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MR. KATZ: But let's continue with roll call with the NIOSH ORAU.

(Roll call.)

MR. KATZ: Okay, then. So let me just make a few preliminaries and then I'll turn it over to Dave - Dr. Kotelchuck. The agenda for today's meeting and most of the material for today's meeting are posted.

Most of these are posted under the NIOSH Board section, schedule of the meeting, today's date.

However, one of the documents, the SC&A review of the main documents that NIOSH is presenting today on the CML facility, that review was errantly posted still on the NIOSH section but instead of under schedule of the meeting, today's date, it was posted under - if you go to the Rocky Flats section of the website under the discussion papers for that it was posted there.

It shouldn't have been - it should have been posted there but it should also have been
posted for today's meeting but it wasn't. Apologies for that.

And then there is also a document that was submitted by Terrie Barrie, the co-petitioner - a memo from her and Dr. McKeel that was set for posting but it hasn't been posted yet. So that's the problems with the posting system. And it will ultimately get posted.

And with that, I think that covers everything. There are a number of people in the public and particular on here that may not know how this works.

But for them and everyone, please mute your phones for this call. If you don't have a mute button press *6 to mute your phone for the call and you would press star six again to take your phone off of mute.

Also, please do not put this call on hold at any point. This is especially important. I think it often happens with members of the public who aren't familiar with this.

But putting the call on hold will cause problems for everyone else in the audio and we will
have to cut your line. So don't put it on hold.
Just hang up and call back in when - if you need
to leave for a piece.

And with that and no more, Dr. Kotelchuck, it's your meeting.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Very good.
And folks have the agenda and most of the materials
are posted, as indicated.

Just a discussion of - today's
discussion or ground rules as we note, this is a
meeting of the Rocky Flats Working Group.

There is on the agenda room for
petitioner comments with regard to the materials
that were sent out earlier this week and a chance
for a presentation by Ms. Barrie.

And but otherwise after the
presentations the discussion - all the discussion
will be by the Working Group.

It is not quite open in the way that the
Board meeting is and anything that's said here
today is recorded and if there are, if you will,
rejoinders to things that are said here, what is
said here is on the record and you will have a chance
to discuss it when we go to the Board meeting in March or any other Board meeting.

Board meetings - there is always time for comments about anything the petitioners or affected persons wish to speak about.

So, with that, let's go to the first items and that is the reassessment for the Critical Mass - report for the Critical Mass Laboratory by NIOSH.

Who would like to present for that?

DCAS/SC&A -- Discussion of SEC192 Rocky Flats CML

White Paper (issued 12/13/16) and of SC&A's Review (issued 1/24/17), followed by the Working Group's decision on closing the issue

MR. RUTHERFORD: That would be me, LaVon Rutherford.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Very good, LaVon.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Okay.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Go ahead.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yeah. I notice this presentation isn't available online either. It's
supposed to be but it's not there, at least not
under the Work Group.

I did provide a copy to Terrie this
morning and she did acknowledge that she did
receive it.

I am going to provide a summary of -

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: However, if I may
say, LaVon, all of us on the Board received - all
of us on the Working Group received that a while
ago and all of the other materials that we need.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Okay. Yeah, so it's
true. Thank you.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay.

MR. RUTHERFORD: I'm going to provide
a summary of NIOSH's reassessment of the internal
radiation dose at Rocky Flats Critical Mass Lab.
This is for SEC-192. Slide two, please.

The purpose of this White Paper was to
reevaluate prior assumptions used to assess upper
bounds on personal dose from mixed fission and
activation products at the Rocky Flats CML.

The report was reassessed because of
corns concerns identified by the CML lead physicist and
A former radiological control supervisor. Next slide.

A little background - we issued our original White Paper on June 9th of 2015 and during the Work Group meeting on July 15th of that year. SC&A responded in general agreement with our findings. Next slide.

During that same Work Group meeting the former CML associate research scientist who's the same person as I identified as the lead physicist I mentioned earlier spoke, indicating that the neutron flux for the CML experiment could not be bounded and that the best one could say is the power level was probably less than 50 kilowatts.

Based on this statement, NIOSH committed to further evaluate or to further evaluate to ensure the assumptions made in the White Paper were appropriate. Next slide.

We did - additional interviews were conducted with the former [identifying information redacted] and with the former [identifying information redacted] who's identified by the petitioner as the person who may have information
The interviews were conducted with the Work Group Members, SC&A, and petitioners online as much as possible.

The former [identifying information redacted] reiterated his concern and indicated that he sent approximately 50 boxes of documents concerning CML to Los Alamos National Lab.

Additional concerns identified by the [identifying information redacted] was a lack of air sampling for build 886 and she also indicated that when they did start sampling that the airborne activity was high. Next slide.

So based on this we felt we should review the documents sent to Los Alamos National Lab to see if additional information was available that could be used to support the dose model.

So in February of last year, NIOSH met and they were able to review the documents at Los Alamos National lab.

A number of the documents were identified for capture. The documents were not released until summer of 2016.
Additional data captures were conducted in Denver in search of air sampling data and surface contamination surveys.

We did not receive all these documents until the fall of 2016. So we were able to reissue or able to issue this White Paper on November - in November 2016.

Next slide. So the model used in reconstructing the mixed fission and activation products did not change from our original White Paper to this new one.

However, the volumes of the specific inputs did change based on the new information made available from the data captures. So I am going to go over the specific inputs used in our original calculation and how the input changed in the reassessment.

So power level - in our initial calculation we used 10 milliwatts for one hour duration and this was from a US DOE document. However, from the CML documents captured at LANL we found a more accurate estimate of thermal power of 3.6 milliwatts averaged over 72 in five minutes.
CML staff, however, reported to ERDA an average thermal power of 6.7 milliwatts over 70 in five minutes based on the same experiment.

So we concluded that we would use that value, the 6.7 milliwatts over 70 that was reported to ERDA in our revised calculations.

Next slide. Originally in our air concentration used in our model was derived using DOE surface contamination limits of 1,000 dpm for 100 centimeters squared.

We went back and captured data 885-886 surface contamination surveys for the 1980-90 period. We included some of that data in Table 3 in the White Paper and specific examples in Figure 225.

From our - from our review of the data we concluded the surveys were conducted regularly. Values in uncontrolled areas were rarely above the limit and evidence indicates spills were promptly cleaned up.

