

Centers for Disease Control  
National Institute for Occupational Safety and  
Health  
Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health  
134th Meeting  
Wednesday, June 24, 2020

The meeting convened at 11:00 a.m., Eastern Daylight Time, via Teleconference, Rashaun Roberts, 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.nealgross.com](http://www.nealgross.com)

## Present:

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

## Registered and/or Public Comment Participants:

Adams, Nancy, NIOSH Contractor  
Barrie, Terrie, ANWAG  
Barton, Bob, SC&A  
Buchanan, Ron, SC&A  
Calhoun, Grady, DCAS  
Crawford, Chris, DOL  
Fitzgerald, Joe, SC&A  
Lewis, Greg, DOE  
Naylor, Jenny, HHS OGC  
Rutherford, Lavon, DCAS  
Stiver, John, SC&A  
Taulbee, Tim, DCAS

## Contents

Centers for Disease Control National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health 134th Meeting Wednesday, June 24, 2020	1
Roll Call/Welcome	4
Special Exposure Cohort Petition Status Update	5
Updates from Work Groups and Subcommittees	6
Plans for the August 2020 Board Meeting	21
Scheduling Meetings for February and April 2021	28
Public Comment	31
Adjourn	32

## Proceedings

(11:00 a.m.)

## Roll Call/Welcome

Dr. Roberts: So first of all, good morning. Okay, good morning everybody. This teleconference --

(Chorus of good morning.)

Dr. Roberts: Good morning. This teleconference is for the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health. My name is Rashaun Roberts and on June 4th I officially became the new Designated Federal Official or what's called the DFO for this Board. With pleasure, I follow Mr. Ted Katz, who as you know served as the Board's DFO for a number of years, and I had the great pleasure of working with him for a short time to make this transition before he retired from this role.

So before we officially move into this meeting, I just want to cover a couple of brief items in order to keep everything running smoothly. I would just ask that each of you check your phone and please mute your phone, unless of course you need to speak. If you don't have a mute button, what you can do is press \*6 to mute. If you need to take yourself off mute, press \*6 again.

I am hearing some background noise, so that means that someone isn't on mute. So if you could please double-check your phone and make sure that you are on mute, so that we don't have interference, that would be great. Okay, perfect. Okay. Would someone please check your phone, everyone please check your phone, because I do hear something in the background. Okay, great.

Okay. It's there again, but I'm going to try to move on. There is an agenda for this meeting, which can be found on the NIOSH website. For those of you who may not have an agenda in front of you right now, know that the agenda is pretty straightforward

and you should find it pretty easy to follow along without it.

So with that, let me formally welcome everyone to this teleconference. The primary purpose of this meeting is to prepare for our August Board meeting, which was supposed to take place in Idaho Falls, face to face. But with travel restrictions in place due to COVID-19, we're going to need to make plans for having that meeting virtually, which we will do later on in the agenda.

And again, if everyone please check your phones. I can still hear stuff in the background. Okay. Before we get to the agenda, let's go first to roll call. There's no issues of conflict of interest with this meeting because it's literally just an administrative type meeting, so we don't need to address conflict of interest. But with roll call, I'll start with the Board. I'll go by alphabetical order since I'm three weeks in and I don't know voices probably at this point.

(Roll call.)

Dr. Roberts: Oh, hi, Loretta, thank you. Thank you. All right. So thanks and welcome again. Welcome to all of you. This should be a relatively brief meeting, but first up on the agenda we have the update from Mr. LaVon Rutherford. So, LaVon?

#### Special Exposure Cohort Petition Status Update

Mr. Rutherford: Yes, you've got it. All right thanks, Dr. Roberts. For the August Advisory Board meeting, NIOSH plans to present an 83.13 SEC evaluation for the Reduction Pilot Plant for the years 1976 through 1978. That report has been sent to the Advisory Board and to the Petitioner. We had intended to present an addendum for Y-12 covering the remaining years of that Petition, 1987 through 1994.

But in the drafting of the addendum, a data issue was identified that required some additional review.

The data issue has been resolved, but we're not sure that the report will be completed in time for the August meeting. We have several SECs that are with Work Groups. I can answer questions on their status during the updates from the Work Groups.

But for the SEC meeting in August, the only new item is the Reduction Pilot Plant, and there is a possibility that the Y-12 report will be done. That's all I've got.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, thank you so much, LaVon. Are there any questions for LaVon at this time?

Okay. Hearing none, let's go move into any Work Group or Subcommittee reports. Who wants to report out on what's happening and what's coming up? Now is a good time for that.

#### Updates from Work Groups and Subcommittees

Member Beach: Hi Rashaun, this is Josie. I'll report out on Metals and Controls if that's okay.

Dr. Roberts: Absolutely.

Member Beach: Okay. So we last met on April 13th of this year. We have a couple of action items that have not been delivered yet, and I'll just quickly go over those. NIOSH said they would give us a comparison of previous AWE sites, granted SECs, and those were Ames, Norton and Vitro and we're still waiting for that. I believe once LaVon took the lead on that, so maybe when I'm done he can just give us an update.

