised time of
18 83 days for inclusion in the SEC, as I mentioned,
19 and the other issue, hopefully, will be addressed
20 by the DOL at some later date.

21 MR. ROLFES: This is Mark Rolfes, from
22 NIOSH. We agree that an update is needed to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 reflect the 83, you know, days where an individual
2 was on site for 24 hours a day.

3 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: You're breaking up.
4 I'm having a hard time hearing you.

5 MR. ROLFES: Okay. Is that any
6 better?

7 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: That's much better.

8 MR. ROLFES: Okay. We agree that the
9 83 days needs to be incorporated into the Technical
10 Basis Document for PPG and so if an individual
11 worked for the day then spent the rest of his time
12 on site for 24 hours a day, if he accumulated 83
13 total days, that would count as 250 workdays and
14 would meet the 250 workday requirement.

15 And we will update the TBD with that
16 information.

17 DR. NETON: Yes, this is Jim. I agree
18 we're going to do that but it really is just for
19 background information only.

20 I mean as Ted suggested, we don't
21 qualify workers for the SEC. We receive cases for
22 dose reconstruction that are qualified already by

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DOL. So, it really would just be for background
2 clarification more than anything. I mean we would
3 never use that number ourselves to qualify someone.

4 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: And Ted, do we know
5 when the DOL is going to respond to us?

6 MR. KATZ: Well, I have -- SC&A is going
7 to send me a memo with just sort of full-fledged
8 information and then I will copy the Work Group,
9 send that memo to DOL and in recent experience,
10 they've been pretty quick to address issues coming
11 from us. So, I expect they'll respond pretty
12 quickly.

13 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Okay. For issue
14 number four then, we're going to wait -- it's
15 resolved in a separate area from DOL, is that
16 correct?

17 MR. KATZ: I'm sorry, I'm not sure --
18 we're talking about issue one I thought just now.

19 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: The Finding Number
20 1, Section Number 4, Finding Number 1.

21 DR. KATZ: Right. So, the DOL issue
22 anyway is not really the Work Group's issue. But

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that I'll take care of independently and keep the
2 Work Group in the loop as to how DOL responds.

3 DR. NETON: Well, Number 1 has been
4 resolved.

5 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Well, Number 1's
6 been resolved then.

7 DR. NETON: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Okay, thank you.

9 DR. BEHLING: Okay, next we have a
10 single Observation Number 1 and that's very easily
11 resolved.

12 The observation really addresses the
13 people that were hired on location and whether or
14 not that they would be qualified for a potential
15 exposure associated with medical x-rays.

16 And my comments were that there was a
17 need for more definitive guidance based on the
18 interim since 2006 when the Site Profile was
19 written.

20 There have been changes to the issue of
21 assigning x-ray doses to personnel where even if
22 the x-ray existed but it wasn't done at an EEOICPA

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 facility that it was not granted.

2 So I raised that as an issue and I think
3 NIOSH responded that they would cancel the
4 ORAU-PROC-0061 criteria and introduce the
5 OTIB-0079 which I believe is going to satisfy that
6 particular observation.

7 MR. SMITH: That's correct.

8 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Any questions about
9 Observation 1?

10 DR. NETON: This is Jim. In general,
11 I guess are we going to follow the protocol that's
12 been followed by like say the Subcommittee on
13 Procedures where we would just put these in
14 abeyance? Is that what we're saying now or?

15 MR. KATZ: Yes, I think so, Jim. I
16 think in these cases where we don't have it spelled
17 out yet in a new document, that's what we would do.

18 DR. NETON: Right.

19 MR. KATZ: Yes.

20 DR. NETON: So, Finding 1 and Finding
21 2 then I have listed as in abeyance meaning we'll
22 revise the Site Profile and I mean some point the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 --

2 MR. KATZ: The finding -- just to
3 clarify, Jim, Finding 1 is simple enough that you
4 can close it because there's no question as to how
5 that gets spelled out.

6 But when you have a finding where you
7 need to see the new text, that's when you put it
8 in abeyance.

9 DR. NETON: Okay, that's good enough.

10 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: So, Observation 1 is
11 in abeyance then, right?

12 MR. KATZ: Yes, I think so, Andy -- I
13 mean Jim.

14 MEMBER ANDERSON: Moving right along.

15 DR. BEHLING: Okay, the next issue
16 addresses Finding Number 2 and that involves the
17 issue of environmental dose.

18 And the term environmental dose may not
19 even be applicable but we'll address it as
20 environmental dose here. It is more likely to be
21 regarded as an occupational external dose, but
22 let's discuss it anyway under Finding 2 what is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 really meant here and what's involved here when we
2 talk about environmental dose at the PPG.

3 In the original PPG Site Profile, there
4 was reference to environmental dose but it applied
5 to other DOE facilities. And the reason being is
6 that many of the people or personnel, civilian
7 personnel, who were part of the PPG workers that
8 we're now concerned with also had affiliations with
9 other DOE facilities at which point they were
10 always also granted exposures that were
11 potentially obtained during that time period when
12 they were at their particular DOE facility.

13 And that included among other things
14 the occupational medical dose as well as ambient
15 environmental dose. But when it comes to the
16 actual environmental dose at the PPG, the Site
17 Profile had very little to say.

18 And that's really the very important
19 one and I think I'm going to spend just a few minutes
20 here discussing why it's very important with regard
21 to keeping that also as part of the occupational
22 dose for people who were exposed at the PPG but who

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 may not have been monitored.

2 And so, from that point of view, I want
3 to go to page 22 if we can.

4 And let's see here, on page 22 -- are
5 we on 22 here? Yes.

6 We have by and large the approach that's
7 taken by the Site Profile for estimating exposures
8 to people who were at the PPG. And in essence, we
9 had, as you see down on the bottom, we had an
10 assessment here for people who were non-DOE
11 participants and I have as an example Operation
12 Greenhouse.

13 And these are taken from Appendix A of
14 the PPG Site Profile and they offer you a
15 distribution of radiation exposures on behalf of
16 non-DoD participants.

17 As you see in the bottom there, there
18 are a total of, let me see, I don't have -- of 551
19 participants, 110 were exposed to zero dose
20 according to the Site Profile and you see the other
21 distributions, 325 were exposed to doses between
22 1 millirem and range of 1 milliroentgen to one

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 roentgen and so on and so on.

2 And I just wanted to make that as a
3 reference point with regard to what is the
4 calculated dose at the 50th percentile which is at
5 the very base, 0.95 rem.

6 Are we on that screen? Let's see,
7 okay.

8 MR. STIVERS: I think you were looking
9 at Crossroads, do you want to go down to the
10 Greenhouse?

11 DR. BEHLING: Yes. I was looking at
12 Greenhouse, I wasn't sure which one you were
13 showing. Oh, that's the -- okay, at the bottom.
14 Okay, yes.

15 Those are the numbers I just cited to
16 you because Greenhouse, I want to reference because
17 it identifies some of the problems that are
18 associated with the failure to accommodate the
19 exposures that come from fallout.

20 Anyway, let's go back. In terms of
21 Greenhouse, this is an example of what the original
22 PPG Site Profile would assign persons from

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 occupational exposure and, as I said, for non-DoD
2 participants of which there were 551 participants,
3 you had the average exposure for that group of
4 individual would have been half of a roentgen of
5 0.5 as you state down there and the maximum on that
6 people was 8.6.

7 But for the 50th percentile value, the
8 occupational exposure would have been assigned of
9 0.95 rem. Okay?

10 And I want you to keep that number in
11 mind because when we now talk about what was the
12 dose perhaps to people who were affiliated with the
13 Greenhouse operation? And were not necessarily
14 even monitored. What might have been their
15 potential radiation exposure from ordinary
16 fallout? Which was obviously not considered in
17 the PPG.

18 And for that, I want to just briefly
19 spend a few minutes just to show everyone what the
20 concerns are. And I want to go to page 30, John.
21 That shows you something that is relevant to that
22 particular issue. If you can raise that up, John,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to show the entire thing?

2 This is Enewetak Atoll which is the
3 Ground Zero for the 42 detonations that took place
4 during the time periods between '46 and '58.

5 And what you see down there are
6 highlighted, the three areas below that are around
7 5:00. And those identify locations, in other
8 words, islands -- the island of Japtan, Parry and
9 Enewetak.

10 And the reason I pointed those out to
11 you is this is where many of the people who were
12 a part of the Operation Greenhouse actually lived,
13 they worked there, they lived here, they
14 essentially spent all times there other than when
15 they were on specific missions.

16 At the same time, when you look at the
17 location of Japtan, Parry and Enewetak, there are
18 a total of four tests that were a part of Operation
19 Greenhouse.

20 And at the very bottom, the first one
21 down there that's highlighted is the Test Dog that
22 occurred on April 7th, '51.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 The second one is Easy which is at the
2 very top. At the very top there you will see Test
3 Easy.

4 And then the third one is in the middle
5 and then that was Test George and the last one's
6 Test Item.

7 And just to give you an understanding
8 of what these facilities looked like that housed
9 these people during this time frame, I would ask
10 John to give you page 31.

