U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROCEDURES REVIEW

+ + + + +

TUESDAY MARCH 23, 2010

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee convened in the Zurich Room of the Cincinnati Airport Marriott, 2395 Progress Drive, Hebron, Kentucky, at 9:30 a.m., Wanda I. Munn, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

WANDA I. MUNN, Chair MICHAEL H. GIBSON, Member MARK GRIFFON, Member* RICHARD A. LEMEN, Member PAUL L. ZIEMER, Member*

NEAL R. GROSS

ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official NANCY ADAMS, NIOSH Contractor ISAF AL-NABULSI, DOE* HANS BEHLING, SC&A* KATHY BEHLING, SC&A* ELIZABETH BRACKETT, ORAU Team* STUART HINNEFELD, DCAS EMILY HOWELL, HHS GEORGE KERR, ORAU Team* JENNY LIN, HHS STEPHEN MARSCHKE, SC&A JOHN MAURO, SC&A STEVE OSTROW, SC&A* MUTTY SHARFI, ORAU Team* SCOTT SIEBERT, DCAS* ELYSE THOMAS, DCAS* BRANT ULSH, DCAS

*Participating via telephone

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
Welcome, introductions	4
Outreach Procedures: PER-12 Update	12
PER Reviews	17
Action Items, continued	150
Discussion of OCUS and ORAU Documents for SC&A Review	214
OTIB-70 Responses from NIOSH	231
PROC-0042, SC&A	233
PROC-95, SC&A	236
Calendar and Administrative Issues	243

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(9:30 a.m.)
3	MR. KATZ: Good morning, everyone
4	in the room and on the line. This is the
5	Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health,
6	Subcommittee on Procedures Review.
7	My name is Ted Katz. I am the
8	Designated Federal Official. We will begin
9	roll call with Board members in the room.
10	CHAIR MUNN: Wanda Munn, Chair of
11	the Subcommittee.
12	MEMBER LEMEN: Richard Lemen,
13	member of the Subcommittee.
14	MEMBER GIBSON: Mike Gibson,
15	member of the Subcommittee.
16	MR. KATZ: And on the line, Board
17	members?
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: Paul Ziemer,
19	member of the Subcommittee.
20	MR. KATZ: Mark? Not yet? Okay.
21	then NIOSH ORAU team in the room.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1		DR.	ULSH:	Yes.	This	is	Brant
2	Ulsh from	n t	he Div	vision	of Co	mpens	ation
3	Analysis a	nd Sı	upport.				
4		MR.	KATZ:	And o	n the li	ine,	NIOSH
5	ORAU team?						
б		MS.	THOMA;	S: El	yse Tho	mas,	ORAU
7	team.						
8		MR.	KATZ:	Welcome	e, Elyse	•	
9		MR.	SIEBER	T: Scot	tt Siebe	rt, C	RAU.
10		MR.	KATZ:	Scott.			
11		MR.	SHARFI	: Mutty	y Sharfi	, ORA	JU.
12		MR.	KATZ:	Okay	z. SC&	A ir	1 the
13	room?						
14		DR.	MAURO:	John I	Mauro, S	C&A.	
15		MR.	MARSC	HKE:	Steve	Mars	chke,
16	SC&A.						
17		MR.	KATZ:	And SC	&A on th	e lir	ıe?
18		MR.	OSTROW	: Steve	e Ostrow	•	
19		MR.	KATZ:	Welcome	e, Steve	•	
20		MR.	OSTROW	: Good	morning	•	
21		MR.	KATZ:	Okay,	and the	en HH	S and

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	other government employees or contractors in
2	the room?
3	MS. HOWELL: Emily Howell, HHS.
4	MS. LIN: Jenny Lin, HHS.
5	MS. ADAMS: Nancy Adams, NIOSH
6	contractor.
7	MR. KATZ: And on the line, HHS or
8	other government employees or contractors?
9	MS. AL-NABULSI: Isaf Al-Nabulsi,
10	DOE.
11	MR. KATZ: Welcome, Isaf. Then
12	members of the public. Any members of the
13	public on the line?
14	(No response.)
15	Okay then, Wanda.
16	CHAIR MUNN: Thank you, Ted. We
17	want to take just a minute to give a special
18	welcome to Dr. Richard Lemen, who is our
19	sparkling brand new Member of our
20	Subcommittee. We are delighted to have you,
21	Dick. Thanks for making the trip here. That

NEAL R. GROSS

1 is a good thing.

2 We have quite a loaded schedule I have pleaded with you to be here if 3 today. you could and to stay as long as you can and I 4 already know that half of you are not going to 5 follow my directive. So we will do the best 6 to cover the material that we have. 7 It is 8 rather significant.

9 Ι am working on the assumption that everyone has our action items list which 10 I sent out by email last week. If any of you 11 do not, please speak now, because we will be 12 relying on that action items list not only for 13 14 what we do today, but for our next step for our coming-up meeting, whenever that is going 15 16 to be.

17 Everyone okay with the materials in hand? You are aware of the fact we are 18 19 going to have what we hope to be a fairly definitive but brief discussion on PERs and 20 21 how we are going to proceed with that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

(202) 234-4433

particular activity in this Subcommittee, and 2 you have had an opportunity to take a look at the carryover items. 3 Also, we have received a set of 4 5 new findings from NIOSH with a number of SC&A updates from last October filtered in. 6 We will have Steve go through a part of that very 7 8 shortly so that we can all, hopefully, be on 9 the same page with respect to where we are on our tracking mechanism. 10 I have one or two things that I 11 12 would like to change, rather, add to our 13 action items list. After lunch, we have --14 the information that you should have received by email should contain updates on OTIB-0029-15 16 01 and -02. I would like to do that right after lunch. 17 After we have looked at OTIB-0051, 18 19 we also have new information on OTIB-0021, which I would like to place right in there. 20 21 Also, I think most of you received a request

NEAL R. GROSS

1

1	from Steve Marschke by email asking that we
2	address, if possible, new OCAS and ORAU's
3	comments for SC&A review. I would like to do
4	that after the afternoon break, right after
5	2:30. If that fits everyone's needs, we will
6	roughly follow that format. If you have a
7	problem with that, please speak now or forever
8	hold your peace.
9	Did I hear someone coming on the
10	line? Could that have been our missing
11	member?
12	MEMBER GRIFFON: I have been on
13	for a few minutes. I think somebody else just
14	came in, though. This is Mark Griffon.
15	CHAIR MUNN: Very good.
16	Excellent. We are all here and accounted for
17	or somewhere and accounted for, in any case.
18	To begin with, let us very quickly
19	see if there is anything of consequence that
20	we need to address in our carry-overs from our
21	last November session. NIOSH was going to

NEAL R. GROSS

1	check with IT to see if there was any good
2	instruction for us on how to provide those PDF
3	files when we were transferring procedures,
4	but have you had a chance to do that, Brant?
5	DR. ULSH: No. Can you refresh me
6	a little bit on what the issue was?
7	CHAIR MUNN: Yes. When we
8	transfer our procedures Steve, could you
9	put one of our an example of an outstanding
10	item that we have with or just for kicks,
11	since we are going to be working on OTIB-0021
12	later, do you want to get that up for us to
13	just serve as an example?
14	As you can see from our procedures
15	tracking there, we try to keep a record of
16	each exchange that has gone on. When we reach
17	a point when, for any reason, we decide to
18	transfer one of these items either to another
19	working group or another subcommittee or they
20	transfer something to us, what we try to do is
21	we want to send them a file of what we can

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

10

1 pull up on the O: drive in this particular 2 database.

Right now we do not have a way to make a PDF file of the material that we have. Now you see, what shows in the windows is not necessarily the whole story, because -- Steve, can you --

8 MR. MARSCHKE: We can make a PDF 9 file. I will make one small correction. We 10 can make a PDF file, but it is a static PDF 11 file. It is an unchangeable PDF file.

12 CHAIR MUNN: We can't transfer it 13 to them in such a way so that they can work 14 with it. We want to know if that can be done, if they can work with it as the same kind of 15 16 file that we have here or they are going to 17 have to send back to us a static report that have incorporate 18 we will to in some way 19 because we haven't established any procedure 20 for exchanges between the two groups with 21 respect to their progress.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	DR. ULSH: Okay. I am not aware
2	of any progress on this issue.
3	CHAIR MUNN: It may not even be
4	possible, but we would like feedback from the
5	IT people on whether or not it is possible.
6	I have not fulfilled my obligation
7	with respect to the transfer of IG-004, even
8	though I have discussed it with Jim Melius and
9	have promised him that it was in the works. I
10	still have not done it.
11	Check for documents on PROC-97 and
12	assure all nine findings are, in fact, covered
13	in PER-12. That was an SC&A requirement.
14	John?
15	DR. MAURO: Yes, I did get up
16	there, and our review of PER-12 is almost
17	done. In fact, we discussed it recently, and
18	we will have a report out. Effectively, what
19	that review will do is describe have
20	several aspects to it.
01	

21 PER-12, by the way, is your

1	outreach procedure. I guess it was OTIB-0097,
2	was your former outreach procedure that was
3	replaced by their more recent PER-12. PER-12
4	being that it added in the tracking system and
5	it made a number of changes.
6	We were tasked by the Outreach
7	Work Group to review PER-12 from many
8	contexts, one of which is the degree to which
9	the new procedure, in fact, subsumes all of
10	the elements that originally were provided for
11	in -97. So I guess the short answer to your
12	question is that won't happen until a couple
13	of weeks from now when we deliver our PER-12
14	report and then we will have a clear picture
15	of what it is in PER-12 that perhaps did not
16	make it into I'm sorry I think it is
17	OTIB-0097 that didn't make it into PER-12 and
18	its significance.
19	So that is a process that is

20 underway.

21 CHAIR MUNN: If I am hearing you

1	correctly then, when you release PER-12 in a
2	couple of weeks, it will actually identify
3	DR. MAURO: Yes.
4	CHAIR MUNN: Included in your
5	submission will be any identification of any
6	shortcoming between PROC-97.
7	DR. MAURO: And more than that; it
8	would evaluate the evaluation of PER-12
9	goes toward that is the first thing to
10	check. Okay, have we carried that forward to
11	the extent that the Work Group feels it has
12	been fully carried forward? But also there is
13	now also an implementation plan for outreach
14	that has been discussed and, I think, was
15	brought before the full Board at the last
16	meeting and I believe the Work Group has
17	accepted it.
18	It wasn't a matter of the Board
19	approving it. I think it was just a matter of
20	the Work Group saying, yes, this is what we
21	are going to use. That implementation plan

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

14

also sets forth now what the Work Group feels 1 2 are all the elements that are good -- that the like 3 Outreach Work Group would to independently evaluate. 4 5 So that becomes another blueprint. б Okay, so when we review PER-12, we are not only reviewing to 7 see that it captured everything in -97, but also whether or not it 8 9 captures everything that is currently in the new Implementation Plan. 10

So it is broader than that, but 11 12 certainly, whatever portion of that you would like to have loaded into here, the mechanics -13 14 - the information will be there. The question is what it is you would like to capture in 15 16 this database and the degree to which PER-12 is part of this or part of Outreach or both, 17 these are matters -- this is one of the first 18 19 times where we have come across a situation 20 where have procedure review and we а 21 simultaneously it is a procedure that falls

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	under the Outreach Group.
2	So there is, I guess, a little bit
3	of the logistics of the communication and
4	coordination that still have to be worked out.
5	CHAIR MUNN: We are, of course,
6	addressing that. We are already working with
7	the plan in the Worker Outreach Group. Do you
8	want to say anything about that, Mike?
9	MEMBER GIBSON: I think John
10	described it pretty well.
11	CHAIR MUNN: Yes. Then we will
12	anticipate the delivery of PER-12 in the next
13	couple of weeks and we will address that at
14	our next meeting as well.
15	The last carry-forward that I have
16	is no, there are two: providing response to
17	PROC-95. There were two requests from that
18	from NIOSH for loading responses into the
19	database and making sure the paragraphs were
20	numbered properly for OTIB-13. Do you know if
21	that has happened, Brant?

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	DR. ULSH: Elyse, are you on-line?
2	MS. THOMAS: Yes, I am.
3	DR. ULSH: Can you take the lead
4	on that?
5	MS. THOMAS: I just got access to
6	write into the database. So those haven't been
7	done. In other words, the database has not
8	been updated on that.
9	CHAIR MUNN: But you have the
10	material you need to do so?
11	MS. THOMAS: Yes.
12	CHAIR MUNN: So it is just the
13	mechanics we are looking at?
14	MS. THOMAS: Yes.
15	CHAIR MUNN: Okay, very good. So
16	that is going to happen by magic here in a
17	week or so. Right?
18	MS. THOMAS: Yes.
19	CHAIR MUNN: All right. Now we
20	come to the meaty part of our action items for
21	this morning. That is the discussion of our

NEAL R. GROSS

PER reviews: where we are with those and how 1 2 we want to approach them in the future. 3 order for everybody to be In starting from the same place, I would like to 4 5 get a brief overview from both SC&A and NIOSH how they perceive this Subcommittee 6 as to should be addressing the PERs as they come up 7 for us in future meetings. 8 9 It doesn't matter to us which of you qoes first. John, would you like to give 10 SC&A view of what you believe the 11 us the Subcommittee should do with your -- you have 12 already given us the protocol to review. 13 14 Right. What happened DR. MAURO: is PER reviews have been subsumed within this 15 16 Subcommittee. At one time this Subcommittee 17 was limited to procedure reviews, OTIBs primarily. It was deemed that, as we matured 18 19 and as we will see, these procedures, the vast majority of the procedures have been reviewed 20 21 and are in various stages of issues

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 resolution.

It was deemed that the next stage of maturation of the program is a lot of old dose reconstructions are in the process of being reevaluated because of new procedures and changes, and the program now -- NIOSH's program includes Program Evaluation Reports, PERS.

9 Basically, what PER does is а says, okay, we are revising a number of our 10 procedures, our site profiles or whatever and 11 12 as a result of that, a lot of cases have to be 13 revisited and there is a protocol that NIOSH 14 follows in order to make sure that they go back into the adjudicated cases, pull out the 15 16 appropriate cases that could be affected by 17 these changes and redo the changes. In some it is a handful of cases; in other 18 cases, 19 it could be literally 1,000 or more cases, cases that might need to be reviewed. 20 So that 21 is the process NIOSH has well under hand, well

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 underway.

The Board and the Working Group decided that, listen, I think it is important that the Board take a look at that to see how well that process is working from several perspectives.

7 selecting One, is NIOSH the appropriate cases to be fixed? When you have 8 9 1,000 adjudicated cases and let's 30 sav percent of them were denied and a judgment has 10 to be made, do we have to revisit all of those 11 Well, maybe we only have to revisit 12 cases? 13 some subset of it, only the ones that we feel 14 have the potential to be reversed. In other 15 words, go from denial to granting.

16 first So the step in NIOSH's 17 process is to make that judgment and it is not always a simple judgment. Sometimes NIOSH 18 19 says, every single case that was denied, no 20 matter what the PoC was, we are going to review it or we are only going to review those 21

NEAL R. GROSS

that had a PoC that was less than 15 percent -

2	- I'm sorry, greater than 16 percent, because
3	we know, no matter what happens, if the PoC
4	was less than 16 percent, there is no way all
5	these changes could ever kick it over the 50
6	percent.
7	So these are judgment calls that
8	NIOSH makes in terms of selecting the cases.
9	It is important to understand with NIOSH,
10	though.
11	Then they go ahead and they do the
12	cases and they implement and make all those
13	changes, redo the calculations using new
14	technical approaches that are new improvements
15	in the protocol of doing dose reconstruction,
16	whatever that might be. Could be a change in
17	neutron to photon ratio. It could be a change
18	in the biokinetics of some inhaled
19	radionuclide.
20	Now the end of the story: the end

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

is a good idea to bring that to the table, to
the Board -- so we will have SC&A review some
selected PERs to see how well that program is
going.

5 То date, Ι believe have we formally reviewed three: Blockson, high-fired 6 uranium, and thoracic lymphoma. 7 These are the 8 three I recall. There may be more. If Hans 9 is on the line, he probably could help us out But along the way, we ran into a 10 a bit. little bit of a knot. That is, during the 11 last one, 12 which I believe was PER-12, it 13 dawned on everyone, you know, SC&A is moving 14 forward reviewing these PERs but we don't have a procedure, because everything else we do on 15 16 the project, whether it is dose reconstruction 17 reviews, site profile reviews, procedure reviews, we have a formal procedure that was 18 submitted to the Board, reviewed by the Board, 19 approved and is sitting up on the Web. 20 But 21 here we are marching down the road.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	The way this actually happened, by
2	the way, is it happened during the transition
3	from our old contract to our new contract. In
4	our recompete, we put in a section that
5	described in some detail the procedure we are
б	going to follow to do PER reviews, because we
7	knew that was going to be an item.
8	So we actually do have a
9	procedure, but it is not a procedure that was
10	formally submitted to the Board for review and
11	approval. It was actually a procedure that we
12	submitted as part of our proposal, and it sort
13	of served as an interim procedure to use to
14	get the PER process started, which is what we
15	did. But it was agreed that, listen, we
16	really need to formalize the procedure, have
17	it formally reviewed and approved, and that
18	was a task that was given to SC&A a while
19	back.
20	We did, in fact, develop the

21 procedure of December 2009, and deliver it to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	the Board. Now we are waiting for the Work
2	Group to review it and comment on it, and
3	NIOSH to review it and comment on it, and to
4	give any feedback whether this is okay.
5	The process eventually would be we
6	would make any revisions that the Work Group
7	feels is needed, and at that point that the
8	Work Group is comfortable with it, it would
9	bring it to the Board as a recommendation for
10	approval by the Board.
11	Then we will be in a position to
12	actually have a formal procedure under which
13	we would proceed. The reason I feel it is
14	urgent that we review and approve or whatever
15	this procedure is we have sort of been in
16	limbo on doing any new PER reviews.
17	It was generally agreed, really,
18	until we get this procedure approved, it is
19	inappropriate for SC&A to move forward
20	there are lots and lots of PERs on any
21	additional PER reviews, because we really

NEAL R. GROSS

Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005-3701

1	don't have a formally accepted procedure for
2	performing those reviews. There is my story.
3	MEMBER LEMEN: Did you happen to
4	bring a hard copy, since I can't get to my
5	computer?
6	DR. MAURO: Of this? No, I don't
7	have one with me.
8	MR. MARSCHKE: One thing I should
9	I would like to add is that this is a
10	December 1, 2009 version. This is the thing
11	that I have shown on the screen here, is a
12	December 1, 2009, version of this PER review
13	document.
14	This reflects comments that were
15	made during the November I think it was the
16	November 17th Subcommittee meeting where we
17	talked about a previous version and we
18	commented on a previous version of this PER.
19	So Hans has taken that, the
20	comments that were made during that
21	Subcommittee and incorporated those comments

NEAL R. GROSS

into this version. So this is like the draft 1 2 2 or draft 3 of the procedure. Yes, and I was making 3 CHAIR MUNN: the assumption that this was the revision from 4 5 which we were -- on which we were basing our 6 comments. 7 Paul and Mark, are you on-board with this with respect to which version we are 8 9 looking at? MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I don't have 10 it up before me. 11 Well, I don't think CHAIR MUNN: 12 13 it is necessary. I just wanted to make sure 14 that neither of you in your reviews have been working from an earlier version. That was my 15 only concern. 16 17 MEMBER ZIEMER: I don't think so. CHAIR MUNN: 18 Okay. 19 It might be nice for MR. KATZ: Steve or John to just do a skeletal summary of 20 21 the components of it and what changed, so that

NEAL R. GROSS

-- particularly for Dick, who hadn't reviewed 1 2 the procedure -- so they have an understanding of the mechanics. 3 DR. MAURO: Let's scroll through. 4 5 Yes. б MS. BEHLING: John, excuse me. This is Kathy Behling. We are on the line. I 7 8 am sorry we weren't here when you had the roll call, but I also just wanted to tell you that 9 this is Rev 1 of that procedure that we did 10 We discussed 11 discuss seems -- is correct. 12 this procedure. 13 We presented it to the 14 Subcommittee during the November meeting, and we have discussed it, and we incorporated --15 16 incorporated all hope have of the we we 17 changes that we had discussed during that meeting. 18 19 So what you are looking at is Rev 1, December 2009, and it, hopefully, reflects 20 21 all of the changes and comments that you had

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1 in November.

(202) 234-4433

2	DR. MAURO: Kathy, your timing is
3	very good. I hope you can hear me. I am at
4	the other end of the table, but one of the
5	things that was just asked is, how about a
б	quick refresher on this procedure.
7	We actually have it up on a
8	screen, the December 1, 2009, Rev 1. If

9 were about to scroll down and I was going to 10 take my best shot in getting it up there, but 11 if you would take over, I would greatly 12 appreciate it.

MS. BEHLING: Okay. I will haveHans do that. He is prepared to do that.

DR. BEHLING: Yes. I think the critical part was that, among the changes that was needed was a retraction of one of the subtasks that came at the request of the CDC contract people.