From SC&A, we're getting for Welding and Thorium a White Paper response to NIOSH's last year's White Paper. Let's see. We need to review surrogate data, use against Board criteria for the same. I believe that's in SC&A's corner. They have -- we've talked about it, but I don't believe anyone's taken action from SC&A on that.

And then for me, I reviewed Mister -- oh, I won't

say his name. I reviewed one of the Petitioner's comments, who commented at our last Work Group meeting, saying that he commented to the Board in August of 2018. So I wanted to just go back and find his comments and determine if there was anything that we needed to address. I completed that in June and found that there were no new items that are not currently being addressed in the Work Group. So that is done.

There are some SEC open items. Just briefly, let's see. The use of surrogate data found from Mound, internal exposure, exposures associated with subsurface maintenance and repurposing activities. This is in Building 10. The Welding and Thorium issue I had mentioned earlier, that we're waiting on that paper. HVAC maintenance, exposures and Building 10 roof and overhead areas, all intrusive work. So that's kind of a brief update of where we are.

I do think we need to schedule another Work Group meeting when these items are available. So that's all I have for Metals and Controls, excuse me.

Mr. Rutherford: Dr. Roberts, this is LaVon Rutherford. Yeah, I can give you an update on our response, Josie. We actually have that response in - - it has just went through its initial review. I expect that that report will be to the Work Group no later than mid-July. It may be a little sooner, but Dr. Taulbee hasn't got a chance to review it yet. That report will actually address the issue of residual contamination periods that have been added to the SEC and the reasons why, and it also addresses residual contaminations that have been denied.

Additionally, we also respond to a couple of Petitioner issues and we also looked at that same individual's issues that were brought up at the Board meeting and came to the same conclusion that we'll tell you. So again, that report should be out no later than mid-July.

Dr. Roberts: Thank you, LaVon. Any other questions

for Metals and Controls, or comments?

Okay. Any other Work Group and Subcommittee report?

Member Clawson: Yeah, this is Brad Clawson. I'd like to just give a report on Hanford. We received materials ---

(Telephonic interference.)

But anyway, so we received it from NIOSH, and I believe this is in SC&A's hands. We're still waiting, I believe, Joe, correct me if I'm wrong. We're waiting for a White Paper from NIOSH accepting these conclusions or not; is that correct?

Mr. Fitzgerald: Actually -- this is Joe Fitzgerald. Actually, we have a memo report that is about to be issued that covers the status of all this, and fills in a couple of unfinished items from the Work Group meeting. So that should pretty much be our assessment on the review.

Member Clawson: Okay. That's, I just hadn't seen anything yet. So I didn't know whether we were at there. Also, while I've got you on, we've got Savannah River. We've received from NIOSH most of the information I believe that they were to provide for us. Are we still waiting on any of it?

Mr. Fitzgerald: From our standpoint, I think we have submitted everything we had, and I think it was moving towards some meeting or some Work Group discussion. I think that's -- it's been a while, but I think that was where it was left in the winter.

Mr. Rutherford: Okay, Tim.

Dr. Taulbee: Brad, this is Tim Taulbee, yes. Just to give you an update on where we are, we have responses to SC&A's comments on Report 92. Those were submitted back to the site for classification review back middle of April. We just got those comments or the review back, I believe it was the

week before last. So are working through getting that document finalized, and then it will be sent to the Work Groups for your all's review.

I am expecting mid-July for that to actually get out and into your all's hands from that standpoint. Then at that point, I think Joe's team is going to want to read that, and then we might be ready for a Work Group.

Member Clawson: Okay. That sounds good. I appreciate that input. Then while I've got you on, Tim, we -- quite a while back we had the final report for the Nevada Test Site, the implementation into the Site Profile, and I believe that SC&A was going to review the implementation of that. I haven't seen anything I believe on that yet. Are you waiting --

Mr. Barton: Hi, Brad, this is Bob Barton with SC&A. I've been kind of picking up that ball and running with it. NIOSH issued, I believe it was a few months back, put a revision to the Environmental TBD which dealt with a lot of these resuspension issues. There have also been a couple of White Papers, a couple from SC&A and also I believe two from NIOSH since the last time we met, which was back in January of 2017.

So what we've been doing on our side is sort of trying to wrap up all these issues, and what we have is basically a very abbreviated matrix because, as you recall, these matrices can get very large. So we're pretty much paring it down to what's left on the table for discussion, and I think that we're really right on the cusp, at least from SC&A's viewpoint, sitting down to really hammer out the remaining Site Profile issues.

Member Clawson: Okay. I appreciate that matrix because when we get down to the end of this, we've taken care of so many of the other ones. And with so many different sites, it's hard to keep them all straight. So I appreciate that, Bob, and we'll be looking forward to that.

And as far as Pantex, I don't think -- I think we're pretty well complete with that, aren't we? Or do we still have anything out there from NIOSH or SC&A?

Mr. Rutherford: Yeah, this is LaVon Rutherford. I believe Pantex has closed all the -- I don't have anything open that I know of.