11 And the first picture is a picture of
12 what the island looked like for Enewetak Island
13 that is subsequent to -- it used to be called Fred.
14 And you see all the facilities, the buildings,
15 these sort of makeshift buildings that were built
16 specifically for the conduct of these tests in the
17 Pacific.

18 When before 1946, these were islands
19 that were covered by coconut groves and there were
20 no structures there.

21 The one below that is Parry Island.
22 Again, you will see all of the structures that had

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to be placed there. This is where people spent
2 their time. They either lived there, worked there
3 or both.

4 And on the next page, there's Enjebi
5 Camp Greenhouse and there you even see at the lower
6 picture, John, is that is actually just nothing
7 more than a tent city where people actually lived
8 there who worked and spent their time there, 24
9 hours a day.

10 On page 33, this is where we start to
11 see what would have been a potential exposure from
12 background alone, not necessarily covered or
13 registered on film badges.

14 Can you scroll -- move it down a little
15 bit so we get the full -- no, the other way, up,
16 I'm sorry.

17 And what you see here for the time frame
18 between April and May, the cumulative exposure that
19 would have been received had you stayed there for
20 the entire time period.

21 And you realize how much radioactivity
22 had fallen in the form of fallout on Parry Island.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 In more quantitative terms, I want to
2 go to, at this point, to page 35.

3 And this was actually introduced by the
4 Defense Nuclear Agency in the rewrites that took
5 place in 1982 where they reconstructed the doses.
6 And this is going to be a little difficult, but if
7 you follow the diagonal line that says arrival date
8 on Parry Island, you will see that the starting date
9 comes as early as at the far bottom left on the 8th
10 of April. Okay? 8th of April.

11 And if a person came to that island and
12 stayed there for the full duration from April 8th
13 to the 1st of June which is on the far right hand
14 side at the very bottom, John, okay, you see the
15 dose for that individual would have been a total
16 dose of 4.28 rem.

17 And so, what I wanted to point out here,
18 if a person had spent that time frame from April
19 8 to June 1, his exposure for occupational
20 radiation, but was due to strictly fallout for
21 which he was not monitored, would have been more
22 than 4 rem.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And you compare that to what I just
2 previously told you with the occupational exposure
3 that would have been assigned to that person based
4 on Appendix A or Attachment A in the PPG Site
5 Profile, it would have been less than 1 rem.

6 And so, what I wanted to do is dramatize
7 the significance of fallout as part of the exposure
8 that in many instances could far exceed the actual
9 monitored exposure based on mission badges that
10 were defined in the PPG Site Profile by NIOSH
11 earlier that I mentioned was less than 1 rem.

12 So, that, in essence, is what concerns
13 the Issue Number 2, that is the occupational
14 environmental dose that was really not addressed
15 in the original Site Profile and, at this point,
16 I think it needs to be looked at very carefully.

17 And that was not necessarily consistent
18 throughout that whole 60 year period, but it did,
19 in fact, involve certain locations, certain time
20 frames that are documented within DNA documents
21 that should be looked at.

22 And I guess from NIOSH's response, they

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 agree with Section 4 and you see, they will
2 obviously address it in Section 6 of the PPG Site
3 Profile.

4 Are there any other comments from
5 NIOSH?

6 MR. ROLFES: This is Mark and I just to
7 point out also that under the current SEC in the
8 absence of bioassay data, internal dose won't be
9 reconstructed for individuals just because of the
10 SEC.

11 DR. BEHLING: Okay.

12 MR. ROLFES: And I'm mentioning that
13 since you had mentioned both external and internal
14 doses in your findings.

15 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Hans?

16 DR. BEHLING: Yes?

17 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Chairman Lockey.
18 This 4 rem, would you consider that the maximum dose
19 from fallout over the whole period for each time
20 frame or is this B

21 DR. BEHLING: No, this is strictly as
22 the slide shows on page 35. The 4.28 rem was the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 calculation that was done by the Defense Nuclear
2 Agency in 1982 when they revisited their earlier
3 version of the issue that involved Operation
4 Greenhouse.

5 There were two documents that defined
6 Operation Greenhouse. The first issue was
7 released in '51 and then there was a revision to
8 Operation Greenhouse by the DNA in 1982.

9 And they went back and they actually
10 looked at some of the data that they did have
11 available and they reconstructed what the doses
12 were at these three locations, namely the island
13 of Enewetak, Parry and Japtan where I showed you
14 pictures with regards to what these locations
15 within the Atoll of Enewetak, sort of staging
16 areas, as work areas, as housing areas, et cetera,
17 et cetera.

18 And so, they came up with that diagram
19 that I showed you on page 35 that allows you to take
20 any combination of when the person may have come
21 on site during that time frame from April to the
22 beginning of June and when he exited.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Since it's the one that is shown in
2 darker color was one that I actually looked at on
3 behalf of a dose reconstruction that I had to do.

4 In review of the dose reconstruction,
5 I looked at that individual's entry which, as I
6 said, was on -- which indicated as [identifying
7 information redacted], hard to read, and he ended
8 up -- that person ended up leaving on [identifying
9 information redacted].

10 And on that basis, I concluded that that
11 person's unmonitored exposure from fallout would
12 have been 0.94 rem which is exactly what he would
13 have received in addition to the occupational
14 exposure based on what the original PPG Site
15 Profile had that identified the value of 0.95 rem
16 that NIOSH would have assigned him.

17 But that exposure for that duration on
18 Parry Island, he would have also received the same
19 amount dose from unmonitored occupational
20 environmental dose.

21 DR. MAURO: And this is all external,
22 Hans, right?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. BEHLING: All external.

2 DR. MAURO: Right.

3 DR. BEHLING: And the important thing
4 here is to understand one more thing, and that is
5 when we look at the failure to address potential
6 environmental dose that is not monitored is that
7 it was very definitely significant.

8 And here I can say for those three
9 locations that I mentioned, Japtan, Enewetak and
10 Parry, if a person had stayed the full duration for
11 Operation Greenhouse, he would have received a
12 total external whole body dose of about 4 rem or
13 slightly more than 4 rem at each of those locations
14 from fallout.

15 And what is really significant here
16 applies to people who do not have the presumptive
17 cancers because their the internal exposure would
18 have been obviously affected by these large
19 occupational external whole body doses.

20 But, more importantly, for people who
21 might have had a claim with skin cancer, which is
22 not a presumptive cancer, what you also then have

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to add to that dose is the beta dose, that we'll
2 talk about under Finding Number 6, and that can be
3 ten times higher.

4 So, I wanted to emphasize the fact that
5 Finding Number 2 has a very real significance in
6 behalf of presumptive cancers, skin cancers as well
7 as non-presumptive especially the skin cancer
8 where we have to add to the additional dose that
9 we just identified, talked about the much higher
10 beta dose that we will discuss under Finding Number
11 6.

12 MR. ROLFES: Hans, this is Mark. I've
13 got a question.

14 DR. BEHLING: Yes?

15 MR. ROLFES: I presume this is the same
16 case that you had referenced further on in the
17 report for which you did the fallout assessment
18 for? Is this for the same individual that's
19 referenced further on in the report? You said yes?

20 DR. BEHLING: Yes.

21 MR. ROLFES: Okay. We have different
22 employment dates than what you had mentioned. We

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 have an employment end date of [identifying
2 information redacted], 1951. And we also do, if
3 you take a look in the DOE dosimetry records for
4 this individual, I do see that there was a fallout
5 assessment done for this particular individual
6 from Operation Greenhouse.

7 DR. BEHLING: Oh, I remember that.
8 But, this was done with 1951 data, not the 1982 DNA
9 data.

10 MR. ROLFES: Okay.

11 DR. BEHLING: I realize there was a
12 very marginal, I think like 60 millirem assigned
13 to him from fallout.

14 MR. ROLFES: Correct.

15 DR. BEHLING: And he clearly stated he
16 lived or stayed on Parry and Enewetak and he also
17 spent time at Enjebi Island before they were
18 removed because the fact that there was a test
19 conducted on Enjebi.

20 So, I don't believe that that
21 assignment of 60 millirem will clearly prove to be
22 the correct value assigned from fallout.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. ROLFES: Okay. Yet, we can
2 certainly take a look at what you've pointed us to
3 here.

4 MR. STIVER: This is John Stiver. I
5 might also add that the NA unit dose assessments
6 are available at the DTRA website for all shifts
7 and locations for all of the PPG operations. And
8 these are the ones that came out in and basically
9 were published in '83.

10 And in addition to that, I know DTRA is
11 graded in SOP Manual with operation specific
12 appendices which I was involved with before I came
13 to SC&A.

14 Those are not available at this time to
15 the public because they haven't been through an
16 external review. But they are essentially very
17 close to the 1983 reports that are available.

18 And I've been involved in NTPR for a
19 number of years. I can tell you that there's a lot
20 of research and work that went into developing
21 those unit dose reconstructions. And those are
22 probably your best bet for assessing fallout dose

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for people at different locations.