20 That was one of the changes, but 21 in essence, the sub-tasks that we have

1	identified remain pretty much the same as they
2	were even in the previous form because that
3	was what we had used in two other PERs, and
4	they are identified. If you can put on the
5	screen put on page 6. There is a summary
б	of the sub-tasks, one through five, that you
7	can just kind of scan over.
8	We have used those particular sub-
9	tasks, not just in the review of PER-12, but
10	also in the PR for Blockson and lymphoma. So
11	I don't know. Rather than read it, if it is
12	available on-screen, I guess the people there
13	at the meeting can just simply read the
14	various five sub-tasks that are really
15	essential here in understanding how we propose

16 to review PERs.

17 Steve, are you in a position to 18 read that on-screen?

MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, we have it upon the screen right now, Hans.

21 DR. MAURO: To back up a little

1	bit, when we originally proposed it in our
2	proposal and then used it, the item that we
3	withdrew was one that really didn't serve us
4	well. It had to do with the genesis of the
5	change.
б	Step 1 in our procedure was, okay,
7	let us first describe why was this PER
8	necessary, what triggered it, what was the
9	experience that occurred that necessitated the
10	change.
11	We found that trying to
12	reconstruct the history of the item necessary
13	to issue the PER sometimes is elusive. All we
14	can say is that over time it became apparent
15	that there was a need for a change for certain
16	procedures as we learned more and NIOSH
17	learned more.
18	So we took that first step out and
19	we start, actually with, okay, given that
20	there was a need for this so we broke it up
21	into five tasks instead of six. I guess, in

NEAL R. GROSS

essence, all we really do with the first, I

2 quess, four steps is relatively simple. really sort of characterize 3 We what the issue is, what has been changed, what 4 5 is the new protocol, the corrective actions that NIOSH says that, listen, I think we have 6 to make these changes. These are the kinds of 7 8 things we have to do and why, why it is 9 necessary. identifying 10 Three, this becomes which cases -- I mentioned earlier -- which 11 12 cases have to be fixed. There could be 13 hundreds of them and to make sure that the 14 decision -- now sometimes that is an easy one 15 for us to review because NIOSH says we are 16 going to review every single case at Savannah 17 River or whatever. For every case that has the potential for high-fired uranium exposure, 18 19 we are going to review every one of the ones that have been denied and redo them, 20 or in 21 some cases here is where things get a ___

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1

1 little more complicated -- NIOSH says, no, we really have to review all 1,000 of them or 2 3 whatever. We know, as I mentioned earlier, 4 5 that if the PoC was less than some number --6 the number 16 seems to ring in my head for one of them. 7 8 John, that is not DR. BEHLING: 9 necessarily correct. 10 DR. MAURO: Hans, please, take 11 over. John, for PER-12 the 12 DR. BEHLING: 13 number of 16 percent is appropriate because it 14 is based on the generic multiplier of four, 15 but the lowest threshold for reviewing a dose 16 reconstruction that is affected by PER is a It changes from one PER to the 17 variable. 18 next. In the case of PER-12, which was 19 20 also forwarded to the Board in the last three 21 days, that turns out to be the number because

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1	of a generic multiplier that says a Super S
2	plutonium has a much longer residency time in
3	the lung and, therefore, the biokinetics
4	change and the multiplier there turns out to
5	be four and it is based on the value that then
6	sets a lower threshold of 16 point some
7	percent change of PoC, but that is a variable
8	that is not constant for all PERs.
9	Again, just to review, sub-task 2
10	in most instances will possibly be a fairly
11	detailed analysis that may require the basis
12	for the PER. In the case of PER-12, we were
13	able to skip that part for the most part
14	because OTIB-49 was, in fact, independently
15	reviewed ahead of the review of the PER-12 as
16	we have submitted in the last few days.
17	So we can kind of gloss over sub-
18	task 2, but what was really important, I
19	think, to the discussion regarding the issue

20 of PERs is how to identify the number of 21 audits that need to be done, which is also a

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

highly variable one and that is defined in
 sub-task four.

If we get a chance -- I don't know 3 if we will even have a chance to talk about 4 5 PER-12 _ _ we can actually go over that 6 methodology by which we have to define which types of audits need be done on dose 7 to 8 reconstructions and the actual number of 9 minimum number.

So those are the key issues here 10 in sub-task four, is to define really which 11 12 types of PERs need to be audited because they will be classified based 13 on how the PER 14 affects the dose reconstruction, and in the case of PER-12 you will see that we have the 15 16 minimum identified ten dose reconstructions 17 that need to be audited, based on the type of 18 target organ that was assessed and the 19 methodology that was used in assessing the 20 original dose reconstruction.

21 I don't know if we have time to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

look at PER-12 today, but that will become 1 2 much more self-evident when have that we discussion. 3 4 CHAIR MUNN: We may or may not 5 take a look at it. Our primary concern -- at 6 least my primary concern right now is to make we hash through this 7 sure that PER issue 8 itself. 9 DR. MAURO: One last thing I would in addition to approving our 10 like to add; when reviewing 11 procedure PERs, there is 12 another outstanding element of it. 13 The last step in all of our PER 14 reviews is to review some real cases, go in -there may be hundreds of cases that were 15 16 redone and the last question is, okay, here is 17 the process NIOSH went through to describe the kinds of changes needed, the selected cases 18 19 that they were going to redo and let's say we 20 go through the process, and everything is 21 great. The changes that were needed look

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1	really are right. They fixed the problems.
2	Not only that, all the cases that they
3	decided to pick and the criteria they used to
4	select the cases were right on target, but
5	there is one last step.
6	Here is where we are sort of stuck
7	right now. That is, okay, then we go in, and
8	we go grab a few cases, some cross-section,
9	some selected number of cases to see if, in
10	fact, they were, in fact, correctly in accord
11	with the new protocol in redoing the cases
12	high-fired plutonium, thoracic lymphoma, all
13	of these Blockson and the issues related
14	to the radon, or whatever it is.
15	Our instructions are very clear.
16	We don't do that last step until the cases are
17	selected by a combined effort between the DR
18	Subcommittee and the Procedures Subcommittee.
19	So, for example, right now on PER-
20	12 Hans has pointed out I believe, Hans,
21	you said anywhere from seven to 12 cases might

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

be needed to actually capture the range of

2	kinds of issues that need to be explored to
3	evaluate how well the PER was implemented, but
4	to date no cases have been selected.
5	DR. BEHLING: Yes, and John, the
6	difficulty is, if we have a chance to discuss
7	PER-12, you will see a matrix that identifies
8	at least 10 permutations that potentially
9	affect the dose reconstruction reevaluation
10	protocols.
11	If you want to at least test one
12	case for each of the 10 different
13	methodologies that will affect dose
14	reconstruction involving Super S plutonium,
15	you would then have to be in a position to
16	identify of the universe of 1,573 dose
17	reconstructions that have been reevaluated
18	using OTIB-49, you may have to select ten out
19	of the 1,573 cases.
20	Now, we don't have access to those

21 cases. So the selection criteria has to first

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1

1	start with NIOSH who will first identify what
2	those 1,573 cases are, and then segregate them
3	on the basis of the type of organ that was
4	assessed and the initial methodology by which
5	that initial dose reconstruction was based on:
6	whether it was urinalysis, air sampling data,
7	fecal analysis, et cetera.
8	So this is a complex process that,
9	at a minimum, requires NIOSH to identify those
10	1,573 cases in the case of PER-12 and then, I
11	guess, the Board or the Working Groups for
12	Procedures and Dose Reconstruction as a
13	combination may have to sit down and then
14	select perhaps one for each of the 10
15	different methodologies that are prescribed in
16	PER-12.
17	CHAIR MUNN: Thank you, Hans. I
18	appreciate that.
19	MEMBER ZIEMER: Wanda.

20 CHAIR MUNN: Yes?

This is Ziemer. 21 MEMBER ZIEMER: Ι

just have a question here. We are focusing on 1 2 sub-task 4 here, right, on the audit of the dose reconstructions? 3 Actually, 4 CHAIR MUNN: we are 5 focusing a great deal more than I had wanted 6 us to. 7 Well, here is my MEMBER ZIEMER: question. I have a note on our November 8 9 meeting that we were going to or did ask that handled by the 10 that sub-task 4 be Dose Reconstruction Subcommittee, actually. Did we 11 12 formalize that? I have that in my notes. Ι 13 didn't compare that with the --14 Well, one of CHAIR MUNN: the reasons we haven't formalized any of it is 15 16 haven't identified because what we our 17 procedure is going to be, whether this is, in fact, going to be the procedure. 18 It is the 19 one that is being recommended by SC&A, but we 20 are not sure that that is, in fact, what we 21 are going to do. That is what we are trying

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1 to get to here this morning.

2 So with that thought in mind and the fact that I think we now understand, both 3 from the document and from the overview that 4 5 we have had from SC&A what the contractor's position is with respect to their view of how 6 to proceed, I would like to hear NIOSH's view 7 8 of how best to proceed on this. Brant, are you taking this? 9

Well, that is 10 DR. ULSH: Yes. actually a good seque. If you could just 11 12 leave sub-task 4 up there, because that is really the one that we have -- well, some 13 14 concerns about, and we would like to raise for 15 the Subcommittee's consideration.

16 is NIOSH's position Ι it quess 17 that we feel that, in terms of PER reviews, appropriate focus is on the decision 18 the 19 criteria, whether or not we have appropriately selected or set up rules that will identify 20 21 the cases that are affected.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	We don't see a lot of value in
2	adding a whole list of DR reviews, simply
3	because you have a standing committee to do
4	that, the DR Subcommittee, and they are going
5	to be selecting DRs to review.
6	As Paul mentioned, if you would
7	like to inform the DR Subcommittee, hey, we
8	have a particular interest in these. Can you
9	include those in some of the cases that you
10	select? That is good, but we feel like the DR
11	reviews are more appropriately handled under
12	the auspices of the DR Subcommittee.
13	He stepped out. So I don't know
14	if Stu wants to add anything.
15	CHAIR MUNN: So if I am hearing
16	you correctly, the current NIOSH position is
17	that sub-tasks 1, 2 and 3 are fairly well
18	characterized in the SC&A document. The
19	question revolves around whether the dose
20	reconstructions are going to be handled under
21	the PER review in this Subcommittee or whether

NEAL R. GROSS

purview

of

the

the

be

it

will

1

2 Reconstruction Subcommittee to decide whether PERs list of redone dose 3 reconstructions should be reviewed again. 4 5 DR. ULSH: Well, yes. Now when 6 the DR Subcommittee picks up the DR to review, they look at a whole number of factors. 7 One 8 of those factors presumably would be any PERs 9 that come to bear on that particular dose 10 reconstruction. So we don't see a lot of value in 11 adding a totally separate effort under this 12 Subcommittee to review additional DRs. 13 14 Could I -- I think DR. MAURO: 15 that you are making а qood point for 16 efficiency. Right under what now, we 17 typically go to our tasks for, we typically are asked to review 60 cases that are selected 18 19 two or three times a year by the Board, and there is actually a selection protocol to make 20 21 sure that we capture different kinds of sites,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

42

Dose

different years, et cetera, et cetera,
 different PoCs, types of cancers.

fairlv 3 So there is а formal process which we have been using for about six 4 5 years. What you are saying now is that there criteria 6 is another that you want to incorporate. 7

8 Now the only concern I have is the 9 philosophy that is in effect -- the philosophy originally, which goes way back, the Board 10 would select two and a half percent of all the 11 adjudicated claims, whether they passed or 12 13 failed, that will meet these criteria, and to 14 collectively select some set or review by 15 SC&A, and it had a certain mission.

The mission goes right back to the The mission goes right back to the Act and implementing the intent of the Act. Now what we have is a specialty area -- and I could see going either way -- whereby you are saying, oh, we could very well accommodate the selection of these cases, whether it is -- in

NEAL R. GROSS

1	this case, it is quite a number of cases: 10.
2	By the way, the others don't
3	demand that number of cases. This one does
4	because of its complexity.
5	CHAIR MUNN: Well, of course, we
6	don't know in the future how many.
7	DR. MAURO: That is true. We did
8	do three, and we know the first two, we were
9	only going to look at three.
10	CHAIR MUNN: Well, that would be
11	an arbitrary number depending upon each case.
12	DR. MAURO: Now the question that,
13	I think, the Board and the Work Group needs to
14	ask is, do we want to combine the two
15	together, certainly make it part of the
16	process of case selection. In other words, we
17	have a new goal as part of case selection. It
18	will dilute down in other words, we would
19	have a new goal as part of case selection, it
20	would be another parameter, namely, let's also
21	make sure we pick some cases that are

NEAL R. GROSS

1 sensitive to this process.

I, for one, think they should be kept separate because I think the PER process is a very special and important process for one reason. It represents the maturation of this program, which is almost like bringing home the bacon.

8 In other words, there is a very 9 long process it goes through where a procedure 10 is being reviewed and revised, Site Profiles 11 are being reviewed and revised and there are 12 lots of cases that are being revisited and the 13 degree to which that process is, in fact, 14 effective.

15 That is a very, very important 16 closure issue in terms of engendering trust 17 but that is different than what we are doing 18 under Task 4. It really has a different 19 objective, and to mix the two together could 20 cause confusion.

21 So I would argue the other way,

(202) 234-4433

1 but I --

2 MR. MARSCHKE: Let ask me а 3 question, John. if we did keep them Now separate, when somebody under sub-task 4 under 4 5 the PER review qiven а dose were 6 reconstruction, would they look at the whole dose reconstruction in their review or would 7 8 they just look at the dose reconstruction 9 portion of it that was done under the PER?

If 10 it came out under the Dose Reconstruction Subcommittee, they would look 11 at the whole body of work that was done, I 12 would assume, from the initial contact all the 13 14 way up through any PERs that were done and so on and so forth, right to the end. 15 But if 16 they are done under the PER review, I can see 17 the argument for, well, let's just look at that portion of the dose reconstruction that 18 19 was done in response to the PER, and let's forget about all the body of work that was 20 21 done up to that point.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	CHAIR MUNN: Hold just a minute.
2	Ted wants to say something. Somebody on the
3	phone wants to say something, and I would like
4	to hear from Stu before we get into this too
5	deeply. Ted?
6	MR. KATZ: Well, Hans could go
7	first but the nice thing about what you said,
8	Steve, I think, is when the I mean, Hans
9	said that the CDC Contracts Office spoke to
10	this, but it was actually a panel including
11	Board members, not CDC Contract Officers who
12	had some thoughts about this procedure, one of
13	which John has already talked about, but they
14	also had thoughts about this, about the audit.
15	A concern in that discussion,
16	which I think Steve sort of addresses nicely
17	in a way, was that, if you were going to do it
18	separately, as John has said is his
19	preference, and have these PERs sort of
20	reviewed independently of doing DR reviews
21	generally, the concern that was raised by the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

panel was, are you going to review the thing whole-hog, every aspect of the dose reconstruction or only the aspects related to the PER.

The panel's view was it is sort of why are we -- if this is about PER, why would 6 be reviewing everything else. 7 vou But 8 related to that, there was a lot of gray area. 9 When you are reviewing a PER, if you are going to be reviewing a dose reconstruction 10 under a PER, it is probably hard to separate 11 12 whether you look at the other stuff or you just look at what is affected by the PER. 13

14 In that respect, I would just say 15 it is kind of nice to do it under the Dose 16 Reconstruction Subcommittee. You are 17 reviewing the entire thing, not just limiting what the PER -- how the 18 your view to PER 19 affected the dose reconstruction, but the 20 entire dose reconstruction. You don't have to 21 worry about that gray area.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	DR. BEHLING: I think we are
2	discussing something that is clearly stated
3	under sub-task 4 under the two bullets. If it
4	is still up on the board for people to read,
5	those two bullets will identify whether or not
б	it is a very limited, focused review of the
7	PER issue only or in bullet number 2 you may
8	have to go through the full gamut, depending
9	on whether or not the original dose
10	reconstruction was a maximized dose and, if
11	such, if the PER affects it grossly, you would
12	then have to potentially redo the whole dose
13	reconstruction because you no longer want to
14	maximize doses that at this point in time you
15	will say, well, we are getting close to the
16	50th percentile value and we cannot use a
17	maximized dose.
18	So if you look at those two
19	bullets, I think the discussion that Steve

20 started and Ted has had a comment on is really 21 resolved by those two bullets, if you are in a

NEAL R. GROSS

position to read that.

Ŧ	posicion co read chac.
2	CHAIR MUNN: We are in a position
3	to read it and thank you, Hans.
4	Was there someone else on the
5	phone who was trying to speak because, after
б	Stu, I would like to hear from the Chair of
7	the DR Subcommittee, who happens to be on the
8	line also and must certainly have some opinion
9	about this.
10	MEMBER GIBSON: Wanda, I have a
11	question, too.
± ±	quescion, coo.
12	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, Mike?
	-
12	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, Mike?
12 13	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, Mike? MEMBER GIBSON: When NIOSH does a when they feel the need for a PER and they
12 13 14	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, Mike? MEMBER GIBSON: When NIOSH does a when they feel the need for a PER and they
12 13 14 15 16	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, Mike? MEMBER GIBSON: When NIOSH does a when they feel the need for a PER and they establish one, and they go back and relook at
12 13 14 15 16	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, Mike? MEMBER GIBSON: When NIOSH does a when they feel the need for a PER and they establish one, and they go back and relook at a dose reconstruction, do you just look at the
12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, Mike? MEMBER GIBSON: When NIOSH does a when they feel the need for a PER and they establish one, and they go back and relook at a dose reconstruction, do you just look at the areas that the PER would review or do you go
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, Mike? MEMBER GIBSON: When NIOSH does a when they feel the need for a PER and they establish one, and they go back and relook at a dose reconstruction, do you just look at the areas that the PER would review or do you go back and redo the whole dose?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	of the redo. So if, in fact, there have been
2	other changes to the technical documents that
3	are used that will be used for that case,
4	the new ones are done. So you don't just do
5	the PER part. You rework it, if there are
6	you know, if there haven't been any, then
7	generally what you are doing is just working
8	the PER change, but if there had been some
9	MEMBER GIBSON: You go back and
10	look?
11	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes. And what
12	Hans mentioned is true. If, in fact, the PER
13	would put if you use the maximizing
14	approach the first time around and the PER
15	would put the PoC, looks like, above 45
16	percent, then you would not use a maximizing
17	approach. Something, either not an
18	overestimate or some smaller overestimate that
19	you would take out, some overestimating
20	approach that was in the original, if the PER
21	was pushed above 45 percent.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	So, yes, as a general rule, it is
2	not just going to be the PER rework. There
3	may be other changes as well.
4	DR. ULSH: Especially if you think
5	about the work flow in terms of doing a dose
6	reconstruction. Whenever we make a change
7	say, we updated a TBD or changed a procedure
8	or something like that, we go through and
9	modify all of the tools that we use to do dose
10	reconstruction.
11	So if we have a dose
12	reconstruction where we are picking it up
13	again because of a PER particular issue, it
14	really would be very difficult for us to go
15	back and recreate that dose reconstruction if
16	

17 the tools have already been updated and it is 18 just easier to redo the dose reconstruction 19 essentially from scratch.

20 So that way you ensure that the 21 current methods are used in all aspects of the

(202) 234-4433

dose reconstruction, including the PERs.

1

2 DR. MAURO: By trying to parse it, would tie the hands of the person doing the 3 review to make also some judgments of where 4 5 one separates the other. So I would say, in my mind, you've got to let the reviewer --6 let's say it is Hans -- have the freedom to 7 say, listen, I have to look at this, to the 8 9 extent that I feel I have to look at it to make sure that I could come out of the back 10 end of the review and say, yes, they redid the 11 12 dose reconstruction and everything that needs 13 to be factored in to reflect a product that 14 has a PoC that you can rely on. 15 So I would not want to tie the hands of the reviewer. Really, the question 16 17 becomes -- it is really one of optics in terms of the public seeing a process at work in 18 19 the process being continuing terms of а reevaluation of performance. 20

21 The PER, in my mind, is such an

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	important part of this program that I would
2	not like to see the reviews of cases relevant
3	to a particular PER subsumed into the world of
4	all of these large sets of the PER reviews,
5	which are there for a totally different
6	purpose.

7 envision a stand-alone Т can 8 document on PER-12 that said, great job in the 9 selection, OTIB-49 is right on target; all the procedures are laid out, and we went in and we 10 picked seven -- together, picked seven, 10, 11 12, whatever the number is that, collectively, 12 we judge represent a good cross-section of all 13 14 the different kinds of situations you could encounter under PER-12 and OTIB-49, and that 15 16 is the last chapter, and we review them, and everything is fine. 17

This is a very important document 18 19 to have the record a stand-alone that on 20 demonstrates the Board has taken a real 21 serious look at this, and they are comfortable

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

To sort of blend it into the other part of the program where we are doing our two and a half percent cross-section for other reasons, broader reasons, I think, would do a disservice to the PER process.

7 I am not going to CHAIR MUNN: express my personal opinion on that until we 8 have heard from Mark. Mark, we are doing such 9 stellar job getting through 10 the dose а reconstructions that 11 are necessary in that Subcommittee. What is your view with respect 12 to the best method for approaching this? 13

14 MEMBER GRIFFON: Well, I actually -- I think you guys have hit all the issues 15 that I was thinking of, but I am actually 16 probably convinced, mainly by just what John 17 said, that I think it might make a lot more 18 sense to keep it -- well, number one, I think 19 it should -- I really do think we need to 20 21 review some figures, because I agree that

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

(202) 234-4433

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 55

¹ with it.

there is an important product coming out of
 the overall Board review.

