

Centers for Disease Control  
National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health  
Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (ABRWH)  
Subcommittee for Dose Reconstruction Reviews

Wednesday, January 19, 2022

## **Wednesday, January 19, 2022**

---

### **Summary Proceedings**

The Subcommittee for Dose Reconstruction Reviews meeting convened via videoconference at 10:30 a.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST), David Kotelchuck, Chair, presiding.

### **Attendees**

#### **Members**

Rashaun Roberts, Designated Federal Official  
Josie Beach, Member  
Bradley P. Clawson, Member  
David Kotelchuck, Member  
James E. Lockey, Member  
Loretta Valerio, Member

#### **Non-Members, Registered and/or Public Comment Participants**

Adams, Nancy, NIOSH Contractor  
Barton, Bob, SC&A  
Behling, Kathleen, SC&A  
Black, Finn, SC&A  
Brackett, Liz ORAU Team  
Buchanan, Ron, SC&A  
Burgos, Zaida, NIOSH  
Calhoun, Grady, DCAS  
Gogliotti, Rose, SC&A  
Rafky, Michael, HHS OGC  
Siebert, ORAU Team  
Smith, Matt, ORAU Team

## **Roll Call/Welcome - Dr. Rashaun Roberts, DFO**

Dr. Rashaun Roberts called to order the Subcommittee for Dose Reconstruction Review at 10:30 am EDT on September 29, 2021 via videoconference. A roll call of all Subcommittee members confirmed that a quorum was present. The quorum was maintained throughout the meeting. Meeting participants declared conflicts of interest with any sites on today's agenda during roll call. Dr. Roberts turned the meeting over to Dr. Kotelchuck, Subcommittee chair

## **Review of Cases from Set 29**

Rose Gogliotti, SC&A led the discussion. She noted that the Subcommittee had discussed Set 29 at its September 2021 meeting. That discussion started with type 1 findings and did not get to type 2 findings. She then led the discussion of the findings and observations for the cases under discussion. They are listed below along with the employment location(s).

- Case 564, Observation 1, *Nevada Test Site*
- Case 567, Finding 1, *Oak Ridge Institute for Science Education*
- Case 568, Observation 1, *Rocky Flats Plant*
- Case 571, Observation 1, *Idaho National Lab, Nevada Test Site, General Atomics, Santa Susana Field Laboratory, Savannah River Site, Hanford*
- Case 572, Finding 2, *Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Oak Ridge National Lab*
- Case 572, Observation 1, *Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Oak Ridge National Lab*
- Case 580, Finding 1, *Idaho National Lab*
- Case 584, Finding 4, *Work locations withheld*
- Case 585, Finding 2, *Pantex Plant, Albuquerque Operations Office*

After discussion the Subcommittee agreed to close all these findings and observations except for Case 585, Finding 2. That finding was reclassified as an Observation but was held "in progress." SC&A could not duplicate the dose value that DCAS reconstructed. DCAS reconstructed the dose in 2010 using OTIB-017, which has been cancelled, and is not available to SC&A. DCAS will provide a copy of OTIB-017 to SC&A for further investigation.

Additionally, the Subcommittee reclassified the following finding as an observation:

- Case 567, Finding 1

## **Review of Cases from Set 30**

Case 30 consists of "blind" reviews. When doing a blind review, SC&A reconstructs the dose for the claim without having access to DCAS's dose reconstruction. The Cybersecurity Modernization Initiative began while SC&A was working on the set 30 cases. Consequently, they have finished only 3 of the 6 cases. During discussions of blind reviews, Subcommittee members and support staff do not discuss all the specifics of cases in order to protect the privacy of claimants.

Ron Buchanan, SC&A, presented the results of SC&A's dose reconstruction of Case B47 in detail, comparing it to DCAS's dose reconstruction. This dose reconstruction was for an Energy Employee (EE) with employment at the Savannah River Site. The dose reconstruction and probability of causation (POC)

values for DCAS and SC&A were very close. Both arrived at a POC value < 50%. The Subcommittee accepted SC&A's analysis and complimented both organizations on the quality of their work.

Kathy Behling, SC&A, presented the results of SC&A's dose reconstruction of Case B48 in detail, comparing it to DCAS's dose reconstruction. This dose reconstruction was for an Energy Employee (EE) with employment at the Y-12 Plant and Oak Ridge National Lab. The dose reconstruction and probability of causation (POC) values for DCAS and SC&A were very close. Both arrived at a POC value < 50%. Ms. Behling noted, though, there was what could have been a significant difference in one component of the dose reconstructions. DCAS and SC&A had used different minimum detectable activities (MDAs) for calculating missed internal dose based on gross alpha bioassay. The two MDA values were contained in different tables of the Occupational Internal Dose chapter of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory site profile. DCAS explained that they had taken the MDA value from the table of recommended MDAs, while SC&A had taken a value from a table in an appendix. The data in the appendix was intended to support the ultimate selection of preferred MDAs. The preferred MDA is the one DCAS used. The Subcommittee accepted SC&A's report and DCAS's explanation.

Rose Gogliotti, SC&A, presented the results of SC&A's dose reconstruction of Case B50 in detail, comparing it to DCAS's dose reconstruction. This dose reconstruction was for an Energy Employee (EE) with employment at General Steel Industries. The dose reconstruction and probability of causation (POC) values for DCAS and SC&A were very close. Both arrived at a POC value < 50%. The discussion of this case was very brief because the two dose reconstructions were practically identical. The Subcommittee accepted SC&A's report.

## **Discussion of Potential Criteria for Selecting Cases to Review**

Rose Gogliotti provided a set of criteria that SC&A recommends for selecting cases for future review. She developed the recommendations after comparing statistics for the cases that have been reviewed to the 2015 statistics for all cases. DCAS cannot provide new statistics for all cases because of the Cybersecurity Modernization Initiative. Ms. Gogliotti first suggested expanding the target POC values to 40% - 55% from the current range of 45% - 52%. This would make more cases available for selection. She also suggested the following areas of focus to make the population of review cases more representative of the population of total cases:

- Focus on cases with an earliest employment date of 1970 or later
- Focus on cases with shorter employment periods
- Focus on the selection of female energy employees

She also suggested focusing on cases for which dose reconstructions were completed recently. DCAS had completed dose reconstructions for 23% of the cases of Set 29 at least ten years before they were reviewed. Frequently the procedures used in those dose reconstructions had been superceded by the time of the review.

The Subcommittee agreed to consider the recommendations but decided to proceed with the selection of the 31<sup>st</sup> set using the selection criteria that has been used to date.

## **Next Meeting**

The Subcommittee plans to meet again on April 20 at 11:00. April 19 will be considered if a conflict develops on the 20<sup>th</sup>. The Subcommittee plans to discuss at least two and maybe all three remaining blind reviews

from Set 30, perhaps select Set 31 of conventional reviews, and discuss changing the selection criteria for future sets.

### **Meeting Adjourned**

Dr. Kotelchuck adjourned the meeting at 3:49 pm.