2 DR. BEHLING: Are we done with that
3 discussion?

4 DR. NETON: This is Jim. I was going
5 to summarize.

6 I think Finding 2 is in abeyance and
7 basically all we are going to do there is to defer
8 any dose reconstruction to Section 6 for
9 occupational dose considering that it's all
10 basically occupational dose.

11 DR. BEHLING: Yes. I had mentioned to
12 you, I only brought it up because it was an issue
13 under environmental but, in essence, you can put
14 it in either camp, either environmental or
15 occupational.

16 DR. NETON: I agree. I think we kind
17 of jumped in to the next finding really. It's
18 getting into the reconstruction of the doses in
19 general.

20 DR. BEHLING: Yes. Finding Number 3
21 is a broad sweeping finding that deals with what
22 was the priority of the monitoring that was done?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And there was many, many problems which
2 I discussed in Section 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 and I don't
3 want to go through -- go over all of those things,
4 but what I want to do is perhaps just summarize
5 those things, some of the issues that I brought up.

6 And that summary is presented in
7 Section 7.4.1 on page 41 and 42.

8 Okay, the bottom of page 41 starts and
9 I just want to briefly go over and among -- we've
10 already mentioned the use of mission badges.

11 For those who are not necessarily
12 familiar with it, mission badges were those that
13 were assigned early on because of the shortages of
14 film dosimeters.

15 Understand, again, I want to go back.
16 In the case of Operation Crossroads, we had 42,000
17 personnel on location and many of these were
18 obviously required to have monitoring done.

19 But monitoring done was oftentimes
20 limited to select tasks when a person had to go to
21 retrieve instruments on the very island where a
22 surface detonation took place.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 They were oftentimes then brought with
2 amphibious ships on to the shore of that island and
3 then on a time basis, go in there, grab that thing
4 and bring it back for us for analysis.

5 And so, the badge for that particular
6 task would be issued on the morning of that day and
7 would be retrieved from that person at the end of
8 the day and that was it. And it would oftentimes,
9 they would subtract and background radiation that
10 was not affiliated with that particular task.

11 And those were the mission badges that
12 we are obviously concerned about and have discussed
13 under Finding 1 that will obviously be an issue that
14 the DOL will have to wrestle with.

15 But, mission badges were one of the few
16 things that oftentimes were monitored. And so,
17 what was not monitored was the very issue that we
18 brought out under Finding Number 2, namely the
19 continuous exposure 24/7 when there was
20 significant fallout for personnel who were living
21 and staying on these other Atolls.

22 So, mission badges obviously were only

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 assigned for select tasks and for a very
2 restrictive time periods. And moreover, mission
3 badges were not assigned for everybody. As I said,
4 they were only there for those people that we
5 considered or they considered were very likely to
6 experience high radiation dose fields for select
7 tasks in hand. On page 42, that summary continues.

8 The other issue was that if you read
9 through some the DNA report was the practice of
10 cohort badging. And cohort badging refers to the
11 practice where, again, for reasons that these film
12 dosimeters were not always there in large supplies.

13 As I said, when you had tens of
14 thousands of people to monitor and oftentimes these
15 badges have to be not only retrieved, issued,
16 retrieved, but then they had to also read these
17 badges and assess their readout and then
18 redistribute it again.

19 And when you do that for that many
20 people, you realize you can't do this at a low
21 multiplication. All these facilities were
22 obviously makeshift land facilities or onboard a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 ship.

2 So, what they did in order to be able
3 to at least provide some measure of protection for
4 workers was to engage in cohort badging where one
5 person would wear the badge such as the rad-safe
6 person who was actually overseeing the activity of,
7 let's say, 50 to 100 men and whatever that person
8 would register on his badge would also apply to the
9 entire cohort which would not necessarily be an
10 accurate assessment but, perhaps, a representative
11 assessment.

12 But another problem with cohort badging
13 is that not always would the people who were part
14 of the cohort identified. So, in essence, what you
15 had was a person who had the benefit of a cohort
16 exposure but not necessarily was documented in the
17 records that he was part of that cohort. So,
18 that's another major issue.

19 And in the next bullet, the cohort
20 badging oftentimes was not necessarily even
21 recorded. At the time, there was limited concern
22 about getting a definitive assessment of exposure

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 but, perhaps, avoiding any exposure that was
2 considered less than safe.

3 And what is the maximum permissible
4 exposure, MPE, which is on the second bullet on page
5 42, that value turned out to be about 100 millirem
6 per day. So, in essence, oftentimes people were
7 monitored strictly to avoid any exposure in excess.
8 And if the daily exposure was below that, then it
9 was fine.

10 And that exposure was oftentimes
11 recorded by a dose-rate instrument. So, there
12 wasn't even a film badge involved that would serve
13 as a permanent record. But, it was strictly a
14 dose-rate instrument that was monitoring the area
15 where personnel worked and, if on a basis of the
16 time frame that these people were in there, would
17 suggest a dose for that day of less than a 100
18 millirem, they were in compliance with the MPE
19 values.

20 So, those were sometimes the mechanism
21 by which the rad-safe people applied their practice
22 of controlling radiation exposure among workers.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Film badge, there were issues that I
2 discussed in these other Section 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 that
3 dealt with how these film badges were calibrated
4 and processed and how they were interpreted.

5 And there were instances I cite where
6 some of the film badges, we always consider film
7 badges to have a limit of detection of around 40
8 millirem. In some instances, as documented and I
9 took verbatim statements out of the DNA reports,
10 some of those badges had an LOD of 400 millirem.
11 Below that, they were not considered reliable.

12 There were other issues regarding
13 decontamination efforts where exposures was not
14 necessarily one that was captured on a film badge
15 but involved skin contamination.

16 Clearly one of the most obvious
17 instances was the estimate of Operation Crossroads
18 where during the Test Able, a total of 67 ships that
19 had been amassed in the lagoon of Bikini were
20 exposed to radiation that came from a bomb that was
21 dropped 550 feet above them with the intent of
22 seeing how these naval vessels would respond to a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 nuclear sub.

2 And of course, as a result of that,
3 these vessels were heavily, heavily contaminated
4 and people would go out there and pretty much then
5 decontaminate them, oftentimes wearing nothing
6 more than short pants and maybe a pair of shoes.

7 And they would also get obviously
8 contaminated on their skin as well as on their
9 clothing and, again, that is contamination --
10 external contamination that was not captured.

11 So, all of these things were discussed
12 here and they by and large constitute Finding
13 Number 3. And there is a fairly extensive response
14 on the part of NIOSH.

15 Let's see here, does anybody want to
16 comment from NIOSH regarding the response for
17 Finding Number 3? Mark?

18 MR. ROLFES: Let's see, I'm just going
19 to go ahead and read through the response here.

20 It says, NIOSH understands that there
21 are deficiencies related to the film badge
22 dosimetry data and procedural practices identified

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 by the NRC in 1989 and SAIC in 1989 through 2006
2 as well as Perkins and Hammond in 1980.

3 In light of these deficiencies, NIOSH
4 finds it intractable to achieve more accurate dose
5 assessments than those provided by the Defense
6 Nuclear Agency and reduced in Attachment A of ORAU
7 Technical Basis 52 with realistic uncertainty
8 ranges.

9 Many of the data have been lost or never
10 captured to make such an effort feasible.
11 However, the next revision of the Technical Basis
12 Document will include a revision to Attachment A
13 to provide the 95th percentile doses as
14 appropriate.

15 And then we've got a reference to see
16 Findings 8 and 9 below.

17 For cases where occupation on the
18 various islands documented in the dosimetry
19 records and their stay times are known, either by
20 personnel badges --

21 Sorry, I just realized I had it on
22 speaker phone. I'm talking into the receiver so

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 hopefully you can hear me a little bit better now.

2 Let's see, where did I leave off?

3 Let's see, okay.

4 -- either by personnel or cohort film
5 badges or reentry logs, additional dose can be
6 calculated in accordance with the information
7 provided in Figures 7-6 through 7-10 and added to
8 doses assigned using Attachment A to account for
9 unmonitored exposure to fallout.

10 It should be noted that during
11 Operation Castle in the first half of 1954, the 85
12 to 90 percent of all personnel were issued
13 operational film badges. In addition, all
14 personnel involved in the reentry activities were
15 also issued mission badges that were read at the
16 end of each mission.

17 For Operation Wigwam on May 15, 1955,
18 and all subsequent tests at PPG, 100 percent of all
19 personnel were issued operational film badges. In
20 addition, all personnel involved in reentry
21 activities were also issued mission badges that
22 were read at the end of each mission.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. BEHLING: Yes, and I think that
2 pretty much satisfies the concern. As I mentioned
3 beforehand, some of the issues that we are
4 identifying on behalf of the findings were not
5 issues that proved they were throughout the entire
6 16 year period.

7 But oftentimes were issues that
8 confined to a certain number of years in the early
9 years and ceased to be a problem later on,
10 especially the issue when in 1956 all personnel who
11 came on site were issued film badges for the full
12 duration of their stay at the PPG.

