

SRS SEC-00103
Status and Definition of Addition to SEC
Proposed by NIOSH

Mark Griffon
SRS Work Group Chair
Prepared for the December 7-8, 2011, ABRWH
Meeting
Tampa, Florida

SRS Thorium-232: Overview

- In November 2008, NIOSH published its Evaluation Report for the SRS Special Exposure Cohort Petition SES-00103. The topic of thorium was reserved to 1960.
- On April 28, 2010, NIOSH published an addendum to its Evaluation report (ER) on Th-232, covering thorium metal handling and processing in the 300-M area, covering the period to 1965.
- On August 9, 2011, published its second addendum to its Evaluation report (ER) on Th-232, covering thorium metal handling and processing in the 300-M area. (The ER was published in 2008.) Hereafter Addendum 2.
- Addendum 2 proposed that certain SRS workers who worked in certain areas from January 1, 1953 to September 31, 1972 be added to the SEC. The basis was that NIOSH determined it was not feasible to do thorium dose reconstruction for those workers for that period. The workers were to be identified by Area codes (up to December 31, 1957, and dosimetry codes for the rest of the period.

Area and dosimetry codes proposed in Addendum 2

- *Area codes from January 1, 1953 through December 31, 1957: A, G, CMX, or TNX;*
- *Dosimetry codes from January 1, 1958 through September 30, 1972: 5A, 5C, 6B through 6Z, 12D through 12H, or 12J through 12Z*
- *250 SEC qualified work days required*

SC&A review

- SC&A reviewed was asked to review a small sample of claims to examine whether the area and dosimetry codes were present in claim records and whether the data were sufficient to implement the SEC in a claimant favorable way.
- SC&A provided a report dated November 28, 2011 to the Work Group. It was discussed during the December 3, 2011 WG teleconference.
- SC&A reviewed 10 claims for records completeness relative to the proposed definition.
- Small sample, not random; most claims examined derived from claimant representative suggestions.

Main SC&A finding re dosimetry records

- **Main finding: There are extensive gaps in the records. Only 1 case out of 10 had complete records, with no uncertainties or discrepancies. Four (4) of the 10 cases have codes corresponding to inclusion in the proposed SEC class; these cases also have gaps. Five (5) of the 10 cases have incomplete, illegible, and/or indeterminate records of work location. In these cases, it appears that excluding workers due to the lack of an SEC code per the proposed NIOSH SEC class definition would not be claimant favorable, since it would be impossible to assure that they did not, in fact, qualify.**

Finding details

- 55% of all employee-years for the 10 claimants had complete records. Gaps, illegible records, blank records, unavailable records, etc. affect the other 45% of employee-years fully or partially. Total work years for the 10 claims = 139 employee-years.
- Of the problem records, scratched out records, illegible records and unreadable records are more prevalent in the early years to 1957 inclusive) and gaps an unknown work location dosimetry code (0000) characterize the latter period, 1958 to Sept 1972).
- A detailed comparison of work locations in dosimetry codes and Computer Assisted Telephone Interviews (CATIs) was not possible. CATIs are generally too broad in their descriptions of work locations to be useful in this context especially to ensure that a worker was not present in the SEC areas during some part of his/her period of employment.

Work Group meeting

- SC&A presented its report during the Dec. 3, 2011 WG teleconference call.
- NIOSH stated that the gaps in the records may be explainable and may not be true missing records. NIOSH will provide more details at the Board meeting.
- Upon review of the SC&A report and their own research, NIOSH suggested that the class proposed in Addendum 2 of the ER be expanded as regards areas and illegible records, in the period 1953-1957, and that employees with the unknown code 0000 be added in the period Jan. 1, 1958 to Sept 30, 1972.
- The WG asked to see a written proposal and NIOSH is providing one for consideration at the Board meeting.