Member Clawson: Okay, Bomber. I appreciate that. Okay, and that's my report.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, great. Thank you so much. Anyone else?

Member Kotelchuck: Yeah, Dave Kotelchuck, Dose Reconstruction Review Subcommittee. We have not met in a very long time, and we urgently need to schedule another meeting. As of a while ago (telephonic interference) NIOSH response on some of the Set 27 reviews, and I don't know if those have been completed. Maybe Rose or John or John Stiver will respond. But hopefully we got some -- we've gotten those responses from NIOSH, and if we have, we should schedule a meeting as soon as possible.

Ms. Gogliotti: Dave, this is Rose. We have gotten the 27th set responses, and we're in the process of responding to those. But we do have the meeting scheduled for next month, on July 29th.

Dr. Roberts: Yeah.

Member Kotelchuck: We do, my goodness. Maybe I -- of course we will -- let me double-check on my own calendar, although there is no issue if we have something scheduled. But I would like to just -- I didn't realize that we had actually gotten a schedule, and, yes, indeed, Rose, we certainly do have this, and it's on my schedule as well. So okay, good.

Ms. Gogliotti: Okay, and presumably we'll be discussing the 27th set at that meeting; correct, rather than the 28th set which we just submitted?

Member Kotelchuck: Correct.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Anything else?

Member Ziemer: This is Paul Ziemer. I have -- I'll give you a brief report on Superior Steel, which is being reviewed by TBD-6000 Work Group. Basically -- and the Work Group met in February this year, and our plan was to present our final report at the April meeting, which meeting was cancelled or in a sense combined with the August meeting.

So I just wanted to give you a heads up that we will be, I presume at this point, on the agenda for the August meeting, the findings and report will be given by Megan Lobaugh and myself. And we basically have closed all the findings on the Site Profile, and we'll be reporting to the Board. I think that will be an action item on the August meeting. Or at least it should be -- or at least I assume, Rashaun, that Ted's probably passed that information along to you.

Dr. Roberts: Yes, he has, and we will get into that momentarily.

Member Ziemer: Yeah, thank you.

Dr. Roberts: Sure. Any other Work Group or Subcommittee reports?

Member Schofield: Yes, Dr. Roberts, this is Phil.

Dr. Roberts: Hello, Phil.

Member Schofield: Hello. Is the 16th definitely going to be set in stone for us for the INL Work Group meeting?

Dr. Roberts: Yes, and actually I was going to keep, just to keep people abreast, we have identified July 16th at 11:00 a.m. Eastern Time as the next meeting date and time for the Idaho National Laboratory/Argonne National Laboratory-West Work Group. And we're just starting to work on the agenda for that one.

Member Schofield: Okay. The other thing is I guess I need to have SC&A and NIOSH both look at we've received a lot of information from the Petitioner over the last few months. I was wondering if we could get a Work Group meeting for Santa Susana Field Lab and De Soto, cover De Soto also?

Dr. Roberts: Okay, and you are suggesting that that take place sometime in July also, or did you have a sense of the timing for that?

Member Schofield: I don't have any particular day. I was kind of leaning more towards August.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, more towards August, okay.

Member Schofield: Yeah.

Dr. Roberts: Yeah. Let's be in touch about that.

Mr. Rutherford: This is LaVon Rutherford. Phil, I'd like to know what information you've received over the last few months because I've received a couple of emails from the Petitioner, but we haven't received any new information. So if you've received new information that we should be reviewing, I'd like to get a hold of that.

Member Schofield: Okay, I'll go back here -- I'm pretty sure I've got -- unfortunately right now, I've got to pick up my new card in Denver next week. Well, the Petitioner anyhow has some questions about some of the data she submitted. Maybe you've already seen all that. That will be a discussion we can have.

Mr. Rutherford: Okay.

Mr. Barton: Yeah, hi Phil. This is Bob Barton again. I think that maybe what we're referring to was possibly last fall we received some additional material from CORE Advocacy related to Santa Susana and De Soto. I believe we have looked at that and reported out. But, again, I agree if there is something new that came in, I don't think SC&A's

aware of it.

And the only other thing I'd add that we could possibly do at an August meeting is we're about to produce a report about the telephone interviews that we were performing with former workers at De Soto to answer some of the questions that remain, specifically about the De Soto SEC period. So that should be ready and in your hands in the next week or two I think. It's right in the queue.

Member Schofield: Okay, thank you.

Member Beach: Rashaun, this is Josie. I want to just do a brief update on LANL, and I'll probably need LaVon's help on this. I got a message from LaVon. It was a partial update. We're -- NIOSH is working on a sampling plan, and I know that he was waiting for a last batch of RWPs. And I'm just wondering if you have received those, LaVon?

Mr. Rutherford: Yeah. Actually, we have not received them, and I'll give you a little more detailed update. We actually shifted -- as you know, we shifted from the sampling plan to a sampling analysis, mainly because -- I mean to an RWP analysis because we actually pulled all the RWPs for the 1996 through 2001 period, and we are including all the RWPs in this analysis.