Two, I think that I might agree with John now. Originally, I was thinking it made more sense to select the cases and do it in the DR Subcommittee. But for a couple of reasons, I think it might make more sense to keep it separated.

9 One was just the mechanics of it, 10 like John was suggesting, that it might be 11 confusing to be transferring back and forth. 12 In most of the cases, even all of the cases, 13 we are doing in our two and a half percent.

14 The other is we also have enough crossover on the two Subcommittees. 15 In fact, at one point I think we all went to the 16 17 Committee. So we've got a lot of crossover on the two, and I think there would be enough --18 you know, we would maintain consistency there. 19 20 So I don't see that as a problem.

21 So I would prefer, actually, to do

1	a I mean, I am satisfied with the procedure
2	the way it was developed, and I think
3	selecting the cases and doing the reviews on
4	the Procedures Subcommittee might make the
5	most sense.
6	I am I think, as we get into
7	this, I think we are going to find that there
8	is selecting the cases might be quite
9	difficult, especially well, maybe for PER-
10	12 it will be the most difficult, but I know
11	that 10 different types of methodologies that
12	Hans is referring to that is not something
13	that NIOSH simply has in the database. I
14	think they have to open up case by case to
15	find those. So this could be a time-consuming
16	activity on the part of NIOSH.
17	Notwithstanding that, I think that
18	the whole thing, may be best served to stay in
19	the Procedures Subcommittee.
20	CHAIR MUNN: I guess I don't quite

21 understand your last comment, since as I

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

understand it, NIOSH will be having to do that 1 2 under any circumstance. 3 MEMBER GRIFFON: Well, yes. That wouldn't matter, where it is at. 4 I am just 5 pointing that out as a issue. I was thinking, you know, case selection; how difficult could 6 7 that be. But this example shows how difficult 8 it might be, is all I am pointing out. 9 CHAIR MUNN: Well, and it is going 10 to have to be --Would happen in 11 MEMBER GRIFFON: 12 either place, yes. CHAIR MUNN: 13 It is going to have 14 to be done, regardless of where any audit 15 takes place. Of course, you realize, Mark, I 16 am just as happy to give your Subcommittee the 17 responsibility as you are to give it to this 18 one. 19 MEMBER GRIFFON: I thought I made a strong argument of keeping it with you. 20 21 CHAIR MUNN: And I am thinking I

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

have just as solid an argument for giving it
 to you.

Paul, do you have a position on this that you would like to express at this time or do you want to think about it a little more?

7 Well, MEMBER ZIEMER: Ι think 8 originally I felt like it should be with the Dose Reconstruction group, in part because it 9 it is being 10 may be that reviewed more comprehensively, not just for some changes, 11 12 and maybe that remains to be seen yet.

13 The Dose Reconstruction Subcommittee, in principle, has been -- they 14 15 have established sort of selection criteria 16 and approaches doing these things. to 17 Granted, there is a fair amount of overlap between our two groups, but at least initially 18 19 it seemed to make to well, sense say, 20 basically, it is review of dose а 21 reconstruction, even though in this case it is

NEAL R. GROSS

1	driven somewhat differently by a particular
2	set of circumstances that you are selecting
3	from sort of a subgroup of the total pool.
4	But that was my initial reaction.
5	I don't know, but we might have to
6	try it. Maybe initially and again, I am
7	talking off the top of my head, but maybe
8	initially we would have to do something like,
9	okay, let's either Dose Reconstruction or
10	Procedures Review select a group of cases,
11	examples, and then let the other group take a
12	look at that and see if they concur.
13	Maybe we have to look at this
14	together and kind of get a feel for it. I
15	don't know, but to some extent we have to get
16	an idea of how things work.
17	MEMBER GRIFFON: Paul, this is
18	Mark. I mean, I could see a case for either
19	place also. I think, if it does stay in the
20	Procedures Subcommittee, I would argue that
21	the review methodology should be consistent

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1	with what we do in the Dose Reconstruction.
2	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
3	MEMBER GRIFFON: So I don't see
4	that as being such a problem, and if we kept
5	it in the if we switched it to the DR
б	Subcommittee, I would certainly treat it as a
7	separate work product, not mix it in with all
8	the other
9	CHAIR MUNN: Absolutely, yes.
10	MEMBER GRIFFON: You know, I think
11	we could handle it either way. I am with you,
12	Paul. Maybe we need to give it a trial run,
13	one way or the other and see how it works.
14	Also, I think that goes for the
15	procedure, too. We may find that we have to
16	revisit the procedure after a few months, the
17	SC&A's procedure. We may find that we may
18	have some problems in terms of it down the
19	line. We can always ask for a modification.
20	CHAIR MUNN: It is very clear from
21	my perspective that, whenever we have any

NEAL R. GROSS

review of rework that has been done under a

2	PER, that that review would be done in a group
3	of separate cases. They should not be
4	included into any routine process that we have
5	gone through. But I can't see that that would
6	be any real problem for the DR Subcommittee.
7	We would simply make a selection
8	based on slightly different criteria than we
9	usually use, and the assessment with respect
10	to how many need to be reviewed would be more
11	of a thorny problem than actually the review
12	itself.
13	There is no reason why that group
14	shouldn't stand alone, as I see it.
15	MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer
16	again. A question I have today is what level
17	do we need to decide this today or are we
18	just discussing it kind of in general terms?
19	What is the end point for this particular
20	discussion? What are we trying to get to?
21	CHAIR MUNN: My hope for the end

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

1	point was to have a decision on which
2	direction we should recommend the Board take
3	at our next teleconference meeting, which is
4	coming up here in just a little over a week.
5	I had hoped that is what we could do, is get
6	the Subcommittee's recommendation as to how to
7	proceed with the PERs.
8	MEMBER GRIFFON: Wanda, this is
9	Mark. You can make a recommendation. I will
10	support either way right now.
11	CHAIR MUNN: All right. Hold on
12	just a moment. Emily has a question.
13	MS. HOWELL: I just wanted to
14	better understand what the Subcommittee and
15	SC&A sees as the path forward with the number
16	of PER reviews. I mean, from the NIOSH
17	perspective, NIOSH is going to continue to
18	issue PERs throughout the existence of the
19	program as necessary. So I would assume then
20	that the need to audit dose reconstructions
21	that are covered by a PER would be similarly

NEAL R. GROSS

of an ongoing nature.

2 DR. MAURO: I could help answer 3 that. see two processes moving forward. Ι One is selection of the cases, the 60 cases 4 5 per year. That is ongoing, and it is well established, and the criteria for selection of 6 it. 7 8 introducing is What we are now 9 another process for selecting cases for a very 10 focused purpose. Now so I see them both moving forward. 11 former, 12 How to script the of is well established. 13 The latter, course, 14 right now we are deliberating on how best to 15 By way of efficiency -- and Steve be done. 16 just pointed this out while we were talking --17 is, let's say today NIOSH says, okay, here is 10 cases that we think meet the criteria for 18 19 PER-12 that we would recommend being reviewed because they capture different dimensions of 20 21 the problem and they are put before us or they

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1

1	put it before the Subcommittee or either one
2	of the Subcommittees, however that is decided.
3	I would like to point out there is
4	an efficiency to this. When that is delivered
5	to us, one of the first things SC&A should do
6	is say, oh, by the way, you see that one right
7	there, number six, we already reviewed that.
8	We are reviewing it right now as part of the
9	47 cases that we currently have in front of
10	us.
11	I would argue that and I would
12	like, to Hans' reaction for all intents and
13	purposes, we have the ten, but we really only
14	have to do nine, because one of them is
15	already captured. That one just happened to,
16	like, pass all by itself.
17	In other words, you know, you
18	folks went ahead and picked the best ten that
19	you think would work. The Work Group could
20	approve it. It goes forward, but then the

NEAL R. GROSS

onus is on us to make sure we are not doing

21

1 one twice.

In other words, I could see some 2 efficiencies going out because we are doing 47 3 right now and I could tell you I have noticed 4 from the -- and Hans certainly could weigh in 5 I believe I have seen some high-6 on this. fired plutonium cases that were revisited and 7 8 returned as part of the audit of our 47 cases 9 and that could very well be one of the cases that would serve us well also at this part. 10

11 So in a way, there could be some 12 efficiencies built in, but still keep them 13 separate.

14 CHAIR MUNN: Let me see if I can 15 respond partially to what I think the question 16 is. It appears that there are actually two 17 selection processes that have to go forward. 18 That has not been well established so far.

19 One is what PERs are going to be 20 selected and the other is what cases are 21 selected under that PER.

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1	MS. HOWELL: Right.
2	CHAIR MUNN: So we have in
3	terms of what do we do now, one of the
4	questions that I had hoped to resolve here is
5	how do you choose the PER and with what
6	frequency, of what number?
7	We are dealing with a total set of
8	unknowns. We have no idea how many PERs we
9	are going to have and we have no idea how
10	complex they may or may not be. So we are
11	starting from ground zero with that selection,
12	and the same is essentially true with respect
13	to the dose reconstructions themselves.
14	So I hope that
15	MS. HOWELL: That helps. I guess
16	my question is I am just it seems like,
17	just as with the dose reconstructions, the
18	number of dose reconstruction PER dose
19	reconstruction reviews is just going to be an
20	ongoing, rolling, continuing thing as you have
21	additional PERs that come up and it is not

NEAL R. GROSS

1	clear to me I did read the SC&A document
2	when it first came out but I don't remember it
3	well enough right now to know if it answers
4	this question, but would you only be doing PER
5	dose reconstruction audit of cases that you
6	had done a full PER review of?
7	DR. MAURO: Oh, yes.
8	MS. HOWELL: So and is there
9	any sort of link numerically, if we are
10	reviewing this PER, then we want to get two
11	percent or whatever of the cases affected by
12	that PER or is it just more of a kind of like
13	how we look at sites when we are selecting
14	individual dose reconstructions where there is
15	no numeric requirement. It is just kind of
16	like we want to make sure it is
17	representative?
18	CHAIR MUNN: The latter is
19	correct.
20	MS. HOWELL: Okay. So then I am
21	trying to understand, then, whether the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

68

1	ultimate I am asking these questions, so
2	you understand, because I am trying to make
3	sure where this kind of fits within the
4	different subcommittees, where it is the
5	Board's work and the SC&A work, and I just
6	want to make sure I have a clear
7	understanding.
8	So is the ultimate goal from
9	reviewing the PER dose reconstructions to
10	validate the PER or is it to validate the dose
11	reconstructions; because it seems like,
12	depending on which subcommittee you make the
13	selection under, it could be either one,
14	because you are saying that you sometimes
15	review PER dose reconstructions under the Dose
16	Reconstruction Subcommittee.
17	DR. MAURO: That would be that
18	will happen not by design.
19	CHAIR MUNN: Serendipity.
20	DR. MAURO: Serendipity. To
21	answer your question, though, which PERs go to

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

69

1	the Work Group, this is a lot like which Site
2	Profiles. Usually, the criteria and this
3	is a judgmental call that is collectively made
4	by the Board. Usually, it is at full Board
5	meeting.
6	SC&A would provide a list of here
7	are all the Site Profiles that currently are
8	underway but have not been reviewed by SC&A,
9	and right next to them would be the number of
10	cases that are affected by that profile.
11	What happened at the last meeting
11 12	What happened at the last meeting is the Board looked at it and said, well,
12	is the Board looked at it and said, well,
12 13	is the Board looked at it and said, well, listen, gee, you know, Kansas City, Pacific
12 13 14	is the Board looked at it and said, well, listen, gee, you know, Kansas City, Pacific Northwest these are some big ones that have
12 13 14 15	is the Board looked at it and said, well, listen, gee, you know, Kansas City, Pacific Northwest these are some big ones that have lots of cases and if we are you know, so one of the criteria that often is used on why
12 13 14 15 16	is the Board looked at it and said, well, listen, gee, you know, Kansas City, Pacific Northwest these are some big ones that have lots of cases and if we are you know, so one of the criteria that often is used on why
12 13 14 15 16 17	is the Board looked at it and said, well, listen, gee, you know, Kansas City, Pacific Northwest these are some big ones that have lots of cases and if we are you know, so one of the criteria that often is used on why we pick a particular Site Profile or the

21 with Brookhaven. We, a while back, were

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

authorized review the Brookhaven Site 1 to 2 Profile with an eye toward the fact that a 3 Brookhaven ER coming within was out six months. 4

5 So in other words, so the Board -it is really a collective judgment on which 6 ones are important to look at, how much money 7 8 is left in the pot for the rest of the year. 9 So SC&A doesn't get involved with the selection of which PERs, but there is general 10 agreement that, yes, PERs need to be reviewed. 11 12 It is very important and part of the overall 13 mandate for the Board to look at them.

How many and which ones are looked at, I believe, is a judgment call that is made by the Board or -- I am not quite sure of the protocol -- or the Work Group. I am not sure at what level those decisions will be made. Maybe, Ted, you have a sense.

20 MR. KATZ: Well, I am going to 21 agree with you. It is a judgment call. At

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

least, so far it has been a judgment call by
 the Board.

clarify, 3 SC&A is Just to not involved in making that judgment call but SC&A 4 5 did assist the Board last time by preparing a It covered certain criteria 6 matrix. like affected but 7 number of cases also the complexity of the changes involved and so on 8 9 and I think that is helpful for the Board.

Those are valid considerations and 10 this Work Group was going to consider those 11 12 criteria and consider whether they needed to 13 be added to or subtracted from or whatever, 14 and that was part of what was going to come out of this Work Group as a recommendation to 15 16 the full Board. Are those criteria the good 17 ones, all the good ones we need, or do they need more or whatever? 18

DR. MAURO: But, remember, that is a lot different. There is the selection of the PERs that should be looked at, and we do

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 1	the best we can to give you the ammunition you
2 1	need to help make the judgments, but the
3 \$	selection of the cases
4	CHAIR MUNN: Well, and Steve has a
5	list up right now.
б	MR. MARSCHKE: This is from the
7 1	protocol that John developed. This is
8 2	Attachment 1, and I guess it was 32 PERs
9 1	total, and it gives a description of it, the
10 1	number of cases, and the level of complexity.
11	CHAIR MUNN: And it will
12 0	definitely be a Board decision to make, but as
13	long as the Board has the full set of data
14 1	from which to make that judgment, then we
15 1	really don't have to worry about it.
16	What we need to do is make a
17 1	recommendation as to how many we should and
18 ł	how frequently we should check the PERs for
19 P	potential review by SC&A.
20	MR. KATZ: And when we discussed
21 1	this at the Board just to remind you, too,

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

about selection of PERs, the other reason I 1 2 had argued at the Board meeting it should be a Board decision also, because you will have 3 members who have conflicts; and the smaller 4 5 your subgroup, the more limited you are, then, in making these choices. So it makes sense to 6 use the full Board, and then you will always 7 8 have an adequate number of people to deal with 9 that consideration.

The only thing that is 10 DR. MAURO: not up here -- and I try to do this and it is 11 12 a little risky is give you a price tag. In other words, some of them are more complex, 13 14 and they may cost a little more, but at least the 15 you know, one of things that is _ _ important that we have been doing -- it is 16 17 almost like a new thing for cost control is, when we give you a menu -- so here are all the 18 19 Site Profiles. Here are all the PERs. Here 20 are all the procedures that have not been 21 reviewed to date, and here is how much --

NEAL R. GROSS

right now, we've got \$1.5 million in the bank 1 2 for this year. So, in effect, you've got limited 3 4 resources. 5 CHAIR MUNN: Yes. б DR. MAURO: And you have to decide how best to invest that money. 7 So I do the 8 best I can to let you know how much is left, because you have committed this much. 9 It turns out there is a certain amount of money 10 that, for all intents and purposes, best we 11 can tell this committee -- we add up. 12 We 13 think we can do all that work, deliver all 14 those products to you, but you still have 1.5 Then you say, okay, we've got 1.5 15 million. 16 What do you want to do with that million. 17 money? I mean, in theory, you could spend it all on PERs or you could say, no, no, no, I 18 want to save some for some other Site Profile; 19 20 I want to save some money for SECs that may be 21 coming down the line.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	So all we can do is give you as
2	much information as we can regarding the
3	nature and complexity of the report, some
4	metric like these, what we believe would
5	possibly the cost to do it and then
6	collectively you decide how you would like to
7	task SC&A.
8	Right now, we are talking about
9	something very narrow: just the cases that
10	really represent cases that have to be
11	reviewed in order to complete our review of

12 PER and right now that job is not done. We 13 are not finished.

14 We have delivered a report but it 15 is stopped without the cases and without a 16 review of the cases where we come out the back 17 end and said, yes, we reviewed the appropriate 18 representative cases that capture the ten 19 different dimensions of the problems, and every single one of them turned out perfect. 20 21 That is а very powerful statement, an

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1 endorsement.

2 Without having the ability to say that in that PER work product that is sitting 3 on the shelf somewhere or delivered to the 4 5 public -- and that is why I would like to keep it clean, not somehow confounded with 6 the selection of the cases that we do under task 7 8 one.

9 CHAIR MUNN: No, they would be Regardless of where we do 10 kept separately. it, they need to be kept separately. 11

12 MEMBER ZIEMER: Wanda, this is One additional comment. I think 13 Ziemer. 14 Emily's questions were appropriate, because one thing we haven't done is -- and by we, I 15 16 am talking, I think, about the Board generally -- and that is make a decision as to whether 17 we are going to look at a certain fraction of 18 19 the total PER cases, as we have done with the 20 total number of cases: you know, some 21 percentage versus simply each time arbitrarily

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1	selecting a certain number of cases that
2	somehow relates to the total available. But I
3	don't think we have ever come up with a
4	sort of a set policy on what fraction of the
5	total of those kind of cases we would look at.
6	CHAIR MUNN: No, we have not. We
7	haven't even attempted to discuss that, and
8	since the number of PERs that are available to
9	us is likely to change from month to month,
10	this is new territory for us.
11	It is time for us to take a break.
12	I would like to do that, like for everyone to
13	give some thought to what we have just been
14	discussing.
15	I think I am prepared to make a
16	suggestion with respect to our recommendation
17	to the Board when we get back, but consider
18	what we have said and I will talk about
19	recommendation and we will have further
20	discussion, if necessary, on whether we need
21	to clarify points as we go to the Board.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	DR. BEHLING: Wanda, can I make a
2	quick comment before we break?
3	CHAIR MUNN: Certainly. Go ahead,
4	Hans.
5	DR. BEHLING: Yes. There is a
б	small fly in the ointment here in the number
7	of dose reconstructions that we would
8	potentially identify for recommendation to be
9	audited is really something that cannot be
10	done until you actually do sub-tasks 1 through
11	3 for each PER because it is at that point
12	that you identify the complexity of the PER
13	and the types of mutations or the number of
14	mutations that come into play here.
15	In the case of PER-12, if you have
16	had a chance to look at it, in Table 2 of PER-
17	12 review, I have identified ten potential
18	permutations. It isn't until you actually
19	review the PER that you come to that wisdom of
20	identifying the minimum number.
21	So in response to Emily Howell's

comments: is it a percentage, is it a number. Yes, it is probably a minimum number that we can identify, but it is a number that we don't know up front.

5 So that in the attachment for the document that you have in front of you, we are 6 not in a position to identify on behalf of 7 8 each PER that has yet to be reviewed the 9 number of cases that we would potentially auditing in 10 recommend for terms of dose reconstruction audit. That wisdom only comes 11 after you actually do the review and it is 12 part of the first three sub-tasks that allow 13 14 you to make this decision.

15 Right. MR. KATZ: Hans, the critical factor that you just laid out is it 16 17 doesn't come under the rubric of doing a sample of -- of auditing or reviewing the 18 19 sample of dose reconstructions. It is guided 20 by the content of the PER.

21 DR. BEHLING: Yes.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	CHAIR MUNN: All right. We are on
2	a 15-minute break. We will be back at 11:05.
3	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
4	matter went off the record at 10:47 a.m. and
5	resumed at 11:04 p.m.)
б	CHAIR MUNN: We will go ahead and
7	see if we can get started here, even though
8	Mark's buy-in on this will probably be a
9	necessary thing. So if anyone is aware of a
10	click on the line which indicates Mark might
11	be joining us, please do stop us and let us
12	know.
13	Having discussed this process and
14	given considerable thought to it over the last
15	few weeks in both the Dose Reconstruction
16	Subcommittee and in this one, it is my
17	proposal that we recommend as a Subcommittee
18	to the Board at our I believe it is March
19	31st teleconference that we proceed in this
20	manner:
21	Annually, SC&A will present to us

the universe of PERs -- that is, to the full Board -- well in advance of an upcoming meeting so that the Board members will have an opportunity to fully understand the PERs that are available for review.

6 Then, if the Board members 7 themselves have additions that they would like 8 to make to that recommendation, they will have 9 an adequate opportunity to do so prior to the 10 meeting.

At the meeting, one of the agenda 11 items then would be for the Board to select 12 whatever number of PERs the Board feels is 13 14 appropriate for review in the coming year. 15 This, hopefully, will also qive SC&A an 16 opportunity to do some budget thinking with 17 regard to what that may cost.

