

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

+ + + + +

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL
SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND
WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

120th MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
DECEMBER 14, 2017

+ + + + +

The meeting convened at 8:30 a.m.,
Mountain Time, in the DoubleTree by Hilton
Albuquerque, 201 Marquette Avenue Northwest,
Albuquerque, New Mexico, James M. Melius, Chair,
presiding.

PRESENT:

JAMES M. MELIUS, Chair
HENRY ANDERSON, Member
JOSIE BEACH, Member
BRADLEY P. CLAWSON, Member*
R. WILLIAM FIELD, Member
DAVID KOTELCHUCK, Member
WANDA I. MUNN, Member
JOHN W. POSTON, SR., Member*
DAVID B. RICHARDSON, Member
GENEVIEVE S. ROESSLER, Member*
LORETTA R. VALERIO, Member
TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official

REGISTERED AND/OR PUBLIC COMMENT PARTICIPANTS

ADAMS, NANCY, NIOSH Contractor
BARTON, BOB, SC&A
BLAZE, D'LANIE
BURGOS, ZAIDA, NIOSH
CALHOUN, GRADY, DCAS
DOMINA, KIRK
FITZGERALD, JOE, SC&A
GRIFFON, MARK
HUGHES, LARA, DCAS*
HINNEFELD, STU, DCAS
JACQUEZ-ORTIZ, MICHELLE
KINMAN, JOSH, DCAS
LIN, JENNY, HHS
NETON, JIM, DCAS
RUTHERFORD, LAVON, DCAS
STIVER, JOHN, SC&A
TAULBEE, TIM, DCAS

NEAL R. GROSS

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

Table of Contents

Welcome and Roll Call.....	4
Review Status of Area IV Santa Susana Field.....	6
Laboratory SEC Petition-00235.....	6
Petitioner Comments.....	24
Board Work Sessions.....	37
Work Group Comments.....	48
SEC Issues.....	53
Subcommittee on Procedures Review.....	54
Public Comments.....	63
Adjourn.....	66

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

2 (8:30 a.m.)

3 **Welcome and Roll Call**

4 MR. KATZ: Good morning, everyone,
5 Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health,
6 second day of our meeting. Just morning, at our
7 meeting today. The main feature is Santa Susana,
8 Field Laboratory Area IV, SEC Petition. But we
9 also have a Board work session following that.

10 So for folks on the phone who want to
11 follow along with the presentation. The
12 presentation's posted on the NIOSH website Board
13 section, schedule of meetings, today's date. So
14 you go there and you can find that presentation,
15 PowerPoint presentation.

16 You can also on the agenda, it lists the
17 Skype connection for a web connection if you want
18 to see the slides move as they're changed here in
19 the room, that's there. And also background
20 materials for today are also posted on the
21 website, if you want to see those.

22 Let's go through -- we have no conflicts

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of interests so I don't need to address those as
2 we go through Board Members, but the few Board
3 Member roll call. I'll just go down
4 alphabetically.

5 (Roll call)

6 MR. KATZ: Okay well, we have a quorum.
7 So, we're good to go. And let's just remind
8 people on the phone to mute your phones. Press
9 *6 to mute your phone. And it's also *6 to take
10 the phone off of mute. Thank you.

11 CHAIR MELIUS: Okay. Start here in a
12 second. Just for the Board work session, we will
13 be going over the August public comments. So,
14 take a quick look at those, it would be helpful.

15 But before that, we'll finish up the
16 Work Group and Subcommittee reports. And I also
17 want to give the time to finish up Savannah River.

18 So I at least want to get updates from
19 Tim and SC&A, Joe, on what our next steps are.
20 The timeframe for those next steps. So we'll do
21 a little bit of planning on that. So you know
22 what's coming. And we'll finish by 11:00.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So, and Phil's not here. So, John
2 Stiver is doing a presentation on peer review of
3 the Santa Susana recent petition.

4 **Review Status of Area IV Santa Susana Field**
5 **Laboratory SEC Petition-00235**

6 MR. STIVER: Yes, good morning,
7 everybody. I'm John Stiver from SC&A. And today
8 we're going to be talking about our review of the
9 Evaluation Report for SEC Petition-235, for the
10 Santa Susana Field Laboratory. From SC&A, Doug
11 Farver and Bob Barton have been working on this.
12 Bob is here, and so if you have questions, we can
13 refer to him.

14 Let's go ahead and get started. These
15 are the Work Group Members. I believe we're all
16 acquainted here.

17 Okay, let's start off with a little bit
18 of a background on the petition itself. In August
19 2016, Petition SEC-235 received for Class, which
20 was all employees of North American Aviation, to
21 include corporate successors and subcontractors
22 who worked at Area IV of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 SSFL from December 31, 1964 through the present.

2 In February of 2017, NIOSH qualified the
3 petition for a limited Class, which was all
4 employees who worked at Area IV SSFL from August
5 1, 1991 through June 30, 1993.

6 And the petition qualified for
7 evaluation based on lost, falsified, or destroyed
8 dosimeter data due to the site's use of a
9 contractor, Controls for Environmental
10 Pollution, or CEP, for providing internal
11 dosimeter data for the period August 1991 to June
12 1993.

13 In August 2017 at the Board meeting in
14 Santa Fe, SC&A was tasked to provide a focused
15 review of the petition. But to really check
16 NIOSH's position that the lack of data for that
17 short evaluation period, did not affect your
18 ability to perform sufficiently accurate internal
19 dose reconstruction for monitored or unmonitored
20 workers.

21 And in November of 2017, we delivered
22 our report to the Work Group, titled A Focused

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Review of NIOSH SEC-00235 Petition Evaluation
2 Report for the Santa Susana Field Laboratory Area
3 IV.

4 And then on December 4th, just a little
5 over a week ago, the Work Group met to discuss
6 our report and the path forward.

7 Now there are three previous classes
8 that have been added to the SEC for SSFL. In
9 2009, Petition 93, for '55 through December 31st,
10 1958. And Petition 156 from January '59, through
11 December 31st, 1964. And then finally SEC
12 Petition 234 which extended the Class from
13 January 1st '65, through December 31st 1988. So
14 basically the entire operational period up
15 through 1988.

16 Now let's just talk a little bit about
17 our review findings in general. We found the
18 employee monitoring and workplace monitoring data
19 was sufficient to bound external exposures. And
20 let me just back up. All of those previous SECs
21 were based on inability to reconstruct internal
22 doses. It was never an issue regarding external

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 dose. And we found the same things for this
2 current SEC petition.

3 Our review of the available
4 documentation didn't indicate any significant
5 changes in the nature of radiological work or any
6 unusual events or occurrences during that SEC
7 period that would preclude dose reconstruction.

8 The bioassay obtained during the
9 remediation period did not exceed that from
10 operations. In other words, the pre-1988 data
11 are proposed for use in dose reconstruction. And
12 basically there are data available outside the
13 CEP period from '89 up to '91, and then post '91
14 as well.

15 So you have kind of two pieces to the
16 remediation period with kind of gap in the
17 middle, and then you have the pre-'88 internal
18 dose coworker model.