We've not stopped. We're not waiting on this. What we're doing is we have all the HP checklists in-house. We've already put them into our analysis. We loaded all the data in on those. We've started the review process on those, and we've also moved into all the RWPs we have in-house. We've moved those into the system. So as soon as those RWPs are released from LANL, we can complete that portion of our analysis.

The other thing we were working on was mixed fission activation products and exotics, an analysis on those. There are contamination airborne surveys that are with that group of RWPs that we're waiting on. And so, again, we didn't wait on those. We've

got everything loaded up, most of the analysis done. We'll re-run everything as soon as we get the rest of that data, and we can pull that data in.

I can't give you a good timeline on completing things until we find out from the site when they'll be able to release. The last discussions I heard, I think Greg Lewis reported out that things are starting to move forward with the sites, and so maybe here in the near future we'll get some kind of response.

Member Beach: Okay, great. Thank you.

Mr. Rutherford: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Lewis: Yeah, and this is Greg from DOE. I mean I can echo what LaVon said. Given the situation, we've had some significant and unique challenges down there. But we are, you know, they're trying to get those out as soon as possible, and it -- you know, when the site staff and folks are able to be back in and fully up and running, that's a top priority.

Member Beach: Right. Totally understand the slowdown. So thanks, Greg.

Member Anderson: This is Henry Anderson. Let me just give you a quick update on the UR AWE Work Group. We met in January to go over the Site Profile issues remaining for W.R. Grace, and I think that was closed out at that meeting. And then in March, let's see what's the date here, we got the issues matrix update, and the TBD has largely been updated, and I think that's closed out. Am I correct, LaVon, on that?

Mr. Rutherford: Had to find my mute button. I think, I think that is correct. You know, I don't have that portion of it in front of me. SC&A can report out probably on that as well.

Dr. Buchanan: Yeah, this is Ron Buchanan with SC&A. Yes, W.R. Grace was closed out. All the issues was closed out with a schedule to present a

slideshow, and then it was -- that meeting was cancelled. And so I don't know if it's tentatively scheduled for August or not. I haven't seen the agenda for August, but I believe it was.

Member Anderson: I remembered we -- I was trying to figure out where it all fit in. So great. I think that's pretty much it, just to give a finalized update to the Board. And then the second one I have is Sandia, and a while back we did do a meeting with the guards out there, and there's been an update. The interviews with the guards, issues there have been summarized, and I think we've got that as well. I don't know. Is there more with Sandia now?

Member Field: No, only surrogates.

Member Anderson: Yeah. Go ahead.

Mr. Rutherford: I was going to say, this is LaVon. I do believe we're still waiting on those interviews to move back through the system.

Member Anderson: Okay. I know they had --

Mr. Rutherford: Yeah. Joe could correct me if I'm wrong on that. But I believe that's what we're waiting on.

Mr. Fitzgerald: Yeah, this is Joe. We pretty much had developed the entire assessment that we're going to provide, but we have held back and are waiting, as LaVon points out, awaiting the confirmation by the interviewees of the summary so we can include that. So that's the only thing holding it up.

Member Anderson: Okay. I think the last I had was some word on the first part of April. Chuck gave an update. I'm trying to get through all my little email messages here.

Mr. Fitzgerald: Yeah, the -- I think the problem is the guards have been in a -- well, in the same place everybody else has been relative to COVID-19. So

the scheduling and everything else has been delayed. I don't know if Chuck has heard anything more, LaVon, but it's really just a question of when they can respond.

Mr. Rutherford: Yeah, Chuck hasn't. He has -- I checked with him just recently.

Member Anderson: Okay. So that's my set of updates.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Great --

Member Anderson: The only other I would have is the SEC Work Group has met jointly with Metals and Controls. We've pretty well closed out the SEC Work Group component at the first meeting, but we've continued to participate with the Metals and Controls group as well. So we're still active.

Member Beach: Henry, sorry to interrupt. This is Josie. Wasn't that SEC with Savannah River, not Metals and Controls?

Member Anderson: Oh, I'm sorry. You're right.

Dr. Roberts: I believe that's right.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Anderson: -- Metals and Control -- I didn't remember which was -- no, you're right, yeah. Okay.

Dr. Roberts: Okay.

Member Anderson: So we're still sitting in on Savannah River, but our Work Group's activities related to that we closed out.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, great. Any other updates that people want to report at this time.

Member Beach: Rashaun, this is Josie. I have a request for an update, and I don't know if, Rose, if you can give an update on the Subcommittee for

Procedures. We haven't met in a couple years, and I'm just not quite sure where we are, and NIOSH may know also with any work products coming up for Procedures.

Ms. Gogliotti: Actually, Josie, that would be Kathy.

Member Beach: Kathy, okay. I didn't know if you -- I didn't think Kathy was on the line, so I didn't know if you had any information.

Ms. Gogliotti: I do not, but I can have her give you an update.

Member Beach: Yeah, okay. That would be great, thanks.

Member Ziemer: Can you remind us, Josie, who's chairing that now since Wanda resigned?