DR. MAURO: I would only make one suggestion. We hold our full Board meetings about once every two months. I would say, rather than have it as annual, as the date for

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

the next meeting is coming up, like this one,

2	and the agenda is being developed for that, I
3	think it is probably it may turn out in the
4	interim a number of PERs may have been opened
5	up, just like there may have been a number of
6	Site Profiles.
7	I think that, to hold ourselves to
8	annually, I would assume to say, this is to be
9	determined by the Board when they want to hear
10	from SC&A, as opposed to automatically making
11	it once a year.
12	CHAIR MUNN: This would not be
13	written in stone. This is my recommendation
14	for our initial cut at this. As is always the
15	case, when I think our experience during
16	the last few years has been whenever you have
17	brought to our attention the fact that there
18	is an outstanding issue that should be
19	addressed, we have taken that into
20	consideration and in most cases have
21	authorized you to go forward and do so.

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	I can't imagine that this
2	particular situation would be any different.
3	I am simply suggesting that, as a routine item
4	for annual consideration and one that you
5	could incorporate into your budgeting process,
6	this kind of presentation be made to the Board
7	so that the Board have an opportunity to make
8	any additional recommendations they might have
9	and we could all be on the same page at the
10	same time.
11	DR. MAURO: This kind of
11 12	DR. MAURO: This kind of information is always available to us. It is
12	information is always available to us. It is
12 13	information is always available to us. It is just really a matter of when the Board would
12 13 14	information is always available to us. It is just really a matter of when the Board would like to hear from us.
12 13 14 15	information is always available to us. It is just really a matter of when the Board would like to hear from us. CHAIR MUNN: Yes. Yes, and that
12 13 14 15 16	information is always available to us. It is just really a matter of when the Board would like to hear from us. CHAIR MUNN: Yes. Yes, and that is why I am suggesting that we do this at
12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>information is always available to us. It is just really a matter of when the Board would like to hear from us.</pre>

21 past with respect to the procedure itself for

NEAL R. GROSS

1	evaluation, and present to the Dose
2	Reconstruction Subcommittee your assessment of
3	the number of dose reconstructions which
4	should be done in that specific case.
5	Since there is no way for us to
б	second-guess what that might be, it appears
7	logical that your assessment would be the
8	basis for any decision that would be made.
9	I would suggest that the final
10	decision with respect to the number and the
11	criteria to be used then be left in the hands
12	of the Dose Reconstruction Subcommittee and
13	that those reconstructions, whatever their
14	number may be, whether it is five or whether
15	it is 25 or whether it is 50, be handled as a
16	separate cohort, not to be mixed in any way
17	except that some may be duplicated. We, of
18	course, would not want to duplicate and
19	that the end result of those audits then as a
20	final step be incorporated into a final report
21	which would essentially incorporate what you

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	have in your current procedure as Sub-task 4.
2	That is my expectation of
3	recommendation to the Board. Does anyone have
4	any contrary suggestions or do you feel that
5	we are off-track in any way? I feel certain,
6	if the Board doesn't agree with us, we will
7	hear from them.
8	MR. KATZ: Well, just, I think you
9	need to supplement it. You need to make a
10	recommendation about the criteria for
11	selecting PERs that the Board is going to
12	consider. SC&A has this proposal, this table
13	of criteria for how to select PERs, but you
14	haven't given your opinion about it.
15	CHAIR MUNN: No.
16	MR. KATZ: If that is adequate, if
17	you want more
18	DR. MAURO: Could I help a little
19	with the criteria a bit? The perfect example
20	the reason we picked a number is
21	MR. KATZ: No, no, no. You are

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	mistaken. I am talking about the selection of
2	PERs. SC&A did a nice job of laying out what
3	it thought were some important factors for the
4	Board to consider, but the Board wanted to
5	hear from the Work Group what its
б	recommendations are, because and in fact,
7	you commented in that Work Group meeting that
8	you wanted to consider those factors that SC&A
9	used to lay out a chart of possible PERs and
10	how you might collect them.

11 CHAIR MUNN: So?

MS. KATZ: Your Work Group needs to either say we like the criteria that SC&A used as factors to consider or there are other factors we would like to see in these to consider which PERs to select, if there are other factors that come to mind to inform the Work Group.

CHAIR MUNN: All right. Perhaps
we need to try to do that today, if we are
going to do that.

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1	MR. KATZ: Steve, do you have I
2	am thinking that there was a table that had at
3	least one more factor than what was showing
4	there that was presented to the Board when you
5	guys presented PERs for consideration.
6	DR. MAURO: But you got to have a
7	column with a price tag.
8	MR. KATZ: I don't think that was
9	a factor from which to select.
10	DR. MAURO: I don't know.
11	MR. KATZ: It was complexity,
12	number of cases.
13	MR. MARSCHKE: This is all I have.
14	MR. KATZ: This isn't the table I
15	am thinking of.
16	CHAIR MUNN: I remember
17	discussions of complexity. I remember of
18	course, number of cases is obvious.
19	DR. ULSH: Just so I understand,
20	John, if I look at it row by row, is this a
21	list of all unreviewed PERs or has there been

NEAL R. GROSS

some filtering applied? 1 2 DR. MAURO: No. I think we have a 3 list of everything, every PER, and some of them we have looked at. We have looked at 4 5 this Ι think PER-9 may be here one. somewhere. In other words, I think our intent 6 is -- what I try to do is keep a complete list 7 8 of every PER and make it clear which ones you 9 have already looked at, where it is. For example, on 12 we have looked 10 There are nine here. I know nine, 12 11 at it. 12 and there was maybe 13. So we looked at that. 13 I think the asterisk says we looked at it. 14 which reviewed Do you know ones have we already? 15 16 No, you looked at the CHAIR MUNN: science. 17 You looked at the complexity. You looked at the number of cases and was there 18

19 one other criterion. I think probably I was20 thinking there should be another criterion.

21 MR. KATZ: Kathy was trying to

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Kathy, do you have something? 1 speak. 2 MS. BEHLING: The only thing I was going to say is the Attachment 1 does include 3 all of the PERs we are currently aware of. 4 I 5 believe there are 32. б reason that they are ranked The the way they are, they are presented the way 7 8 they are, is because we did try to put those 9 PERs that we felt the Board might be most interested in looking at at the top of the 10 list. So when I went out and generated this 11 list, I first of all looked at the number of 12 13 cases that were potentially involved, and also 14 the level of complexity. That is a two-part 15 thing. First of all, how complex was the 16 selection criteria and for PER-12, as Hans has 17 indicated, that was a fairly complex selection 18

19 process for what cases will be looked at.

20 Then thirdly, we looked at the 21 science involved. How complex was the science

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1	involved and how much rework had to be done to
2	go back to these dose reconstructions? But
3	all of the PERs are listed in Attachment 1 of
4	our proposed procedure but they are just
5	ranked by those that we thought you might be
6	most interested in looking at.
-	

7 MR. KATZ: Thanks, Kathy. You 8 actually answered my question. I thought 9 there was another element, and it is really that there are two elements in the single 10 column. 11

12 MS. BEHLING: Right.

13 MR. KATZ: You have the selection 14 criteria complexity and you have the science 15 complexity. I recall that there was another 16 and that is the other factor. They are just 17 both in the same column under level of complexity. 18

19 CHAIR MUNN: And as much as I 20 would like to be able to say yes, it would be 21 nice to have John's assessment of cost

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	involved I think the cost was the other
2	element that I was thinking of at the time
3	that we had discussed it earlier but it is
4	very difficult for me to see how such a cost
5	estimate could be made until the Dose
6	Reconstruction Committee's decision with
7	respect to the variable number of cases can be
8	seen.
9	DR. MAURO: That is true. When I

10 originally did the cost, we originally were talking about three and that was a number we 11 just plucked out of the air; we'll do three. 12 But 13 now Ι am starting to realize, no, 14 sometimes three is not going to be enough.

15 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

DR. MAURO: Now whether or not this PER-12 is the unusual one where you had so many different cases you need to really get the cross-section, I don't know, but you are right.

21 So when I put a cost up, I do that

1	because I feel I do the best I can to get
2	an idea of where we are headed. They are
3	usually not right on the button, but usually -
4	- sometimes it turns out some are more and
5	some are less, and in the end we will probably
6	be okay.
7	CHAIR MUNN: Well, even looking at
8	your chart, at PER-17, that would be trying
9	to choose cases out of that number of cases
10	and cover the criteria that Hans and Kathy
11	would like to see, as we, I think, also would
12	like to see, is going to be a touchy business.
13	Some of them will be easy to do and some of
14	them will be difficult to do.
15	DR. MAURO: Yes. And I am going
16	to add another level of complexity that is
17	unfortunate, which is, of course, when you
18	slow the train down, you've got the
19	document was completed. We reviewed OTIB-12.
20	there was a formal procedure for doing high-
21	fired plutonium. It received a positive

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

review, which is a lot we can stand on. 2 Now, unfortunately, at Hanford, we are in the middle right now of a review of the 3 Hanford Evaluation Report. There are a number 4 5 of issues. Even though Hanford has now 6 expanded its recommended period of coverage for the SEC, there are still a number of 7 8 issues that Arjun is working with the team 9 that may very well result in some additional 10 changes.

happened 11 So what is PERs are 12 issued when NIOSH realizes ___ this is а 13 constant issue of PER, because enough has 14 changed that we better revisit these cases. 15 But some of those sites are still in the 16 process of undergoing some degree of review. 17 Savannah River is a perfect example. Hanford is another one. 18

19 Idaho -- INL, we only had one --We have a Site Profile review in INL. 20 We had 21 one Work Group meeting where we went over all

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

1	of our cases, and or all of our issues, and
2	we are just warming up to issues resolution.
3	So just bear in mind that, in
4	theory, we could do a PER review on INL,
5	Idaho, and within the context of that PER
6	notwithstanding the fact that things might
7	change some more in the future, bear in mind
8	that we could do one and say, okay, given this
9	new set of guidelines as captured in the
10	revised version of a whether it is a Site
11	Profile or an OTIB and now this PER is
12	issued that is these many cases.
13	We could put that into the
14	machinery and do a review but always
15	recognize, if that particular site is still in
16	the middle, things could change again.
17	CHAIR MUNN: Board members will
18	have to recognize that at the time that they
19	look at your universe and make their
20	selection. Yes.
0.1	

21 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes. This is

(202) 234-4433

1	Ziemer and I think you always have that
2	possibility on any particular site. The door
3	is never closed to something being revised or
4	changed or a PER coming out. So you have to
5	deal with where you are at the moment.
6	CHAIR MUNN: True.
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: And go from there.
8	CHAIR MUNN: Then hearing no real
9	objection to the contrary, I will put this
10	recommendation into writing, send it to all
11	the members of this Subcommittee and, if you
12	have any suggestions with respect to wording
13	or with aspects of my recommendation, then
14	please get back to me as promptly as possible.
15	Bear in mind that, between Friday
16	morning and the time that we go to our
17	teleconference on the 31st, I will be almost
18	incommunicado. I will really be hard to reach
19	and if you do reach me, I will probably be
20	highly medicated. So if we can do this, it
21	would be helpful.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer
2	again. Just one other comment. I think the
3	chart that SC&A provided us with, as I
4	understand it, was sorted by sort of impact,
5	number of cases from top to bottom and the
6	reason certain facilities were at the top of
7	the list were the number of cases' impact.
8	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: Is that not
10	correct?
11	CHAIR MUNN: Kathy had said that -
12	- in order of importance, as they saw them.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I think the
14	importance was determined by potential number
15	of cases to be reevaluated. Isn't that
16	correct?
17	MS. BEHLING: A combination of
18	number of cases, like I said, level of
19	complexity for the different criteria. It is
20	selection criteria and the science involved,
21	as we saw it. It is objective.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

(202) 234-4433

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay. As I look
2	at the numbers in column 3, it is pretty clear
3	that they go from well.
4	CHAIR MUNN: From high to lower.
5	MEMBER ZIEMER: High to lower,
6	whereas the complexity thing doesn't seem to
7	do that.
8	MR. KATZ: It is not totally
9	consistent in terms of numbers alone.
10	CHAIR MUNN: Steve, may I ask that
11	you send that particular document, the list of
12	PERs?
13	MR. MARSCHKE: This is attached to
14	the new protocol that I can send it, yes.
15	CHAIR MUNN: If you would send it
16	separately.
17	MR. MARSCHKE: It is part of
18	Attachment 1 to the procedure.
19	CHAIR MUNN: We all just have the
20	procedures in there.
21	MR. MARSCHKE: And it is just

Attachment 1 for that procedure.

2 CHAIR MUNN: No, that's okav. don't worry about it. Don't worry about it. 3 I was just thinking that it might help the 4 5 committee members if they had that in hand at the same time they had my recommendation but 6 we all know where to find it. 7 8 LEMEN: Could just MEMBER you 9 summarize your recommendation for me one more time? 10 I will try to 11 CHAIR MUNN: Yes. do that. 12 I am going to recommend is 13 What 14 that at least annually, SC&A will present to 15 the Board the universe of PERs that exist with 16 any recommendation that they have for review. I am asking that they do that prior to a full 17 Board meeting so that, if anybody has any 18 19 suggestions other than their suggestions, they can come forward with that at the time that we 20 21 have it on the agenda at the Board meeting.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

1	Then the Board will make the
2	selection.
3	MEMBER LEMEN: Now what is the
4	criteria, though, for them to present it to
5	us? Like this?
6	CHAIR MUNN: Like this, yes.
7	MEMBER LEMEN: Just like this that
8	is in here?
9	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, their criteria,
10	and we are not including the cost, simply
11	because it is difficult to impossible to
12	evaluate what the cost, actually, for their
13	work will be until they have recommendation
14	from the Dose Reconstruction Committee with
15	respect to how many dose reconstructions the
16	DR Subcommittee feels should be done to
17	adequately cover their universe of concerns.
18	MEMBER LEMEN: So out of this list
19	then the Board will select a fixed number or
20	some number, whatever they decide, and then it
21	will be costed out to see if it is feasible to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 100

1 d	lo, and then SC&A will come back to the Board
2 w	with the cost figures. So then the Board will
3 s	say, okay, you can do two or you can do three,
4 b	pased upon the cost figures, or how does that
5 w	ork?
6	CHAIR MUNN: I did not intend to
7 g	get into the cost now.
8	MR. KATZ: I think SC&A can give
9 y	ou rough costs. I mean, the only thing that
10 i	s uncertain is how many cases would be
11 r	reviewed dose reconstruction cases would be
12 r	reviewed. But they can give you rough
13 f	igures, just like they do for Site Profile
14 r	recently did for the Site Profiles that were
15 p	presented and so on.
16	CHAIR MUNN: In my recommendation,
17 a	fter the Board selects cases that it might
18 l	ike to see, then the Dose Reconstruction
19 S	Subcommittee will identify what their
20 r	ecommendation will be for the number of
21 c	ases. Only then will we be able to ask SC&A

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1 for some cost estimate.

2	MEMBER LEMEN: For example, if
3	SC&A PER-12 seems to be the one that they
4	are pushing, but we may want as a Board to see
5	PER-29, 14 and 17 done. How do we if we
б	vote that we need those done and the Dose
7	Reconstruction Committee then does their
8	review, how do we know how many are going to
9	be done? Does SC&A come back and tell us,
10	okay, we got enough money to do these or what?
11	DR. MAURO: I know we would like
12	to be precise, but the reality is let's say
13	during any given Board meeting, you pick four.
14	Okay? Now we don't know at the back end of
15	the process, after we go through the first
16	three steps, which ones are going to come up
17	with we could assume that there will be a
18	minimum of three. There may be some of them
19	that will demand more. Okay? We don't know.
20	Now does that mean we can't give
21	you some rough sense of what we think the cost

NEAL R. GROSS

1	would be, the average cost per case?
2	Actually, we could right up front. Of course,
3	we so, therefore, everyone has a sense,
4	because when you start to aggregate and you
5	look at our group of four, if there is one
6	outlier that ends up being more expensive,
7	very often there are others that are less
8	expensive.
9	I am concerned. I need a sense.
10	Is this a \$20,000 job or this is a \$200,000
11	job and a sense of where we are and when we
12	are knocking on the door that we might be
13	exhausting resources. I think we could do
14	that up front.
15	When this slide goes up during a
16	full Board meeting, there will be some dollars
17	next to it. Everyone will recognize the
18	dollars are going to have a degree of
19	uncertainty. Certainly, what happens then is,
20	on the basis of that, you folks make your

NEAL R. GROSS

judgments, how many, which ones, and you will

21

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

have a sense around that a whole deal may end 1 2 up costing \$100,000. Okay? Now given that, we are given the 3 The next time we green and go to work. Okay? 4 5 meet, two months from then, I will be prepared to discuss with you, and I will always be 6 prepared to let you know how -- in fact, every 7 progress report that comes out every month --8 9 take a look at it. will 10 You see in every progress report, I make a statement right in the front, 11 12 the first page, based on all of the work that has been authorized to date by the Board and 13 14 our best estimate of what we think it is going to cost to deliver those products to you, here 15 is how much money, I believe, that we are 16 committed -- we are obligated to spend and how 17 much do we have left. 18 19 So you will always know very early

20 on whether or not we are starting to knock on 21 the door of the 3.44 million that has been

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	allocated this year to support the Board.
2	Right now, we still have got 1.5 million in
3	the bank. That doesn't mean it won't go away
4	quickly in terms of not that we've spent
5	it. I make a decision, where do we spend and
6	what is committed.
7	So again, I think it will serve
8	the Board best and the whole program best if I
9	do the best I can to put a number next to each
10	one and you folks make your judgments as you
11	see fit given that, more or less, those
12	numbers are in the end, the collection of
13	four or five or six cases, I am going to come
14	in, more or less, where sort of average out
15	and come in where I say they are.
16	If there is a big surprise oh,
17	my goodness, you know, it is going to be 10
18	times more I will let you know right away.
19	In fact, we just recently had a very big
20	surprise which went the other way. We set
21	aside about \$100,000 to do a particular piece

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

105

1	of work from the last meeting that, it turns
2	out, we didn't have to do. So we just put
3	\$100,000 back in the bank. So maybe it can go
4	either way.
5	Once we get started and we
6	realize, oh no, this job is not going to be as
7	difficult it happens both ways, and it is a
8	living process.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: Isn't there a
10	natural hold point that Sub-task 4 I mean,
11	we come down. We do Sub-task 1, 2 and 3 and
12	then there is a natural hold point at Sub-task
13	4 where we've got to wait for the Board or
14	somebody to authorize what PERs are going to
15	be reviewed.
16	So at that point, you can
17	DR. MAURO: Revisit.
18	MR. MARSCHKE: I mean, you need to
19	revisit the process, and you could do it at
20	that point.
21	DR. MAURO: I think we just got to

1	keep talking to each other. We realize it is
2	a living process. We do the best we can as
3	early in the process as we can to let you
4	know, here is what we think needs to be done;
5	how many of those do you want that you will
6	call. Here is what we think about the prices.
7	And as we learn more and think the picture
8	changes, we would just let you know real
9	early, the picture is changing.

10 So as manager of the project in terms of making sure the Board knows where the 11 obligations of the money have gone and when we 12 are going to get into trouble, I take that as 13 14 my primary responsibility to make sure that 15 you are not authorizing us to do work that we 16 are just not going to be able to do within budget. 17

18 MEMBER LEMEN: How many of these 19 did you do last year?

- 20 DR. MAURO: Last year? PERs?
- 21 MEMBER LEMEN: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	DR. MAURO: We did 9 and 12. I
2	don't know
3	MEMBER LEMEN: Nine and 12?
4	DR. MAURO: PER-9 and PER-12.
5	MEMBER LEMEN: Okay.
б	DR. MAURO: Hans, help. Do you
7	guys remember any others besides 9 and 12 we
8	did last year?
9	MR. MARSCHKE: Up to Sub-task 3.
10	DR. MAURO: Well, we didn't finish
11	them.
12	MEMBER LEMEN: Sub-task 3, they
13	didn't do. So how many have had dose
14	reconstructions?
15	DR. MAURO: We didn't our
16	contract started we are in the second year
17	of our new contract and we did
18	MR. MARSCHKE: If you look at the
19	Attachment 1, every one that has an asterisk
20	next to it, we have done not under this
21	contract, but either this contract or the

NEAL R. GROSS

1 preceding contract.

2 DR. MAURO: Right. That's why I am having trouble. 3 MR. MARSCHKE: You will see that 4 5 there is some that have, like, OCAS PER-9 has 6 a single asterisk next to it. That means, I guess, it has currently been assigned. 7 If you 8 look above it, OCAS PER-007 has a double 9 asterisk next to it. That means it has already been included in one of the previous 10 deliverables qiven 11 that we have to the 12 Subcommittee. 13 PER-20 has a single. If you look 14 at the bottom of the -- basically, the Board 15 has assigned -- a single asterisk means Board 16 has assigned this PER to SC&A. The double asterisk means it is included in the third 17 The triple asterisk means it was -- I 18 set. 19 think that is the January 2005 -- I think that is the first set. 20

21 So you can see, but all these

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	reviews have been only done through Sub-Task
2	3. None of them have had any DR done.
3	CHAIR MUNN: The Board has never
4	directed that that be incorporated into a
5	review of a PER before. This is relatively
6	new ground for us. That is why we are having
7	trouble deciding where the responsibility
8	lies.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: All the ones that
10	have the double asterisks and the triple
11	asterisks were done under the Procedures
12	Review documents. When SC&A conducted their
13	review of this PER as being a document, we
14	conducted that review under the Procedures
15	document. Now we have gotten a little bit
16	more sophisticated with this dedicated PER
17	review document.
18	MEMBER LEMEN: I presume, and
19	maybe wrongly, that those that have a double

past has received your reviews? 21

(202) 234-4433

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1 That is CHAIR MUNN: Yes. 2 correct. 3 MEMBER LEMEN: And what happens then when they receive your reviews? 4 5 MR. MARSCHKE: Usually, what 6 have number of issues happens is we а associated with any of the documents that we 7 8 review, and I am just going to scroll through 9 here and see if we have any PERs that I can We can look, and we just 10 pull out -- PER-3. happen to have -- We did a review of PER-3. 11 We have -- you can see on the summary screen 12 here, we had four -- what happened? 13 14 We track it and MEMBER LEMEN: 15 then what do we do with that? Do we track it? It is resolved. 16 CHAIR MUNN: 17 DR. MAURO: There are four findings noted in and the status of 18 those 19 findings are tracked. 20 MEMBER LEMEN: And then once it is 21 tracked and resolved by the Subcommittee, what

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 happens?