19 Let's see, we also found that extending
20 uranium, plutonium, and mixed fission product
21 intake rates as proposed in the OTIB-80 likely
22 bound the potential intake rates during the CEP

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 period for those radionuclides. With a caveat,
2 which we'll get into at little bit later,
3 assuming it is adequately established via air
4 sampling that conditions did not appreciably
5 change.

6 And one of the main reasons we're kind
7 of focusing on air sampling data -- don't want to
8 jump too far ahead here -- was that the main
9 source of exposure during D&D work is obviously
10 that being airborne particulates stirred up
11 during operations.

12 We thought it was important to take a
13 look at that. Even though NIOSH is hanging their
14 hat on the bioassay where the rubber meets the
15 road. So we're looking at those.

16 Remaining areas of concern, our review
17 of OTIB-80, which was delivered back in November
18 of 2014, identified several findings relevant to
19 the '91 to '93 period. And none of those findings
20 that have been made up to today have actually
21 been resolved. And it's also not clear how NIOSH
22 is going to reconstruct internal exposures to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 other actinide contaminants, such as americium
2 and thorium, during the evaluated period.

3 And just keep in mind that inability to
4 reconstruct intakes for those two radionuclides
5 is that basis for SEC Petition-234, which would
6 consist of the period of the operations, tail end
7 of the operation period.

8 As I mentioned earlier, we also
9 suggested a comparison of general air and
10 breathing zone data from the 1991 to 1993 period.
11 The other D&D data, the period right before and
12 after that. And also the operational period,
13 mainly as an assurance that radiological
14 conditions are sufficiently similar or bounding
15 for use in internal dose assessment.

16 NIOSH does propose to use the internal
17 coworker data from the operations period to
18 reconstruct intakes during the SEC period. And
19 when we were doing review, it kind of left us
20 scratching our head. Because it's kind of a
21 unique way of using a coworker model during the
22 operations period for a later period when types

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of activities are different.

2 So it's in a way, it can be thought of
3 as kind of straddling this gray area between
4 traditional gap analysis, where you might have a
5 couple of years where you've got no data but you
6 have good data before and after that.

7 You know by process knowledge and other
8 research that conditions didn't change during
9 that gap. So, then you can use the data before
10 and after to kind of bridge that gap.

11 But then you also have this idea
12 that well, you know, we've got this data. This
13 coworker model during the operations period.
14 We're going to apply to D&D activities after the
15 operations.

16 Well, you know, we thought about that.
17 Is that really a surrogate data issue? It's
18 really not according to the strict definition of
19 the Advisory Board, taking data from one facility
20 and using it for another. Here we're taking it
21 from the same facility.

22 We've got the same source terms, the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 same mix of radionuclides, we just have different
2 activities during the period in question,
3 compared to what's going on during the operations
4 period.

5 So, given that, I mean we were okay
6 using that even though to my knowledge, I've
7 never seen that particular approach proposed. So
8 I mean, we may have done that, and Jim would
9 probably be able to answer that question.

10 OTIB-80 -- get back to OTIB-80 -- was
11 approved in March 2014 and provides intake values
12 for plutonium, uranium, and fission products.
13 The plutonium intakes were developed for '65 to
14 '88, uranium for '65 to -- excuse me, plutonium
15 '65 to '86, uranium for '65 to '88, and the
16 fission product from '65 to '91. As I said
17 earlier, we reviewed and submitted our review
18 report in November 2014, with a total of 15
19 findings.

20 Now what findings, if any, are still
21 relevant to the SEC-235? We found that some of
22 the original findings were obviated by SEC-234.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Those were Findings 4 and 11. Others are no
2 longer relevant because OTIB-80 has not been
3 updated to reflect the
4 time-weighted-one-person-one-statistic or TWOPOS
5 approach to coworker model. And that would be 5,
6 8, and 10.

7 And most of the remaining findings
8 center around the calculation of the coworker
9 intakes during the operational period. They're
10 probably not really relevant to the SEC. But
11 still are applicable to Site Profile issues.

12 These included for example, combining
13 years of data in order to get a statistically
14 valid sample. The IMP guides I believe are
15 suggesting around five years. I think we're at
16 a period of about 27 years of learning from this
17 period.

18 But anyway, be that as it may, I don't
19 really want to go into that right now. The other
20 was interpretation of "less than," so in the
21 bioassay results and inclusion criteria for
22 usable bioassay results.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 There's only one finding we felt that
2 was still relevant to this particular SEC. And
3 that was of other potential radionuclides,
4 tritium, thorium, americium. And as I said
5 earlier this Finding 15 was really what prompted
6 NIOSH to go take a closer look and really was
7 what prompted the SEC-234. We feel that's
8 relatively valid.

9 The SEC-234 is granted based mainly on
10 the inability to reconstruct internal exposures
11 to thorium and americium during the operational
12 period. And the current SEC evaluation does not
13 discuss this. It's silent on this potential
14 source term or the methods for reconstruction,
15 doses of radionuclides during potentially
16 relevant D&D activities.

17 Based on our discussions, December 14th
18 meeting, NIOSH has agreed to evaluate the
19 exposure potential to these contaminants and if
20 necessary develop methods to reconstruct internal
21 exposures to them.

22 Air sampling data during the SEC period.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I think this is important to look at. Those types
2 of data are available for most radiological areas
3 during the SEC period. For example the Rockwell
4 International Hot Laboratory, the Radiological
5 Materials Disposal Facility, and the SNAP
6 facilities, System Nuclear Auxiliary Power
7 Facility.

8 The Hot Laboratory data are available
9 throughout SEC period. Other areas have partial
10 data due to regulatory recommendations at the
11 time. Other relevant air sampling may be
12 available but has not really been researched and
13 codified, developed at this point. As I said,
14 because NIOSH is relying on the bioassay data for
15 the coworker.

16 However, be that as it may, NIOSH has
17 agreed to determine the availability of air
18 sampling records and evaluate relevant records to
19 assure that radiological conditions during the
20 SEC period are sufficiently similar to other D&D
21 activities, and are effectively bounded. So
22 basically, it just provides kind of an assurance

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 value. Just kind of a second corroborating set
2 of data, to say, yes, we're pretty confident that
3 radiological conditions didn't really change
4 during this two year period.

5 Next, we've got to move on to another
6 aspect. We looked at the affected claimants for
7 this evaluation period. We found a total of 30
8 claims. One more had been submitted since the
9 NIOSH Evaluation Report was released. We took a
10 look at the claims for CATI information that
11 might have been relevant to the SEC discussions.

12 We found that there was one incident
13 described, demolition work, but it wasn't clear
14 that there were radiological hazards present. It
15 was just based on, you know, health hazards.

16 We didn't find any information in the
17 CATI reports that would indicate significant
18 changes in work practices or the general
19 radiological environment during the SEC period.
20 We thought that was quite important. And we have
21 kind of a limited sample size.