So use of the contamination limit in deriving the air concentration seemed to be abandoned.
Next slide. So as I said, use of the contamination limit and we resuspended that contamination and to promote with our airborne concentration and we determined that it would be bounding - that using our original assessment was bounding.

However, based on the concern that there was no air monitoring data for building the 886 and the concern with elevated air concentrations brought up, we decided to request any air monitoring data for the '80-'89 period.

Since the only captured plant wide procedures instead of the air monitoring program for alpha particulate emissions, air sample locations for Building 875 and 886 and air sample results.

Next slide. We concluded that - well, based on our review we concluded Rocky Flats plant had a well-defined air monitoring program as required by procedures.

Air samples for Building 886 and 875 appeared to have been routinely collected and analyzed and samples were - results were evaluated
against the RCG of 70 dpm per cubic meter.

Sample air results were also reviewed and initialed by management. Next slide.

So using the air sample data collected we were able to come up with a bounding air concentration. We determined the weighted average concentration by using the three recorded values in the excess of the RCG. We used them as they were.

Sample between 10 and 100 percent of the RCG were 100 percent. Samples less than 10 percent of the RCG were 10 percent and no risk for detection. This results in a weighted average concentration of 19.2 percent of the RCG or 13.5 dpm per cubic meter.

Next slide. So our concern was with potential internal exposure to mixed fission activation products from numerous spills and enriched uranyl nitrate.

No indication of confirmatory bioassay being performed for persons involved in this field and no indication of routine bioassay for mixed fission activation products.
Next slide. So as mentioned earlier, the approach used for bounding mixed fission activation the dose is the same approach used - as used in the previous White Paper.

The internal dose model - the maximum mixed fission activation products internal dose model we used a representative UNH experiment, average thermal power and duration, average air concentration from the CML data that we - that we got - ICRP-68 dose conversion factors. We used OTIB-54 to identify the dosimetrically significantly nuclides and ORIGEN-S code.

Next slide. So our bounding values, as you can see, came out significantly less than the one millirem and a couple of orders of magnitude lower than previous.

Now, the biggest driver of that lowering dose was actually because of a calculation that we had in the previous calculation.

Also, the other factors that drove the lower dose are the reduced power levels from 10 milliwatts to 6.7 and also the reduced airborne activity used in the calculation.
And that's it. I have Jim Bogard and Bob Burns, who were critical in developing this White Paper online, to help answer any questions and provide clarifications as well.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Right. And that - the Working Group Members, are there any questions you want to ask of him before we go to the SC&A's review?

MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. None here. It appears to me that a very good job was done parsing through this information produced. Highly technical, difficult to follow and much appreciated.


DR. BUCHANAN: Okay. This is Ron Buchanan and I did that reassessment and review of the assessment paper, and that document is available online. It's been cleared.

Essentially, I won't go through everything in our paper because what I did was - there was a comment made it's highly technical in
areas and so what I tried to do in our paper was in section two was outline what NIOSH did and go through some of the sample calculations to verify their assumptions and some of the references and some of the calculations and play it out in a form that, you know, a reader could follow it and I hope that that was what I did there.

And if you can look at section two that does - that it expounds on some of the calculations and some of the references, and that brings up section three, our evaluation.

Essentially, we went through those, verified them and we did not rerun the computer programs on simulations to determine the fission activation product inventory.

But we did look at that inventory list. We also compared it to OTIB-54 and what is available for some of the reactors. And also I ran some sample IMBA programs to do the dose calculations to verify NIOSH's last table in there of the dose that would result from the intake of the fission activation products on a 50-year committed organ dose and for the type S and M solubility.
And essentially my conclusions and summary there in section four is that the doses would be very small. We looked at NIOSH's method and did not see any outstanding flaws or errors in them and if you did various assumptions - if you changed the parameters by a factor of five or 10 one way or the other, the results would be - still be that the dose would be very small.

The fission activation product inventory would be very small under the critical and subcritical experiments conducted at this facility.

And so we find that the doses would not be - reach the one millirem level which would be included in dose reconstruction.

So we concur with their findings and also that even if you went back and tweaked the figures they'd know it wasn't - if it was 10 times that, the dose still would not be significant.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Thank you. Are there any questions? Otherwise, we just - let's discuss the Working Group let's - Members, let's discuss the results.
Wanda, you had mentioned before that the NIOSH study was a thorough study and I agree with you.

MEMBER MUNN: Ron seems to have substantiated that.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah.

MEMBER MUNN: Thank you for another good report, Ron.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah. I - in looking over the reassessment reports from NIOSH, the - I was a participant in the telephone conversation with [identifying information redacted] and he had - well, it seemed to me a matter of great concern when he raised the fact that he did not feel that the average power was reasonably - was measured and was reasonably estimated and he said - as LaVon said that all he could say was that the average power output was less than 50 milliwatts.

I felt - the thing that impressed me most about the NIOSH report was Table 2 on that - on Page 8. There were - after the work that they had done there were six criticality experiments for
which thermal power and fission rate were estimated
by - by the way, by the staff at the CML and five
- well, first, one of them seemed to be in error
with 25 milliwatts of - actually 25 watts.

But there was - it turned out then and
they were - said on the record that there was a
mistake in that measurement.

For the other five measurements, they
went from - they went from 0.92 to 6.7 milliwatts.
And my feeling is that that certainly suggests that
one can measure the average power. It was done.
There were a number of cases in which it was done.
And there was a consistency and it was first well
below the 10 milliwatts that was done in the
original White Paper on this from NIOSH. And, as
they said, they decided to use 6.7 as the average
power in the work that they did later in the
assessment.

So that really gave me - gave me
reassurance that these numbers could be measured
and were measured and that it seemed to me to refute
[identifying information redacted] concern that we
really couldn't measure this, it was not reliable.
So that reassured me and I think made me feel that the report was a good one and the other - the other aspects of it in terms of the air levels and - also was thoroughly done and vetted by SC&A.

So I'm satisfied with that report. And it says then that - it says - it concludes that we can - we can make individual assessments - we can make dose - individual dose reconstructions for people who worked in the CML lab.

Other folks have thoughts and more comments? Bill, I gather you may not be talking a lot but if you have - or Phil.

MEMBER FIELD: Yeah. This is Bill. I think you summarized it fairly well. I can't understand the difference, but, you know, I'm onboard with what you've just stated.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah. Yeah.