2	DR. MAURO: Can we go back to
3	that? We could see where they are. That is
4	why a little primer here.
5	MR. MARSCHKE: If you look at the
б	detail, basically if you look at what is up
7	here, this is the SC&A finding or a summary of
8	the SC&A finding. There is a report that SC&A
9	issues. So this is a summary out of that
10	report.
11	Then what happens so this is
12	our finding out of that report or a summary of
13	our finding out of that report. NIOSH comes
14	back and they respond to that finding and then
15	basically what we do is we come up with a
16	follow-up recommendation to NIOSH's response,
17	and
18	MEMBER LEMEN: At that point then,
19	the Board
20	MR. MARSCHKE: Then at that point,
21	the Work Group

21 the Work Group --

(202) 234-4433

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MEMBER LEMEN: This Work Group
2	gets it at this point and then this Work Group
3	make a decision to either keep it open or
4	close it.
5	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes. There are
6	MEMBER LEMEN: I understand.
7	DR. MAURO: In essence, there is a
8	big report sitting on the shelf somewhere and
9	there are findings regarding this particular
10	PER. We boil it down to a database.
11	MEMBER LEMEN: So is that report
12	then made available back to the petitioners?
13	MR. KATZ: I can explain it. It
14	is not petitioner-specific. So this
15	Subcommittee does its work on a whole host of
16	procedures, and periodically this Subcommittee
17	then reports to the full Board, and
18	MEMBER LEMEN: I understand that.
19	MR. KATZ: and covers these are
20	the procedures that we have covered, that we
21	have closed, and so on. At that opportunity,

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	the Board, of course, could engage hasn't
2	really meatily engaged, but could engage on
3	any of the questions.
4	MEMBER LEMEN: I guess my question
5	is very simple. It is closed now, and so it
6	goes to a shelf, you say. What happens? Is
7	it public record at that point in time that
8	anybody can pull that report out and read it
9	or is it sent to the original petitioners?
10	Once something is closed just sitting on a
11	shelf doesn't seem to do much for anybody.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: Sometimes in order
13	to close the issue, it would require a change
14	to a procedure. It would require NIOSH to go
15	back and do something. Usually, that is
16	Because our comments usually are on a PROC
17	document or an OTIB document, sometimes the
18	closure of the comment requires that NIOSH
19	revise that particular document.
20	So that would really be the but
21	as far as the public or the claimants having

(202) 234-4433

1	access to this particular database, they don't
2	have access to this particular database. I
3	don't know about the again, this is the
4	original document that SC&A puts together with
5	our comments on it usually comes in the form
6	of something like this, which is a letter from
7	John to the CDC and with the document attached
8	to that letter and it includes all the
9	documents that we have reviewed and all the
10	again, if we look through here
11	CHAIR MUNN: This document that
12	you are talking about
13	MEMBER LEMEN: That is a public
14	document.
15	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, that is a public
16	document. That is the closed document.
17	DR. MAURO: You are bringing up a
18	very important point and I agree with you. We
19	put up on the Web, on the open Web, all the
20	procedures for the world to read.
21	We put up on the open Web our

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	report to see our comments on it but then we
2	engage in this process, a very complex
3	process, because we have over 100 we have
4	103 procedures that we review to date. Each
5	one has perhaps five to ten comments.
6	We systematically march through
7	and in the marching through, that is why we
8	have this database that you just looked at.
9	Every time we have a meeting, we address an
10	issue, and we discuss it, and usually the
11	discussion goes like this. Well, SC&A we
12	will say this is our problem and it is in that
13	database. Here is our problem.
14	NIOSH has an opportunity before
15	the meeting to say, well, listen, we think we
16	are okay, here is why, and it goes within the
17	database and you just saw that window.
18	Then the last step in the process
19	is we will talk about it, and very often SC&A
20	is saying, yes, we saw your answer, and we
21	agree with you; we think that you have solved

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	the problem, or they will say, no, SC&A, we
2	agree with you, that is a problem with our
3	procedure and we are going to fix it.
4	What happens at that point, the
5	Board does one of two things a number of
6	things. For that particular issue, it
7	decides, okay, the procedure has been revised;
8	it is new, we have issued a new procedure that
9	solves that issue. It has been out there now.
10	We could close it, because
11	MEMBER LEMEN: When you say the
12	Board, do you mean this Subcommittee?
13	DR. MAURO: I'm sorry, this
14	Subcommittee. This Subcommittee is the one
15	that has the final say and votes, do we close
16	that issue. This particular one that we are
17	looking at, it has been closed. Very
18	important, though. Sometimes we disagree, and
19	we will say, no, no, no, and we disagree, and
20	then it is still open.

That means we have not closed it.

21

1	We have not resolved it. Then there is a
2	gray area where we sit around the table and we
3	agree in principle on the solution, but that
4	change has not yet found its way into the
5	procedure as a revision, so it is called in
6	abeyance. That means, for all intents and
7	purposes, the problem has been solved but we
8	are not going to close it yet because, until
9	we actually have a new procedure that captures
10	the sense of the concern and has fixed it, it
11	is only then when the Work Group says we will
12	close it.
13	MEMBER LEMEN: When it is closed,
14	does that mean that NIOSH has taken the
15	actions that are necessary to correct any of
16	the disagreements?
17	DR. MAURO: Absolutely.
18	MEMBER LEMEN: And everything is
19	copacetic.
20	DR. MAURO: It's finished, but you

21 know what?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MEMBER LEMEN: Why doesn't it go
2	after that back to the petitioners?
3	MR. KATZ: Well, first of all, the
4	petitioners this is Procedures.
5	MEMBER LEMEN: I understand that.
б	MR. KATZ: But these aren't
7	petitioners. There are no petitioners. These
8	are procedures.
9	MEMBER LEMEN: Why isn't it a
10	public document?
11	MR. KATZ: But you are saying why
12	isn't it in the public. This is a morass of
13	details. This is really very granular at this
14	level.
15	MEMBER LEMEN: It is like us
16	sitting here saying, well, the public wouldn't
17	understand it.
18	MR. KATZ: No. No, I mean, the
19	public could how would the public find its
20	way through this morass of details at any
21	given time?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Wait, wait. 1 MS. HOWELL: Let me 2 clarify because, if there were requests for these materials, the public could receive 3 them. 4 5 MR. KATZ: They would make them available. 6 7 However, basically, MS. HOWELL: in order to be able to put -- this is all pre-8 decisional document. 9 What you are seeing on the screen right now isn't final, and so to 10 make that available to the public could be 11 12 potentially misleading. 13 Now once it is closed, there are 14 things that can be made available, but they all have to go through a level of review. 15 16 Certainly, they could be requested as a Board 17 document or under a FOIA request and the proper reviews would have to take place and 18 19 then they would be released to the public. 20 So it is not that they would never 21 get to the public. It is that we are not

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	taking the step of doing those sorts of
2	reviews and creating I don't even know the
3	kind of server capacity we would have to have
4	to have all of this stuff posted all the time
5	on the website.
б	So it is available. I do want to
7	clarify that the material would ultimately be
8	made available in some fashion.
9	MEMBER LEMEN: Well, what is go
10	ahead. I have got another question to follow
11	up on that.
12	CHAIR MUNN: These are the
13	internal machinations of the organization that
14	are necessary in order to work out the
15	technical details of how to reach the goal
16	that is established for us by the law.
17	These internal machinations really
18	and truly are detail-specific. They are tiny
19	little things. We struggled at the outset.
20	We started off with an ordinary matrix like
21	everyone has, and discovered very quickly

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

(202) 234-4433

1	that, by the time we reached not even our
2	halfway point, we were completely beyond being
3	able to control a paper matrix.
4	So this database was, over a
5	period of about three years, put together and
6	formulated as a way for us to internally keep
7	track and for the Board internally, to keep
8	track of the issues that had been raised by
9	our contractor and the resolutions as they
10	progress and the resolution for each one of
11	these. Sometimes it is simple. Sometimes it
12	goes on for years.
13	So we wanted to be able to have,
14	when all is said and done, an archive that
15	anyone who wanted to could go back into and
16	follow through step by step and date by date,
17	this organization or this person says this,
18	the response was this, the agreement was not
19	this, it turned out to be this and what was
20	done about it was this.

21 MEMBER LEMEN: But the PER is

1 specific to a petition. Right? 2 CHAIR MUNN: No. 3 Well, MEMBER LEMEN: these are right here. 4 I mean --5 CHAIR MUNN: No. Ιt is to а 6 a program review, program. Ιt is not а petitioner. 7 8 MEMBER LEMEN: But it is a program 9 review of -- well, let's see if I can get back to the beginning. It is a program review of 10 one particular site, isn't it? 11 Yes, sometimes. 12 MR. KATZ: Some 13 of them are, and sometimes --14 Some of them are MEMBER LEMEN: general for all sites? 15 16 DR. ULSH: Sure, Super S 17 plutonium. That appears at Rocky Flats, but it is also several other sites as well. 18 19 LEMEN: But if it is MEMBER particular to one site and only one site, that 20 21 is -- I am wondering why that wouldn't be --

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that would be available to petitioners only if 1 2 they did a FOIA. 3 KATZ: Well, there may not MR. even be petitioners for the site. I mean, it 4 5 depends on the site. MEMBER LEMEN: What if there is -б I understand that. 7 Т know there is not 8 petitioners for every site, but --9 DR. MAURO: The point is that we agonized early that we have an obligation to 10 archive all the thinking, all the analysis, 11 12 all the exchange which has been going on now 13 for six years and tracking it, we were 14 in a table by hand. We realized actually, that we are not creating an archive. 15 16 think, to have this system so Ι that we could not lose sight of where we are -17 - this forest is enormous. 18 But even more important, it is important that we operate in 19 the sunshine. 20 21 So when this was invented many

(202) 234-4433

1	years ago, it was as much a reason to have an
2	archive where every decision where we went
3	from an issue that we raised on some PER or
4	some procedure we said, listen, we have a
5	problem here, and then there is a process we
6	went through that ended up closing that, a
7	process that could have taken a year and five
8	or six meetings before we closed it. But it
9	is all there and it is in the transcript.
10	By the way, one could argue that
11	everything is in the transcript. If you
12	really want to know how it happened, the

13 transcript is here but we also realized that, 14 who is going to read 10,000 pages of 15 transcript because every meeting -- this is 16 300 pages.

17 So we have a better way. We are 18 going to do this. So now -- but you are 19 right. What we have not talked about, and I 20 think it is important, is at what point do we 21 make this available to the public so that, if

NEAL R. GROSS

1	anyone is interested and is concerned how
2	was the high-fired plutonium issue resolved?
3	We know that they issued OTIB-0029, but how do
4	we know that, in fact, it was properly
5	implemented and all the workers who are
6	affected by that new way of modeling internal
7	dose were, in fact, given you know, it was
8	all done correctly?
9	The answer is we go to the PER
10	process. SC&A does its thing. We do the
11	cases and it is all archived. So anyone who
12	wants to could determine for themselves
13	whether or not this all has been done in an
14	open way and in a scientifically sound way.
15	MEMBER LEMEN: And this archive
16	then is kept by NIOSH?
17	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, it on a
18	computer system.
19	MEMBER LEMEN: But is there a
20	docket office that somebody could walk into
21	like in any regulatory agency and just pull

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 out these and review them?

2 CHAIR MUNN: Not yet, but there 3 Dick, you are getting a skewed view may be. of what we are doing also, because you are 4 5 coming in at the program review stage, and these PERs are relatively new and relatively -6 - they have become increasingly complex as the 7 program has gone along and have increased in 8 9 number, of course, as the program went along.

first 10 The few years of the program, there was not enough of a program 11 12 issue to be reviewed and that is why you have 13 only 32, as a matter of fact. But they have 14 in complexity increased as the programs themselves has expanded, but the PERs, in the 15 16 view of this Subcommittee, are a very, very 17 small part of what we are looking at.

We look at all of the procedures that are involved in the internal operations, and all of the other procedures we have come to grips with how we should handle. The PERs

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	have now become complex enough and large
2	enough in number that it behooves us to
3	include them as a part of our procedure.
4	MEMBER LEMEN: Okay. All of the
5	other procedures that you are talking about
6	do you track those?
7	DR. MAURO: That is most of what
8	this is.
9	MEMBER LEMEN: That is PERs and
10	the other stuff combined; right?
11	MR. KATZ: Everything.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: See, there's 538
13	issues up there and most of those 538 are on
14	TIBs, OTIBs, PROCs and other documents like
15	that.
16	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
17	DR. MAURO: For example, we could
18	open up OTIB-49, which deals with the high-
19	fired plutonium, and see how we resolved that
20	issue.
21	MEMBER LEMEN: That is fine, but

(202) 234-4433

on the open issues then, how many of the 500-1 2 some are still open? 3 We got a nice table DR. MAURO: 4 for you. 5 CHAIR MUNN: Is this a good time the summary? 6 That is the way to see we usually start our meetings, is by looking at 7 8 status, and the status also will be our 9 available to you on the O: drive, as it is to all Board members. You want to talk about it, 10 11 Steve? 12 MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, we can talk 13 about it. This is something that can be 14 generated from the -- it is one of the tables that can be generated. If you go up here to 15 the reports, new reports button, you can press 16 17 that, and you can generate this file here. Ι have a hard copy of it. I will re-generate 18 19 it.

20 Actually, I sent this through 21 email to everybody. I think it was yesterday

1	last night. Our office does this is a
2	list of the finding dates. When we issue a
3	report, that includes findings on a procedure
4	or another document included in a PER. This
5	is the date that report was issued.
6	This is the number of findings
7	that were associated with that report. The
8	three big ones here are what we call these
9	are the three combined reports, if you will.
10	We looked at multiple procedures in these. We
11	looked at I don't know maybe 20
12	procedures, 20 or 30 procedures, and so these
13	are the three big ones.
14	Most of these other ones where you
15	just have single digits or maybe a couple of
16	dozen comments those are individual
17	documents, individual procedures that have
18	been looked at.
19	So these are the numbers of

19 So these are the numbers of 20 findings. These are the ones that are open at 21 this point, and open means -- the definitions

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of the terms are down here. Open means that 2 SC&A has issued an issue or a finding, has 3 made a finding. NIOSH has not yet responded 4 to that finding, and so there has been really 5 no discussion.

б Out of the 538, there has really been no discussion within this Subcommittee of 7 8 101 of those findings. In progress means that 9 NIOSH has come back and responded to -initially responded to our finding, and they 10 said, well, this is our interpretation and 11 this is our reason why, this is our proposed 12 13 resolution, or whatever; and we have come back and said, well, we don't quite agree with you, 14 15 So we are still negotiating, if you NIOSH. 16 will, within the Subcommittee as to what the resolution to those 35 issues are. 17

18 In abeyance, as John talked about 19 before, is NIOSH has come back with their 20 response to our issue and we have discussed it 21 here at the Subcommittee and we come to a

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

(202) 234-4433

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	meeting of minds and said, yes, that is a good
2	resolution, but they need to change in
3	order to implement that resolution, they have
4	to change the document.
5	That means we are in agreement in
6	principle, but there still has to be the
7	mechanics carried through. So there is 86 of
8	those that are in that bucket.
9	Addressed in finding, that means
10	that, you know, we made a finding but it is
11	similar to another finding that we made maybe
12	on another procedure, so we direct you to that
13	other procedure and there have been 15 of
14	those.
15	Transferred means it is better
16	that this particular issue be handled in a
17	different subcommittee or be handled as a
18	general generic issue, something along those
19	lines, and we got 41 of them in that class.
20	Closed is exactly what you would
21	expect it to mean. We have come to a meeting

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of minds. There is no more changes required 2 to any of the documents. So this issue is put to bed, and we've got about 250 issues in that 3 4 category. 5 MEMBER LEMEN: Is there any 6 process for the closed, if new information might alter the decision that was made? 7 8 MARSCHKE: No, I don't think MR. Once it is closed, unless NIOSH goes back 9 so. and changes the document and causes us to re-10 review that document, there is really no --11 that is put to bed, and that issue goes away, 12 13 as far as I --14 But that triggers a DR. MAURO: 15 In other words, let's say NIOSH agrees PER. 16 that, yes, we have to change this procedure. Then you go back to 17 MEMBER LEMEN: 18 the process and start a PER and go back 19 through it again? That is all I was asking. 20 That is all I was asking.

21 MR. HINNEFELD: New information.

1 MEMBER LEMEN: That is all I am 2 asking.

And you could see the 3 DR. MAURO: We start off looking at technical 4 maturation. 5 procedures, and then we end up getting to a place where, yes, 6 NIOSH says, you know, Ι think we better fix this procedure. 7 But wait 8 a minute, when you fix a procedure, does that 9 not mean that it might affect some dose Yes. So all of a sudden --10 reconstructions? I don't know how many years ago we merged --11 12 you folks implemented the PER program where there is a whole process where they go back 13 14 and they review. And that is what this whole 15 discussion started because now we are in a 16 mode where we are doing less procedure reviews 17 and are moving into a mode where PER we reviews are becoming the coin of the realm, so 18 19 to speak, because that is where, you know, you 20 bring closure. Yes, they in fact have 21 implemented changes, and everything is looking

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fine or not.

2 MEMBER LEMEN: Well, now you see 3 the problem with putting a new person on the Board, having to come back and explain things 4 5 to them. CHAIR MUNN: б And this is a very complex process to be explained. 7 8 MEMBER LEMEN: Thank you for your 9 indulgence. 10 MR. HINNEFELD: Ι don't necessarily want to extend the conversation, 11 12 but from our standpoint there is a fair amount 13 of benefit in having a closure document 14 available to the public on these findings, because from our standpoint, the reports are 15 16 all public. You know, they are all on our 17 website, and they said, boy, there is all these problems with the procedures. 18 Then there is nothing else there. 19

19 Then there is nothing else there. 20 So from our standpoint, it would be 21 worthwhile to have some sort of closure thing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

saying that this finding from this document 1 2 was closed in this fashion. 3 MR. MARSCHKE: The only thing I can think of in that line is, periodically the 4 5 Board does send to the Secretary a summary 6 letter saying that so many have been closed, so many are still open, 7 and so on and so 8 forth. 9 It is very general, very generic, and very upper-level, but -- and I don't know 10 how available that is to the general public. 11 12 MR. HINNEFELD: They are there. 13 MR. KATZ: That is available. The 14 only thing I thinking when Dick was was raising this, other than -- I think the PER is 15 16 the nicest closure, because it really brings 17 it to the very end where dose reconstructions are redone according to a new procedure, but 18 19 of course, not everything ends up in a PER either because some of issues, findings, are 20 21 closed and no change is needed and so on.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	The only thing that could be done
2	but it would require, I think, a separate
3	database in a sense, would be to take the
4	closed ones and put those in the database that
5	is publicly available.
6	MR. HINNEFELD: Or you print them
7	out in a report.
8	MR. KATZ: Or print them out in a
9	report, the closed ones; and if people want to
10	see those details, they could see how those
11	issues were closed.
12	MEMBER LEMEN: Could the summary
13	document serve as or does the summary
14	document sent to the Secretary summarize the
15	closed documents?
16	CHAIR MUNN: No. We try to keep
17	the communication with the Secretary as clear
18	and as upper-level as possible.
19	MEMBER LEMEN: Is it possible that
20	the closed documents, as Stu was saying, would
21	be beneficial to them, maybe a short summary

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	to put it in layman's terms what the meaning
2	out of the closed document means could be made
3	available to the general public?
4	MR. KATZ: That would take a lot
5	of translation. To translate these into
6	layperson's terms for each item that is
7	closed, someone would have to sit down with
8	that and write something de novo. That sounds
9	like a lot of work.
10	MEMBER GIBSON: It is a good
11	issue. I mean, that is one point we get
11 12	issue. I mean, that is one point we get constantly on the whole program, is we can't
12	constantly on the whole program, is we can't
12 13	constantly on the whole program, is we can't break it down into layman's terms that people
12 13 14	constantly on the whole program, is we can't break it down into layman's terms that people will understand.
12 13 14 15 16	constantly on the whole program, is we can't break it down into layman's terms that people will understand. MEMBER LEMEN: Well, I think we
12 13 14 15 16	constantly on the whole program, is we can't break it down into layman's terms that people will understand. MEMBER LEMEN: Well, I think we have to address that issue, because when I
12 13 14 15 16 17	constantly on the whole program, is we can't break it down into layman's terms that people will understand. MEMBER LEMEN: Well, I think we have to address that issue, because when I came in, that is one of the things I got hit

not being translated. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	I think we need to, at some point
2	in time, maybe make it an agenda for a future
3	meeting or a full Board meeting to translate
4	how we get this information out.
5	I hear you, Paul. You want to say
б	something.
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, yes. This
8	is Ziemer again. I just wanted to point out
9	that, in the two reports to the Secretary,
10	although we don't deal individually with each
11	of the closed items, there are statements
12	where we have indicated what the impact of
13	these different items are on the whole system.
14	In other words, the question
15	the real bottom-line question is, okay, there
16	have been some issues in terms of the
17	procedures. There are some findings that have
18	been identified and corrections have been
19	made. What is the impact on this?
20	There is a couple of them. One of
21	them is that some procedures have been

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	changed. So there are some summary statements
2	in the reports to the Secretary that kind of
3	give that bottom line. I think that is sort
4	of what the public wants to know also. Are
5	the findings such that the system is broken or
б	are these procedures that are and have been
7	fixed, and that kind of thing?
8	That is what we have tried to
9	convey to the Secretary. Are we able to say
10	that, with these procedures, either as being
11	used or as being revised, is the bottom line a
12	scientifically sound approach to dose
13	reconstruction?
14	CHAIR MUNN: I believe the letters
15	to the Secretary are on the
16	MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, they are on
17	the website. Those are all public. Yes.
18	CHAIR MUNN: So, easily
19	identifiable.
20	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
21	MEMBER GIBSON: I think I see

1	Richard's comment as a little different than
2	that, than just the public saying, yes,
3	scientifically been decided or met properly
4	and stuff. They want to more understand the
5	program.
6	MEMBER LEMEN: Exactly.
7	MEMBER GIBSON: I mean, we have an
8	Worker Outreach Work Group and we have
9	certainly talked about committees. We would
10	love to have you, because that is something we
11	are struggling with with that group with how
12	to make things more clear to the claimants and
13	the public, dose reconstructions and the
14	documents.
15	CHAIR MUNN: We have put in a
16	great number of hours in various of our Work
17	Groups and Subcommittees attempting to provide
18	information in a variety of ways and in as
19	clear a manner as possible. To the best of my
20	knowledge, it has made little impact on the

21 complaint that what is being done is difficult

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to understand.