22 Several claims did indicate that they

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 were monitored externally and/or internally.
2 However, no corresponding monitoring records, DOE
3 records, were identified in the files. Of the
4 monitoring records that were found, the DOE
5 records, the internal data, the whole body counts
6 were 5 of 29. The reason there was only 29 is
7 because that last claimant, the data had none.
8 They received -- external data was available for
9 10 of the 29.

10 Our survey found that of the current
11 population, 11 of 30 would likely require a dose
12 reconstruction if it is deemed feasible. The
13 others have already been compensated or have been
14 administratively pulled.

15 And we also looked at the past dose
16 reconstruction methods for these claimants. For
17 internal dose, whole body counts were used when
18 available. And then, environmental internal
19 exposures or program-wide guidance documents,
20 like OTIB-2 and OTIB-18 were applied.

21 For external dose, obviously personal
22 monitoring data were used, or not available. And

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 when not, ambient external exposures, or some
2 combination of the two were adapted.

3 Our recommendation in regard to the
4 claimants is if dose reconstruction is deemed
5 feasible, we felt it would be beneficial to the
6 Board to review some example dose
7 reconstructions. Either real or hypothetical,
8 just to understand how NIOSH would implement
9 their new internal and external coworker dose
10 assignments. Note, that we don't consider this
11 a Site Profile issue.

12 Now for a path forward, there were
13 basically four things that came out of our
14 meeting, the summary, whatever I talked about.

15 First is that NIOSH is going to review
16 and summarize the available reports, extract
17 summary air sample information for relevant
18 facilities for the remediation period, post-1988.
19 And as I said this is to rule out any
20 abnormalities in the exposure potential during
21 the CEP period, as well as before and after.

22 They're going to present this and in a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 paper. And I believe there are a lot of quarterly
2 summary reports available. So, it's not really
3 going to be a granular study in any regard. But
4 trends will be available, if there are any there,
5 to show abnormalities.

6 Issue 2, NIOSH is going to provide more
7 detail and relevant references on the nature of
8 the source term for thorium and americium during
9 the residual period, based on the continuation of
10 possible feasibility as it's seen as the basis
11 for SEC-234.

12 NIOSH is also going to provide the
13 sample dose reconstructions for the CEP period,
14 after Issues 1 and 2 have been discussed and
15 resolved.

16 And then finally, the petitioner
17 provided a lot of additional information that may
18 be relevant to this SEC, just before the December
19 4th meeting. And so, NIOSH and SEC are going to
20 review that information and then report out.

21 That's really all I have to say. I'll
22 take any questions you have, Mr. Chair.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIR MELIUS: Okay. Board Member
2 questions for John? David.

3 MEMBER RICHARDSON: So you pointed out
4 the difference between the types of activities
5 and types of controls during operations periods
6 versus seen non-operations periods. And one of
7 the examples that came on the CATI was demolition
8 work.

9 And I guess what this is making me just
10 think about is could you describe a little bit
11 more? These are quarterly samples, quarterly
12 summaries of air sample gathering, routine air
13 sampling? Or is this task based on specific air
14 samples, the way you would do for an asbestos,
15 for demolition work? Was that --

16 MR. STIVER: I'm not really sure what
17 data are available at this time. That's really
18 one of the reasons that NIOSH is going to go back
19 and look at it and see what's there. It's kind
20 of a corroboration.

21 MEMBER RICHARDSON: I guess, I mean you
22 could imagine, it being very reassuring in a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 sense if you've got area monitory placement in a
2 few places. But performing tasks which have the
3 potential to kick up or generate.

4 MR. STIVER: Oh, absolutely. I mean you
5 could have highly concentrated localized air
6 concentrations.

7 MEMBER RICHARDSON: And we've seen that.

8 MR. STIVER: Individual lists, and then,
9 you know, ten meters away hardly any. Depending
10 on which way the movement was. And there's going
11 to be a lot more uncertainty and air stability.
12 But what we're looking for is not really -- I'll
13 tell you, whoever reviews this thing, that NIOSH
14 is not going to use this data for dose
15 reconstruction, but just a sort of a secondary
16 check.

17 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Right.

18 MR. BARTON: Just to clarify a little
19 bit. On those quarterly reports, we took a look
20 at a few of them, examples. And they contained
21 both area monitoring and job specific breathing
22 zone samples. And there will be averages over

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the quarter. They also show some maximizing
2 results, and results that are above a certain
3 amount.

4 They also talk a lot about respiratory
5 protection. That's why we felt they would be
6 very useful as a weight of evidence to really
7 address the notion that things didn't change
8 during this two year window that we're talking
9 about.

10 And the other thing I wanted to clarify
11 is when we talk about the types of jobs and
12 processes not changing, it's actually from the
13 radiation period before, during the period we're
14 talking about, and after.

15 We see no evidence of significant
16 project changes or anything that would give us
17 cause that there's some strange activity going on
18 that's very different from the surrounding
19 activities, or necessarily the operational
20 period.

21 But again, we felt that since that air
22 sampling data, at least there's some of it there.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 There may be even more there, and to not do a
2 vigorous statistical analysis on it. But again,
3 you see trends. And if there was any red flags
4 in there, I think you might see that too, which
5 is why we suggested it. It was not a finding.
6 It was a suggestion.

7 Again, just to provide more information
8 and assurance that we're on solid ground here.

9 CHAIR MELIUS: Additional questions from
10 Board Members? No.

11 Our Petitioner is here, do you wish to
12 speak?

13 **Petitioner Comments**

14 MS. BLAZE: I'm sorry. I'm confused.

15 CHAIR MELIUS: You're up. You're up.

16 MS. BLAZE: Okay, thank you.

17 CHAIR MELIUS: I was trying to find you,
18 I didn't know if you were in the room. I couldn't
19 see you behind Tim.

20 MS. BLAZE: I wouldn't miss this for
21 anything.

22 CHAIR MELIUS: Well, we weren't going

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to go look for you. I saw you earlier.

2 MS. BLAZE: I'm D'Lanie Blaze, of CORE
3 Advocacy, representing Santa Susana and SEC-235.
4 SEC-235 was written to include all Santa Susana
5 employees of DOE, its contractors, corporate
6 successors, and subcontractors from 1965 to the
7 present.

8 NIOSH limited this SEC to 1991 through
9 1993. And on December 4th a teleconference was
10 held to address this, in its review of the NIOSH
11 ER. I promised to provide some additional
12 information to support my SEC. And I asked that
13 NIOSH restore the dates that were originally
14 specified.

15 Essentially, we cannot reconstruct dose
16 with sufficient accuracy for workers of Santa
17 Susana and its associated sites. And those
18 people that were originally intended to be helped
19 by our previous SECs, they, in many cases, still
20 don't have access to this program. Not in the
21 way that NIOSH intended, when they initiated
22 these Classes.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So, restoration of my SEC timeframe to
2 its original dates for all the workers,
3 regardless of work location or job title could
4 help correct the problem.

5 NIOSH has not demonstrated that it can
6 reconstruct dose to americium or thorium after
7 1988, which is when site remediation really
8 geared up. And that's when most Area IV site
9 remediation workers would be likely to encounter
10 those materials.