13 So, one had to realize that not all
14 these findings have relevance to the entire 16 year
15 period.

16 And in context, the recommendation to
17 use the 95th percentile dose that are part of the
18 Attachment A, it's the original PPG Site Profile,
19 that certainly raises the bar considerably for a
20 coworker dose in the event that there are no
21 additional exposure data available for that
22 individual.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Any other comments
2 about that?

3 DR. BEHLING: Okay.

4 MR. KATZ: I guess, can I just check
5 with you, Andy, and the other Board Members,
6 though? So, how does this finding stand for you
7 all in terms of the context that addresses his
8 concern, but he's speaking for SC&A?

9 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Jim Lockey. I think
10 I'm fine with this. If we're going to use the 95
11 percent where additional data is not available, it
12 sounds like that data is available after '54. Is
13 that correct, Jim?

14 DR. NETON: No, we're going to use the
15 95th percentile of the mission badges that were
16 summarized in Attachment A and they were recorded.
17 Then we'll add any additional dose that we may find
18 or the fallout doses as Hans indicated particularly
19 in Figure 7-6 through 7-10 if we have that
20 information.

21 Oftentimes we don't have that kind of
22 specific information for these folks. It's a lot

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 more sketchy. But if it is there, that's what we
2 will do. We'll modify the Site Profile
3 accordingly.

4 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: And what about after
5 1954?

6 DR. NETON: After '55 they were
7 operational badges.

8 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: And that's the data
9 you used then, correct?

10 DR. NETON: That's a good question.
11 Gene Rollins is on the phone, I'm not as familiar
12 with the data as he is, I think.

13 MR. ROLLINS: It should be after -- at
14 starting with Wigwam, everybody was issued a badge.

15 DR. NETON: Right.

16 MR. STIVER: This is John. I might be
17 able to help out a little bit here.

18 That is correct, after Wigwam and it's
19 particularly in their PPG operations starting with
20 Redwing.

21 All the participants had permanent
22 badges and any additional mission badges they got

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for a particular activities like retrieving
2 instrumentation and so forth were worn with the
3 permanent badge.

4 So basically, it's going to be like
5 raisins in the pudding. I mean whereas in their
6 earlier years, they didn't have those permanent
7 badges so we had the mission badges which reflected
8 activities that did not include the fallout but
9 particular occupational activities would then have
10 to be added to the fallout dose to get the full
11 picture.

12 DR. BEHLING: And like I said, you
13 know, the issues that I addressed with regard to
14 some of the problems involving the calibration,
15 involving issues that were oftentimes fraught in
16 the design of the film badge.

17 One of the major concerns that they
18 encountered were the very, very adverse conditions
19 that the Pacific Ocean and the latitude presents,
20 and that is the high humidity and the constant high
21 temperatures that these badges and oftentimes
22 badge failures that were commonplace in those days

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 cannot be rectified.

2 So, you have to simply live with the
3 fact that, you know, they were certain deficiencies
4 in the program, the design of the badges, the
5 calibration of the badges and so forth.

6 And we can't make a change to that. We
7 have to simply accept that that as part of the
8 compensation as NIOSH has been doing through --
9 offer here, is to use the 95th percentile value.
10 Because we can't go back and change what happened.
11 We can't undo certain problems involving faulty
12 calibration procedures or anything else.

13 But I think the benefit of doubt can be
14 given by using the 95th percentile as the coworker
15 value that may be appropriate.

16 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: One more question
17 about Wigwam. So, we have -- so, in 1955 with
18 Wigwam when people were issued operational film
19 badges, was that carried through when they went
20 back to their personal headquarters? Sleeping
21 headquarters, et cetera? Were those badges -- did
22 they maintain those badges during that time?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. BEHLING: Yes, they did. From
2 what I gathered, when they were assigned, the
3 people were actually asked to keep them on their
4 person for the full duration, 24 hours a day.

5 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: While they were in
6 the area no matter what they were doing?

7 DR. BEHLING: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Okay, thank you.

9 MR. KATZ: So then, Work Group, is this
10 finding in abeyance?

11 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Let's go around.
12 Andy?

13 MEMBER ANDERSON: I think so.

14 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Loretta?

15 MEMBER VALERIO: Can you hear me?

16 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Yes, I hear you now.

17 MEMBER VALERIO: Okay. I believe that
18 it is in abeyance.

19 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Jim Lockey. I
20 agree.

21 MR. KATZ: Okay, thanks.

22 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Go ahead, Hans.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. BEHLING: Okay. Finding Number 4,
2 the issue there is one of, let's see here, in the
3 PPG in Section 6 of the original NIOSH PPG Site
4 Profile, the statements that the assignment of
5 unmonitored dose to participants who did not
6 receive a dosimeter should be evaluated.

7 Now, I don't know what that really
8 means. Again, it should be evaluated but can it
9 be reasonably evaluated by someone who is a dose
10 reconstructor without some additional guidance and
11 additional information? And that is really the
12 concern I had with regard to Finding Number 4.

13 So, that beyond the recommendation that
14 an unmonitored dose should be evaluated, NIOSH
15 really should provide some additional guidance as
16 well as information that may be used by the dose
17 reconstructor to do this.

18 MR. ROLFES: This is Mark, Hans. In
19 the next revision of the Site Profile, we'll revise
20 the statement to read as follows.

21 It says, covered employees that
22 participated in the various Pacific Proving Ground

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 operations and were not badged can be assigned
2 coworker doses as outlined in Attachment A.

3 DR. BEHLING: Okay. Now, is this the
4 coworker dose that is referenced above under
5 Finding 3, the 95th percentile value?

6 MR. ROLFES: That's correct, as
7 appropriate.

8 DR. BEHLING: Okay. So, I'm going to
9 just add that to my list here, 95th percentile value
10 for coworker. Okay.

11 Okay, item --

12 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Hans, are you happy
13 with that?

14 MR. KATZ: Hans, do you agree with
15 that?

16 DR. BEHLING: Oh, yes, yes. I wasn't
17 sure that I was being asked here. Yes, as I said,
18 if the 95th percentile coworker dose and, again,
19 I think there should be an additional statement
20 that if there's any exposure that's associated with
21 significant fallout as was the case with Operation
22 Greenhouse, I think that also should be included

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in unmonitored exposure.

2 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: As an add-on?

3 DR. BEHLING: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Right? Okay.

5 MR. KATZ: Does the Work Group?

6 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: I'm fine with that.

7 I vote for abeyance.

8 MEMBER VALERIO: I agree that it's in
9 abeyance, too.

10 MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes, I agree. We're
11 not closing out much.

12 MR. KATZ: Well, abeyance is
13 effectively closing it. I mean the reason I'm
14 trying to capture this, too, is because this
15 relates to work being done by the Dose
16 Reconstruction Subcommittee. And if we get these
17 in abeyance then closure, then they can move
18 forward with --

19 MEMBER ANDERSON: Okay, that's --

20 MR. KATZ: -- sited work.

21 MEMBER ANDERSON: I don't think
22 there's anything more for us to do other than to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 --

2 MR. KATZ: Right.

3 MEMBER ANDERSON: -- verify that it's
4 occurred.

5 MR. KATZ: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: That's correct.

7 MR. KATZ: Okay, thanks. Hans?

8 DR. BEHLING: Okay. Finding Number 5,
9 the issue here is one where I think the PPG Site
10 Profile recommended the assignment of 30-250 keV
11 for external photon dose.

12 And when I look at the average energy
13 from fission products that are obviously the
14 principle source of the external photon dose, the
15 average photon dose is more along the lines of 700
16 keV.

17 And when I look at the radiation
18 exposure geometry, when you have fallout, it occurs
19 over the infinite plane, meaning that if you're
20 standing on infinite plane and fallout is all
21 around you, front, back, side, you are in essence
22 exposed to a rotational isotropic exposure

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 geometry.

2 And when I look at the DCF values in
3 Implementation Guide 1 for all organs, you were
4 inclusive of skin dose, you will find that the DCF
5 value is consistently higher for the exposure
6 geometry of isorotation for a 250 keV photon dose
7 as opposed to 30-250.

8 MR. ROLFES: This is Mark. And I'll go
9 ahead and start with the response here that we have.

10 And that is that, although the
11 isotropic or rotational geometries might be more
12 realistic, the general approach taken in our dose
13 reconstructions is to apply the dose conversion
14 factor which yields the highest Probability of
15 Causation.

16 And with the exception of the lungs,
17 esophagus, red bone marrow and bone surfaces which
18 are referenced in Guide 1, Section 4.4, the highest
19 dose conversion factor is typically associated
20 with the 30-250 keV photon energy range and the AP
21 geometry when we're converting exposure to organ
22 dose as you would with the film badge.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 In addition, that's described in Table
2 5A of the NIOSH IREP Technical Documentation, the
3 radiation effectiveness factor is significantly
4 higher for photons in the 30-250 keV energy range
5 compared to the greater than 250 keV energy range.

