

Centers for Disease Control
National Institute for Occupational Safety and
Health
Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health
125th Meeting
Wednesday, October 17, 2018

The meeting convened via teleconference at 11:00
a.m. Eastern Time, Ted Katz, Designated Federal
Official, presiding.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

Members Present:

Henry Anderson, Chair
Josie Beach, Member
Bradley P. Clawson, Member
R. William Field, Member
David Kotelchuck, Member
James E. Lockey, Member
David B. Richardson, Member
Genevieve S. Roessler, Member
Phillip Schofield, Member
Loretta R. Valerio, Member
Paul L. Ziemer, Member
Ted Katz, Designated Federal Official

Registered and/or Public Comment Participants:

Adams, Nancy, NIOSH Contractor
Barrie, Terrie
Barton, Bob, SC&A
Crawford, Chris, DOL
Fitzgerald, Joe, SC&A
Harmond, Lokie, DOE
Lewis, Greg, DOE
Naylor, Jenny, HHS
Neton, Jim, DCAS
Rutherford, Lavon, DCAS

Contents

Centers for Disease Control National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health 125th Meeting Wednesday, October 17, 2018	1
Roll Call/Welcome	4
Procedures Subcommittee	4
Metals & Controls Subcommittee	4
Dose Reconstruction Review Subcommittee	5
New Petitions	8
Adjourn	15

Proceedings

(11:00 a.m.)

Roll Call/Welcome

Mr. Katz: So let me just welcome everyone. This is the Advisory Board on Radiation Worker Health. It's our Board administrative teleconference we use to prepare for face to face meetings. We have a face to face meeting in December.

The agenda for today's meeting is not posted and that's my faux pas. Somehow I left -- I sent it to everyone but the person who posts these things.

But there's not much to the agenda. It's pretty routine reporting to get us up to date so we know what to expect in December.

So let me get started with roll call. We have no issues that we're discussing substantively today so we don't have any conflict of interest matters that we need to address during roll call.

So I'll run down the list. Those of you that I know are on the line I'll respond for you. If I don't -- and I'll just do this alphabetically. I believe I heard Henry Anderson, right?

(Roll call.)

Mr. Katz: Why don't we just, while we're waiting for LaVon, why don't we just swap items and get started with Work Group Subcommittee chairs who have something they want to report.

Procedures Subcommittee

Metals & Controls Subcommittee

Member Beach: Yes, Ted this is Josie. I'll go ahead and start. I have two Work Groups that are going to meet, well, one Subcommittee and a Work Group. The Procedures Subcommittee is set to meet on October 31 and Metals & Controls will meet in

Cincinnati on November 20.

Mr. Katz: November 22 I think, right?

Member Beach: I have the 20th. I just set my flight.

Mr. Katz: I think that's Tuesday, isn't it? November 22.

Member Beach: Let me check. Yes, it's the 20th, Ted. Tuesday, the 20th.

Mr. Katz: Right you are. I had that swapped around with something else. Thanks.

Member Beach: And I think for LANL we will be setting a Work Group call in the next month or so.

Mr. Katz: Yes, so that actually, I'd like to set it this week actually, the date. Even though we don't have anything ready yet. But we can set the date. So I'll be sending out a notice for LANL that everybody can respond and we can pin down a date in those last two weeks before the Board meeting.

Member Beach: Okay. Sounds great, thank you.

Dose Reconstruction Review Subcommittee

Member Kotelchuck: And this is Dave from Dose Reconstruction Review Subcommittee. Working on the new report on the 2018 report just to say that we're moving along on that.

Mr. Katz: Thanks, Dave. And for everyone that's the report to the Secretary following up on the last report which was a couple of years ago, I think 2016.

Member Kotelchuck: Right.

Mr. Katz: Thank you.

Member Roessler: Ted, this is Gen. I could probably say a word about Carborundum because I think we have it on the agenda for the December meeting.

Mr. Katz: Yes.

Member Roessler: Okay. The Work Group needs to have a discussion on some Site Profile issues primarily on modeling of external doses. We plan to -- hope to have a Work Group meeting at the end of November, early December. And if we get that done we'll make a presentation at the December Board meeting.

That should clear up everything for this site.