11 The NIOSH TBDs verify the presence of
12 americium and thorium, and stack effluent at
13 Santa Susana and De Soto facility until at least
14 1999. And records show radiation, D&D's site
15 remediation workers routinely rotated between
16 both sites with no changes in job codes,
17 radiation badge numbers, or visitor badges. And
18 I've provided that documentation.

19 Area IV site remediation personnel meet
20 the established eligibility criteria with
21 subcontractor employees, including those
22 employed right now today, cannot prove that they

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 are working in Area IV.

2 Many of these employees were once
3 employed by Boeing, but Boeing has been providing
4 information to Department of Labor that
5 misrepresents these workers as affiliated with
6 non-covered locations.

7 Many of these workers may be represented
8 as Canoga employees, or workers affiliated with
9 Areas 1, 2 and 3, and summarily dismissed. Large
10 portions of their employment totally disqualified
11 or all of their employment totally disqualified.
12 And on another look we find that they were in
13 Area IV, monitored for radiation. They should
14 have qualified for the program.

15 Once these guys become subcontractor
16 employees, they are unable to obtain any
17 employment verification from DOE or Boeing.
18 Neither of which will disclose a list of the
19 subcontractors currently on site.

20 Even if the employee can get records
21 from social security to verify the employer,
22 those records will never verify an Area IV work

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 location. Area IV subcontract workers tell me
2 that Boeing has been discouraging them from
3 applying for EEOICPA, by stating, this program
4 was never meant for them anyway.

5 Some of them have sent me photographs
6 showing that their performing site remediation in
7 Area IV. And in the photos they're at the
8 radioactive materials handling facility wearing
9 Boeing-issued gear, and Boeing-issued work
10 badges. And it's still not enough to qualify
11 them for EEOICPA.

12 Upon switching from Boeing to
13 subcontractor status, they lost their unions,
14 their wages and benefits were lowered. In some
15 cases, their radiation monitoring protection was
16 taken away. But their work locations and their
17 job duties never changed.

18 Boeing states it cannot verify
19 subcontractor employment because they have no
20 access to personnel files for another company.
21 But today, I'm submitting a copy of the Boeing
22 D&D subcontractor general requirements contract

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that outlines subcontractor obligations to
2 provide Boeing with detailed information about
3 every worker on site.

4 So it does appear that Boeing is in
5 possession of employment data that is subject to
6 the Privacy Act in EEOICPA. They just won't
7 provide it. And I think that's a pretty good
8 basis for an SEC there.

9 So, we're finding that there's been
10 information provided to Department of Labor that
11 persistently misrepresents eligible workers
12 across all years of site operations as ineligible
13 employees. And this is proving not to be an
14 eligibility issue, but it's looking like a data
15 falsification issue. Or at least a data
16 manipulation issue.

17 When we discovered this had been
18 happening, and it impacted an unknown number of
19 eligible claimants, we started seeing claims able
20 to be reopened. We don't know how many have
21 impacted. We don't know how many dose
22 reconstructions have been totally derailed based

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 on incomplete information. DOE and Boeing then
2 stopped complete personnel files that actually
3 contain authentic employment records.

4 And according to Department of Energy,
5 they've now changed Boeing's contract, so they
6 don't have to provide complete personnel files.
7 But they are still allowed to provide the
8 misleading data that has been proven to be
9 inaccurate.

10 NIOSH based its decision to limit this
11 SEC on the data falsification that occurred
12 between 1991 to 1993 by CEP. NIOSH has
13 demonstrated its latitude to call out data
14 falsification when it interferes with dose
15 reconstruction.

16 It's been established and we've been
17 talking about this for the last day and a half,
18 about the importance of establishing job titles
19 and work locations to obtain accurate dose
20 reconstructions.

21 Boeing has been providing information
22 that keeps NIOSH from recognizing the length of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 time that a worker was in the covered area, the
2 location the worker was monitored for radiation
3 expose, the worker's potential job titles or
4 duties that may have been performed. And even
5 what radionuclides they might have been exposed
6 to or monitored for.

7 NIOSH can't say this is an eligibility
8 issue. This is basis for an SEC Class and we
9 have an obligation to acknowledge that we're
10 unable to reconstruct dose with sufficient
11 accuracy under these kinds of circumstances.

12 We discussed some other topics during
13 the teleconference. Some of the information that
14 I've brought with me and provided to LaVon,
15 includes a complete list of Area IV locations
16 where EPA identified americium and thorium.
17 There's about 60 locations. Most of those are
18 missing from the Site Profile, along with all of
19 their associated processes and environmental
20 data. That is supportive of an SEC Class.

21 The list includes an approximate date
22 of structure and facility demolition. But that's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 a poor indication of risk for site remediation
2 workers, given job requirements that are
3 associated with soil excavation, environmental
4 restoration, heavy equipment operation and
5 maintenance, ground and surface water
6 remediation, debris removal and waste disposal.

7 All these things that occur after a
8 structure has been removed. And in some cases,
9 those things didn't start happening until years
10 after the facility had been demolished and taken
11 away.

12 Also I provided Boeing's incident report
13 on air sampling media from the RMHF. That was
14 never evaluated or included in the environmental
15 data used in the Site Profile. The air sampling
16 media was found in a file cabinet, contaminating
17 historical records that were designated for
18 preservation.

19 But by 1994, that building had been
20 taken over by rodents that had damaged the
21 records. The report might address various gaps
22 in air monitoring data for some of the more

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 important facilities. And also our hardship in
2 obtaining historical records, or at least give
3 NIOSH an idea of the precedent and how those
4 things were handled on site.

5 And I included evidence showing the
6 visitor badges were issued quarterly. There are
7 records of dosimeter issuance at various
8 radiological locations at Area IV and De Soto.
9 But NIOSH cannot interpret the location of
10 issuance or use of the badge, how long the badge
11 was worn, the length of time the worker may have
12 been in the covered area when they were wearing
13 the badge, the radionuclide that was monitored,
14 or the frequency or duration of the exposure.

15 These inabilities support an SEC Class
16 and it also shows that many workers wore several
17 visitors' badges at the same time in addition to
18 their standard issued personnel film badge.

19 This raises questions about why so often
20 Boeing only provides the visitor log records in
21 personnel files for workers that we'd expect to
22 see abundant radiation monitoring data. They are

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 portrayed as workers associated with a non-
2 covered location. And then as only occasional
3 visitors into the site with sporadic monitoring.
4 And often times that is totally inaccurate.

5 And I've submitted evidence showing that
6 in vivo whole body scan results were selectively
7 omitted from employee radiation records.
8 Including Helgeson data. And I think those
9 records were generated in the late 1980s. And
10 I'll soon be providing more information on that.

11 I thank you guys for your hard work on
12 this site. I know there's a lot of complex
13 issues. And I'm confident that if we keep working
14 on it, we'll get through it. Thank you.

15 CHAIR MELIUS: Okay, thank you. Any
16 further comments or discussion? Do we have a
17 time table on our next steps? Mr. Neton, Jim.