Phil, what are you thinking?

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: I agree with that assessment there.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah. So seems to me that we have the material for closing this issue that we were asked - that we were charged with
investigating back in, actually, 2013.

So I'm - I would wait for a motion from someone and we close the CML issue.

MEMBER MUNN: I'll be glad to make that motion. It appears that, after a thorough vetting and reassessment by both NIOSH and SC&A, we have come to the conclusion that the material has been carefully covered and that we may move on and close the issue.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay.

MEMBER FIELD: This is Bill. I'll second it.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Good. Okay. So let's just say in the - do we - do we all agree that that's - that that is - excuse me, want to vote? Those in favor of the motion say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Oppose. Abstentions. Okay. So it's a unanimous agreement on that.

DCAS -- Brief overview of the status of SEC Petition 192 Rocky Flats Plant

Alright. Now we need - I think we will
go on to discussing the petition, SEC Petition 192, Rocky Flats Plant in general. And perhaps LaVon will give us a brief overview of the status of the petition, where we are now having closed the CML.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Okay. Well, I'll start with the cobalt-60 source. At the last Work Group meeting we discussed the petitioner's concern with the cobalt-60 source. We provided a leak check survey, an area survey for the unit and the removal work package for the - for removing the unit.

During that discussion, Dr. McKeel indicated that it would be better if you had more leak check surveys. We did do a number of data searches at the records center in Denver and we were not able to find any additional surveys themselves, meaning the actual surveys.

But we did find a 1987 health physics audit report that indicated the leak check had been conducted and showed no leaks. We found specific requirements in health physics documents requiring leak tests be performed at six-month intervals.
We also found a document that indicated who the source custodian was and we were able to interview the source custodian last week. The source custodian indicated that the source was routinely checked and never found to be leaking. The person indicated this unit was rarely used after 1979 until its removal in 1999. The person also indicated they had no idea where the actual surveys had went to.

So after our review we concluded that the requirements did exist for leak checking the source. And based on that 1987 report and the source custodian interview and leak test that we do have from 1999, I believe, we concluded that leak test measurements were made.

We also concluded that if the gamma cell had leaked it would have been seen during contamination surveys when they were prepping the unit for removal. So we find the cobalt-60 source is not an issue.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. And I think that that was - we discussed this at an earlier meeting and I think there was general agreement
about that.

I don't think we - I don't think - I am not sure if we had a vote on it but there was general agreement by the Working Group that that closed that issue.

And then - LaVon?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Do you want me to continue on?

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yes, please. I'm sorry. Yeah.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Okay. Now, I do have to say during that - during our interview with the source custodian, the person indicated that they were a [identifying information redacted] and that they had other exposure concerns that they could not discuss over the phone.

Given the status of this petition evaluation I thought it was - you know, we - and I discussed this with both Stu and Jim and we felt it was important to conduct this interview.

So we are currently working on setting up a classified - or a secure interview and we would like to have a cleared Work Group Member and SC&A
present for the interview as well.


Good. I am not - well, I think two of us are cleared, if I'm not mistaken.

MR. KATZ: That's correct.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: And so one of those two you'll ask and -

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yeah.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: When do you think this discussion will be held?

MR. RUTHERFORD: I am trying to expedite this to get this done as quickly as we can. I should - I would suspect we could have an estimate on completion, you know, on when the interview could be conducted within a week or so.

I just - I am working with our ORAU team and then we have got to work around schedules for Work Group Members and SC&A to ensure that we can get it done. The hope is to have this interview done before the March meeting.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yes, that would be very good. So, now - go ahead.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Also, during the last
Board meeting the petitioner indicated that she was recently given access to all the safety concerns from Rocky Flats.

She indicated she knew NIOSH and SC&A went through the safety concerns in '07 and only considered 40 of the almost 5,000 safety concerns as possibly having effect on dose reconstruction.

She indicated she had concerns with that and felt a number of concerns were associated with the lack of quality control of the internal and external monitoring data. She also indicated that their review identified falsified issues and other issues.

So, as the petitioner noted, you know, we did look at these back in '07 and we haven't used any additional resources at the time to relook into that issue. So I just wanted to status that because it was brought up at the December meeting.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Let me get that. You say it's the data - the safety concerns. Okay. I was not aware that was ongoing.

MR. RUTHERFORD: No. Well, it's - like I mentioned, it was looked at in the previous
petition under SEC-30 back in 2007, but it was brought up by the petitioner again at the December meeting and we - again, I have not - you know, we have not gone back through those safety concerns, but I wanted to bring that up because I am sure Terrie will bring it up later.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Sure. No, that's fine. I appreciate your raising it. Alright. Go ahead. Or is that your - are you finished?

MR. RUTHERFORD: I'm finished with discussing that. You know, we have not - as I mentioned, we have not done anything with that issue at this time.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Mm-hm. Mm-hm. But those are two - so those are two outstanding issues that you've raised that we still have to complete.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Well, yeah.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Or we may want to - let's put it this way. We definitely have to complete the interview from the cobalt-60 employee. The data falsification, I'm not sure. Wanda, are you about to say something?
MEMBER MUNN: Yes, I certainly am. And my first question is, do we have new information that we did not have when we closed this after considerable discussion almost a decade ago?

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah.

MR. RUTHERFORD: I don't believe we do. Based on my review of the information, I don't believe we have any new information.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah.

MEMBER MUNN: Okay. My memory was that this particular item received more than considerable attention from the Work Group at the time because there were serious concerns in this regard.

And, again, from memory alone, it seems to me that we spent a considerable amount of time and did a great deal of onsite work, both by NIOSH and SC&A in this regard, and came to the conclusion that we had not reason to believe that there was a serious problem we needed to pursue at that time.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah.

MEMBER MUNN: So, absent new information - if we had new data, then that's one
thing. If we do not, then it has been closed, in my view.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Right. And I thought - I did not think that was an open issue and I wasn't here in - I wasn't on the Board in 2007. But if it - it doesn't seem to me to be an outstanding issue unless later on there will be time for petitioner comments. And if Ms. Barrie or whoever wants to raise it we'll certainly talk about it further.

So, really, we have just the one outstanding interview, and hopefully that could be done in March.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Right. The remainder thing I wanted to mention was metal tritides. Another - that was brought up again by petitioner at the - actually brought up in, I believe, in June of 2015 the first time. And this issue was discussed thoroughly under SEC-30 as well and was closed in agreement.