2 find the ideal How one can 3 translator for that is a mystery, but we do the best we can and we keep trying to keep our 4 5 communication lines open as much as possible, and even in all of our discussions we always 6 opportunity for 7 have the anyone who is 8 interested in what we are doing to be on the 9 phone line, but it gets pretty dull just listening to this. 10

Well, thing 11 MEMBER LEMEN: one 12 that I see after what you said was that, you 13 know, you can throw this issue to the Outreach 14 Subcommittee, but the Outreach Subcommittee doesn't understanding 15 really have the of 16 through Procedures Committee having sat 17 meetings to really understand this issue. So how can the Outreach Committee really even 18 19 begin to translate this?

20 CHAIR MUNN: Well, the argument 21 that I have heard personally from -- and the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

requests that I hear from the public don't

2	have anything to do, really, with what we do
3	here. The question is really, why is this
4	decision made the way it is, and explaining
5	why the decision is made the way it is varies
6	from one claimant to the other, from one case
7	that is being reviewed to the other.
8	It is difficult to see how there
9	is any simple way to show in any kind of
10	meaningful way how what we are doing applies
11	to the concern that most claimants seem to
12	have.
13	MEMBER LEMEN: Well, it seems to
14	me that, if you are going to go to the
15	Outreach Subcommittee with this, this
16	committee at least has the responsibility of
17	getting the closed document and saying, here,
18	Outreach, this is what we decided. Someone
19	has to translate this.
20	MR. KATZ: Again, it just would be
21	resource you could have resources. You

1

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS

1	could have a person or persons assigned to
2	taking each closed item and writing up a
3	little summary of, this was the issue, this is
4	how it was closed, and this is what its
5	relevance is for dose reconstructions and
6	MEMBER LEMEN: Well, that doesn't
7	seem hard to me to do.
8	MR. KATZ: Well, except there are
9	hundreds. So it is not a small volume
10	MEMBER LEMEN: You would have to
11	catch up. I understand.
12	MR. KATZ: So, it could be done.
13	It is just a question of
14	MEMBER LEMEN: So once you catch
15	up, it is not a big problem.
16	MR. KATZ: It is just a question
17	of resources.
18	DR. MAURO: Interestingly enough,
19	the Outreach Work Group the genesis of the
20	Outreach Work Group had to do with lots of
21	concerns that went on for a while that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

workers, petitioners, would bring information

2	to NIOSH and they felt that they weren't
3	always heard. Therefore, the information that
4	is being transmitted is not making its way
5	into the work products and into the decision-
6	making.
7	So most of the Outreach I'm
8	speaking from I was involved in the genesis
9	of this, too. Most of the Outreach was
10	concern or is concerned with, listen, we
11	think it is very important that, when
12	information comes in from workers during
13	interviews, during data-capture efforts or
14	whatever vehicle it is, that that information
15	is recorded and recorded completely and
16	accurately and then seriously considered when
17	a work product like a Site Profile is produced
18	and decisions are made regarding, you know,
19	judgments regarding whether an SEC petition
20	should be granted or not.

21 Now you are bringing a new

1

dimension by way of enriching the process even 1 2 further, that being that folks out there who are concerned about this program probably are 3 not aware of this and this is, in my opinion, 4 5 extremely impressive. The agony and the 6 and granularity -- we haven't amount even gotten -- we haven't started knocking heads 7 yet, but it is all here and, quite frankly, I 8 9 am thinking that -- and I don't know the 10 degree to which NIOSH does this, but the to which, when NIOSH goes out, 11 degree and 12 whether it is a data-gathering effort or it is 13 an effort to communicate about what is going 14 on, I don't know the extent to which NIOSH discussion of, by the 15 includes some way, listen, when we hear you and when we get your 16 17 information and when we revise our procedures Site Profiles in light 18 and our of that 19 information, it doesn't stop there. It goes We went back and redid 10,000, 1,000 20 to PERs. 21 -- I don't know how many cases in light of all

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this information.

2 In a funny sort of way, this PER closes don't if 3 Ι know the loop and petitioners and members of the public realize 4 5 that this is -- when all is said and done, 6 beside the SEC process, this closes the circle and makes sure that everybody is being treated 7 8 correctly.

9 MEMBER LEMEN: Oh, I hear a lot of complaints of people saying exactly that. 10 We are spending a lot of money. We are spending 11 12 a lot of sweat and input from a lot of people 13 and we have a lot of contractor support to do 14 that, but what are we getting for that money and why can't these closed reports help answer 15 16 those questions?

17 Т think it would be good PR for the whole program if you could show that the 18 19 circle has been closed, because right now the 20 circle is left open, and there is a gap 21 between this end of the circle and the

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

beginning of the circle that has not been
 closed.

3 DR. I could MAURO: say Ι am aware, at least for the thoracic lymphoma and 4 5 the high-fired, there were a lot of reversals 6 which, you know, in one respect you could say, oh my goodness -- it is good. 7 You put in 8 place a process that we found -- we learned 9 something and we fixed it and we had these 10 many reversals.

11 MEMBER LEMEN: I think that is 12 good news.

13 DR. MAURO: Yes.

MEMBER LEMEN: That good newsought to get out there.

16 MAURO: I agree and I don't DR. 17 think that information is getting out. Ι don't know. Is it? I mean, when you folks go 18 19 to your Outreach, do you talk about that? This is Ziemer. 20 MEMBER ZIEMER: Т 21 think what could be done would be something

NEAL R. GROSS

1	like that, that is somewhat generic. If we
2	took it item by item, I think we would have a
3	problem, because and Dr. Lemen, I will just
4	mention, for example, I just pulled up at
5	random here a finding. But here is an SC&A
6	finding: the fitting of the data to a log-
7	normal distribution was statistically
8	acceptable, but many times did not represent
9	well the data at the highest end of the
10	results.

Well, all right. I don't think 11 that particular finding is worth spending a 12 lot of effort to try to explain to the public 13 14 what that has meant. What we need to do is 15 look at the issues that impact, like high-16 fired plutonium or maybe categorize broadly a number of findings of the type just mentioned, 17 that there were a number of findings that have 18 to do with how the data are reviewed or how 19 the data are utilized or something like that 20 21 and then indicate what has been done.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	To do each finding in the level of
2	detail that we deal with, I don't think, would
3	serve the public very well, because it
4	wouldn't add to the overall understanding of
5	what really is going on unless simply knowing
б	that we are doing with that level of detail,
7	if that helps.
8	I mean, so many of these findings
9	are taken individually by themselves, are
10	really a great amount of detail in how things
11	are done.
12	CHAIR MUNN: This has been a good
13	discussion and one that, I hope, is helpful
14	for our new member as well as giving us some
15	material for thought for the rest of us.
16	I don't know about the rest of
17	you, but your Chair is ready for lunch, and we
18	have, I believe, come to some decision with
19	respect to at least what you are going to be
20	seeing in the next day or so from me and what
21	I propose for what we will, I hope, as a

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Subcommittee propose to the Board.

2 When we return from lunch, I hope we can leave this on the table and revisit it 3 again after we have all had an opportunity to 4 5 address some of the other issues, other than 6 our PER setup here, and we will try to take up where we left off which would have been about 7 8 the eleven o'clock item on our Action Items. Lunch -- return at 1:30, if that 9 is amenable with all. 10 Wanda, this is Kathy 11 MS. BEHLING: I just wondered on the PER issue if 12 Behling. I could make one additional comment. 13 14 The question was initially asked, how many PERs did we do last year and the 15 answer is three and it is PER-20 and PER-12 16 17 which is the high-fired plutonium and the

18 lymphoma -- PER-9, the lymphoma issue.

19 One of the things I just wanted to 20 make mention of; we have never discussed the 21 PER-20, the Blockson TBD revision, under your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	Subcommittee. So perhaps that is something
2	we could put on an agenda at some point in
3	time.
4	CHAIR MUNN: If that is one of
5	those that we have been directed to do. I am
6	not sure.
7	MS. BEHLING: SC&A was directed to
8	do PER-20, PER-12, and PER-9 under the
9	protocol that we have been using as protocol.
10	Those are the three PERs that we have done
11	under that protocol but we have never
12	discussed the PER-20 issue with your
13	committee.
14	CHAIR MUNN: Do we have it on our
15	board yet? Okay. Thank you, Kathy, for
16	calling that to our attention. We appreciate
17	it.
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: At 1:30, then?
19	CHAIR MUNN: One-thirty, yes.
20	MEMBER ZIEMER: Thank you.
21	MR. KATZ: Thank you, everyone on

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	the line.							
2		(Where	eupon,	th	е	above	-enti	tled
3	matter wen	t off	the re	cord	at	12:13	p.m.	and
4	resumed at	1:30 p	•.m.)					
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								

(202) 234-4433

1	A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N
2	(1:30 p.m.)
3	MR. KATZ: This is the Procedures
4	Subcommittee and we are reconvening post-
5	lunch.
6	Wanda, can I just bring up my
7	point for closure?
8	CHAIR MUNN: Please do.
9	MR. KATZ: Just following up, Paul
10	and Mark, from the discussion we had just
11	before lunch about, sort of, closure with
12	procedures.
13	We chatted off-line a bit about an
14	idea, which is to have SC&A run through the
15	procedures database, and then for those
16	procedures, complete procedures for which
17	everything is closed or perhaps closed and in
18	abeyance, they could produce just like a two-
19	pager that summarizes what were the major
20	findings and how those were resolved, and then
21	by that means just give substantive closure to

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

that whole procedure review.

2 So, Paul and Mark in particular, I don't know what you think about that. I would 3 like to task SC&A with doing that, if that 4 5 sounds like a good idea to the Subcommittee. б MEMBER ZIEMER: Do you have a feel for the extent to which we have a number of 7 8 them that are in that category? Is it just 9 one or two? We don't know yet. 10 CHAIR MUNN: They are going to have to check and see. 11 Steve did just sort of 12 MR. KATZ: 13 a very quick look at the database and it seems 14 like some of the earlier procedures are going to fall in that category, and we don't have to 15 do, you know, vast numbers at a time, even if 16 17 there were a lot of them. We can do this incrementally, but 18 19 it would be a nice way to just have a final record of disposition for procedures that have 20 21 been reviewed.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Seems like a good
2	plan, at least worth trying and see what the
3	product looks like. I think, as I understood
4	what Mr. Gibson and Dr. Lemen were saying,
5	that it ought to be something that could be
6	conveyed to, certainly, the worker population
7	to give them a feel for what we did and what
8	the outcomes were.
9	MR. KATZ: Yes. I also think it
10	would be nice for the Board itself to have
11	this kind of closure on a substantive basis on
12	procedures versus the Secretary's report,
13	which doesn't get into details at all.
14	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
15	MR. KATZ: Does the rest of the
16	Subcommittee feel like this is Mark?
17	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, this is
18	Mark. That sounds fine to me, Ted.
19	CHAIR MUNN: We will just see what
20	shows up, and we will see what we actually
21	have. We don't know yet what we actually

NEAL R. GROSS

1	have. We will make that judgment when we need
2	to meet next, and we will make that decision.
3	DR. MAURO: By the way, what I
4	could do is to make we will go through the
5	list and see how many fall into that category
6	and we will do one.
7	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
8	DR. MAURO: We will do one, send
9	it out to you. What do you think? Is this
10	what you had in mind?
11	MR. KATZ: I think that would be
12	great. Thank you, John.
13	CHAIR MUNN: We are going to take
14	up our action items list. Under the first
15	item, originally scheduled for eleven o'clock,
16	status of new tracking methods for changes to
17	SC&A procedures that are being used to review
18	NIOSH procedures. SC&A is going to have to
19	show us where we are with the database before
20	we start using it. Steve?
21	MR. MARSCHKE: We don't really

1	track changes to SC&A procedures per se. We
2	do keep a file of every procedure that was
3	issued and so I think this came out we were
4	revising the SC&A procedure that we use to
5	review the NIOSH procedures, and we don't
6	like I say, we don't really keep track of
7	those changes in any kind of a systematic
8	tracking system or anything like that.
9	What we do do is we keep a
10	permanent record of all the procedures that
11	have been issued. So we have Version 0, and
12	then, when Version 1 comes on, we put that
13	into the permanent file as well.

14 So if you wanted to see the changes between Version 0 and Version 1, what 15 you would have to do is you would have to go 16 to our -- Judy, who basically maintains that 17 file, and she would call up both versions of 18 the document, and you would have to sit there 19 and compare them page by page. 20

21 CHAIR MUNN: As I recall the

158

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS

1	discussion that we had when we were talking
2	about this before, we were urging SC&A to
3	adopt the practice that is used by NIOSH and
4	by other organizations whereby a tracking page
5	is inserted into the procedure itself, so that
6	if changes are made, there is an indication of
7	who made the procedure change, what that
8	change was or at least where it can be found
9	in the new procedure and the date.
10	MP MARCHER Okay We did not

10 MR. MARSCHKE Okay. We did not 11 pick up on that and we will do that and revise 12 the future revisions. Future revisions of 13 SC&A procedures will then include a tracking 14 page.

DR. MAURO: Yes, just like -- yes, I think it is a great idea and we should do that.

18 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

DR. MAURO: So just like you folks have one like the date, the revision date and a brief summary of what the changes are. I

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	know I find it useful when I look at your
2	material. We should be doing the same thing.
3	Yes.
4	CHAIR MUNN: That is good. All
5	right. Then we will have this same item show
6	up next time so that we can identify any new
7	additions to your process. Okay?
8	MR. MARSCHKE: Okay.
9	CHAIR MUNN: The next item: OTIB-
10	0047-01 and -02. We are going to review the
11	cleanup of issue status and show the database
12	link to clarification responses.
13	MR. MARSCHKE: What we have done
14	is Brant sent us NIOSH responses a week or so
15	ago, 0047-01 I believe it was, and we have
16	looked over these responses.
17	Basically, what it was is NIOSH
18	agreed with some small comments that we made
19	on the previous go-round. Back in November,
20	NIOSH had given us a response where they did
21	an analysis of measured dose rates.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	There was a units-conversion
2	problem where they assumed they were weekly
3	responses, and in fact, they were quarterly
4	responses or vice versa I am not sure
5	which. We picked up on that.
6	We happened to pick up on that,
7	and conveyed that at the November meeting and
8	NIOSH has gone back and looked at, you know,
9	where we said that they agreed that they did
10	make that units conversion, and in what Brant
11	sent out last week or so ago was basically
12	saying, yes, we did do a unit conversion and
13	we will have redone the analysis. Is that
14	correct?
15	DR. ULSH: I think pretty much.
16	Elyse, do you want to add anything, or anybody
17	else?
18	MS. THOMAS: Right. I don't think
19	I want to add anything, but I think George
20	Kerr may be on the line, and he may want to
21	add something.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIR MUNN: So where are we? Are
2	we still in progress?
3	MR. MARSCHKE: I would say
4	recommend we change to in abeyance, because we
5	basically are you know, NIOSH and SC&A are
6	in agreement on this one. So I would
7	SC&A's recommendation would be to change the
8	status from in progress to in abeyance.
9	CHAIR MUNN: Because we are really
10	just waiting for what: wrap-up?
11	MR. MARSCHKE: We are just waiting
12	for wrap-up.
13	Now the second portion about the
14	database link to the clarification responses,
15	you can see right here is the related link and
16	when you click on it, that portion of the
17	database is not working since we have made the
18	migration from the ORAU machine to the OCAS
19	machine.
20	CHAIR MUNN: Are we going to be
21	able to make it work?

1	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes. I thought we
2	had that in place but I guess I am wrong.
3	CHAIR MUNN: I thought we had. So
4	is that your action, NIOSH, to get the hotline
5	done?
6	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes. Okay.
7	CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Do we have
8	anything else to say about that? Is there
9	anyone who disagrees that this is now in
10	abeyance? Steve is updating the database as
11	we sit here, getting the date and we are
12	changing it.
13	MEMBER LEMEN: And we can pull
14	these up?
15	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, you can.
16	MEMBER LEMEN: From the CDC
17	website?
18	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, anywhere.
19	MR. HINNEFELD: When you log on to
20	our system, not from our public website, but
21	when you log on to our system.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

If it ever works, I 1 MEMBER LEMEN: 2 will do that. 3 then it is CHAIR MUNN: And accessible to you. All right. 4 5 The next item, as Ι indicated, first thing supposedly after lunch: 6 OTIB-0029-01 and -02 that were recently distributed 7 8 to us. Responses to selected findings from third set. We have -- and who was the sender? 9 Who is going to talk about this? It was just 10 11 sent. 12 DR. ULSH: Probably us. Is that 13 the one I sent Friday? 14 MR. MARSCHKE: No, I think 0029 --15 What happened was we --16 This is Mark. MEMBER GRIFFON: 17 There was a NIOSH email on 3/19, I believe, I think from Brant. 18 19 What happened was MR. MARSCHKE: 20 there was a -- Ron Buchanan had responded to, I think it was, OTIB-0057, and at the last go-21

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

round in November, I had promised to forward 1 2 those responses to the Subcommittee. 3 In that response that Ron made on OTIB-0059-07, he included also responses to 4 5 OTIB-0029 and, I believe, OTIB-0051. So when 6 I sent out the response -- to fulfill my promise to the Subcommittee to send out Ron's 7 8 responses to OTIB-0057, you also received his 9 response to OTIB-0029, and I believe that is maybe why Wanda added that to the agenda. 10

11 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I did add it to 12 the agenda because it was new to me and it was 13 sent as a different set than OTIB-0021 and 14 OTIB-0057.

15 MEMBER GRIFFON: Just for 16 clarification -- this is Mark again -- that 17 Ron response -- I thought that had 21, 51 and 18 57 in it.

19CHAIR MUNN: That is correct. It20did.