18 DR. NETON: I don't know that, if you
19 could establish an exact date. Lara Hughes is on
20 the phone, maybe, and she might be able to shed
21 some light on that. But I don't think these are
22 big research type issues.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 We purposely said that we would evaluate
2 the air monitoring results that we had. And not
3 go out and do some de novo data capture effort.
4 So that shouldn't take that long. I think we're
5 in the several month timeframe.

6 CHAIR MELIUS: Okay.

7 DR. HUGHES: Yes, this is Lara Hughes.
8 Yes, I agree with Jim. We're looking at a few
9 months in my estimation.

10 CHAIR MELIUS: Okay, thank you. Phil's
11 not here. Any of the Work Group Members have any
12 comment?

13 MEMBER BEACH: I don't really have any
14 comments. I mean we just had our meeting and
15 John covered what the next steps were. But how
16 do we bridge the gap between '88 to '91?

17 I'm not really clear because the SEC
18 ended in '88 and then this new one starts in '91.
19 Is there a path that we could ask for, anyways?

20 DR. HUGHES: This is Lara.

21 CHAIR MELIUS: Go ahead.

22 DR. HUGHES: Based on our current

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 situation, we do not have established an
2 infeasibility. So there is no dose
3 reconstruction gap in that sense. That we will
4 continue doing dose reconstruction for that time
5 period like we have been in the past.

6 CHAIR MELIUS: I think it would be a
7 Site Profile issue. I mean when your next step,
8 would be a Site Profile. And then if in that
9 process you find an infeasibility, then I think
10 that -- short of a petition of some -- that's the
11 other, yes. I think that would be the way to
12 handle it. Okay. Henry. Okay, Board Work
13 Session. Well, actually why don't we just go
14 ahead straight into Savannah River. I think
15 we've got the time and maybe some questions.
16 First, Tim, do you want to give us an update on
17 what's the next step for you?

18 DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

19 (Simultaneous speaking)

20 CHAIR MELIUS: You when --

21 DR. TAULBEE: The whole group --

22 CHAIR MELIUS: Yes, well--

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 **Board Work Sessions**

2 DR. TAULBEE: There's a lot of things
3 here. At the end of the presentation slides from
4 yesterday, there's kind of a breakdown of six
5 different issues that the Work Group was still
6 addressing. And so those are our primary focus
7 right now to report back to the Work Group.

8 Currently, NIOSH, we owe a response on
9 the SC&A report as well as the NOCTS Monitoring
10 Report that I went over yesterday. We haven't
11 actually issued those reports yet. We hope to
12 get those out.

13 The first of January we've got a lot of
14 staff out, the rest of this month. But we do
15 hope to get them out. And I'm not sure we could
16 do classification review, but around this time of
17 year, at least in a timely manner. But that's
18 the next two steps, major steps that we have.

19 We do, we are waiting on those
20 assessment reports that I mentioned during my
21 presentation, from the site. They are looking
22 for those. They did have some people out for the
23 past month, which we just learned last week,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 which is why we had not received them yet. And
2 so they are working on that.

3 There's the IS evaluation that we
4 committed to the Work Group. That we'll be
5 presenting to them, hopefully again, in the first
6 of January. And then this transient comparison
7 that the Work Group asked for as well.

8 Yesterday I mentioned some of the RWPs
9 that we did just locate from an old finding aid,
10 it's 1997, was the finding aid. And I misspoke
11 when I said 300 boxes. It's actually over 700
12 boxes from the Atlanta Federal Record Center. So
13 we're trying to track those down.

14 What I'd like to propose is that we do
15 a short Work Group call the 3rd week of January
16 type of timeframe to give an update on what we
17 find from the site, and from Atlanta FRC, to see
18 where those boxes are, if they still exist, et
19 cetera. But we can give an update to the Work
20 Group at that time.

21 CHAIR MELIUS: When do you think you
22 would have actual access to them? At least in a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 preliminary way?

2 DR. TAULBEE: Well, to me one of the
3 issues is going to be, do you go through 700
4 boxes, or?

5 CHAIR MELIUS: Well, no --

6 (Simultaneous speaking)

7 DR. TAULBEE: That's a lot of --

8 CHAIR MELIUS: -- obviously, we'd do a
9 sampling, obviously we'd do a sampling from that
10 standpoint.

11 DR. TAULBEE: Well it depends upon where
12 they're at, as to the access. If they're at the
13 Atlanta FRC still, getting access to them I think
14 would be fairly quick and easy. If they're on
15 site somewhere, then we've got to go through the
16 site records. And so I really can't give you a
17 time estimate on that.

18 CHAIR MELIUS: Okay, okay.

19 DR. TAULBEE: I do hope to, I would like
20 to give that update though to the Work Group, the
21 third week of January if we can schedule a quicker
22 short call. Maybe an hour type of timeframe to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 go over that and decide the path forward with
2 regards to those.

3 CHAIR MELIUS: And I think, I was going
4 to suggest that also at some point. The fact
5 though, do you think you'd get through the 700
6 boxes over the holiday?

7 DR. TAULBEE: No, no, gosh no, no, no.
8 I mean first we've got to get with the site to
9 see if they can respond. And honestly, I don't
10 know that we're going to get much of a response
11 before the first of January because they'll have
12 staff out as well.

13 CHAIR MELIUS: DOE works hard though.

14 DR. TAULBEE: Right. So those are the
15 next steps, at least from the NIOSH standpoint.
16 And SC&A they can speak on what they're steps
17 are.

18 CHAIR MELIUS: Okay. Joe, Bob?

19 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay, of the six action
20 items in the Work Group, we have two of them.
21 Okay, one of them deals with an issue that came
22 out of the review that we did of the NOV and the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 31 corrective actions that were a part of a
2 process of self-assessment that took place in
3 '98.

4 And one of the corrective actions was
5 to correct the facility characterization process.
6 They were finding that they were missing nuclides
7 and in particular americium-241 was being missed
8 in terms of certain operations. So they weren't
9 winding up on RWTs and workers were not being
10 bioassayed necessarily for those source terms in
11 certain locations.

12 Well that was, that's a red flag of
13 sorts obviously, in terms of unmonitored workers
14 and enrollment issues. And this is one reason
15 DOE insisted that all the sites do a self-
16 assessment against 31 generic deficiencies they
17 were finding across the complex where these
18 things were cropping up.

19 So in fact, Savannah River did establish
20 that yes, the facility characterization process
21 was faulty. And they needed to have more
22 systematic process based on actual analysis of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 operations, versus sort of a historical knowledge
2 of sites and everything.

3 What was happening was the operations
4 were changing rapidly in the 90s and the
5 characterization process wasn't keeping pace. So
6 our action was to one, we've already given the
7 SRDB numbers to NIOSH. But we're going to write
8 this up. And certainly it's a sort of a sidebar
9 issue, but a very important sidebar issue that
10 needs to be addressed. So we're doing that.

11 The second issue is more on the notion
12 of stratification and NOCTS data -- as you heard
13 yesterday we're concerned about stratification.
14 But how subcontractors are being, you know,
15 addressed appropriately in coworker model
16 development.