And you may - after the petitioner brought this issue back up in 2015 we had additional discussions internally and we found no new
information that would - and we found no new
information at that time that would support
reopening the issue. And the petitioner has
provided documents, and I've reviewed those
documents, but I see nothing in those documents -
and those documents have been made available to
SC&A as well and the Work Group - and I have found
nothing in the documents that would support
reopening that issue.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah. And I think
the Working Group affirmed - it did not - affirm
that there was nothing to reopen. It was raised
and looked at and I think I see no reason to consider
that anything but closed. Or, that is to say, not
so much closed, but it wasn't an issue. It was
brought up, looked at and it's not an issue that
would raise to the level of Working Group
discussion beyond what you've reported. Okay.

MR. RUTHERFORD: And that's all I have.
Discussion by Working Group Members of the five
issues mandated for investigation at RF by the
Board (10/17/13) for the time period
after 12/31/83

CHAIR KOTECHUCK: Okay. So I would
like to - let's see. We're going to mention the
five issues mandated for investigation by the Board
- Item 3.

If you'd like, folks have it. The
PowerPoint that I presented to the Board in late
2015, the third slide there, Petition Overview,
lists the five items that we have - that we were
charged with investigating by the Board at its
October 2013 meeting.

And with the closure of the Critical
Mass Lab, the issues were, first, the
magnessium-thorium alloy at Rocky Flats, which we
closed.

There has been, earlier this week, a
letter and materials from a FOIA investigation and
those will be discussed later. But let's just say
that was closed.

That may be that we have the - we will
listen to what the persons have to say, Terri, and then if we wish to reopen it for any reason that's in our - that's in our purview.

But in terms of what we have done so far, we have five issues: magnesium-thorium alloy, the neptunium exposure potential, the tritium issue, the data falsification issues.

All of these have had White Papers and NIOSH papers and they have been reviewed by SC&A and we closed on them, and this morning we closed on the Critical Mass Lab.

So in terms of the issues that we were charged by the Board with going through, we have closed all of them, which were issues essentially to investigate in terms of whether we want to approve the - or urge the Board to approve, and the Secretary to approve, SEC-192 or not.

So maybe what we should do, first, I think that that close - these close the issues that we're charged with, all of them. It has taken a long time. We were charged with this, as I said, in October of 2013. This is now January - February 2017. So, and I think we should be ready to come
to some conclusions beyond - or some broader conclusions.

But before we do, let's talk. There has been an issue, Barrie and Dr. McKeel raised the issues about mag-thorium, and if they'd like to, I would - well, before - I should say, before I introduce them and ask them if they - or if Ms. Barrie would present, I want to ask all of the Working Group Members: have you seen and had a chance to review the letter from - and the letter in the enclosure from Ms. Barrie and Dr. McKeel? Have you all seen it and had a chance to go over it?

MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. I certainly have.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah, and I. Phil, Bill?

MEMBER FIELD: I looked at it last night.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay.

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yeah, this is Phil. I looked at it also.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Good. So,
I mean, even though it's not posted because it has to go through the posting process, we all have it and I think we can talk about it.

So then let me ask Ms. Barrie to present on that - on her email and the enclosure.

MS. BARRIE: Okay. Thank you, Doctor. Yeah, when I - and I've only had - I didn't have this interview for a very long time. I just got it, like, last week. But I was really concerned.

You know, I realize that the - everybody agreed that if there was - you know, previously that if there was magnesium-thorium alloy plates it would have been at Rocky Flats during the period of time that is already covered by the latest expansion of the SEC status.

However, when I read that this worker said that he - that there was radioactive material that he was not aware of in 1984 and 1986 - or 1989 - that's concerning to me because I think that NIOSH and SC&A and the Board should go back through to see if they can really identify this unknown material that he's talking about.

You know, he's quite well aware of
depleted uranium and other kinds of alloys, but this one specific alloy that he refers to is concerning to me because that would have an effect on dose reconstruction.

And also I'd like to point out that he admits that they weren't monitored for dose-or for radioactive materials back then and here we have depleted uranium in Building 440 and the possibility of having magnesium-thorium plates there also.

And is this my time to provide other comments or should I wait?

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: I would wait on that, if you would.

MS. BARRIE: Sure.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: And I will certainly give you a chance if we move on further issues. But for the moment, I'd like to just focus on your letter and the magnesium-thorium issue.

MS. BARRIE: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. And we certainly read the letter and also looked at the interview.
Now, the fact of that there was a person who believes that he or she was working with - I don't know the name and it's confidential - that the person believes that they were working with magnesium-thorium.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Can I make a correction?

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Sure.

MR. RUTHERFORD: That person did not indicate that they believed they were working with magnesium-thorium alloy. That person was unaware of exactly what metal was in the box. The person never stated that they - in fact, that is not the only person we interviewed that day.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Absolutely.

MR. RUTHERFORD: We interviewed two - a few other individuals and none of those individuals could identify magnesium-thorium alloy ever being used. And, you know, that was part of those specific questions. In fact, one individual indicated that they would have known if magnesium-thorium alloy was used.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Right. And I have
to say that the Working Group Members were aware that there were, I believe, five persons interviewed, only one of whom believed that he possibly was working with magnesium-thorium, and that - and this interview is what I believe - this - the fact that this was the case, that one person said that they thought they had or might have, was discussed with us really in December - let me see - in our meeting on March 17th, 2016. And in the report Joe Fitzgerald was saying, indicated that there were a number of people interviewed.

First, that there was - the NIOSH and ORAU - NIOSH went through the records and could not find any objective confirmation that magnesium-thorium was actually used at the plant.

However, we know that the person - that some of the workers at Dow, the Dow Company in Illinois, said that they were quite confident that they had sent it to Rocky Flats.

But we could not verify that, and then the interviews were done and there was one person who - we have one that says Rocky was sent it. That's on Page 38 of that transcript.
So, we knew about this. I certainly was aware that there was one individual. So, what - do folks want to comment on what you believe - let's first ask Board Members and Working Group Members - what's your take on what was said in the letter and the report by Ms. Barrie?

DR. McKEEL: Dr. Kotelchuck, this is Dan McKeel. I didn't mean to intervene but I do beg you to let me just say a word to correct the record, please.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Alright. You were not in - by the way, you were not in on the original roll call.