Mr. Katz: Right, thanks, Gen. Just like Josie's meeting for LANL for Carborundum I'll be sending out a note to all the Members and staff today or tomorrow so we can get that scheduled. Just as you were saying.

And the one uncertainty we have about that. Bob Anigstein who is our sort of lead staff person for SC&A on Carborundum, I think he's been unwell and so I haven't been able to get confirmation from him. He received certainly NIOSH's latest work, the modeling work and the follow-ups on the other items that have been addressed by SC&A. I know he has all of those things. I'm not sure whether he's had a chance to look through those and confirm that he's good and will be ready. But I expect he will be. And I'll let you all know if anything happens there in terms of what he responds between now and then. That takes care of Carborundum. Any others?

Member Clawson: Ted, this is Brad. This is more a question for Greg Lewis. We've been having a little bit of a hard time getting information from Savannah River. I'd love to address if you've had any luck in helping with that.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, a little trouble is probably an understatement. It's been a significant issue with the classification reviews.

I've been updating NIOSH. We have management level involved in Savannah River. They haven't come up with a plan to resolve this yet. I know on the federal level their federal classification officer had left and they've been unable to fill that spot so that's

been a real challenge for us because our recourse, my recourse is the feds sponsor the programs to go through the federal site management.

But without a federal classification officer the federal management there is very supportive and is trying to identify a solution. They're trying to work with headquarters. They're trying to call in additional support.

We're hopeful that we'll be able to get some I don't know if the right word is either a waiver or sort of approval for an alternate review process because the majority of these documents are most likely not classified and in fact many of them to me are sort of data. It's not all numbers, but they're very, it's dosimetry entries, things that are very repetitive and just pages and pages. So it would seem like we may be able to facilitate a quicker review.

We don't have a firm plan yet. Again Pat's been involved. I've been involved talking to site management. In the next week or so if we haven't heard anything more we'll have Matt call the site manager. But I think the issue is not the willingness of the site, it's been on coming up with a strategy that's going to work because there is a significant amount of documents that is in the queue as you're well aware.

Member Clawson: I appreciate that. It's just that it is creating a problem. I appreciate that.

Mr. Lewis: We're very concerned. That's probably our number one priority, our number one concern right now with the program is this delay at Savannah River. But this isn't one of those situations where it's just a matter of getting them to do the work or they don't understand the importance. There's actually a manpower issue.

With the amount that we have it's actually just a real challenge in order to come up with a way to resolve this.

Member Clawson: I appreciate that.

Mr. Katz: Yes, thanks, Brad. It's important. And thanks Greg for what you're trying to do to get something done there. Because it has been awhile and we would like to move forward with this site and we can't until we get through this.

SC&A has produced some responses to NIOSH work on some items but the larger matters on the table rely on this work. Thanks.

There's a similar situation with INL I think, right. They also have a manpower issue that is holding up to some degree our -- SC&A's review on the existing, proposed SEC Class.

So as everyone, I think knows, among Board Members -- SC&A is reviewing claimant cases to see how those work with that. And they still haven't a full sample of those cases to be able to complete that review which is why INL will not be on the agenda for this upcoming meeting in December. That's not ready as well.

Any other Work Groups want to report? We have LaVon back.

Mr. Rutherford: Yes, this is LaVon Rutherford. I apologize to everyone that I'm late.

Mr. Katz: That's okay. But I think we've gotten through the Work Group reports and you can do your report now.

New Petitions

Mr. Rutherford: Okay. Really, there's only two new petitions that we will be presenting at the meeting in December. One is Superior Steel and that's an 8313. And the other is an 8314 for Y-12.

Those are the only new petitions. I'm sure that there will be some updates on Los Alamos National Lab and Sandia. And that's about it.

Mr. Katz: Thank you. Any questions for LaVon? Okay, then I think everyone else will get covered in my reporting to you on staff's agenda for the December meeting.

So and the December meeting is going to be in Redondo Beach, California. It's December 12 and 13. And the 13th right now we have quite a full agenda and it's quite a lot of action items, SEC action items possible. A number of these are tentative. It depends on getting work done in time and reviewed in time.

But right now it goes from December 12 through 2:30 p.m. on December 13. So it's most of the day the 13th as well.