17 And we provided comments in the context
18 of OTIB-75 about a month ago. And we got into a
19 discussion, it was an abbreviated discussion at
20 the Work Group meeting. But it was pretty clear
21 that we needed to sort of take those comments and
22 address them in the context of OTIB-81, which is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the more relevant OTIB in terms of what we're
2 talking about for Savannah River.

3 And so we're doing that. I don't think
4 it's going to change some of the concerns we're
5 raising, which is in fact the appropriate
6 stratification of subcontractor groups, and the
7 extent to which this is very relevant for what
8 we're talking about, in terms of the use of NOCTS
9 data.

10 Whether that, you know, NOCTS data, for
11 routinely monitored workers. Whether that can be
12 applied appropriately for this cohort? And so we
13 really look at that. And that actually tends to
14 be a prerequisite, I think, to our diving deeply
15 into the analysis, which I think NIOSH is
16 providing in terms of NOCTS monitoring data.

17 We saw some of the raw data at the Work
18 Group meeting and we're going to hopefully get
19 the datasets after DOE gets finished with them,
20 sometime in January or February. But we're going
21 to look at that. I think it's appropriate to
22 look at. I think it's going to be informative.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I think, you know, this is a cart and
2 horse issue. The horse in this case is, you know,
3 whether or not the datasets are the same? Or the
4 ones that, you know, the routine data can be, in
5 fact, used for the subcontractor Class we're
6 talking about, whether that stratifications were
7 done appropriately?

8 So that, you know, I think we need to
9 deal with that issue. Try to get that resolved
10 before we end up spending a lot of time doing a
11 data analysis on the NOCTS monitoring results.
12 So we're going to do that, but sort of with an
13 eye toward resolving that fundamental question
14 first.

15 Let's see, I guess the other question
16 is we're waiting with baited breath on the now
17 700 boxes of RWPs. You've heard me talk about
18 the dearth of RWPs, all 13 that we found last
19 summer. So, obviously this is like the
20 motherlode.

21 I think it might actually offer a
22 pathway, although it's going to be a torturous

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 pathway to sort of informing the process. We're
2 dealing with lack of data at this point. So, you
3 know, any data is going to be helpful. But the
4 amount of data we're talking about sort of makes
5 your head spin. So, you know, we'll certainly be
6 interested in seeing what that comes to.

7 CHAIR MELIUS: Horse and cart, but I'm
8 not sure which way the horse is pointing all the
9 time.

10 MEMBER RICHARDSON: When you look at one
11 of these RWPs, is it a single page? Is it a
12 multi-page document?

13 DR. TAULBEE: Typically it's a single
14 page. But in many cases they are multi-pages.
15 Where they'll be an additional sign-in sheet
16 stapled to it. And so the main page will have
17 the basic information of the work being done, the
18 PPE requirements, the bioassay requirements. And
19 then at the bottom, there will be a sign-in sheet.
20 It'll have their payroll ID to identify, you
21 know, whether they are construction trades and so
22 forth. But for some of the bigger jobs, there

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 will be multiple secondary sign-in sheets.

2 MEMBER RICHARDSON: And it would cover,
3 is there a page per worker? Or is there is a
4 page per task?

5 DR. TAULBEE: Page per task.

6 MR. FITZGERALD: And what complicates
7 it further -- and I think Tim and I also saw this
8 when we were on site -- is that you have -- and
9 this before '98 when they decided to consolidate
10 and come up with a uniform RWP process, which
11 again, I find a little shocking -- but in '98,
12 before '98 there were several different forms
13 that were carried forward.

14 Some were actually very explicit. Had
15 a lot of, you know, the data on the job and
16 identified nuclides. Others were sign-up sheets.
17 I guess you can almost imagine if you're dealing
18 with hundreds of subcontractors coming in and
19 out, basically they have a badge. But they're
20 signing for work that they may or may not be given
21 a task for.

22 So, you know, it's a very fluid process

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in the, they call them standing RWPs. It's not
2 always clear who actually got called into work.
3 And what they actually did. So there's a lot of
4 questions on that. And actually the standing RWP
5 was a source of problems for Savannah River.

6 And some of the corrective actions in
7 '98 were to correct the fact that that was such
8 a loose system. So, it was interesting that a
9 lot of the traditional ways of doing business
10 with RWPs were corrected in '98 because of the
11 concerns over, that were raised by the
12 violations, as well as DOE headquarters.

13 CHAIR MELIUS: Okay. Any other
14 questions?

15 I think we also need another meeting,
16 joint meeting of the SRS Coworker. I meant this
17 is again the horse and cart issue. But I think
18 that might be helpful to at least get some issues
19 out of the way, or address what else might need
20 to be done that we've overlooked. So we'll try
21 to schedule also. I may wait until we hear from
22 the Work Group probably. We'll figure it out.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 There's only so many days in the month to the
2 end, left.

3 Any other, anybody have any leftover
4 questions, or from yesterday? We had to cut that
5 session short.

6 MEMBER BEACH: I'm going to hold mine.

7 CHAIR MELIUS: I waited until Stu took
8 away the computer, so Tim, the other 30 slides.
9 But we all have them. Okay.

10 Get caught back up on the Work Group and
11 Subcommittees. I don't know if Jim Lockey is on
12 the line?

13 Pacific Proving Ground? We have one, a
14 couple issues left over on that. I think that's
15 NIOSH's court.

16 DR. NETON: That was, when I tried to
17 answer yesterday.

18 CHAIR MELIUS: Pick a site, we'll get
19 there.

20 **Work Group Comments**

21 DR. NETON: Yes, the Work Group actually
22 closed all the issues. And Dr. Lockey reported

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 out on that last Board meeting. And Dr. Melius
2 raised a concern and the Board concurred that we
3 need to flesh out a little better how we can do
4 external dose reconstruction with sufficient
5 accuracy.

6 To that end, we actually, we were
7 relying on the summary data to generate
8 distributions. Where so many people between
9 certain limits, and they were very coarse, crude
10 distributions. It turned out during discussions,
11 and Tim Taulbee pointed this out, that the actual
12 raw data were available in tabular form from the
13 Department of Energy, all along.

14 So, we requested that and as of last
15 week, I just heard that we received those. So
16 it'll be a short coding effort to get that in and
17 we'll generate some more refined distributions
18 that will hopefully put this issue to bed.

19 CHAIR MELIUS: The point Tim, like the
20 dog, finding missing data of some 700 boxes,
21 sniffing around, you know, DOE.

22 Okay. It's again a Phil issue, I'm not

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 sure there's much activity
2 Portsmouth-Paducah K-25?

3 Okay, Rocky? David.

4 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Sure. Well the only
5 thing to report is that as we discussed
6 previously, folks are going to be looking for any
7 magnesium-thorium records at LANL, with the boxes
8 that were there. That we talked about during the
9 earlier Board meetings.

10 And LaVon is in touch with me and said
11 that he will be going in January to look at the
12 final records. So we're still pursuing the
13 possibility that something will appear. And if
14 there is new information about that, obviously
15 we'll have a meeting and we'll talk about that.
16 They'll give a report. And we'll talk about that.