DR. McKEEL: That's correct.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: But you are here now.

DR. McKEEL: Yes, sir. That's correct. I joined.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Alright.

DR. McKEEL: I'll make my comments very brief.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Oh, I hope so.

Good. But go right ahead.
DR. McKEEL: The new interview we don't believe is the same as the one in the Bogard-Stempfley paper. The new interview was one that I obtained through the FOIA process, and both Ms. Barrie and I believe that it is a worker who testified in a public comment made to the Board. He identified himself by name. I won't give it here.

But, anyway, he said that he had worked specifically at the Building 440 modification center at Rocky Flats for 17 years. And we believe that that's the person that had a secure interview, and I obtained the unclassified notes from that interview and included it and sent it along to Ms. Barrie, who sent it on to the Work Group. And that's the interview that you all have.

And the thing that convinces us that, with all due respect, I think the people who interviewed that gentlemen failed to ask him the right questions. And what he actually observed was metal plates that he removed from a wooden box that was marked radioactive material. And in the interview this gentleman asked his
supervisor about that material, what it was, and
the supervisor said, basically, don't worry about
it, it's safe, it's not radioactive.

Well, we do know that the gentleman also
said he used depleted uranium to shield railroad
cars and rail cars in Building 440 in the MOD
center. And so, if you think about it, the only
kind of metal plates, other than just steel armor
plates, would be magnesium-thorium alloy, which
has only 4 percent thorium.

And so although we all know that is, in
fact, radioactive, you know, his supervisor may
have thought, well, it's sort of like depleted
uranium, it's not very radioactive.

But anyway, that's what he told the
worker and so that's one of the main reasons the
worker didn't know what was in the boxes. I think
the worker was misled.

So what we are asking, and what I still
ask, and I don't believe it's happened yet, is the
four people that were interviewed and reported on
by Bogard and Stempfley in the earlier paper
mentioned, the worker interviews - we need somebody
at Rocky Flats who actually managed the shipping manifests and in the shipping department who would know about shipments in and out of that plant. And we know exactly what building it was used in.

So it shouldn't be that difficult to get the records from Building 440 and shipments that went into it and out of it, remembering that the main thing that they modified in there were huge semi-trucks and railroad cars, all of which, particularly the rail cars, have extensive identification. You know, and if they are from the Department of Energy they are called APMX cars.

So we're asking that NIOSH go back and get that kind of information and see what was in those wooden boxes. And I don't think that's ever been done before. I'll say for sure it's not on the record that I am aware of. It's not in any paper that I know of. And, of course, we are at a huge disadvantage because we don't know - we can't match up exactly the man's name in the secure interview and the person that interviewed at the - before the Board. But that should be easy for you all to do.
CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: I'd like to ask two questions and then go back to a Board discussion.

DR. McKEEL: Yes, sir.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: The first question is, you're asserting that this is one of the people that was interviewed but not the person who reported that they used the material - they used magnesium-thorium?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Can I -

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yes, I would - I would be glad -

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. RUTHERFORD: No one has ever said that they used magnesium-thorium alloy. That needs to be corrected for the record. No one ever said that.

DR. McKEEL: No, this gentleman that I'm talking about was named in the Bogard and Stempfley paper as his interview was a specific SRDB document and that's what I requested.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Dr. McKeel, I would like to - I wanted to hear your report but we are not having a general discussion among us all.
DR. McKEEL: Alright. You said you wanted to ask me some questions.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: This is a working meeting. Oh, yes. No, I'm happy with the thing. But at this point I asked you who it was. I was going to ask for, and do ask for comment. And Grady, I believe, you were speaking.

MR. RUTHERFORD: No, this is LaVon.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: LaVon - excuse me.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes. Actually -

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: So I don't - I would like to get information from you, as a - as a Board - as a Board Member, your comments.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Okay. I want to point out that this is not a new interview, that was not as Dr. McKeel had indicated. This is an interview - one of the interviews that was conducted in support of the White Papers that we developed.

And, again, there is no - and we also, during our development of that report we asked for design documents. We asked for - we went to Sandia. We went to a number of other organizations
looking for additional information to look for magnesium-thorium alloy.

We talked to the individuals there and we have found nothing that would support magnesium-thorium alloy being used at Rocky Flats, and we stand by that position at this time.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah.

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: LaVon, this is Schofield. I've got a quick question on that. I haven't seen anything in the way of - if they're going to be doing that, I would assume they have a casting where they would be casting this alloy into sheets or whatever particular form they want them. And I haven't seen any indication of any casting being done. Did you see any such thing?

MR. RUTHERFORD: No, they didn't do any casting. They - well, I can't get into too much discussion but I will say that they did do some modifications to the - to the sheets that they used on the - on the rail car.

So there was things that they had to cut, punch, or do different things to it. But there was no casting.
CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Right. And there was - in the - in the material that was sent in the attachment earlier this week the indication was that they received sheets and they were punched. There was - must have been a - and there was - there was a punch and these were punched and then mounted.

So the - so, LaVon, you - yeah, you'll stand by the assertion. And could I ask you, Dr. McKeel suggested that perhaps there - the manifests of what was going in and out of the building were perhaps not examined. Did you not examine those?

MR. RUTHERFORD: I can't - I can't confirm that. We looked at so many different documents to try to come up with an idea if the magnesium-thorium alloy could have come to Rocky Flats. And I know at one point manifests were looked at, at least under SEC-30. I don't know if they looked at those specific manifests associating with Building 440. I don't know for sure. It's been a while.

I could - I would have to go back and actually look at our data capture request to see what the specific items -
CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah. Yeah. I will say, I mean, the reports that you gave us in the past, the examination investigation seemed to us thorough. And at the time when we last discussed this, we agreed that it did not - given limited resources, it did not make sense for you to continue further to go, I believe it was, to LANL and look at things further. Am I correct? Is that - was that LANL?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah. Yeah. And this certainly is one person's interview. Just now talking among Working Group Members, do we - the magnesium-thorium, there was an assertion in the letter that the RF worker interview demonstrates that workers were being deliberately misled by the supervisor.

I - as a Board Member, I don't believe - it does not seem to me to be correct. That there is an issue with magnesium-thorium - it has less than, you know, 3 to 5 percent - say, roughly, 4 percent thorium, and there is a question as to whether this constitutes a large dose of serious
exposure to radiation, and that this is one of those borderline cases.