Member Ziemer: What was the time on the 13th?

Mr. Katz: 2:30 p.m. it would end.

Member Ziemer: 2:30, okay.

Mr. Katz: So those of you that are on the east coast or even Midwest you probably won't get home that day. You'll probably stay over that night.

Let me run through what I have right now and I'll give you the provisos for where they apply.

So on the first day we have the usual reports. And then still in the morning the one Site Profile review we hope to do is Carborundum as Gen mentioned earlier. And we'll follow up on that.

Then we have, LaVon mentioned we have Y-12 plant 8314 SEC petition that morning. And then to the end of the day we have the two California items. We have area 4 Santa Susana field lab. I'm assuming still, haven't heard otherwise that reports we'll need from NIOSH, from SC&A and the Work Group to review will be ready by then. Before then we'll have a Work Group meeting.

So that's another Work Group by the way we need to schedule. And I'll be sending out a scheduling

request for the tail end of November or the very beginning of December to allow as much time as possible for that work to get done.

With that said that's in other words two SEC petitions, the Santa Susana one that we have and the De Soto one that we have that are possibly actionable at that meeting.

And then public comment session ending the day.

On Thursday we begin with Superior Steel. LaVon also mentioned that's an 8313 new SEC petition that will be presented to the Board. And then we have, and this again depends on what happens at a Work Group meeting that Josie mentioned, Metals & Controls potentially actionable following that.

And then finally, also potentially actionable but depends on that Work Group meeting, LANL at the end of the meeting taking us to 2:30 p.m. So those are the items I have presently.

If any Board Members have any questions about those or about items that are not on the list right now you can discuss those.

Okay, not hearing anyone I also wanted to, since I have you on the line --

Member Kotelchuck: Sorry, I was on mute. Dave. I was trying to get a copy of something to send on the Secretary report for that meeting. I'm not sure. But I think there's a reasonable possibility. I would put it on the tentative agenda.

Mr. Katz: Okay. We need a Subcommittee meeting first to go over a draft report. So I don't think you'd be ready to present a report at that meeting.

Member Kotelchuck: Okay.

Mr. Katz: But certainly you can update the Board on your work during a work session.

Member Kotelchuck: Sure. In other words we should

go through the DRR Subcommittee first.

Mr. Katz: Correct.

(Simultaneous speaking)

Mr. Katz: I mean, that's normal protocol.

Member Kotelchuck: Yes, that sounds good. I was figuring I would go directly to the Board. That is circulate -- hopefully every Board Member would have a chance to look at a draft and give input. But either way.

Mr. Katz: It's up to you really. The normal protocol is you develop the report in the Subcommittee and then you bring it when the Subcommittee feels it's ready to bring it to the Board.

You can circumvent that but no reason not to. There's no required protocol in a legal sense to do it in that order. It's up to you, Dave. But that's the normal way we've done these.

Member Kotelchuck: Okay. I just remember the last time and I don't think I went separately to the Subcommittee but I went to everybody on the Board. You know what? It doesn't matter.

(Simultaneous speaking)

Mr. Katz: We discussed it multiple times in the Subcommittee before we discussed it at the Board level.

Member Kotelchuck: Did we? Okay.

Mr. Katz: Yes, we did.

Member Kotelchuck: Okay, well that's short-term memory. Fine. Let's do it. Anyway I'll give a report of some sort.

Mr. Katz: All right, that sounds good. Okay. I just wanted to raise then David Richardson I think is still on the line. David had asked at the August Board

meeting of DOE about DOE's budget for all of its records provisions et cetera that it does, records provisions, queries of records and all that that for NIOSH and also for DOL on employment verification and so on.

I followed up with Ms. Harmond, Lokie on that and she sent me a note. She's on the line so she can speak directly saying it.

It seems like the annual budget is about \$4.5 million and some portion of that is for -- I don't know how that breaks out, but either Lokie or Greg, if you want to address that in more detail you can do that now or we can follow up in writing if you need to do more work.

(Simultaneous speaking)

Mr. Lewis: Oh, go ahead, Lokie.

Ms. Harmond: I can try to explain the best I can. I guess, Greg, you can kind of fill in.