Member Beach: I am.

Member Ziemer: Oh, okay. I thought that was the case, but since you were asking the question I wasn't sure.

Member Beach: Well, it's been such a long time since we've met, and I'm kind of a little -- I didn't go back and look at any notes to prepare for this meeting, but I thought I should maybe just get something moving on that.

Member Ziemer: Yeah, thanks.

Dr. Roberts: Thank you. Any other questions or updates, reports?

Member Anderson: Did we get an update on Savannah River? I just see here I have a June 3rd, and sent around -- memo on a few of the imputation methods, and I was wondering where that is standing.

Dr. Taulbee: This is Tim. With Savannah River, we are preparing responses to the Report 92, the construction trades worker evaluation. These are

responses to SC&A's comments on that report. And then at that time, once we get that back to the Work Group, we'll be ready to schedule the next Work Group meeting, which we're probably going to have to do multiple Work Group meetings just due to the timing.

This was intended to be like a day and a half face to face meeting, but trying to do this virtually is probably going to take us longer and a few meetings to do, so. But once we get this report back, that's when Dr. Cardarelli will be contacting Brad and yourself to start trying to set something up.

Member Anderson: So we're going to keep the joint Work Groups together is what I'm really asking?

Dr. Taulbee: I believe there's only -- there is one issue that the -- your Work Group, the SEC Issues Work Group, could weigh in on, and that is with regards to the stratification discussion and our responses to that. But other than that, from the co-exposure model, you are correct. Your Work Group has provided all of the guidance that we needed, and we finalized that implementation guide, and it's out there.

But the issue of stratification is something that we could still value the SEC Issues Work Group's opinion on.

Member Anderson: Just for the SEC members on the phone here, that that will probably be the next call for setting aside some time for a Work Group, joint Work Group meeting.

Mr. Barton: And, Dr. Anderson, this is Bob Barton. I might just add on to that. I think what you mentioned was imputation. That came out of the joint SRS/SEC Work Group meeting back in December. And at that time, SC&A was tasked with taking a closer look at that as a general method, not just how it was applied to SRS, though that was the first site that this method was really applied to. But

it is sort of a universal method across the program for all these sites.

So that's something that SC&A produced quite recently, I think maybe right at the beginning of June. So I believe you have a non-PA-cleared version of that? And I think we're still working on getting a PA --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Anderson: Yes, that's true. I just was able to get to my NIOSH computer here and to the website, and that's when I saw that that came on June 3rd. So that's pretty recent.

Member Clawson: But this is Brad. I don't, you know, trying to get these two groups together, there's going to be stuff coming up with Savannah River. We've been at this an awful long time, and I don't want to hold it up just because the other Work Group can't be joining us. I will give all the best efforts we can, but we've got to move forward on this. This has been out there a long time.

Member Anderson: I would agree with that, Brad, and that's why I was kind of trying to sort out are there specific issues which our group needs to weigh in on, rather than I would view -- we're happy to, since we've spent a lot of time kind of getting up to speed, happy to contribute to discussions. But I would then say don't do anything in order to get all of our members to be able to attend if it isn't an item that we specifically need to address.

Member Clawson: Right, because Savannah River has really, you know, everybody knows that this one has been going on for an awfully long time now. And I just -- and I do respect having the other Work Group members there, but my feeling is that we push forward. If we come into an issue, we may have to bring you in and look at it from that standpoint. But my biggest thing is we need to deal with the Petition and the implementation and going from there most of all. Okay?

Member Anderson: That's fine with me. It's just with all the communication via email, it would be good rather than just send out invitations to both Work Groups looking for dates, I would ask, Brad, that you kind of take the lead on this, and if you and Rashaun believe that our group needs to be pressed to participate, let's -- we'll do that. Otherwise we --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Clawson: Henry, I really -- I really appreciate the input from your group. I'm just saying that we need to get on this. We're still waiting for things to be able to come out from NIOSH and SC&A. So when we set this up for this Work Group, we are going to try everything we can to involve you guys in it because I appreciate your input.

But the thing is too is this -- we need to get Savannah River taken care of most of all. So that's all I was trying to say.

Member Anderson: Sure. I just want to avoid confusion as to where we go and what our roles, since it's -- you're site lead, I would say.

Member Clawson: Yeah, I'm the site person for that one, but we have a lot of things that we need to sort through before we can really have a Work Group. But when we do set it up, we'll try to involve you. But we just want you to be aware that if it's because of your group that we can't meet, I'm going to tell you right now I want to push forward and get ours taken care of. And if there's an issue that rises, we'll work with you guys, okay?

Member Anderson: Sounds good.

Dr. Roberts: Okay.

Member Anderson: Moving right along.

Dr. Roberts: Great. Great. Thanks so much, and

thanks for that conversation about moving forward. Are there any other Subcommittee or Work Group meeting updates before we move on to talking about the August Board meeting?