6 These two factors lead to the
7 recommendation given in Section 6.

8 DR. BEHLING: Well, I don't agree with
9 it. If you look at the DCF for rotation and ISO
10 for any organ and, I'm looking at the exposure R
11 to organ. In other words, a roentgen to rad dose
12 value, the DCF's the higher for the two 250 keV.

13 MR. SMITH: Well, this is Matt Smith
14 with ORAU team.

15 I'm looking at the same things. I
16 picked the colon just to grab an organ that doesn't
17 have any correction factors that need to be applied
18 per the IG.

19 And, you know, if we take a look at what
20 the AP DCF would be with the colon, it's a value
21 of about 1. It's 1.06 at 30-250 keV.

22 Now, if we were to assume a geometry of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 exposure that is either rotational or isotropic,
2 it certainly could be the case in the conditions
3 that are discussed here, the highest value would
4 be, as you said, for greater than 250 keV, it would
5 be a value of 0.720 and that would be for a
6 rotational assumption.

7 Certainly, if you look at rotational on
8 its own as a geometry assumption, the 30-250 value
9 would be .68 and the greater than 250 would be .72.

10 So, certainly, choosing that higher
11 energy range would be appropriate if he were just
12 going to go with limiting your assumption to
13 rotational.

14 But, as Mark said, on this program from
15 a very early date, we've gone ahead and gone with
16 an assumption of the DCF that gives us in most all
17 cases a higher dose. And in this case, that would
18 be using a DCF of 1 under the AP 30-250 criteria.

19 And also, per the IREP Technical Guide,
20 when you're in that mid-range photon category,
21 you're getting a greater REF factor which affects,
22 you know, which drives the PoC higher.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. BEHLING: Yes. Well, as I said,
2 when I look at the historical data in some of the
3 DNA documents, they oftentimes mix roentgens, rad
4 and rem interchangeably and so it's very difficult
5 to see what you're really measuring.

6 I realize some badges were used but were
7 they calibrated in units of roentgens or rem or rads
8 or rems? I don't know.

9 MR. SMITH: Well, we're certainly
10 assuming exposure or --

11 DR. BEHLING: Okay.

12 MR. SMITH: -- the quantity being
13 measured in the field.

14 DR. BEHLING: I guess I would consider
15 this a minor issue given the uncertainty of the
16 dosimetry program as a whole and then I think we
17 can possibly put this just away and not spend a lot
18 of time addressing that particular issue.

19 DR. MAURO: This is John. Just a quick
20 question. Is this explanation you just gave in the
21 Site Profile or is this something -- a position you
22 have taken, of course, more recently and will be

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 applied in this circumstance?

2 MR. ROLFES: This is Mark. And this is
3 something that has been done essentially from day
4 one when converting exposure to organ dose.

5 The only change to it essentially is the
6 accepted four organs which we had mentioned here,
7 the lungs, the esophagus, red bone marrow and bone
8 surfaces.

9 DR. MAURO: Okay, so, then this
10 description is in the current Site Profile?

11 MR. ROLFES: It wouldn't be in the Site
12 Profile.

13 DR. MAURO: Oh, okay.

14 MR. ROLFES: It would be in our
15 Implementation Guideline B

16 DR. MAURO: Okay.

17 MR. ROLFES: -- or in dose
18 reconstructors instructions on how to interpret
19 the --

20 DR. NETON: But it does say -- this is
21 Jim -- to use the 30-250 keV energy range which is
22 claimant-favorable. I mean I think we've

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 established that, that this is a
2 claimant-favorable approach. I don't think
3 there's any modification required here.

4 DR. MAURO: So, 30-250 and AP is your
5 approach to the dose conversion factor strategy
6 for, let's say, this large surface area
7 contamination?

8 MR. STIVER: I think this would be an
9 isotropic or I think you can also probably use the
10 --

11 DR. NETON: No, you could -- if you went
12 for isotropic or rotational, you would end up with
13 a lower --

14 DR. MAURO: Lower dose, yes.

15 DR. NETON: -- lower dose. I mean --
16 (Simultaneous speaking.)

17 MR. STIVER: We're going to go with
18 whatever geometry gives you the highest dose in the
19 most claimant-favorable outcome.

20 DR. NETON: But -- in almost all cases,
21 it will be 30-250 AP geometry with the exception
22 of the lung, esophagus, red bone marrow and bone

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 surface.

2 DR. MAURO: Oh, okay. Well, unless
3 anyone else -- the way I see it is that you're taking
4 the most bounding set of assumptions.

5 DR. NETON: That's the idea.

6 DR. MAURO: Yes. Okay, got it. Thank
7 you.

8 MEMBER ANDERSON: Even if it perhaps
9 doesn't most accurately reflect what it actually
10 was?

11 DR. NETON: Well, we just don't know.
12 I mean, yes, it could be it's more likely
13 rotational, but we don't know. I mean --

14 MR. ROLFES: Yes, we certainly agree
15 that the exposure geometry could be different than
16 the AP geometry, but the AP geometry is essentially
17 giving us a dose conversion factor two times higher
18 than the isotropic and a little bit higher than the
19 rotational for the colon for the organ that Matt
20 Smith had mentioned when converting exposure to
21 organ dose.

22 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: So, how do we resolve

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this? Is the SC&A willing to say they accept the
2 NIOSH approach here?

3 MEMBER ANDERSON: Or the NIOSH
4 explanation?

5 DR. BEHLING: Yes, I think it's one
6 that we will go along with, the approach that NIOSH
7 is taking.

8 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Okay.

9 MR. KATZ: So, the Work Group Members?

10 MEMBER ANDERSON: That's fine with me,
11 yes. I understand the rationale.

12 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Jim Lockey. I do
13 too. I'm fine with that.

14 MEMBER VALERIO: This is Loretta. I'm
15 fine with that as well.

16 MR. KATZ: Okay, good. Thanks. Back
17 to you, Hans.

18 DR. BEHLING: Okay. Finding Number 6,
19 and this is a very important one here for at least
20 a couple of special cases and that involves the
21 beta-gamma dose ratios.

22 If we go to on page 44, John, we will

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 see what was at least in a summary fashion
2 recommended in behalf of supplying a beta-gamma
3 dose ratio for those instances where we had a deep
4 dose available.

5 And in that particular table there, you
6 see is Table 7-3, gives you an understanding of what
7 the ratio was between beta and photon for various
8 time frames following a detonation.

9 So that between zero and 50 days after
10 detonation, if you had a dose rate that -- or a dose
11 measurement that involved a photon deep dose, the
12 beta dose or the beta dose rate would be a factor
13 of ten higher.

14 And again, you see on that table, there
15 were different time frames, 50-365 days, one to
16 five years greater and five years.

17 The latter years are not really
18 relevant with regard to the PPG. These were --
19 these tables were developed for the Nevada Test
20 Site.

21 When you a facility such as the PPG
22 where you had, especially in later times,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 detonation after detonation, what you have to
2 understand is the dose rate for both gamma and beta
3 diminishes exponentially.

4 And so, if you have a detonation that
5 took place, let's say, two months ago, and then you
6 were subject to a fallout from a recent one a day
7 or two old detonation, the fallout from that, the
8 ratio may increase for the beta-gamma for the
9 earlier one because of the time frame.

10 But the actual absolute quantity in
11 terms of dose or dose rate would be so severely
12 diminished so as not to really contribute very much
13 to the new dose that was generated from a detonation
14 yesterday where the beta to gamma ratio was only
15 a fact of ten as opposed to, let's say, 25.

16 And so, what we really have to focus
17 here with regard to PPG is the beta-gamma ratio of
18 ten because of the large number and frequency of
19 detonations.

20 But anyway, what I wanted to -- there
21 are much more detailed information in the Nevada
22 Test Site Profile in Appendix C, I believe.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 But what I really wanted to point out
2 here with regard to my finding was that the
3 refinement that you could introduce here for skin
4 doses that involve certain parts of the body and
5 that is defined by a document that was published
6 in Health Physics by Barss and Weitz in 2006 and
7 that is on page 45. And that is really the issue
8 that I wanted to bring up here.

9 And what they have here is also a ratio
10 that is defined by time from everything from a
11 fraction of an hour all the way to two years.

12 But in addition to that, there is also
13 the distance from the plane source to a particular
14 part of the external body.

15 And so, you see distances from one
16 centimeter to 200 centimeters. In other words, a
17 six foot person or more would be essentially, you
18 know, or more than that, a basketball player would
19 reach that height.

20 But when you have, for instance, a skin
21 cancer that occurs at the level of the knee or the
22 calf, you will might also then have a secondary way

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of increasing or defining that dose based on the
2 lower level that would obviously represent a higher
3 dose than that's represented by the dose ratio in
4 Figure 7.3 or 7-3 that we just looked at.

5 And so, I wanted to just introduce that
6 table and this, in fact, introduced, I believe, in
7 the NTS Site Profile.

8 Now, one of the things that I really
9 wanted to bring out here, however, and that is much
10 more important than this refinement that
11 identifies the height above the plane ground as
12 given here in Table 7-4 by Barss and Weitz is the
13 fact that I looked at the NTS Site Profile and on
14 page 49 of that Profile, it gives you yet another
15 option and this is an option that was, in fact,
16 exercised by the dose reconstruction that I
17 audited.