21 MEMBER GRIFFON: Not 29.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	CHAIR MUNN: No.
2	MR. MARSCHKE: Okay, I am sorry.
3	Shooting from the hip again. I should know
4	not to do that.
5	CHAIR MUNN: And those that just
6	came so let me see where it came from.
7	DR. ULSH: I see that I sent out
8	something, as Mark indicated, on 3/19, which
9	would have been last Friday. Is Liz Brackett
10	on the line?
11	MS. BRACKETT: Yes, I am here.
12	DR. ULSH: Okay. This response
13	was written by you. Do you want to perhaps
14	walk through?
15	MS. BRACKETT: Well, I was just
16	frantically emailing people saying what is
17	going on. I am trying to find these
18	responses. I didn't know this was on the
19	agenda and I don't know what issues we are
20	addressing.
01	DP III CU: The end I get that we

DR. ULSH: The one I see that we

21

have a more recent response that you wrote on

2	January 14th is OTIB-0029-02. The initial
3	SC&A finding was that the ORISE CER database
4	of uranium urinalysis records for the Y-12
5	site for 1950 through 88 was used without
б	questioning the accuracy of these records.
7	The records were used despite the problem
8	pointed out by ORAU OTIB-0029.
9	CHAIR MUNN: And had an initial
10	NIOSH response in July of last year and an
11	SC&A recommendation from 12/17.
12	DR. ULSH: Right.
13	CHAIR MUNN: Whether either of
14	these changes anything or has been added to
15	the database, I don't know. We have SC&A
16	recommendations for 0029-01 that is dated last
17	December, and again, since these things have
18	occurred since our meeting in November, I
19	guess the real question is whether these items
20	are currently on our database. Do they need
21	to be incorporated? Do we have them

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

1	correctly? That is the real bottom line.
2	DR. ULSH: Well, I will chime in
3	here and, Steve, correct me if I go off the
4	rails. But I think the answer to your
5	question, Wanda, about whether or not it is in
6	the database is probably not, because this is
7	in that interim period when the database was
8	going to be migrated over to the NIOSH server.
9	So I don't think the database is
10	up to date. Am I right, Steve?
11	MR. MARSCHKE: I don't think so.
12	I think you are right, yes. I don't think it
13	has been updated. I don't believe this has
14	been added to the database, but the database
15	is up to date. It has been migrated over and
16	it was caught up on our side. It was up to
17	date on our side.
18	DR. ULSH: Oh, okay.
19	MR. MARSCHKE: And any changes
20	made since that time have to be made on our

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1	there that has not been added, but it is up
2	and running, and it is up to date on our side,
3	other than things that have been exchanged
4	through email and have not been put in it.
5	DR. ULSH: Okay. All right, I was
6	wrong. Liz, have you come up with it yet?
7	MS. BRACKETT: I just got emailed
8	two copies of it.
9	DR. ULSH: Page six of six.
10	MS. BRACKETT: I don't have oh,
11	okay, this is the addition of the information.
12	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I think so.
13	Theoretically, the earlier information is
14	already on the database, theoretically.
15	MS. BRACKETT: I believe that what
16	happened at the last meeting was the question
17	about you know, the OTIB said that there
18	were these outstanding questions, but in fact,
19	that was my mistake, that the office of the
20	TBD had found this information and
21	incorporated it into the TBD, but I did not

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

reference that. I didn't realize that this
 information had been put in there.

3 So this response was now pulling that information out of the TBD and showing 4 5 that it was available. Ι have had 6 correspondence with one of the TBD authors since this was written where he said he found 7 additional information on -- there is a factor 8 of eight that is in that equation that isn't 9 explained other than to say it is a constant 10 incorporating various parameters and he found 11 the documentation specifically on what that 12 13 factor was. But I just got that at the end of 14 February.

MR. HINNEFELD: This was discussed in the --

17 MEMBER GRIFFON: I am sorry to 18 break in and this is Mark. That is the bottom 19 line. I am in favor of including all of these 20 if we can just figure out that factor of eight 21 and put that to bed.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	MS. BRACKETT: Okay. I do have
2	information on that now.
3	MEMBER GRIFFON: All right. If we
4	can more clearly explain that, at least from
5	my standpoint, speaking for myself.
6	MS. BRACKETT: Okay. Do you want
7	to do that now or I assume that you want it
8	in writing.
9	MEMBER GRIFFON: Well, Wanda, I
10	guess you should probably submit it in writing
11	like we usually would, right? So, yes.
12	CHAIR MUNN: But at least we can -
13	- we don't have it in writing anywhere, then;
14	right?
15	MS. BRACKETT: I sent a note to
16	Elyse at the end of February. So I am
17	guessing that none of this has gone I
18	didn't formally write it out, but I sent her a
19	note saying that I had been provided this
20	information from the TBD Office.
01	CHAIR MUNNI: Stove are we looking

21 CHAIR MUNN: Steve, are we looking

at the correct communication?

2 MR. MARSCHKE: I don't know. This is what we received the other day from the 3 email there and then it does talk about an 4 5 equation that has a factor of eight in it and it defines -- underneath factor of eight is 6 equal to a constant incorporating time, count 7 8 and volume constants, including the 20 9 milliliter electroplating volume. But then there is 10 MS. BRACKETT: nothing after that, is there? 11 12 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes. Then it 13 says there is no information on UCC on what 14 the includes daily constant or what the So I think that is what you 15 excretion was. are saying you found more information on. 16 17 Right, Liz? BRACKETT: Yes, I 18 MS. have one 19 It says see below after that, and there now. is -- it is actually -- it looks like a copy 20

21 of an old document like a picture from a typed

NEAL R. GROSS

1

document explaining -- well, it gives 1 some 2 more equations. 3 MEMBER GRIFFON: Oh, great. So that might resolve all this, I think, in my 4 5 mind. б MS. THOMAS: This is Elyse. Liz, we got that information after this response 7 8 had been submitted to NIOSH, but before NIOSH 9 submitted it to the Subcommittee. So we probably just need to collect it all in one 10 that. 11 place again to do That is what 12 happened. 13 MS. BRACKETT: Right. 14 DR. ULSH: So is it correct to say 15 then that we will issue a revised response 16 document to the Subcommittee for your review, 17 and it will address specifically -- it will include what we've got here, what we sent out 18 19 this Friday, but then also past some additional information on that factor of eight 20 21 in the equation. Right?

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	CHAIR MUNN: Is that right? Yes.
2	DR. ULSH: Elyse? Liz?
3	MS. TAYLOR: Yes, that sounds
4	right.
5	CHAIR MUNN: All right. So it is
6	a NIOSH action. Is there anything in -01
7	that we need to address other than just seeing
8	that it is incorporated that your most
9	recent comments are incorporated into the
10	database?
11	MR. MARSCHKE: Again, looking at
12	what was sent out at the top of page 5 and
13	what was sent out on Friday, the SC&A
14	recommendation was to propose this. I think
15	the date on that should be 11/17/2009.
16	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I think it
17	probably should be. MR. MARSCHKE:
18	That is when we had our meeting.
19	CHAIR MUNN: That was our meeting
20	date.
21	MR. MARSCHKE: Based upon what

happened at the meeting last time, we were
 satisfied.

3 CHAIR MUNN: So can we, on our 4 database -- is there any objection to closing 5 -01 on OTIB-0029?

б GRIFFON: Ι think this MEMBER might have been held up for me, and I since 7 8 have had a chance to review it, and I am 9 satisfied with the NIOSH response to this one. One is okay. 10 CHAIR MUNN: We will get response for -02 next time. 11 So we are 12 going to close -01. Steve is doing it right 13 now.

14 I got a question. DR. MAURO: The material that we are talking about that was 15 16 exchanged recently and the additional material 17 that will be coming in which provides more elaboration on exactly the date, are those 18 19 White Papers something that will be hooked 20 into this, that becomes ultimately the 21 technical basis for why they are closing it?

NEAL R. GROSS

1 It answered our question.

The question becomes, how is that captured in the database. I understand there is some difficulty incorporating PDF files and White Papers into the system because we do need that material on the record.

7 MR. HINNEFELD: There really shouldn't be that problem with that. 8 Ιt should just be a matter of getting the TST 9 team to put the whatever folder -- I suspect 10 that that folder with those other documents 11 12 was not as apparent as the other folders that 13 had to move over, and so the issue here is 14 that, you know, when your application looks 15 for a file, there is a certain presumption of 16 where you are telling it to look. If you don't 17 specify, it is going to look in the folder where it is, and that folder was not 18 19 put over in the right place when it came over. I think it is a simple fix. 20 It is 21 just a matter of our TST folks have to be able

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

to identify the folder as it existed on the 1 2 ORAU side and put it in where it belongs on 3 our side. I think that is a pretty simple fix. 4 5 So I think we will be able to use it and whether this is a White Paper or not, I 6 don't want to say. It sounds like, if we have 7 8 essentially an image of another document, that 9 is something that will probably have to be put in as a link. But this response isn't so long 10 that we couldn't just cut it and paste it. 11 12 CHAIR MUNN: No. I thought the 13 response just going into the was to go 14 database. 15 The problem with MR. MARSCHKE: putting the response in the database -- there 16 17 are two things. One, Stu is right. If you look, there is no -- actually, there is no 18 19 subfolder to these. Usually, there is a subfolder underneath here where all the PDF 20 21 files are stored. There is no subfolder.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	The problem with cutting and
2	pasting the thing in is that these fields,
3	these ASCII these access fields are limited
4	to only ASCII characters. You cannot put in a
5	figure. You cannot put in a table. You
6	cannot bold. You cannot underline. You
7	cannot superscript. You cannot subscript.
8	So, basically, you are limited to
9	ASCII, and a lot of the responses, a lot of
10	the people who write these responses, you
11	know, use Word and get very fancy with all
12	their stuff, and all that is lost when you
13	block copy paste into these access fields.
14	So in theory, we could take all
15	these responses and put them in as links, but
16	the other problem with that is you are only
17	allowed one link per issue. Now we can
18	combine multiple documents into one PDF file
19	and overcome it that way, but there are
20	certain things that have to be
21	MP UINNEFEID. I moon just

21 MR. HINNEFELD: I mean, just

1	reading this response, it looks like it is
2	pretty much ASCII. This, we could clip and
3	put in the database. Then, if the additional
4	information requires this image, if we already
5	have a link, we could use it for that and, if
6	not, we would have to combine it with
7	something.
8	DR. MAURO: Did I understand
9	correctly that you said that, like, you could
10	only have one link to each file here that you

11 have on the screen, and the way to deal with 12 that is to create a single folder that may 13 have lots of different files.

14 In other words, let's say it turns 15 out there are two or three pieces of 16 information that going to go into a folder, each dealing with a different aspect of the 17 problem. Can we put them in the same place? 18 19 Is that what you are saying?

20 Let's say there are three or four21 subjects being addressed.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. HINNEFELD: What he said was
2	you would append them into one file.
3	DR. MAURO: And they are appended
4	into one file. So they will all be there, I
5	would hope, in separate files.
6	MR. HINNEFELD: Whenever you hit
7	that link, you get them all.
8	DR. MAURO: You get them all.
9	Well, that is okay.
10	MR. MARSCHKE: Everything that is
11	associated with this particular issue would
12	come up. So again, this is one of those that
13	doesn't have a link. Let's go back, just
14	temporarily go back to 47, since it did have a
15	link in 47.
16	The only place you can put the
17	link is in this related link file, and you are
18	only allowed to put one link in there. So
19	whatever you put in there, you have to be all
20	appended into the PDF file.
21	So if NIOSH has a response and it

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	has figures and tables in it, and they put it
2	in the PDF file, and then SC&A comes back, and
3	we have figures and tables, we have to append
4	our figures and tables into that. Otherwise,
5	when you try to stuff it into the the
6	tables get collapsed, and the figures just
7	disappear.
8	DR. MAURO: So this one folder,
9	when you can link to it, that one folder
10	MR. MARSCHKE: One file will
11	include
12	DR. MAURO: include many
13	others.
14	MR. MARSCHKE: It may include more
15	than one document. It may actually end up
16	looking something similar to what was sent out
17	on Friday where you have, you know, an initial
18	response, an SC&A recommendation, additional
19	response, and then, you know so you would
20	have several levels of detail in one file.
21	DR. MAURO: Well, my main concern

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that five years from now,

2	comes back and wants to see how a particular
3	matter was resolved, and they go into this
4	archive, that they can navigate their way
5	through without pulling their hair out of
б	their head.
7	CHAIR MUNN: We should be able to
8	refer to the reference file, and in the
9	reference file we should be able to include
10	virtually any number of documents that were
11	necessary for the closure of that particular
12	item. Surely, there is no limit to the number
13	of reference documents we could put into a
14	reference file, is there?
15	MR. MARSCHKE: No. It is just
16	work for the people who have to do it, because
17	you have to create this PDF file every time,
18	and you have to make sure that you don't
19	overwrite. If I come up and I have a PDF file
20	which is my response, and I go in and

21 basically replace what NIOSH has put in there,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

is

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 when someone

1 that is a no-no.

2 I have to make sure that, when I with what there 3 do it, Ι start in was initially, like if I wanted to augment this 4 5 particular issue and I had something which had figures and tables on it, I would have to go 6 and pull this PDF file out and append to that 7 8 PDF file additional information, and then 9 restore it.

10 CHAIR MUNN: And that is more complicated than what I was envisioning. 11 You 12 may be telling me that what I am envisioning 13 is not technically possible. But Ι had 14 envisioned a reference folder, a hotlink to a reference folder. I don't know where the 15 reference folder would be, but in that folder 16 17 one would be able to place virtually any number of documents, PDF files or 18 whatever 19 came to hand.

20 Does it have to be a PDF folder? 21 MR. MARSCHKE: The way the program

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

is written now -- I mean, technically you are

2	absolutely correct, Wanda. You can write a
3	program that will allow you to do that. The
4	way this system has been written is we only
5	allow one link to that reference.
6	You see, basically, your data up
7	here this is your folder, reference
8	document. This is the folder. You can have
9	any number of PDF files in this reference
10	document's folder, and the folder doesn't know
11	where they are coming from. But in this
12	detailed area, you have to put a link
13	someplace.
14	Right now, the way the program has
15	been structured, the only place you can put
16	that link is right in this field here. You
17	don't have additional fields. So you only
18	have one link that gets you into the reference
19	documents folder per issue.
20	autor Minnie de chet sere basse to

20 CHAIR MUNN: So what you have to 21 do essentially is convert anything that you

(202) 234-4433

1

1	are going to put in there to a PDF file?
2	MR. MARSCHKE: And that is the
3	other thing. The way this is written now is
4	that it goes out and looks for a PDF file. It
5	pulls this into a viewer, which is a PDF
6	viewer.
7	CHAIR MUNN: Is this a shortcoming
8	that we have overlooked in setting up the
9	MR. MARSCHKE: It makes life
10	perhaps a little bit more difficult. I don't
11	know whether you would call it a shortcoming,
12	but it should be something that you should be
13	aware of when you are manipulating the data
14	file or the database.
15	CHAIR MUNN: And how much
16	bloodletting would have to occur to change
17	that to the type of file more easily added to
18	what I had envisioned earlier?
19	MR. MARSCHKE: That, I don't know.
20	You know, where you have basically an
21	unlimited number of links per issue; I don't

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1 know how much that would take.

2	CHAIR MUNN: I wouldn't consider
3	them to be unlimited, but it wouldn't surprise
4	me to find that in some circumstances, we
5	perhaps might need a folder as large enough as
6	12 documents, not necessarily large documents
7	but, you know, a dozen documents.
8	MR. MARSCHKE: It is not merely
9	the size of the folder on it. It is where you
10	have a field that specifies a link.
11	CHAIR MUNN: Right.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: So how many fields

13 you want to specify a link to that folder, and 14 whether or not -- there may be other ways to do this. 15 I haven't talked to my IT people to 16 Again, right now we are not making find out. any -- we have made the decision not to make 17 merely programming changes 18 any to this 19 database.

20 MR. HINNEFELD: Don't forget there 21 is supposedly effort going on on our side on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 document tracking. I am not up to date on 2 where that is.

3 It would be really CHAIR MUNN: helpful for the two to get together and to try 4 5 to identify how we can do this business of 6 referencing multiple documents because, clearly, we can't put it all on this archive. 7 8 If we can reference multiple documents into a 9 folder somewhere that is electronically connected to this and, therefore, accessible 10 for those who want to go from there. 11

12 MR. HINNEFELD: I haven't heard 13 anything from the developers for a while, and 14 identifying Ι know they Ι was were _ _ priorities and rights for various players and 15 16 for the Subcommittee not only but just 17 different groups.

18 CHAIR MUNN: Am I off in left 19 field thinking that this is the best of all 20 possible worlds if we can get --

21 MR. HINNEFELD: I just have to get

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	with them and see where they're at I
2	suspect they have been distracted on other
3	things, and I haven't been bothered about it.
4	CHAIR MUNN: So can we ask that
5	you give us information on that next time,
6	because that is I guess I had some
7	confusion in my mind with respect to what we
8	were going to be capable of doing. I think
9	that is what I was aiming for in earlier
10	issues when I asked for
11	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, now we
12	haven't really hit a real bad problem with
13	this database yet, because there is no link on
14	the one we were talking about where we might
15	be able to put in a link. There is no link on
16	that finding, so we haven't really run into a
17	bad problem on the use of this database yet.
18	CHAIR MUNN: No, not yet.
19	MR. HINNEFELD: I understand we
20	could.
0.1	

CHAIR MUNN: I see that coming.

NEAL R. GROSS

21

1	DR. MAURO: Then the problem would
2	be the downside is that if, for some
3	reason, the one we were just looking at does
4	have a link, if someone was working that and
5	wanted to add more material, they could put a
6	link in. So that we would lose that one. You
7	wouldn't even know that happened. All of a
8	sudden, that would disappear and a new one
9	would be in there, the other one would be lost
10	forever to the archive.
11	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, the person
12	who put it in there would have to know that
13	they are renaming that they are naming
14	their file exactly the name that is already
15	there.
16	DR. MAURO: Mechanically, the
17	person would open that up and drop in the
18	material.
19	MR. HINNEFELD: I think I'm not
20	even exactly sure how it works, mechanically.
21	DR. MAURO: My only concern is

1	that, without realizing it, we may corrupt the
2	archive and lose information that we didn't
3	want to lose.
4	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, and we don't
5	want to do that. We really don't want to do
6	that.
7	MR. HINNEFELD: I don't think that
8	will happen inadvertently.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: To take you back a
10	little bit, we have run into the problem. The
11	problem has arisen, and if you go back to 47,
12	OTIB-0047, you can see we already have a
13	related link in there in OTIB-0047, and then
14	if you go back and look at the SC&A response
15	of 8/11/2009, we have a actually, this is a
16	Board file that had tables associated with it,
17	and when the table got imported into this
18	little box here, basically all the table
19	structure got removed.
20	So all that you have here now is a
21	whole bunch of numbers which really don't come

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	up. Now, if we had brought this into it as a
2	linked document, we could have changed the
3	Word file into a PDF file and put it in as a
4	link. The table would be there, and the
5	structure would have been maintained.
б	So it is not purely an academic
7	MR. HINNEFELD: Is that 0047-01?
8	MR. MARSCHKE: That is 0047-01.
9	CHAIR MUNN: A perfect example of
10	what we need to circumvent, one way or
11	another. We are going to trust the program
12	wizards have a way to do this. All right. We
13	will ask for NIOSH to pursue that for next
14	time.
15	For this current moment, I am
16	gathering that did I understand you
17	correctly, Steve? We can or cannot get our
18	new information that we have here?
19	MR. MARSCHKE: We should be able
20	to well, two things. One, we don't have a
21	link already. We don't have a link that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 already exists in 29-01 or 29-02, I don't
2 believe.

The other part is that, with the way NIOSH has written the response, it is appearing in an ASCII file. So it can be brought in.

7 CHAIR MUNN: So we can do it.

8 MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, into the 9 access field without losing any formatting.

10 CHAIR MUNN: Let's request that 11 you do that, not necessarily here right now. 12 So I will put that as an SC&A action, to get 13 that incorporated.

MR. MARSCHKE: Well, NIOSH is going to update that response, and when the updated response comes, we will incorporate it.

18 CHAIR MUNN: All right. I am 19 trying to do three things all in one lump. 20 Any other questions on 29, OTIB-0029? If not, 21 we will go on to OTIB-0049-01, response to

NEAL R. GROSS

1	contact with SC&A regarding the estimated
2	doses for plutonium strongly retained in the
3	lung. NIOSH?
4	DR. ULSH: I think we sent out
5	let me make sure I have the right one here
6	a response on this, 0049-1. Okay, I think
7	this is one where it was Super S and there
8	were iterations back and forth and we had some
9	concerns that the dose reconstruction wouldn't
10	really be conducted in the way that SC&A
11	thought that it would. But we have not yet
12	received a written response to that effect.
13	Elyse, is that the one? Am I
14	thinking of the right one?
15	MS. THOMAS: Yes, it is the one I
16	sent you the long email string, and was
17	whether or not to have a technical call or to
18	call a technical call.
19	DR. ULSH: Right. I think at the
20	last meeting of this Subcommittee we had
21	discussed whether or not it would be

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	productive for SC&A and NIOSH to have a
2	technical call to discuss this issue. That
3	didn't come to pass and we didn't do it and I
4	think we decided instead to task ORAU with
5	writing a written response that we would
6	present to SC&A. That has not yet been done.
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer.
8	The note I have was that NIOSH was going to
9	provide a written response first and then
10	determine whether a technical call was needed.
11	DR. ULSH: So that has not been
12	done yet, Wanda.
13	CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
14	DR. ULSH: I would say that that
15	would be on the next meeting agenda.
16	CHAIR MUNN: That is a carryover.
17	So we are expecting a written response from
18	NIOSH. Right?
19	DR. ULSH: Right.
20	CHAIR MUNN: The next item is
21	OTIB-0057, review current material to be sent

NEAL R. GROSS

1	to the Committee and provide the hotlink for
2	the supporting data. SC&A.
3	MEMBER ZIEMER: Was that 67 or 57?
4	MR. KATZ: Fifty-seven, Paul.
5	CHAIR MUNN: Fifty-seven, five-
6	seven.
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: Five-seven, yes.
8	Okay.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: Is this one of the
10	ones that I was talking about before?
11	CHAIR MUNN: I can't pull it up on
12	my screen, so I don't know. We are relying on
13	you, Steve.
14	MR. MARSCHKE: This is what we
15	have in the in Ron Buchanan's responses to
16	OTIB-0057, I did incorporate those into the
17	database. Now it says that these are
18	okay.
19	The first one was I think the
20	story here was this is the file that Ron
21	which I spoke about previously when I got

NEAL R. GROSS

1	confused. 7	This is tl	ne file	that I	Ron had	given
2	responses t	o and I	was re	ading	at the	e last
3	meeting or m	naybe it w	was the	Octobe	er meet	ing
4	I was read	ing from	Ron's	respor	nses, a	ind no
5	one, even	on the	Subcom	mittee	, had	those
6	responses	or NIOS	SH dia	dn't	have	those
7	responses.					