17 CHAIR MELIUS: That's good. Sandia,
18 Santa Susana, Savannah River, we've done science
19 issues today.

20 MEMBER RICHARDSON: So several months
21 ago we received a large report from ORAU on dose
22 and dose rate effectiveness factors. It was 394

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 pages. It was circulated. I've had a chance to
2 read it. I hope others have. I was hoping that
3 we could schedule a time for at least a conference
4 call to go over it.

5 And prior to that I can at least point
6 people to the first 40 pages of the report --
7 give a really nice summary of it. And I think
8 the report is much more digestible than the
9 previous draft that we saw, in terms of
10 sharpening the focus on a few key topics rather
11 than a lot of what's reviewed. In some sort of
12 meaningful -- we can set aside pretty quickly.

13 CHAIR MELIUS: Jim.

14 DR. NETON: I just have a couple
15 comments and an update. The report is really
16 long but as Dr. Richardson points out, it's
17 pretty digestible in the sense that a wide range
18 of issues are reviewed. But it really boils down
19 to the epidemiologic studies that are in there
20 that will form the basis, or at least their basis,
21 for a recommended revision to the DDREF.

22 Also I would report that Oak Ridge

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Center for Risk Analysis, who wrote the report,
2 requested that they will be able to submit the
3 document for publication in Health Physics
4 journal.

5 And we thought that was a good idea to
6 get another external source of peer review. So
7 we said, okay. It's in the journal for review
8 now. But I could possibly make a draft of that
9 available because it is a fairly digestible. For
10 publication it comes down to about 20 pages. And
11 I don't think I sent that out. But I don't think
12 there's any prohibition that I couldn't.

13 So, I could provide that Health Physics
14 journal version of it, which is much more reduced
15 and refined in scope. And I may be able to make
16 that available.

17 MR. KATZ: Okay, sounds great. I just
18 questioning timing. So, what are talking about?
19 A month from now, or weeks from now, or what would
20 you like?

21 DR. NETON: Well, I think weeks from now
22 will be sort of in the middle of holidays.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: I mean, in other words, mid-
2 January?

3 DR. NETON: Yes.

4 MR. KATZ: Or February, or what works
5 for you?

6 DR. NETON: Mid-January.

7 MR. KATZ: Okay, so I'll send out a
8 schedule and request things.

9 **SEC Issues**

10 CHAIR MELIUS: Okay. SEC issues,
11 evaluation issues? That's me on that. And the
12 one addition to that I believe at the last Board
13 meeting, we had discussed the issues with how to
14 deal with DOE Order 835, or whatever, on
15 monitoring issues and so forth.

16 And so Stu and I, and LaVon talked and
17 we're going to have the SEC Issues Work Group
18 sort of handle that preliminarily. Because it
19 deals across several sites. And we may have to
20 have some site specific follow-up on it.

21 But at least to try to figure out a
22 general methodology, how we want to approach

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that. So we will be doing that. We just need to
2 work out a schedule and so forth to be able to
3 follow-up on that. But we -- Subcommittee on
4 Dose Reconstruction I think is that --

5 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yes, the only thing
6 I didn't mention yesterday on the report was that
7 we are, our next meeting is January 9th. It's
8 all set.

9 MR. KATZ: The other thing I think we
10 might just report for everyone else. You know
11 that we've been working through the backlog. But
12 now we've gotten quite a ways through it. And we
13 restarted the machinery to add additional sets of
14 normal dose reconstruction reviews from SC&A. So
15 that's in the works.

16 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yes.

17 CHAIR MELIUS: Subcommittee on
18 Procedures Review.

19 Wanda.

20 **Subcommittee on Procedures Review**

21 MEMBER MUNN: We met November 20th for
22 the first time in a number of months. So, we

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 have a couple of things that the Board needs to
2 be aware of, or take action with. Among the
3 things that we covered during our meeting were a
4 review of Report 5 on Alternative Dissolution
5 Models for Insoluble Plutonium 238. It's still
6 one or two things to be completed with that, but
7 it's moving forward.

8 We took a look at SC&A's very complete
9 review of Report 78, Technical Basis for Sampling
10 Plans. An interesting and for me, unusual paper
11 that required me to think about hypergeometric
12 distribution. But which I didn't think very much
13 about frankly.

14 But we looked at outstanding findings
15 for our two Subcommittee reviews that we hadn't
16 addressed yet. And tried to get a little better
17 handle on that. We're expecting during our next
18 meeting to have a fairly broad concept of what
19 our next steps are going to be, with regard to
20 whittling down what's still on the books.

21 Our contractor is very heavily involved
22 as I've said repeatedly with Program Evaluation

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Reports at this point. And one of the things
2 that we did was assign for Task 4. Assignments
3 to 4, as we've discussed several places
4 otherwise, PER 80 GSI, PER 76 Aliquippa Forge,
5 PER 77 Simonds Saw and Steel, and PER 81 Hooker.

6 Those are underway and selections, case
7 selections criteria are being provided and cases
8 chosen at this time.

9 There were two things we need to bring
10 to the Board's attention. One was, in our review
11 where we are with the exposure matrix for Linde,
12 TKBS 25. We have a bit of stalemate. In that
13 our most recent activities from SC&A with their
14 review of previous revisions from the matrix, and
15 they recommended a focused review of the TBD to
16 ensure the changes that are agreed on, were
17 appropriately being incorporated.

18 The position that NIOSH has taken is
19 that Revision 4 of Linde was prepared to respond
20 to the comments on the previous revision. So,
21 they don't feel that an in-depth review is
22 warranted. So what our next steps are on that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 have yet to be defined. But it's something that
2 the Board needs to be aware of, we believe.

3 And SC&A requested assignment for a
4 complete review of one of the TBD-6000 items. At
5 one of the sites that I think very few of us have
6 any knowledge of at all.

7 MEMBER BEACH: Wanda, I think it's 73.

8 MR. KATZ: It's Birdsboro Steel.

9 MEMBER MUNN: It's -- I beg your pardon.

10 MR. KATZ: It's Birdsboro Steel.

11 MEMBER MUNN: Birdsboro, yes, I know.

12 MR. KATZ: Okay.

13 MEMBER MUNN: Birdsboro is, I was trying
14 to identify the name of the appropriate PER. But
15 Birdsboro is one of the small activities for
16 which we never did a full site document, which
17 explains its presence in the TBD-6000.

18 They were a rolling operation that
19 assisted in the design and implementation of the
20 Paducah plant. It's a 1951-1952 time site. And
21 the Subcommittee discussed that and recommends
22 that Birdsboro do in fact be given a full review

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 by SC&A.

2 I'd like to propose that to Board to get
3 started.

4 MEMBER BEACH: I'll second that.

5 CHAIR MELIUS: I think we have, don't
6 we have another one?

7 MR. KATZ: There is a second one.

8 CHAIR MELIUS: Okay, so why don't we do
9 them both together, so?

10 MEMBER MUNN: Huh?

11 CHAIR MELIUS: Go onto the next, and
12 lets' do them both together. You have a 62?

13 MEMBER MUNN: We do have 62?

14 MR. KATZ: PER-62.

15 CHAIR MELIUS: PER-62.

16 MR. KATZ: Which relates to OTIB-52.

17 MEMBER MUNN: Oh.

18 CHAIR MELIUS: You mentioned it several
19 times.

20 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, I did.