#### Plans for the August 2020 Board Meeting

Okay. Well hearing none, let's move into that part of the agenda. So as I mentioned briefly earlier, due to the current HHS and CDC travel policy related to COVID-19, we're actually restricted from conducting the August Board meeting face-to-face in Idaho Falls, which had been planned for August 26th and 27th.

So rather than postpone the meeting to have it face-to-face, you know, when travel restrictions are lifted, which it's difficult to know when that would be, it seems best to move forward at this time with having the meeting virtually, and also since the Board has done meetings before using the Skype platform, also using Skype for that particular meeting.

What I have thought about, and this has been done in collaboration with Ted before he retired from this role, is that the meeting, we propose that the meeting be done across two days, but in four to five hour sessions each day. So with that said, are there any comments or any other perspectives on, you know, divvying things up in that way, and any other comments on having the meeting virtually on Skype?

Member Beach: Rashaun, have you thought about Zoom meetings, or are we going to stay with the Skype?

Dr. Roberts: I think because the Board has used Skype in the past, I don't want to -- since this is our first attempt to do, try to emulate a face-to-face meeting virtually, we probably don't want to introduce too many new things. So I think for this first one, to do it on Skype versus Zoom.

So, you know, there have been some glitches with Zoom also that I have some concerns about, so the proposal is to do it on Skype.

Member Beach: Okay, and then are the August dates going to hold, the 26th and 27th?

Dr. Roberts: That's what I'm thinking since those days were designated before, you know, to kind of keep that timing if that's okay.

Okay. Was someone else going to ask a question or make a comment?

Member Ziemer: Yeah, this is Paul. I was going to ask, we've used Skype before, but only to show slides. We've not used it virtually for seeing each other at a meeting like we do with the Zoom meetings. When you say we're using Skype, is that just to show the document and the slides, or were you thinking a virtual face-to-face? Because we've not used Skype for that before.

Dr. Roberts: Well, right. I was thinking just doing it with the slides, and, you know, assuming that that meeting's going to be a success, if we do have to do future virtual meetings, we can add a video component. But I think for the time being trying to keep it basic.

Member Ziemer: Thank you.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. So if that seems like a reasonable plan in general, let me just run through what I have in terms of the potential items for the two agendas. And again, before Ted vacated the DFO role, we did have a chance to come together to talk about his recommendations for the agenda if the meeting needed to be done in this fashion.

So the items that I'm going to describe really rely heavily on his recommendation, since he had a greater familiarity obviously with what he -- could best be handled on a virtual platform. So let me just go with what I have. So obviously on the first day

we would be opening up with a welcome. Then having the NIOSH Program Update by Grady, as per usual.

And then the DOL Program Update, the dose reconstruction-related claims appeals process and experience in claims rate forecasting is the item that I have here, presented by Chris Crawford. So let me stop there and just make sure that those items are okay.

Okay, any comments?

Okay. Well moving forward, I also have the DOE Program Update to be done by Mr. Greg Lewis. We have the Site Profile Review for W.R. Grace on the agenda. Let's see. I did hear that the recommendation as the Work Group reports were provided was that Superior Steel, SEC petition number 247, be put on the agenda. However, that wasn't something that came with Ted's recommendation. But let me open it up and just kind of get some insight from you all about adding that.

Member Ziemer: Well, we did have it scheduled for the April meeting initially, where -- and I think -- I believe that there was going to be a presentation by Megan Lobaugh, and I was going to actually present a brief introduction to that. And the whole thrust of that is we have -- the Work Group has closed or recommending closure of all the remaining issues in the Site Profile, which in essence is that the Work Group recommends that -- or agrees with NIOSH's recommendation that dose can be reconstructed. And I believe that would require a formal act of the Board.

Dr. Roberts: Mm-hmm, okay.

Member Ziemer: I don't know -- I didn't catch whether Megan is on the line today, but someone can confirm that, either from SC&A or from NIOSH.

Mr. Rutherford: Yeah, Dr. Ziemer, this is LaVon Rutherford. Megan is not on the line, but, yes, you are correct. The last Work Group meeting everything was closed out, and the plan was to present at the April meeting originally that Megan was going to do that presentation. Now I'm not sure that Megan will be available for the presentation, but someone will be available for the presentation from NIOSH.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. So it sounds to me, Paul, that you're okay with this going on the agenda for one of the sessions in August? Are you on mute?

Member Ziemer: No.

Dr. Roberts: I'm sorry, I didn't catch --

Member Ziemer: Oh, this is Ziemer. I lost the call for a moment, and I just came back on.

Dr. Roberts: Oh, okay, I'm sorry. I was just kind of confirming with you that the Superior Steel petition, that we should go ahead and consider that, or add it to the agenda for August.

Member Ziemer: Yeah. I think a formal action is required, is what was my understanding.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, okay, all right. There's also the Y-12 SEC petition number 250 that was flagged for going on the agenda as well. Are there any comments about that? And I think on that agenda --

Mr. Rutherford: I was going to say, this is LaVon Rutherford. I can comment on that. That was an addendum that was to address the 1987 through 1994 period. I reported out on that that we did -- yeah, we did find a data glitch, and I'm not sure we're going to have that in time. It's kind of up in the air at this point.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, okay. So that may or may not go, okay. Okay, that's fine. Let's see. The next thing that's on here is the SEC petition status update,

which I think is a routine item. Fifteen minutes allocated for that. There is a slot for the Board work session that runs about an hour. And then there is an item agenda on the INL, an update on INL Site Profile review.