So the figure that I sent you it was for EV NIOSH and NIOSH supplemental and DAR requests. And so that was \$4.5. So that is not our whole program budget, that was just the cost of going up until August 2018 of the cost for those responses.

And then the other number that I sent was for NIOSH projects. That was 106. So, \$106,000. And so that total does not include the \$4.5. I'm not sure if I answered your question?

Mr. Katz: I guess I'm just, I'm unclear about, like, I don't know what NIOSH projects is versus the rest.

Ms. Harmond: Greg, do you want to?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I can jump in. And just again to clarify she basically gave you the amount that we've spent through when the question was asked what we had. I think we may even have a more updated number now but that was through probably 10 or 11 months of the year in terms of our overall budget.

So it's actually not \$4.5, it's probably between \$5 and \$5.5 plus the project costs plus administrative costs here and some other things that we spend funds on.

Our overall program budget for the year is probably closer to \$6 million in terms of what we actually spend, between \$5.5 and \$6 million.

When we put NIOSH projects that's anything besides pulling dose records for Bob Smith for Bob's EEOICPA claim. I mean that's any of the SEC research, SC&A going out to a site, making a records request, pulling people to interview, all the administrative time it takes to do that. So basically all of the work done for this Board would fall under the \$106,000 number in terms of the projects.

I will also say that that number is likely -- in fact I know that that number is low. For big projects when NIOSH or SC&A brings a team out to a site and is there for a week pulling boxes and reviewing things and then there's a classification review or places like Savannah River, Hanford where we've been doing big projects, we're pretty good at separating out that work.

But as the folks that are doing the research, the SC&A and NIOSH folks know a lot of it is there will be a big initial effort but then a lot of small follow-up questions, a small follow-up request or working with smaller sites or at a major site for some information about an AWE.

And a lot of that stuff, remember, to show up under this \$106,000 on our list someone's got to -- whoever is doing that work has got to stop, they've got to bill it out under a separate charge code or make a note of it so they can somehow segment that from the other work.

And I know a lot of times for these smaller requests that doesn't happen which I'm okay with because the administrative cost associated with separating this out is just not always worth it. We want to have a general tracker of what we spend for this NIOSH

project.

Or we do the same thing for Department of Labor when they're out there doing their research to enhance their site exposure matrix. We try to segment that out as well.

So when we say about \$100,000, one it would be higher than that because that's through basically 10 months of the year or 11 months that we'd add some for the work that was done in August and September so it's a little bit higher.

And I would also say it's probably low because we're not tracking, we're not going in the lawyer seven minute increments of time that people are tracking as they answer phone calls and work with NIOSH and SC&A.

I don't know, did that answer the question? I believe that's what you all were asking.

Mr. Katz: Well, that answered my question about how it breaks out but the NIOSH -- the SEC work is maybe only a couple -- and Site Profile work is maybe only a couple of percentage points of the whole budget.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, and like I said it's probably under reported here. But it is accurate to say the vast majority of our funding dollars goes toward the responding for individual claims for DOL and NIOSH.

Mr. Katz: David, is this answering what you wanted to know about?

Member Richardson: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Katz: Okay. All right. So, thank you, Greg and Lokie for that very much.

Mr. Lewis: If there's any follow-up questions or you want any clarification we'd be happy to do our best to answer.

Mr. Katz: Okay. Any other matters before we

adjourn?

Member Anderson: What's the location of the meeting again?

Mr. Katz: So we're going to be meeting in California in Redondo Beach which is close to the airport. That's sort of the point.

Member Anderson: You'll send out all of the --

Mr. Katz: Yes. It will be a very easy commute from the airport to the hotel.

Member Anderson: Okay. Which airport?

Member Clawson: Is that LAX?

Mr. Katz: Yes, LAX.

Member Kotelchuck: And Redondo Beach is in the L.A. area, right?

Mr. Katz: It is. It's very close, David, to LAX, to the airport.

Member Kotelchuck: Okay.

Adjourn

Mr. Katz: And it's also very easy. You don't need to rent cars because you can walk to places and eat there and so on.

All right. Well, thank you everybody and I think then if we're all in agreement we can adjourn.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:29 a.m.)