18 And when I looked at that, I sort of was
19 concerned that this might be used more frequently.
20 I don't know how much it was used in existing cases
21 where there was a need to assess the beta components
22 of a photon exposure.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 But on page 49, and I'll just read it
2 to you, there -- I don't have it available, so I'm
3 going to have to read it for portions that are
4 relevant here.

5 It says on the second paragraph of page
6 49 it states in the NTS Site Profile the following,
7 no routine beta monitoring data exists for NTS
8 prior to 1966. For the time period from 1966 to
9 1987, 368 of data pairs were identified from 84
10 claim files with positive beta and gamma results.

11 In other words, between 1966 and 1987,
12 there were claims filed where there was both a
13 photon dose and a beta dose. And they paired those
14 and they said on the basis of that pairing, the 50th
15 percentile beta to gamma dose ratio was 1.04
16 essentially unity, 1-to-1, and the 95th percentile
17 was 4.59.

18 And in the case that I looked at, they
19 actually assessed the person with a skin melanoma
20 and there they assigned a beta to gamma dose of 1
21 unity, one.

22 And I looked at that and the use of NTS

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 data that involves empirical data, they apply to
2 NTS but understand one thing, when I looked at these
3 paired beta and gamma dosimeter readings that
4 occurred between 1966 and 1987, you have to realize
5 that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty that says no more
6 atmospheric testing was signed on September 24,
7 1963 and was enacted in October 10, 1963.

8 So that even the earliest of those
9 paired -- of beta-gamma doses were essentially
10 established three years after the test ban treaty
11 and up to, obviously, 20-some years later when we
12 talk about 1987.

13 Not to mention the fact that people at
14 NTS were not camped out out there where they
15 detonated in years past prior to, you know, 1963
16 and were exposed to purely fallout.

17 So, I would recommend very strongly
18 that the issue or the option to assign a beta to
19 gamma dose ratio of one, that might be applicable
20 for the other years at NTS should not be used for
21 PPG.

22 I mean, after all, the pictures that I

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 showed earlier, these people were there in the
2 aftermath of Operation Greenhouse that had four
3 detonations in rapid succession over a period of
4 two months= time frame and they were exposed to
5 fresh fallout. That is it. I mean there was no
6 alternative.

7 At NTS a person might have had their
8 badge exposed to radiation that had nothing to do
9 with fallout, but may have been exposed to
10 radiation sources inside buildings as opposed to
11 sitting out there in the field.

12 So, the most important point I want to
13 make here is that goes outside the finding that I
14 had for Finding Number 7, but in essence, I wanted
15 to make sure that the use of a beta-gamma ratio that
16 was in fact used in a dose reconstruction, a PPG
17 dose reconstruction, actually did use the issue of
18 the 360-some badges, paired badges, that showed a
19 50th percentile value of essentially 1.0 in terms
20 of beta to gamma, and I hope that that will not be
21 used.

22 MR. ROLLINS: This is Gene Rollins. I

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 own both of those documents, the NTS and the PPG.
2 And I agree with you entirely and I think it's
3 wholly inappropriate to use the 1.04 at PPG and
4 we'll be making changes to the TBD to make sure that
5 doesn't happen again.

6 DR. BEHLING: Okay. Okay, Finding
7 Number --

8 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: So, before we go on,
9 then from the Board's perspective, any other
10 questions about Finding Number 6?

11 MEMBER ANDERSON: No, I don't.

12 MEMBER VALERIO: No, I don't. I was
13 just taking some notes, no.

14 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Okay, so we're -- and
15 Ted, we're in abeyance with this also?

16 MR. KATZ: Yes, that sounds right.

17 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Okay.

18 MR. KATZ: Thanks. Hans?

19 DR. BEHLING: Okay, where are we here
20 now? This is Finding Number 7, okay.

21 My Finding Number 7 comes in context
22 with the statement that I paraphrased on page 45.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 John? Okay, are you on page 45, John? Okay.

2 Okay, Statement Number 5 that I can read
3 for you here. Statement Number 5 appeared in
4 Section 6 of the PPG Site Profile and states the
5 following.

6 Assign missed dose based on the number
7 of exchanges found in the dosimetry records.
8 During these tests there were operation badges that
9 were worn for the entire test sequence, and so
10 forth.

11 By the way, you realize afterward,
12 we've talked about the use of a photon badge
13 assignment did not occur until about 1956 or so time
14 frame. So, when we talk about assignment of missed
15 doses, one cannot really rely on that statement
16 because these badges were oftentimes not
17 available, if they were available at all.

18 And when they were available prior to
19 '55 may have been associated with a mission badge.

20 And so, the missed dose as it's stated
21 here, the assignment of a missed dose which would
22 not necessarily apply here.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And this obviously is more important
2 when we talk about exposures that were not
3 monitored at all.

4 So, my reference to the issue of the
5 missed dose here based on that guidance is the
6 Finding of Number 7.

7 And also, I wanted to -- there was a
8 correction. If I go back, that was the second
9 issue, and that, I have to go back to page -- oh,
10 John, if you can go back to page 22? That was
11 another part of that issue.

12 Okay, one of the things that I looked
13 at was the actual calculation of the 50th
14 percentile.

15 If you look at the equation up top here
16 that says 50th percentile is the sum of A times B
17 over C and you look at that and then you realize
18 what A times B can represent and when you look at
19 the bottom of the -- and this is for each cell that
20 is for each of the cells A and B and over C.

21 For each of the cells, if you go to the
22 bottom of that page, John, you will see, for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 instance, that one of the things that you look at
2 for each cell, the first cell has 0R. And I pointed
3 out that there's no such thing as a 0R, it's below
4 LOD.

5 And so, what in effect that really
6 should mean, and that's given on page -- go back
7 now to page 47 where I made use of that example --
8 if you go back to page 47.

9 There you have the, let me see, so, and
10 you have the first cell as zero dose and the second
11 cell as 1 milli-R to 1-R and so forth.

12 The first two really should be adjusted
13 in the sense where you have zero to 0.04-R and it
14 may mean that that's the LOD and the second cell
15 should be 0.04 to 1-R and those should be the one
16 -- those should be the values that should be applied
17 to the equation that I showed you on page 22.

18 And I'm not sure the response to that.
19 What was the response? I'm not sure that there is
20 a response.

21 For, let's see here, as I said, they
22 actually bridge both Finding 7 and 8. As far as

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Finding 7, I said that the guidance for assigning
2 missed dose is based on assumption and not
3 supported by facts, and that really references the
4 issue of mission badges and an issue that may
5 involve coworker data that if it is available.
6 That's really Number 7 and the issue of the 50th
7 percentile value is really Finding Number 8.

8 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Number 8. So, we've
9 addressed in 8 the 95 percentile?

10 DR. BEHLING: Yes, yes. I think for
11 Number 8 that minor error involving that
12 calculation is obviously no longer the issue if you
13 assign the 95th percentile value.

14 With regard to Finding Number 7, I'm not
15 sure I know what you can do to identify missed doses
16 when you have a time period when mission badges were
17 assigned when exposure was defined by a cohort
18 badge or, worse yet, a dose-rate instrument that
19 may have assigned a dose because there are no film
20 badges assigned.

21 We think they don't represent film
22 badges or missed doses. You don't know what they

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 are.

2 So, when we talk about missed dose, we
3 always talk about the film badge that comes back
4 as below LOD. In those cases -- in all instances,
5 I believe, throughout the time period, film badges
6 were routinely processed with the subtraction of
7 background doses. So, you don't really have
8 anything to work with in terms of film badges coming
9 back zero.

10 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Okay.

11 DR. BEHLING: I'm not sure what you can
12 do about that. Obviously this is an inherent
13 problem when you have obviously for many years
14 monitoring that was done by cohort badging by
15 dose-rate instruments or, in many instances, there
16 was no monitoring.

17 DR. NETON: Well, Hans, this is John.
18 I think we're going to have to talk about the
19 difference between missed dose and unmonitored
20 dose. I mean in the finding here you're
21 specifically talking about missed dose which is a
22 badge that was read that has no recorded dose on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 it.

2 DR. BEHLING: Yes, as I said, the fact
3 is they subtracted background anyway. In which
4 case you would almost have -- if a badge had nothing
5 above the background -- I would see what they had
6 were lots of film badges that were distributed to
7 people as mission badges, et cetera and then there
8 were badges that were also kept on location which
9 were subject to fallout.

10 I read DNA reports on behalf of
11 Operation Greenhouse where they processed some of
12 the badges on locations that were subject to fairly
13 high fallout and background radiation that was
14 substantial.

15 And what they would then do, is take
16 those badges that had not been assigned, use them
17 as control badges and subtract the radiation that
18 was -- the dose that was registered on the so-called
19 control badges from those that were issued.

20 So, you would almost invariably end up
21 with a dose that was zero if there wasn't any
22 significant dose other than what was already

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 registered on the control badges subject to
2 fallout.