And I understand that that was originally on the agenda because we were going to be meeting in Idaho for this meeting. But, you know, we could keep that on the agenda or move it to a future agenda item. Any comments or insights?

Member Beach: Well, I'm wondering if that can be kind of in limbo until after our call on the 16th of July. That might let us know where we're at. That's just my thought, but I'm not the Chair.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Phil, would you have any thoughts on that?

Member Schofield: Actually, I agree with Josie on that. Let's wait and see what happens on the 16th. Then we may be ready to move forward something, bring something before the whole Board.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. All right, thank you. Then we have the RPP, Reduction Pilot Plant SEC petition number 253 on the agenda for about 90 minutes. Is that a go?

Mr. Rutherford: Well this is LaVon Rutherford. From NIOSH's standpoint it's a go. I think it's a good idea to get it out in front of the Board. That way the Board can either move it to SC&A or take action, and we can get that one moving.

Dr. Roberts: Okay.

Member Ziemer: Do we need that -- this is Paul. Do we need that much time on this one, LaVon?

Mr. Rutherford: No, I really don't think we need that much time. I mean based on our history, I don't anticipate us needing that much time for this one.

Member Ziemer: Will the Petitioner be involved in

this discussion of that item?

Mr. Rutherford: You know, there's a chance. The Petitioner has been -- has been active in discussions with Josh Kinman. But I don't know for sure, you know. I don't think we've reached out at this point to see if they want to speak or not.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Well what would be the recommended time allotment for that item?

Mr. Rutherford: Well, you know, the presentation would take no longer than 30 minutes, and I do anticipate some questions from the Board. But, you know, no more than an hour.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, okay, great. All right. And then there's about an hour allotted for a public comment session as well for that agenda. Let's see. So I think that is actually all I had. Are there any recommendations for items that I did not mention?

Member Ziemer: Well this is Paul again. I have one question on the public comment period. Normally at our regular meetings where we're at a site, you have a good possibility of a number of local people speaking. Since we're virtual on a phone call, do we anticipate a lot of public comment?

Dr. Roberts: Yeah. I think that's hard to tell, but I do think that we're --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Ziemer: I guess the idea would be to set aside an hour, and you open it up at the beginning of that time, and then if there's no one beyond some point that wishes to speak, that ends it I suppose. So --

Dr. Roberts: Yeah. But I do think that we are obligated --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Ziemer: Keep the hour available.

Dr. Roberts: Yeah, to allocate the time. Exactly, exactly.

Member Ziemer: Right.

Dr. Roberts: Thank you. Okay.

Member Clawson: This is Brad. Yeah, this is Brad. I got dumped off the phone, so I had to call back in. I don't know if you've covered this or not, but are we going -- and this is a question for Tim. Are we going to have something for Savannah River? This has been a push for quite a while?

Dr. Roberts: In terms of this particular agenda for August, there isn't anything on Savannah River, not for this virtual meeting. It sounds like there needs to be some kind of Work Group meeting set up, you know, in the relatively near future for that site. But in terms of this virtual agenda, no items on Savannah River.

Member Clawson: Okay.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Any other questions or comments?

Member Beach: Was that just day one?

Dr. Roberts: No. This would be content for both days, and, again, we would be looking at four to five hours per day roughly. What I'll have to do is go back and look at the items and actually try to mock something up to put the timing to them, and just see how everything falls out. Any other questions or comments?

Ms. Naylor: Dr. Roberts, this is Jenny Naylor with HHS OGC. Can you remind me if the Advisory Board has received the annual ethics training?

Dr. Roberts: I do not believe so. I think that the -- from what I understood, that was planned for December, from what I understood from Ted.

Ms. Naylor: Okay. That's perfectly fine. We usually

have it at the first in-person meeting of the year. But there's really no reason for that to occur in the first meeting of the year, or even if we do decide it to add it to a third meeting. We can definitely use the remote technology to have a separate ethics training session with the Board members since that training session would have been closed, administratively closed and not open to the public members anyway.

Dr. Roberts: Right, right. Okay, yeah. So I think it's just a matter of maybe figuring out the timing for scheduling that.

Ms. Naylor: Sure, yeah.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Anything else in terms of the August agenda?

#### Scheduling Meetings for February and April 2021

Okay. So I just kind of wanted to make a couple of notes for meetings that are scheduled for beyond August, meetings of the full Board. They're for October 27th. There's a plan to have a teleconference for the full Board, and then December 8th through 9th has been identified as having a face-to-face meeting, assuming that that's going to be possible at that time. So I just kind of wanted to mention those.