And the letter by Dr. McKeel and Ms. Barrie says that - it notes that magnesium-thorium, in item four, certain NRC regulations exempt magnesium-thorium with less than 4 percent for use in commercial products such as lantern mantles and welding rods.

And I certainly know that that is the case with lantern mantles, which I happen to have used and others may have, that that level of radiation, certainly in the mantles, is not considered a high level and therefore it's perfectly okay to let people in the general public use it.

And it's noted in the interview that this is considered a cold area. That is to say, the level of radiation is presumably low enough that people are not required to wear badges and that they can work there.

So this is a - this is, to me, a situation where the amount of exposure is quite small and the work that's done on the - that's
reported does not suggest a high degree of machining that would involve exposure to small - to dust or to materials from the machining.

So it does not seem, to me, to be deliberately misleading. The person - it is, as Dr. McKeel pointed, the person there in supervisory capacity may have just said that it was not enough of a problem that people would have to worry about, and therefore, from their point of view, it was not radioactive.

Of course, in terms - in absolute terms, of course, it is radioactive, and any magnesium-thorium is. But the level is low.

So I don't see - I don't see that this information from one person gives me the feeling that we should overturn what - the decision that we made earlier to close this. That is to say, it doesn't - it doesn't provide enough information, in my opinion, to reopen.

Certainly, the person being interviewed says that the work was done from '84 to '89, which is beyond the SEC period that has been granted. But that is one person among others who
interviewed and among, in particular, a search for
documents that came up with nothing despite
extensive efforts to find something.

So that's my take on it. I don't know.

Others? Wanda, Phil, Bill?

MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. I had so
much to say about this when we discussed it last
time, I don't think I need to repeat all that.

The one new thing that I learned from
the information that's been provided to us recently
is the comment from the supervisor that workers did
not have a need to know.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Pardon? Workers
should not have any -

MEMBER MUNN: Did not have a need to
know.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Mm-hm.

MEMBER MUNN: And that was - I think
that's tantamount to saying this is above your pay
grade, which is pretty annoying to the person who
asked the question. I can testify from personal
information this is true, but not necessarily at
this site. But it was - that was new information
to me, and from my perspective an incorrect
response to an inquiry from any worker.

But that's neither here nor there, and
it - but I see nothing new, other than that comment,
which psychologically makes an impact for me, but
in point of fact, for our deliberations, it does
not and I don't believe should.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah. Other
comments?

MEMBER FIELD: Yeah, this is Bill.
LaVon, you said the verify - you indicated - I think
you indicated that this person was indeed
interviewed. Was that correct?

MR. RUTHERFORD: That is correct.

MEMBER FIELD: Okay.

MR. RUTHERFORD: Yeah, and that
interview was used in support of developing our
White Paper.

MEMBER FIELD: Thanks.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Phil?

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: I just - my question
was already answered, because I was just thinking
that if there is much scrap generated and stuff,
typically those are either consolidated in some form or sent back to the origin that they were received from. And personally, going through different documents, I haven't - could not find any such reference or anywhere near documents I've looked at.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah. Yeah. So, in my opinion, and I think I don't see that this provides information that would make us reopen the magnesium-thorium. And -

DR. McKEEL: Dr. Kotelchuck, this is Dan McKeel.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yes. This is Dr. McKeel.

DR. McKEEL: Yes, sir. I must correct what Mr. Schofield just said. I just must correct that.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: I mean -

DR. McKEEL: It's incorrect.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: There is - this is on the record. There will be, at some point, a Board meeting and you have every right to comment and critique anything that was said here. But this
is - this is not - this is not a discussion.

This is a discussion of the Working Group. There is, in general, no public comments unless the Working Group asks it. And we have requested you, Ms. Barrie and you asked, and we certainly agreed. But and you have - and, of course, you have things that you can write to Board.

**Petitioner's Comments**

But I don't - I don't wish to open a debate between members of the public and petitioners and the Group at this point. Again, you will have an opportunity and by all means use it if you wish.

So shall we - I don't know if it requires a motion. Ted, do you think it requires a motion that we do not reopen and -

MR. KATZ: No, it doesn't. It doesn't, because you never had a motion to reopen it.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Right. And I don't - I don't believe this requires a motion. I think that there is agreement from the Working Group. There was no indication that any of us want to
reopen the issue, and therefore it remains - it will remain closed. And I'm perfectly happy to just say that.

And so are there - let's go to - let's go to Item 5.

MR. KATZ: Well, wait, Dave?

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yes.

MR. KATZ: I just - you had - so, Terrie had sort of cut off her comments to just deal with this one issue, but it seemed like she might have had other issues beyond this that she wanted to touch on. Do you want to get those before you move on to 5?

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Well -

MR. KATZ: It's up to you.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah. Terrie has other issues. I thought that we would ask her if we - if we are going to make a decision on the path forward. But we still have one outstanding interview and I don't think we will be able to - well, that will be open to the Group.

MR. KATZ: I mean, just to speak to that, I mean, there is always more information.
You can certainly take an action, make a recommendation, develop a recommendation at this Work Group meeting, and that be provisional to not having the world turned upside down by whatever comes out of this interview.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: I see. Okay.

MR. KATZ: But you don't need to hold another Work Group meeting after that interview information if it doesn't turn up anything that's substantial.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Alright. Well, that's helpful because that's exactly - if they are - I mean, I didn't know if we could make a provisional recommendation provisional on that interview.

MR. KATZ: Yeah. We have done that many times.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Well, that's good to know, and thanks. In which case, since Item 5 really discusses other issues, and Ms. Barrie certainly said that she had some other issues, I would be - I would be willing to ask Ms. Barrie now to raise the other issues that she wishes
to raise, if that's okay by Members of the Working Group.

MEMBER MUNN: Yes, I support that.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Alright.

Please, Ms. Barrie, go ahead, Terrie.

MS. BARRIE: Thank you. Thank you very much. And to just briefly touch back on the magnesium-thorium, and I appreciate Wanda's statement about, you know, the need to know. That was - that was very prevalent, you know, during the production - well, actually during the entire years of Rocky Flats' operations.

So you can't just discount because - it was - it was common for the workers not to know what they were working with, and I want you to understand that and to take that into consideration.