3 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: So, Jim, how do we
4 handle -- this doesn't seem like you can answer this
5 question, is that correct?

6 DR. NETON: I'm not sure where we go.
7 I guess I'm still a little confused as to what the
8 finding is here. I mean --

9 DR. BEHLING: Well, you know, the
10 finding of it, Jim, is essentially was based on the
11 following statement, I read Statement 5 on page 45
12 that says assign missed doses based on the number
13 of exchanges found in the dosimetry records.

14 Well, you know, that's the
15 recommendation that applies to conventional DOE
16 facilities where you have an exchange rate and
17 there may be instances where in a person's
18 dosimetry record you will find that there are doses
19 that involve film badges or TLD badges that came
20 back with zero.

21 In that which case you say, well, what
22 was the LOD for that particular time frame for a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 film badge? And you would say, well, it was 40
2 milli-R and if it came back zero, you'd take the
3 midpoint and assign him 20.

4 Well, that kind of policy doesn't work
5 for PPG where the routine film badges were not even
6 assigned on a routine basis. And therefore, you
7 know, what you do is reduce the assigned doses when
8 this guidance, as I read it to you, really just
9 simply doesn't apply.

10 DR. NETON: Well, but the next sentence
11 I think recognizes what you just said which it says,
12 also compare the total of the recorded doses plus
13 the missed dose to the 50 percent dose in Attachment
14 A and assign the larger dose.

15 So that accommodates, I think, what you
16 were just discussing is that we don't really know
17 the missed dose very well so we'll look at the
18 values in Attachment A and use the larger of the
19 two numbers.

20 DR. BEHLING: Well, I can say it seems
21 the two badges were worn, you know, I don't see that
22 either as a probability since both badges were to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 be worn at the same time, only one's there. I mean
2 these people weren't assigned two badges.

3 You talk about a time frame when a
4 full-time badge was assigned in addition to perhaps
5 a specific task where they wanted to just in a very
6 discrete way identify what was the dose associated
7 with that particular task which would be recorded
8 on both the full-time badge and the mission badge
9 that was assigned simultaneously for that
10 duration. That didn't occur until many, many
11 years later.

12 MR. KATZ: So, it sounds like what Hans
13 is saying is, is you might as well drop this
14 guidance because there's nothing to implement
15 here.

16 DR. BEHLING: Exactly, exactly.

17 MR. KATZ: Right.

18 DR. BEHLING: Yes, I think we should
19 just simply ignore that guidance because I'm not
20 sure you can do anything about that.

21 DR. NETON: Okay.

22 DR. BEHLING: So, I think we covered --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: So, I'm sorry, before we
2 move on, does this cover Finding 7?

3 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: So, the results are,
4 we're going to ask NIOSH to drop this guidance. Is
5 that correct?

6 DR. BEHLING: I think so. There's no
7 way you can implement this guidance, at least not
8 in the first ten or so years, from '46 to '56.

9 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Yes.

10 MR. KATZ: So, I think Jim just said
11 okay to that.

12 MEMBER ANDERSON: Just dropping it and
13 doing nothing, is that better than --

14 MR. KATZ: Well, there's nothing to do
15 for that period, '46 to '56.

16 MEMBER ANDERSON: Oh.

17 MR. KATZ: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: All right, so we'll
19 drop the NIOSH guidance from '46 to '56, but it's
20 applicable after that, correct? Correct?

21 MR. KATZ: That, I'm not going to
22 answer. I can't answer that but that sounds like

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 what Hans was --

2 MEMBER VALERIO: So, Ted, I have a
3 question. Can you hear me?

4 MR. KATZ: Yes.

5 MEMBER VALERIO: Why the '56 date? I
6 got lost on that when under Finding Number 3 it does
7 say that on May 15th of 1955 and also for ten tests
8 at the Pacific Proving Ground they were issued film
9 badges? So, why the difference in the years? I
10 got lost there between '55 and '56.

11 MR. ROLLINS: We should be able to
12 start using that guidance with Wigwam which is in
13 '55.

14 MEMBER VALERIO: Okay.

15 MR. ROLLINS: Everybody was 100
16 percent badged at Wigwam and from there forward.

17 MR. STIVER: One thing to keep in mind
18 for Wigwam is that really it wasn't in the PPG, it
19 was about 400 miles south of San Diego and it was
20 a deep water detonation, an underwater detonation
21 for a one day event.

22 And so, you don't have this issue of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 fallout. There wasn't mission badges versus
2 permanent badges.

3 MEMBER VALERIO: Okay.

4 (Simultaneous speaking.)

5 MR. STIVER: Yes, in the NTPR program
6 beyond '56, you know, we've run in to quite a few
7 situations where there were zero readings and we've
8 used the same approach, the half of the NDL. So,
9 I think at that time, it's actually a situation
10 where you deal with the detection limit of the
11 badge. It's not a matter of what we see earlier
12 where they're subtracting out really large fallout
13 doses from the contaminated controls.

14 MEMBER VALERIO: Okay, thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: So, Loretta, so were
16 the dates between '46 to '54 or '46 to '55?

17 MEMBER VALERIO: See, I would say, well
18 --

19 MR. STIVER: From an administrative
20 standpoint, I would say up to '55 because at that
21 point everybody's badged.

22 MEMBER VALERIO: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. ROLLINS: Yes, the middle of '55 is
2 when they made a decision to badge everybody.

3 MEMBER VALERIO: Right, and that's the
4 date that I'm looking at.

5 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: All right, so drop
6 the NIOSH guidance from '46 to June of '55 and
7 except -- just drop it from '46 to June of '55. Is
8 that an appropriate date?

9 MR. ROLLINS: Now, you're sticking up
10 this guidance that we put in a response here?

11 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Yes, from looking at
12 Finding Number 7.

13 MR. ROLLINS: Okay, now, what would we
14 do up to June of '55? What would be your
15 recommendation there?

16 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Well, what I heard
17 from -- what I heard was that the NIOSH -- we really
18 couldn't apply the NIOSH guidance to those earlier
19 years. It would be impossible to do that, so why
20 mention it?

21 MR. ROLLINS: I understand that, but
22 how did we account for the dose?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. BEHLING: Well, I agree, again,
2 with the fact that it can't be applied when you
3 don't offer a film badge dosimeter routinely on a
4 monthly basis or whatever time and during the early
5 years up until '55, '56, mission badges were
6 issued.

7 And from mission badges, all background
8 exposures were subtracted. So, you don't really
9 have the option of saying what's a missed dose? I
10 mean they were -- they only selectively assigned
11 mission badges and from those, the background from
12 fallout was subtracted anyway.

13 So, I think there is no way to even deal
14 with missed dose because they don't exist. I mean
15 missed dose is the only dose as we normally applied
16 to those film badges or TLDs were the processing
17 of that badge turns out to be a value that is below
18 LOD, and that didn't exist there.

19 MR. ROLLINS: Okay, so, what I'm
20 hearing is that we need to put a statement in the
21 TBD that says prior to June of '55, missed doses
22 cannot be reconstructed.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. BEHLING: There are no missed
2 doses. Yes, it can't be reconstructed since there
3 are no missed doses. They didn't issue badges and
4 then send them back and said, oh, your badge was
5 below LOD and we record it zero. That doesn't
6 exist. So, there's no point in injecting that.

7 MR. KATZ: Right, there's a
8 distinction between it's not -- cannot be
9 reconstructed is that they don't exist.

10 DR. BEHLING: They don't exist,
11 exactly.

12 MR. ROLLINS: Okay. We can put that
13 statement in there.

14 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: But July 1st '55 on,
15 we can do that?

16 DR. BEHLING: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Okay.

18 MR. KATZ: So, is that good with all the
19 Board Members?

20 MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes.

21 MR. KATZ: Okay. Okay, thanks.

22 Hans?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. BEHLING: Yes, and you know, I kind
2 of garbled Finding Number 8.

3 I had mistakenly identified Finding
4 Number -- I've got so many documents here on my desk
5 it became very confusing.

6 But Finding Number 9 has already been
7 addressed and that is the issue that we discussed
8 under the issue of assigning zero to 40 millirem
9 in cell one and 40 millirem of milli-R and 40
10 milli-R to 1-R in cell two.

11 That was actually Finding Number 9, the
12 last one and I'm looking at NIOSH's response and
13 they said Attachment A will be revised to ensure
14 the coworker dose approach follows the guidance of
15 ORAU-OTIB-20 with respect to the treatment and
16 inclusion of potential missed doses.

17 I guess that does address potential
18 missed doses when you have that first cell in that
19 calculational methodology on page 22 that says cell
20 one was really zero.

21 Well, it's zero to some value up to 40
22 millirem. And if I look at the guidance that was

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 issued in the -- let me just take a look here, go
2 through my shelf here -- I mean I look at the film
3 badge, there's symmetry in atmospheric nuclear
4 tests that were done by the National Research
5 Council, they at least consistently talk about a
6 40 millirem LOD value.