21 CHAIR MELIUS: And I thought we'd so one
22 motion.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, why not?

2 CHAIR MELIUS: Yes.

3 MEMBER MUNN: Please do, I would like
4 to recommend that we accept the contractor's
5 request to pursue those two items as we
6 previously have previously discussed.

7 CHAIR MELIUS: Any further discussion?

8 If not, voice vote. All in favor?

9 (Multiple ayes)

10 CHAIR MELIUS: Opposed?

11 (No audible response)

12 CHAIR MELIUS: Abstained?

13 (No audible response)

14 CHAIR MELIUS: A few, not here.

15 MEMBER MUNN: Thank you.

16 CHAIR MELIUS: Jim, you have a question,

17 or you --

18 (Off the record comment)

19 CHAIR MELIUS: What, yes.

20 MR. KATZ: Deal with the folks on the
21 phone.

22 CHAIR MELIUS: Yes. Okay, so move

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 forward on that. Anything else Wanda?

2 MEMBER MUNN: Nope. That's all for us.
3 We don't have a timeframe because we don't have
4 a good feel for exactly when we're going to get
5 feedback with respect to how many we have
6 outstanding, and what the progress of the Task 4
7 items is going to be.

8 CHAIR MELIUS: Very good, thank you.

9 MEMBER BEACH: Jim, I have a real quick
10 comment.

11 CHAIR MELIUS: Yes.

12 MEMBER BEACH: And I mentioned it
13 yesterday on the BRS system and updating and
14 making sure that everything that we've discussed
15 is loaded into the BRS. Is that a tasking for -
16 -

17 MR. KATZ: No, not for the Board.

18 MEMBER BEACH: Not for the Board, okay.
19 It would be helpful to have that all in there.

20 MR. KATZ: Yes, and normally it get
21 there. I mean I think you've found some problems
22 or something, but normally that gets done

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 routinely, by either SC&A --

2 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, they do and we did
3 have verbal commitments from both NIOSH and SC&A
4 to take a double check.

5 CHAIR MELIUS: I think it's pretty clear
6 it's not being done. So, I mean --

7 MR. KATZ: Well, it is being -- it's
8 generally being done.

9 (Simultaneous speaking)

10 CHAIR MELIUS: But general isn't good
11 enough.

12 MR. KATZ: No, but I'm saying --

13 CHAIR MELIUS: -- for other Board
14 Members.

15 MEMBER BEACH: Well, just like yesterday
16 we talked about 20 and 52 --

17 MEMBER MUNN: 20.

18 MEMBER BEACH: -- and if somebody would
19 have went back and looked at those OTIBs to make
20 sure everything was loaded, that would have been
21 helpful. And that's not done. That's why I
22 brought it up.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, that's quite true,
2 and you had said you found that to be true in 20.
3 And that surprised me a little because we got
4 most of that.

5 MEMBER BEACH: Fifty-two was better, 20
6 was not.

7 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

8 MEMBER BEACH: So anyway, just --

9 MR. HINNEFELD: After this was brought
10 up yesterday, I consider it NIOSH's action to go
11 back and try to remedy that.

12 MEMBER BEACH: Thank you.

13 CHAIR MELIUS: Okay. I'm not sure if
14 Dr. Ziemer is back on the line, TBD-6000 Work
15 Group?

16 Okay, Henry?

17 MR. KATZ: Henry's gone.

18 CHAIR MELIUS: He disappeared too, huh?
19 Strike the item.

20 And Surrogate Data really nothing to
21 update on that.

22 And Weldon Spring, there's a meeting on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 -- okay, Weldon Spring?

2 MR. KATZ: I don't think we do have a -

3 -

4 CHAIR MELIUS: Yes, we scheduled a
5 meeting for January, February.

6 MR. KATZ: February.

7 CHAIR MELIUS: February 1st.

8 MR. KATZ: Right.

9 **Public Comments**

10 CHAIR MELIUS: Okay, and I think that
11 completes our Work Group reports. And public
12 comments.

13 (Off the record comment)

14 MR. KATZ: I have the updates, there
15 were a couple missing updates that I sent to
16 everybody, I sent everybody an updated public
17 comments session that I just got when I was
18 traveling. So, I forwarded it by phone. So, you
19 should all have that. But Jim couldn't open that.
20 So he doesn't that, there were two Jim Neton
21 responses, I think that Josh hadn't included
22 previously, and one other item.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIR MELIUS: So we can cover those
2 next -- I'm not going to, I wasn't going to spend
3 an hour trying to compare the two documents.

4 Okay, this we can do relatively quickly,
5 so you -- and I think the document everyone has,
6 whichever version you're looking at could be
7 fine.

8 But the Numbers 1 through 6, Petitioner
9 relative to Los Alamos. And LaVon has followed
10 up on those. That Phil said from Senator Udall's
11 staff, comments, again LaVon.

12 Additional Number 8 and additional
13 comments on LANL, again LaVon. Everything here
14 is LaVon on that. And a number of the individual
15 comments down through 16, also LaVon or they
16 didn't reply. These were people that spoke at
17 the public meeting we had.

18 And the same through -- you were busy,
19 Lavon. Up through 31, those are all pretty
20 straight forward. Comments regarded, questions
21 regarded Pacific Proving Ground. Those may have
22 been what Jim followed up on, that's Numbers 32

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and 33.

2 There were comments from Fernald about
3 the workers there, and the people that attended
4 the meeting, that's Number 34, 35. Again, Mark
5 Rolfes followed up on those.

6 Terrie Barrie had comments on Los Alamos
7 and Rocky Flats. Again, Lavon followed up on
8 those.

9 Number 39 is an attorney who had issues
10 about how we handle non-SEC cancers. That,
11 there's another commenter regarding Idaho
12 National Laboratory. FOI requests that one.
13 Don't have a response on, that may be another one
14 that he's following -- it's an FOI issue so it
15 may not have been addressed in the meeting.

16 Again 41 and 42 are some questions
17 regarding Fernald again. Mark Rolfes followed up
18 on those. Then we had a whole series on Metals
19 and Controls by Pete Darnell followed up on
20 those.

21 Then we had a whole series of comments
22 on Area IV Santa Susana. And Lara Hughes followed

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 up those. And finally we had comments on Savannah
2 River. And Tim followed up on that. That's the
3 last one on my list, 59. But they're all pretty
4 straight forward.

5 If you have questions, let us know.
6 But, I think, people are responding which is the
7 point of this, getting back.

8 Correspondence? I don't believe we had
9 -- one set of correspondence. I can't remember
10 which site it was that NIOSH ended up responding
11 to. But I was involved in the process.

12 MR. KATZ: Yes, we have one letter
13 related to Fernald, which I circulated to the
14 Board. And that's it.

15 **Adjourn**

16 CHAIR MELIUS: Yes. Any other business?

17 I think we're adjourned then.

18 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
19 went off the record at 9:38 a.m.)

20

21

22