Now, my other issues are, first, let's get back to the safety concerns. In my presentation to the Board on November 30th, I did reference the NIOSH and SC&A investigation into the safety concerns.

But there's this one I'm going to quote:

NIOSH continues its investigation of two safety
concerns involving lost or invalid bioassays. They are safety concerns number 90-169 and the inadequacy of the internal and external dosimetry program 92-048.

And I still have not been able to find if this investigation of these two safety concerns were completed. And I'd like to have NIOSH either confirm and supply me with that investigation, or to take another look at these.

I appreciate that you're going to have that interview about the cobalt-60.

I'm concerned about the data falsification White Paper. NIOSH is tying that only to the SDI rate and I think that's illogical. I mean, there is - I have identified falsification outside and before the SDI rate and I think that needs to be taken a look at again.

Let me see. Building 460 and 440. You're saying that your assumption because these were cold areas that there wasn't a need for bioassay, and I disagree with that.

For instance, I'm still going through the safety concerns, and I just found another one
for Building 460, which was also a cold building. It's safety concern number 91-093, which states that an RCT was posted there in 1991. If it was cold, why would they need an RCT to be there?

I also went to – and I am not sure if this ever went to the Work Group, but LaVon and I, last June, had a discussion about depleted uranium in Building 444. And I don't want to get into all of it, but he did explain to me that depleted uranium would need a catalyst to emit neutrons. And a worker told me that beryllium would act as a catalyst, and in the other side of Building 444, which was separated by a three-foot wall, was beryllium.

So we had depleted uranium on one side and Be on the other side. So LaVon said he was going to take a look at that and I'm not sure if he has or not yet.

The neptunium issue, I still have a problem with the Department of Energy document that says that you cannot use plutonium bioassay to reconstruct dose for neptunium, and that's what's being done here for Rocky Flats. And it's not
being done for Los Alamos.

And the other issue I want to raise again and on the record is the documents that I filed a FOIA request for. I do not always get them because they belong to someone else.

And I understand that the Board and SC&A also have access to these documents, but you are - you are involved with so many other sites I don't see how it's possible that you go through each and every - and maybe you do, I don't know - each and every document that is cited by NIOSH and SC&A. And it would just make me feel so much better if I could get those documents also just in case someone somewhere overlooked something.

And that's all I have for today and I will - yeah, I will, you know, obviously, be presenting, you know, at the March meeting also.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay.

MS. BARRIE: Thank you.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BARRIE: Do you have any questions?

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: I don't - well, personally, I have - first, Working Group Members,
if you want to say something. I will say that Item 3 - I'm taking notes - the data falsification and the neptunium - those have been closed.

We have discussed them with you and knowing - you know, and on the record, and those were closed. And unless you bring up - you expressed, you know, concern and I respect that, and you - and nor do you need necessarily to have agreement. But those items were closed and I don't believe you raised issues that would suggest that we should reopen them, or at least, put it this way, I do not, as one Working Group Member.

For the FOIA request, that's Item 7, what decisions are made in terms of -

MEMBER MUNN: We lost you, Dave.

MR. KATZ: Dave, we just lost you. Hold on. I can address the FOIA thing.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Can you hear me?

MR. KATZ: Yeah, now we hear you again. Dave?

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah.

MR. KATZ: So, you cut out. So whatever you were trying to say about the FOIA, you
cut out. But I can address that if you want. I mean -

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay, fine. I was just going to report - you go ahead.

MR. KATZ: I mean, just the FOIA issue is, this is - this is just the way FOIA works, is the owner of the document is the only agency that can release them. And so - and I think going through the right procedures to request them from those agencies, and in some cases you have to appeal if they don't provide what you want, and the appeal may or may not succeed.

But in any event, NIOSH and the Board are not in a position to release documents - neither NIOSH or the Board, in effect. I mean, the Board uses NIOSH's own documents. So there's nothing to be done by this agency. The only recourse there is the FOIA process.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah. Yeah. Alright. Well, at some level, there were many items that Ms. Barrie raised. I'm not - I don't feel like - this is not a back and forth discussion. They were presented.
I'm going to ask the Working Group Members or the technical consultants - NIOSH and SC&A - if they have comments on any of those or on - there was - there was an issue raised in Item 4, Building 460 and 440, and Ms. Barrie, you said we said that there was no need for bioassay, and I don't believe that's a correct quote.

It's not the question of whether we believe there should have been - there should be a bioassay. The question is, were bioassays conducted? And they were not, apparently. I'm not sure whether not at all or rarely. Does anybody - can anybody speak to that who has been over the records?

MR. RUTHERFORD: This is LaVon Rutherford. I can't remember - I know that - I can't remember from the data whether we have any bioassays from 440 and 460. I can't say for sure.

I don't know if Dan or Jim Bogard or anyone has looked at it and can make a statement on that. But I can't be for sure.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Certainly we know that those buildings were cold and that was
the considered decision based on materials people
were working with.

And so LaVon or others, what about the
- her - the issue she raised about Building 444?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Building 444, I would
like to clarify that the, you know, neutron
exposure from depleted uranium is not an issue.
You don't have enough there. But I did commit to
looking into whether there had been any neutron
monitoring at all in 444 and which I have not done
yet. I'll admit that.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Alright.
So that's another thing that would --

MR. RUTHERFORD: But I want to point
out that there is a - there was an NDRP report.
There was a lot of review done on neutron exposure
under SEC-30 that I see no reason why it should hold
up this petition at all.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Mm-hm. I missed
the first part of that. Could you repeat?

MR. RUTHERFORD: I said the NDRP - and
Jim may remember what the acronym stands for - I
can't remember. But there was a detailed neutron
study done at the Rocky Flats. And corrections were made to dosimetry results from that, and also neutrons were discussed thoroughly under SEC-30. So I don't feel like this is an issue that should hold up this petition.

Further WG discussion as needed of any other issues related to the SEC Petition 192

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. So, and that leaves me only with we've talked about things now on the items - the only - the first item she raised on the safety concerns, and I think we have discussed that already today.

So let me ask Members of the Working Group, I'm on Item 5, are there any other issues related to the SEC Petition 192 that you believe should be or might need to be looked into at this point?