7 I think that should be either amended
8 so that the zero should be replaced with a solid
9 zero to 40 millirem because that is the designated
10 LOD value that is cited commonly for all operations
11 during the atmospheric testing period in the PPG.

12 And so, the second cell should also
13 then read instead of 0.01-to-1 R, it should read
14 0.04-to-1 R, and therefore, any calculations as
15 defined on page 22 that I'd previously shown to you
16 in the -- that comes from Appendix A from the PPG
17 Site Profile, that calculation methodology should
18 amend those cells that have zero in the first cell
19 and then some value that is less than 40 millirem
20 as the starting point for cell number two.

21 I'm not sure, does anybody -- everybody
22 follow me or am I --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. NETON: This is Jim, Hans. I don't
2 think it'll make a huge difference in the --

3 DR BEHLING: No, it won't make a huge
4 difference and I'm not sure, Jim, tell me what is
5 OTIB-20 again?

6 DR. NETON: Matt Smith probably knows
7 that better than I do.

8 MR. SMITH: Yes, this Matt Smith of
9 ORAU team.

10 OTIB-20 is the, I'll call it kind of
11 like guidance document, that sets forth the
12 methodology to do external coworker analyses. It
13 kind of gives the layout --

14 DR. NETON: It certainly includes the
15 guideline on using missed dose in the calculation.

16 DR. BEHLING: Okay, okay. If a missed
17 dose.

18 But, in this case, I think we can use
19 real numbers because, as I said, according to the
20 National Research Council and their study of all
21 of the nuclear tests that were done in the PPG, they
22 consistently cite 40 millirem as the LOD for the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 film badges used, so you can use that.

2 So, cell one would then become 0.0 to
3 0.04 R and the second cell from 0.04 to 1 R and then
4 use that equation as defined on page 22 of my report
5 would then apply than using the numbers that are
6 currently identified for calculation.

7 It's a marginal difference admittedly.

8 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Okay, any other
9 questions? So, then I see 8 and 9 similar, both
10 in abeyance, is that correct?

11 DR. BEHLING: Yes, I think so.

12 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: You like those
13 numbers? Andy?

14 MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes, okay.

15 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Loretta?

16 MEMBER VALERIO: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Before I give this
18 up, anything else we need to cover today?

19 MR. KATZ: Hans?

20 DR. BEHLING: No, as I said, I think the
21 major outstanding issue that I'm hoping we can
22 resolve is the issue that's now going to be in the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 hands of the DOL.

2 MR. KATZ: Right, right.

3 (Simultaneous speaking.)

4 MR. KATZ: And I understand that and I
5 will copy the Work Group and SC&A, everybody as I
6 do that as soon as I get the memo from SC&A to work
7 with.

8 DR. BEHLING: Yes, and just -- if I can
9 take a couple of minutes, I can at least offer
10 something here with regard to that issue. Stop me
11 if you think I'm, you know, talking out of hand here
12 or out of turn.

13 But, you know, when you have even
14 mission badges as was defined in the second
15 bulletin, you can at least do one thing. One thing
16 is for sure we do know, when a person is assigned,
17 let's say, over a six month period, let's assume
18 he was truly there for six months and he was
19 assigned a mission badge.

20 Let's say he was there for March to
21 September and he was assigned one mission badge in
22 March and he was assigned a mission badge in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 September or August sometime towards the end of
2 that six month period.

3 One thing we do know, that that's a
4 given, we don't have to be or make any assumptions
5 that when people were assigned there, as I had
6 mentioned to you before, the Marshall Islands is
7 in a remote part of the world and in the 1940s, there
8 was no commercial air flight there. There was no
9 landing strips for commercial airlines. People
10 were transported there by ship mostly, military
11 ships and so forth.

12 And when they were there, if a person
13 was there for six months and his first badge was
14 assigned, let's say, in March, you can be very sure
15 that person is there until the second -- at a
16 minimum, the second badge was issued because they
17 don't shuffle people around for a day trip or for
18 a single assignment of a day task that involves a
19 mission badge.

20 So, one of the things that should be as
21 a minimum applied when, if in the end, we can only
22 establish employment periods on site by virtue of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 badges in the early days which would have involved
2 mission badges, then at least accept the fact that
3 any time interval between two successive missions
4 badges that were assigned was also time spent on
5 site. That, as a minimum, is just a no-brainer for
6 me.

7 And so, if we have to assist the DOL on
8 that issue in understanding that people weren't
9 shuffled back and forth for a single day's worth
10 of work where a mission badge was assigned, in all
11 likelihood, that person was there the full duration
12 between mission badges as a minimum and there may
13 be times before and after the first and the last
14 mission badge that he was there. But as a minimum,
15 you can conclude that he was there between the time
16 frame of two successive mission badges.

17 So, it's just, you know, a
18 recommendation that I would at least pose to them
19 if it turns out that they are really no other ways
20 to establish employment periods at PPG if the only
21 option is to use mission badges as they were issued
22 during the earlier years of the PPG time frame.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: Right. Hans, if you just
2 lay out everything as clearly as possible in the
3 memo and I will get that to DOL.

4 DR. BEHLING: Will do.

5 MEMBER VALERIO: Okay, Ted, this is
6 Loretta, I have a quick question.

7 MR. KATZ: Yes?

8 MEMBER VALERIO: What -- I don't know
9 what the likelihood and it's kind of hard for me
10 to wrap my mind around it, is say a cafeteria worker
11 would be issued a mission badge, how are they
12 verifying those employments for those claimants?

13 DR. BEHLING: Well, that's a good
14 question. And then for people who were never
15 monitored, you're kind of, you know, Holmes &
16 Narver, I'm very familiar with Holmes & Narver,
17 I've worked with some of those people, they have
18 pretty good records in terms of employment.

19 But there were some people inclusive of
20 Marshallese who were used oftentimes for doing
21 menial kinds of things and I can guarantee you
22 there's no employment records for those

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 individuals.

2 And I'm sure there were people who were
3 hired at various locations for whom we don't have
4 a documented employment record and they may not
5 have been ever issued a single dosimeter.

6 Now, the question is, would they also
7 be among the claimants who are at this point of
8 concern? I don't know.

9 I mean I'm sure that any person among
10 the Marshall Islands is who oftentimes did work for
11 the AEC in those days. But, you know, I don't think
12 you have any claims coming from that direction.

13 But there may be, as you just mentioned.
14 A person who was there who provided food services
15 and preparation of things like where he was never
16 in a position where a mission badge was assigned
17 to them. That's possible.

18 MEMBER VALERIO: Right, but they still
19 -- there was a potential of exposure to fallout.

20 DR. BEHLING: Absolutely. As I had
21 mentioned, just for Operation Greenhouse, if a
22 person had stayed at any of those four locations

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for the period of April and May, two months, he
2 would have potentially been exposed to around 4 rem
3 and that dose -- that exposure is not recorded
4 anywhere other than in a reproduced document that
5 DNA put out in 1982.

6 And if he can prove he was there, he
7 would obviously be in a position to take credit for
8 that exposure. But the fact is, is there any
9 record for that individual at this point in time?
10 I don't know.

11 MEMBER VALERIO: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Good question. I
13 don't know, how do we handle that, Ted?

14 MR. KATZ: Well, there's nothing to
15 handle here, I mean, really. This is -- the DOL
16 will have as much information as they have
17 available to make these, you know, 83 day
18 determinations and that'll be that. That's really
19 their territory.

20 So, all we can do is give them some
21 guidance on for the information they have
22 available, how to use it and that's what we'll be

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 doing. But there's -- it's a DOL issue, it's
2 really, it's not our issue and it's -- you can't
3 -- there's nothing to be done in the absence of
4 information, I mean for some situations.

5 I don't how DOL handles that and, you
6 know, guys, you're welcome to inquire with DOL how
7 they handle that but it's really, it's not
8 something for the Board to struggle over.

9 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Okay. Any other
10 questions or issues that somebody wants to raise?

11 Okay, the action forwarded then is,
12 what, wait until hear back from DOL?

13 MR. KATZ: Yes, I will copy you on my
14 correspondence with them including their response
15 and then you'll get to see what goes on there.

16 And it's been a lot of time since, you
17 know, since Hans did the review in the first place
18 and, who knows, you know, what DOL is doing right
19 now anyway.

20 So, you know, they may already be doing
21 things that have sort of remediated the situation.
22 I have no idea.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: Very good.
2 Anything else we need to cover today?

3 MR. KATZ: No, but I want to thank --
4 I thought this was very efficient and great job on
5 everybody's part. So, I just want to thank you all
6 for that.

7 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: I concur, thank you,
8 everybody for their time and effort.

9 DR. BEHLING: Thank you.

10 MR. KATZ: And have a good weekend.
11 Have a good holiday weekend.

12 CHAIRMAN LOCKEY: You too. Take care,
13 bye-bye.

14 MEMBER VALERIO: Bye.

15 MR. KATZ: Take care. Bye-bye.

16 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
17 went off the record at 3:34 p.m.)
18
19

NEAL R. GROSS

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