Moving on to scheduling meetings for next February and April, February would be a teleconference of the full Board, and April 2021 presumably would be in person. Now to make the timing consistent with previous years, we would be looking at around February 24th for the teleconference, and April 21st and 22nd for the in-person meeting. So I just throw that out there, and if anyone has any comments or questions about the timing, please make those now.

Member Anderson: Was that April 21, 22?

Dr. Roberts: Yes. For next year, yes. Any other comments or suggestions? Okay, well hearing --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Kotelchuck: -- Dave. I didn't quite get the December date that you announced for our meeting. I missed that.

Dr. Roberts: That was December 8th and 9th.

Member Kotelchuck: Okay, good, thank you.

Dr. Roberts: Mm-hmm, sure. Did anyone else want to comment? I thought I heard somebody in the background.

Member Anderson: For the face-to-face, are you sort of thinking about that for the April meeting?

Dr. Roberts: The April meeting, yes. I think those are typically face-to-face, the one -- the April meeting.

Member Anderson: Well, I'm just -- because we need to decide on a potential location at some point.

Dr. Roberts: Yes, exactly and --

Member Anderson: Because you've got travel then too.

Member Beach: Well and December --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Dr. Roberts: Right.

Member Beach: -- we would need a site also.

Dr. Roberts: Right. Let's open that up for suggestion. We don't actually know whether or not we're going to be restricted in terms of travel for December. But let's just, in case we are able to do a face-to-face meeting, let's just talk a little bit about where that might be.

So the August face-to-face was supposed to be in Idaho Falls. I assume that that might be a possibility, but let's open that up for discussion.

Member Schofield: Avoid Idaho in December.

Member Anderson: That's what I was going to say.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Clawson: If you would come out, you'd understand how nice it is.

Member Schofield: Good luck.

Member Anderson: We could call it crisp.

Dr. Roberts: Yeah. So avoiding Idaho, would there be an alternative location that might feel better to people?

Member Anderson: Well are there any SECs that we may be discussing at that point, that we'd look for a city near where those are?

Member Clawson: This is Brad. I'm hoping to be able to be discussing Savannah River.

Member Anderson: That's a good place there.

Member Clawson: I would put in a suggestion for Savannah River if, Tim, if you think that we're going to be able to have the materials available before that to be able to discuss.

Dr. Taulbee: This is Tim --

Member Anderson: That could be either December or April.

Dr. Taulbee: I would actually like to recommend at this time you propose for the December location when you meet in August. We'll know better where we're at over the next couple of months between all of the sites from that standpoint, rather than trying to do it now. If I recall correctly, we normally try to do the scheduling for the next meeting location at the previous face-to-face.

Isn't that correct?

Member Beach: Yeah, that is correct.

Dr. Roberts: That is correct, okay, okay. Well then why don't we do that then for August, and talk about location. I had in my notes, just to kind of give you the dates, the potential dates for these meetings. But we can certainly hold off on talking about the locations at the next meeting, the August meeting I should say. Okay. So think about that between now and August, what are some potential locations, and we can come back to that discussion point.

#### Public Comment

Okay. So to kind of round out, I know that we're just after twelve o'clock. So we didn't receive any public comments or anything for this particular meeting. But the Board would like to read a letter that they have written to Ted for his retirement as DFO. And so I'd like to ask Dr. Paul Ziemer to go ahead and read that letter into the record for today.

Member Ziemer: Of course, thank you very much. And I'll just mention before I read it that this tribute that I'm about to read was prepared jointly by the members of the Board. It was privately given to Ted last month, just prior to his retirement. But the Board agreed that we should include it in the public record through the use of today's transcript. So I will proceed to read that. It's entitled A Salute to Theodore (Ted) Katz.

The Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health extends its congratulations and best wishes to Theodore (Ted) Katz upon his retirement as the Designated Federal Official of the Board, concurrent with his retirement from the Centers for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

For the past 12 years, Ted provided organizational leadership, operational advice, and procedural wisdom for the Advisory Board members, for the Board's contractor, SC&A, and for the members of

the DCAS group at NIOSH.

In all of these activities, the Advisory Board members have observed Ted's clear understanding of the requirements of the EEOICPA Program and its regulations, his fairness in dealing with all stakeholders in the dose reconstruction activities, and his personal interest in all the individuals involved.

He has demonstrated a clear understanding of the ramifications of the science and public policy issues that have arisen over the years. His advice on such issues has been valued and well-received by the Board.

He has carried out his duties in what was often a politically charged environment and has done with diplomacy and consideration for others. Ted shows himself to be a person of integrity, honesty, and trustworthiness in all that he does.

As Ted Katz requires from his years as the Designated Federal Official for the Board, the Board members offering him our gratitude for the work that he has done on our behalf.

We send him our best wishes in all that he does in the next phase of his life and hope that we will all be able to get together again in the future.

Dr. Roberts: Great, okay. Great. I'm not sure if you can hear me. I'm hearing a lot of background noise, but thank you so much, Dr. Ziemer, for that.

#### Adjourn

And with that, we'll go ahead and adjourn the meeting, just in recognition of Ted's wonderful work as the DFO. Thank you and have a good day.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:07 p.m.)