MEMBER MUNN: No. The only questions that I had were involved with issues that LaVon just discussed.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yes. Okay. Then it seems to me that we have - this has been - this is year four of this effort on the 192 petition and
we've closed out the item that we agreed to look at. We've investigated some other items. What is left outstanding is an interview with the person who was working with the cobalt-60, and also that the neutron monitoring in Building 444 will be looked into by LaVon and confirm his remembrance of that, right?

MR. RUTHERFORD: Correct. And I will also - Terrie brought up the question on the two bioassays, whether they had followed up on that issue from SEC-30. I'll see if I can find what the closure on that was and provide that.

**Working Group decision on path forward and/or recommendations on SEC Petition 192 for the March ABRWH meeting**

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. But - okay. Then I think those are issues that can be dealt with and that we could and should move ahead with the provisional decision on the recommendations to the Board for the March meeting on Petition 192.

Is there - do I hear a motion?

MEMBER MUNN: Our specific question
Was whether or not to extend the dates of the SEC. Is that not correct?

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: That's correct. From '83, which it is now, to I think the request went to '89.

MEMBER MUNN: To '89. That was my memory.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yes. Would you like to make a motion?

MEMBER MUNN: I'd like to make a motion that we do not extend the dates of the SEC that currently exist.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Second?

MEMBER FIELD: This is Bill. I'll second it.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Further discussion on this? This is provisional on the interview, the neutron monitoring, and the checkup on the two bioassays, although I'm not sure how they would exactly input. It's a question of were they done, or LaVon, I'm not sure. Try -

MR. RUTHERFORD: I think it's a question of - and I've got to go look into the issue
myself, but I think it's a question on the path forward or how they close the issue out that was previously identified under SEC-30.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Got it. Okay. Okay. So I think - I think - do we - any further comments?

MR. KATZ: Yeah, just - well, just to add to your motion, to clarify, I mean, it's a motion to find that dose reconstructions are feasible for that period.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: That's right, that - that recommending that we not approve the SEC Petition 192, it means that all individuals who have exposure in that post-'83 period, that we can do individual dose reconstructions and that their claims will be processed and acted upon based on those.

MR. KATZ: Right. Thanks.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Surely. Hearing no further, I think - I mean, this - if we will, let's do it in roll call fashion in terms of - to approve - to approve the motion or disapprove. Well -
MR. KATZ: It's just to approve the motion, Dave.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah.

MR. KATZ: And it's to make this recommendation to the Board.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Right. Do we - should we - can we do this by voice or should we -

MR. KATZ: We can do it by voice.

You've all already spoken to the motion.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Right. Okay. All those in favor of the resolution, please say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Oppose? Abstain?

Okay. So it's a unanimous decision. It's provisional and we will get a report back from - hopefully during - before the March meeting so that we can make a report to the Board in March.

And all issues that - either petitioners or others in the public related to the Rocky Flats petition that they want to raise, they are welcome to do so at the March meeting and time
will be given for that before the Board acts.

So that, I believe, will close this. I
don't - I think -

MR. KATZ: Dave, so just as an
administrative matter, it's important, I think it
makes sense for someone to prepare a presentation
for you to give to the Board on this.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Oh, absolutely.

MR. KATZ: So, I mean, I know - it's
totally up to you. You're welcome to prepare it
yourself. You're also welcome to have SC&A
support and NIOSH support to the extent in drafting
that. I mean, I expect that, given that CML came
up before the whole Board, LaVon, I expect you'll
give a presentation to the Board. Isn't that
correct?

MR. RUTHERFORD: I can give the
presentation that I gave or modify it accordingly
if you think that's necessary.

MR. KATZ: Well, I think since that's
sort of a - sort of technical presentation - it's
up to you, Dave, whether you want LaVon to present
in - or you want me to summarize it or yourself,
and either can be done. Certainly I can share all
the materials from today with all of the Board in
either case. So it's just a question as to how we
want to handle -

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Sure. I don't -
well, let's see what we did in the past. I don't
believe the White Papers on deciding the issues,
the four out of the five issues that we had, were
presented to the Board. I think I just reported
on it.

MR. KATZ: No. What I was saying is that
the CML issues came up before the Board and were
discussed some at the Board level, too, because you
discussed them and so on. But anyway --

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yes. Yes. You're
right, we did. Well, since we raised it before the
Board there's - I would say that why not actually
then have - conclude the discussion before the
Board. That is, the reports - basically the
reports that LaVon made and Ron made should be given
before the Board.

MR. KATZ: Okay. I mean, they can give
them or you can just -- it's up to you, Dr.
CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Well, I'm - if the Board has been privy to this discussion we certainly - I certainly should report it to the Board that this issue was open and why it was open. I think it would be worthwhile, and then I will prepare a report. In this case, I'll look to your advice for what I should do for a deadline because I would like to circulate this to SC&A and NIOSH.

MR. KATZ: Well, do you want - do you want SC&A to draft your presentation or do you want to do the first draft yourself? It's up to you.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: It's - at one level, I'm more than happy to have them do it. But let me ask you, since this would be the first report of this sort in terms of the Working Group. Is this the way it's done customarily? I may ask -

MR. KATZ: It's done both ways. It's just - it's really every Work Group Chair has a difference preference. Some Work Group Chairs, like Paul likes to make his own presentations and generally prepare them himself and then run them by. Of course, you'll run it by the staff so that
they can check your work and -

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Right. I think then I will - I will do the first draft.

MR. KATZ: Okay. Then -

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: And I will make sure I get it to people.

MR. KATZ: Yeah. Then in timing it, if you can get your draft to everyone else in the Work Group. Get them to me and I'll circulate it. But I'll circulate it to the Work Group and the staff. If you can do that three weeks - get it done three weeks ahead of the Board meeting that would be fine, in time for them to add any details that you might add and you can -

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. I'll set a March 1st deadline for myself.

MR. KATZ: Yeah, and just - just do parentheticals. If you want them to fill in details that you don't have time to get to just do a parenthetical with instructions and they can do that.

Adjourn

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Sounds
good. And thank you, everyone. I think we are finished now, in time for lunch for some of us and breakfast for others.

MR. KATZ: Yeah.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: And coffee for others. Okay. Thank you all very much. And Bill, I hope you're feeling better soon.

MR. KATZ: Yeah. Thanks, Bill, especially for joining us.

MEMBER FIELD: Thanks. My pleasure.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Yeah, appreciate it. Okay.

MR. KATZ: Take care.

CHAIR KOTELCHUCK: Bye, folks.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:04 p.m.)