8 What Ι have done is Т have 9 uploaded Ron's responses into this database, and I have also sent an email with Ron's 10 responses to the Subcommittee and to anybody 11 that Wanda had put a reply-on line as agenda. 12 So you should have Ron's file that has these 13 14 responses in it.

15 If you go back to the October 15, 16 2009 transcript, will you that the see Subcommittee basically agreed on 0057-01 to 17 propose this item, and it is on page 201 of 18 19 the transcript. You can see where that is written or that was talked about, and right 20 21 now in the box called, SC&A follow-up, that

NEAL R. GROSS

includes Ron's -- or SC&A evaluation of the 1 2 NIOSH response. So we don't need a 3 CHAIR MUNN: 4 hotlink to support it? 5 MR. MARSCHKE: Don't need а hotlink. 6 7 CHAIR MUNN: We have got it in 8 here. Okay. 9 MR. MARSCHKE: Now the same type 10 of -- the same story is true on --57-02, and basically, the response from Ron here is he 11 12 wanted to change this to in progress, and you see SC&A's response in 0057-03 as the reason 13 14 Again, so I have updated the database to why. reflect that. 15 16 MEMBER GIBSON: Can we go back to 0057-01 for a minute? 17 18 MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, we can. 19 MEMBER GIBSON: In the attachment 20 to the email that came out, it shows as of October 2009 that Ron said in abeyance. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. MARSCHKE: Ron?
2	MEMBER GIBSON: Is there something
3	since then?
4	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, we did, in
5	November at our meeting we talked about the
6	material that he sent.
7	MEMBER GIBSON: So this wasn't the
8	latest version that came out in email the
9	other day?
10	MR. MARSCHKE: SC&A recommended
11	that it be in abeyance in Ron's
12	recommendation. The Subcommittee determined
13	that they wanted to close it.
14	MEMBER GIBSON: All right.
15	MR. MARSCHKE: You don't have to -
16	- I mean, the Subcommittee, obviously, did not
17	have to follow the SC&A recommendations.
18	Now talking about the hotlink,
19	this is the one where you might be needed.
20	0057-03 you can see there is a link in
21	0057-03. There is also a very big, bit

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

quite a detailed response.

2 Aqain, there is a table in here which got collapsed and so on and so forth. 3 So I don't know how readable the SC&A follow-4 5 up on the database would be. б Now you can expand this -- I mean, right now a field is only two lines high. 7 Tt. 8 is very difficult to read, but if you do the printout version of it, you get a bigger field 9 so that you can print it out. You can see the 10 whole thing. 11 That can't be done on 12 DR. MAURO: 13 the screen, though. 14 It cannot be done MR. MARSCHKE: on the screen. 15 16 DR. MAURO: Is that another limitation? 17 MR. MARSCHKE: No, it is not a --18 it is a limitation, again, of the way that 19 20 this system has been designed. You know, you 21 can program the thing to do anything.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

1	CHAIR MUNN: But you can scroll
2	through it.
3	MR. MARSCHKE: We can scroll
4	through it.
5	CHAIR MUNN: You can read it.
6	MR. MARSCHKE: Two lines at a
7	time.
8	CHAIR MUNN: Correct.
9	DR. MAURO: I mean, if one of the
10	areas if I wanted to read Ron's report, I
11	have to print it out and that is fine. But
12	right now sitting around the table if you
13	wanted to read it on the screen, you can't do
14	that.
15	CHAIR MUNN: No. It would take us
16	a while.
17	MR. MARSCHKE: And the other
18	thing, you would lose if you print it out
19	from the way it is set up here now, you would
20	lose all the structure of the table. What you
21	should have done when we installed this

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1	what we usually do what I try to do when I
2	install it is I try and take the ASCII version
3	of the response and put it into the field, the
4	Access field, and then put the Word version of
5	the response convert it to a PDF file, and
6	attach that so that you can see the formatted
7	version.

8 So I think what you will look at, if you go back up here and you look at what is 9 the NIOSH initial response and then you look 10 the related link, which is the NIOSH 11 at response as well, I think 12 you are going to get a duplicate. One is a duplicate of the 13 14 other, only the -- again, the NIOSH response, if I recall correctly, it had some figures in 15 16 it or something in it, maybe some tables, graphs 17 which -you know, additional and tables, full response in the related link. 18 19 CHAIR MUNN: In any case, we have

20 two clear examples of why we need a little 21 more tender loving care from the IT wizards.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Hopefully, we will have that by the time we
2	meet next, and at least some feel for what is
3	possible. If we are asking for
4	impossibilities, then we will have to fall
5	back and regroup, I guess.
б	DR. MAURO: You know, I would like
7	to hear I mean, I understand we are talking
8	about the mechanics of managing the database,
9	but I would like to hear a little bit more.
10	Apparently, there is a disagreement.
11	In other words, you folks have
12	come up with an answer, but our people feel
13	the issue is still in progress. I would like
14	to hear some of the technical substance of
15	what is at play here. What is the problem?
16	Obviously, we are not in
17	agreement. Now we can't really tell what that
18	is. Is there anyone who knows the story?
19	MR. MARSCHKE: Not at this go-
20	round.
01	MAUDO: Oliori

21 DR. MAURO: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. Not from SC&A's MARSCHKE: 2 point of view. So Ron isn't available 3 DR. MAURO: to us on the phone to tell the story? 4 5 MR. MARSCHKE: No. Should we get him on б DR. MAURO: the phone or do you want to move on? 7 8 MEMBER GRIFFON: Well, John, I am 9 with you, actually. If I am reading through that correctly, maybe it could move the ball 10 along for the next meeting. It looks like the 11 12 disagreement is the uncertainty that NIOSH is 13 assuming for the doses, and they are saying it 14 is 25 percent uncertainty based on the numbers 15 derived from the accident, the criticality 16 accident, and Ron is suggesting that a higher 17 uncertainty is probably a more valid value. 18 Т think he is recommending 50 19 percent or something like that. Then I think, at the bottom of his rebuttal, he asks where 20 21 the basis for NIOSH's 25-percent derivation

NEAL R. GROSS

1	came from. So maybe that might be a starting
2	point for NIOSH when they look back at this,
3	is to answer that question; how did you come
4	up with this number, and then we can continue
5	this discussion at the next meeting.
6	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, I have a
7	question about Ron. Are we talking about the
8	SC&A response on October 2009? Is that the
9	latest thing, the reason why it shouldn't be
10	closed or is there something later?
11	DR. MAURO: Well, I got the sense
12	that Ron is recommending just looking at
13	it.
14	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, he is
15	recommending he is saying
16	DR. MAURO: He has a problem.
17	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, just reading
18	that is apparently the last thing here is
19	the October 2009. He has the table of doses.
20	Before the table of doses and this is the
21	issue, the evacuation following the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	criticality, and there were some six or seven
2	employees who were quite close to the
3	criticality event, and their dose is
4	determined by sodium activation in the blood.
5	Okay?
б	There is also a predicted dose, if
7	you only use the one over r-squared from the
8	number of fission because one over r-
9	squared was used for everybody else. You
10	know, the people who were in the building but
11	farther away did not get sodium blood
12	analysis. They just assigned it based on one
13	over r-squared.
14	Ron makes the statement in his
15	response that all five workers, B, C, D and H
16	that is five of the seven who were close
17	determined by the blood analysis was less than
18	the predicted by one over r-squared, but he
19	presents the table right below. Unless
20	something is mislabeled, it is exactly the
21	opposite.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	For all of those five workers, the
2	dose by sodium activation is or by blood
3	analysis is higher than the one over r-squared
4	and it is in the table right where he made
5	that statement. So there is either something
6	mislabeled or something going on there.
7	The data in this table is
8	consistent with the explanation that was
9	provided by ORAU during the last meeting,
10	which was the employees who were quite close
11	to the event, first four on the table, didn't
12	know where the criticality occurred and they
13	didn't evacuate away from the criticality
14	unnecessarily. In fact, one of them even had
15	a particularly bad route in terms of going
16	past I think, from one side past the
17	criticality, the drum where it occurred, to
18	another exit.
10	So there are people here who have

So there are people here who have
significantly higher blood activation doses,
according to this table, than you would

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 calculate by one over r-squared because they 2 weren't at the one over r-squared. They went 3 past the drum after the criticality when there 4 were still some delayed neutrons coming off 5 the criticality.

6 So other people who were far 7 enough away did not really approach the drum 8 in any meaningful fashion anyway on their way 9 out of the building. So one over r-squared is 10 appropriate.

Now two of the seven close people 11 12 are considered the benchmark people and their activation apparently, 13 blood it _ _ was 14 reconstructed that they took a direct route out, quickly out. They were not the real 15 16 Their blood activation was 20 close ones. rads and they are considered the benchmark for 17 one over r-squared. 18

19 So all the one over r-squared 20 doses are calculated as if, if you were that 21 far away, your dose was 20 rads. Okay. So

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	unless there is something mislabeled in the
2	table, Ron's discussion doesn't line up with
3	the data in the table.
4	So the discussion that George Kerr
5	provided at the last meeting, that the reason
6	that they used those two people is because
7	they went out directly and it was a good way
8	to use one over r-squared, and for all the
9	other people in the building who would not
10	approach the drum in any meaningful way on
11	their way out of the building, one over r-
12	squared is a good approximation. But for
13	these people who are close and didn't evacuate
14	directly, one over r-squared isn't really the
15	correct approximation. So you would use blood
16	activation.
17	That was George's discussion last
18	time, and that is where this is. As Ron has

20 doesn't say anything about the argument that 21 George made last time.

NEAL R. GROSS

written this, or as the table is presented, it

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

19

1	MEMBER GRIFFON: I agree with you.
2	That is backwards from what Ron was saying in
3	the paragraph. That is mislabeled or
4	something, yes.
5	MR. HINNEFELD: Unless the table
6	is mislabeled or something, it is backwards
7	from what Ron wrote.
8	MEMBER GRIFFON: That confused me
9	as well, yes.
10	CHAIR MUNN: And we have not
11	captured any of that discussion on the
12	database.
13	MR. HINNEFELD: Did we not give
14	you a written?
15	MR. MARSCHKE: I think the
16	discussion was the last time when we had
17	this at the last meeting, we weren't using
18	the database.
19	CHAIR MUNN: That's right. We
20	were dead in the water.
21	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes. It was

21 MR. MARSCHKE: Yes. It was

(202) 234-4433

1	problems with the database, and we decided not
2	to utilize it. So the discussion that George,
3	you gave, there is nothing in here. I guess
4	we can go back to the transcript and try and
5	pull something out of the transcript or I
6	could just put in here a reference to see
7	to the person to go see the description or the
8	discussion that is contained within the
9	transcript.
10	MD KEDD: Evanas mo Thia ia

10 MR. KERR: Excuse me. This is 11 George Kerr. Isn't the discussion in the Part 12 2, OTIB-0047-02? Well, I can't see your 13 database. I'm sorry, I've got an email here.

MR. HINNEFELD: I think we aremainly on 0057-03, George.

16MR. KERR:Yes.Well, the17discussion was on 0057-02.

18 MR. HINNEFELD: Yes. It starts in 19 0057-02, yes. I believe we provided -- it is 20 not put in the database, but we did provide 21 the written discussion, and that was what

NEAL R. GROSS

1	George is speaking from.
2	George, if I had known you were on
3	the phone, I would let you have the argument.
4	MR. KERR: No, that is fine.
5	CHAIR MUNN: So it is in writing
6	somewhere. We just don't have it captured
7	yet?
8	MR. HINNEFELD: It is not on the
9	database yet.
10	MEMBER GRIFFON: That is correct.
11	It is in 0057-02.
12	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, right.
13	CHAIR MUNN: That discussion is in
14	0057-02?
15	MR. HINNEFELD: It is not in the
16	database, but it is on the additional the
17	document that was sent by email.
18	DR. MAURO: And we have that. So
19	it sounds to me, we have to ask Ron what is
20	proper.
21	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes. This

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS

1	sentence doesn't mesh with the table.
2	DR. MAURO: Right, got it. So we
3	will take that.
4	CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Fifty-seven,
5	two is where the discussion is going to take
6	place?
7	MR. HINNEFELD: It addresses both
8	-02 and -03, I believe. I believe it will
9	address both.
10	CHAIR MUNN: All right. So SC&A
11	has an action and so does NIOSH with respect
12	to the problem.
13	MEMBER LEMEN: So does that mean
14	it is going to come up at the Subcommittee
15	next time?
16	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, it will. It
17	will be on our action item listing.
18	The next action item on the list
19	is OTIB-0051-01, link to the White Paper and
20	closing on the database. The link to the
21	White Paper in that?

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

1	MR. MARSCHKE: No, we didn't get
2	any links to the White Paper because we can't
3	link.
4	DR. MAURO: Notwithstanding the
5	What I am looking at is, as of the last
б	meeting, the last exchange, we had accepted
7	that. Is that correct?
8	MR. MARSCHKE: Recommended in
9	abeyance. NIOSH has complied and update at
10	the next Subcommittee meeting. That was back
11	in June. Obviously, if you look at the
12	status, the Subcommittee didn't agree with our
13	recommendation and they kept it in progress.
14	CHAIR MUNN: And my note said we
15	were going to close it on the database, that
16	it was a NIOSH action the link to the White
17	Paper and close on the database. Am I
18	incorrect?
19	MR. MARSCHKE: The date of our
20	last meeting?
21	CHAIR MUNN: November 17th.

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer.
2	In the October meeting we got the NIOSH
3	response on 0051-01, and then in the November
4	meeting let's see, 0051-01. Whatever was
5	supposed to happen I guess just linking it
6	had not occurred. That is why we carried it,
7	I guess.
8	CHAIR MUNN: The link, and close
9	the database.
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right. But we
11	have the information. Right?
12	CHAIR MUNN: That was my
13	understanding, that the White Paper resulted
14	in everybody's agreeing, yes, that does it.
15	But without some kind of link in there, there
16	is no way to close it. Do we need to carry
17	that one over?
18	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes.
19	CHAIR MUNN: Until we can make
20	sure we know what we are doing, we will carry
21	it. Steve is saying wait a minute.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, 0057-01 we
2	have 0057-02, we seem to have we do have
3	0057-03, I should say. It has been closed and
4	it does have a link to NIOSH's additional
5	responses. This is 0057-03.
б	MEMBER ZIEMER: Three was closed.
7	MR. MARSCHKE: Three was closed.
8	MEMBER GRIFFON: I thought we were
9	on 0051-03.
10	CHAIR MUNN: We are on OTIB-0051,
11	finding one.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: Fifty-one I'm
13	sorry. Did I say 0057? Fifty-one, three.
14	I'm sorry. Thank you.
15	DR. ULSH: Fifty-one, three is
16	closed. Is that what you said?
17	MR. MARSCHKE: Fifty-one, three is
18	closed, and it has a link. I had that in my
19	notes from the October meeting.
20	DR. MAURO: So do I understand
21	this correctly? 0051-01, there has been

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	exchange of the material where, for all
2	intents and purposes, SC&A and NIOSH are in
3	agreement in principle, but it hasn't
4	physically made it mechanically into the
5	system. So for that reason, we are not making
б	it closed. We are going to leave it open
7	until we mechanically incorporate the
8	material? I guess I am a little lost here.
9	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
10	DR. ULSH: Wait, wait. I thought
11	it was just a matter of updating the database
12	and putting the correct link in.
13	DR. MAURO: That is what I meant,
14	and that is the reason we are leaving it in
15	progress even though we all agree, really, it
16	is closed. We are going to leave it in
17	progress because we mechanically couldn't
18	really capture the information yet. It is
19	sort of like a reminder.
20	CHAIR MUNN: That is correct.

21 DR. MAURO: I just want to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 understand.

2	CHAIR MUNN: Correct. We are all
3	on the same page somewhere.
4	DR. MAURO: Somebody fix this, so
5	we can close it.
6	CHAIR MUNN: I have it as a NIOSH
7	action.
8	The next thing I have is OTIB-
9	0021, both -01 and -02. That was one of the
10	things that we received by email just last
11	week. We just got an email transmitting about
12	five pages with SC&A responses on it to some
13	of the NIOSH responses.
14	SC&A was their responses are
15	shown in green and it was a broad printout of
16	findings 1, 2 and 4 from OTIB-0021.
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
18	CHAIR MUNN: And there are two
19	pages of that that are OTIB-0021. I am unable
20	to verify whether any of that has been
21	captured on our database.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. MARSCHKE: It is in the
2	database.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
4	MR. MARSCHKE: This one actually -
5	- these were responses that NIOSH provided
6	back, I think, in August. Ron Buchanan's
7	responses were provided back in
8	MEMBER ZIEMER: October.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: October, and we
10	just have not as a Subcommittee have not
11	discussed it, I don't think, and Ron recommend
12	for 0021-01 is that he agrees with the NIOSH
13	response. SC&A and NIOSH agree, and the
14	procedure needs to be revised accordingly, and
15	we recommend that the issue 0021-01 be changed
16	to in abeyance.
17	CHAIR MUNN: And it is an action
18	item for NIOSH to do the procedure. Right?
19	MR. MARSCHKE: And the revision.
20	CHAIR MUNN: The revision with the
21	procedure, sections and items having already

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1	been identified. And Item Number 2?
2	MR. MARSCHKE: So is it in
3	abeyance?
4	CHAIR MUNN: Is there any question
5	to that? It is a NIOSH item, and we are in
6	abeyance.
7	MEMBER LEMEN: And both 1 and 2?
8	MR. MARSCHKE: Number one.
9	CHAIR MUNN: No, just one. We
10	take them one at a time.
11	Then finding number 2. October,
12	Ron says SC&A would like to see calculations
13	showing how NIOSH revised the gamma on 99
14	percent values in Table 3, page 11 of OTIB-
15	0021 for the years 1950, 53, and 55. He gives
16	the rems for each of those. SC&A could not
17	arrive at those values using the data in Table
18	2 and the procedures stated in Section 7, page
19	9, step 3 of OTIB-21.
20	Any discussion necessary on that?

21 DR. MAURO: Except I guess this

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	should be called in progress now, now that we
2	have acted on it.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, that is what Ron
4	is recommending. It should be in progress.
5	Any discussion here about that? Does NIOSH
6	agree that needs to be done?
7	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, we will do
8	it.
9	MEMBER LEMEN: That wasn't real
10	enthusiastic.
11	CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Action item,
12	NIOSH.
13	MR. MARSCHKE: So the Subcommittee
14	agrees that that is in progress.
15	CHAIR MUNN: Any disagreement with
16	that?
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, was this
18	just an issue of SC&A couldn't reach the same
19	values? They weren't sure where the numbers
20	came from, or what was
21	CHAIR MUNN: That is what it looks

2 MR. HINNEFELD: That is what it 3 looks like. It looks like they 4 CHAIR MUNN: 5 don't follow the math. б MEMBER ZIEMER: So all they are asking NIOSH to do is show them where 7 the 8 calculations came from? 9 CHAIR MUNN: Correct. Yes. See the difference. 10 Again, that is all 11 MR. MARSCHKE: 12 we are asking. 13 MEMBER ZIEMER: Not to do a new 14 set of calculations, but just show where they came from? 15 16 Exactly. MR. MARSCHKE: 17 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay. CHAIR MUNN: And then the next 18 19 item is finding number 4. In the October 20 NIOSH response from Ron was that this was in 21 progress. Section 7 Step 1 describes how the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

like.

1

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

221

1	1961 and later data was adjusted for less than
2	a full year of dose results. However, the
3	last sentence of that paragraph states that
4	the data prior to 1961 was not adjusted, since
5	it was apparently represented doses received
6	during the entire year.

7 Note that SC&A does not suggest 8 that the data prior to 1961 was quarterly 9 data, but instead it was the sum of all badging periods for a year for an individual. 10 However, this sum may be only for the partial 11 year of badging caused by starting employment, 12 ending employment, change in jobs, et cetera. 13 14 It does not appear reasonable to assume that 15 those data prior to 1961 are for full years, but the dose data for 1961 and after are for 16 partial years and, therefore, were adjusted as 17 described in Section 7 Step 1. 18

Does NIOSH have any documentation that the seeder data compiled for the epi studies are included or was adjusted for dose

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	data for a 12-month period?
2	So there is a question.
3	MR. HINNEFELD: We will see what
4	we can find out.
5	CHAIR MUNN: Action, NIOSH. Do we
б	agree that the status is in progress?
7	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.
8	CHAIR MUNN: Hearing no one to the
9	contrary, the action will be changed to in
10	progress.
11	The next page is OTIB-0051-01.3.
12	DR. ULSH: Didn't we already cover
13	that?
14	CHAIR MUNN: I think we have
15	beaten that one to death.
16	DR. ULSH: We did cover that.
17	CHAIR MUNN: I wanted to make sure
18	here. We did change it to in abeyance.
19	MEMBER LEMEN: We said for -01 we
20	might carry it over.
21	CHAIR MUNN: That was -01,

1	carrying over. Yes.
2	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, -02 and -03 ,
3	we said SC&A was going to follow up on.
4	CHAIR MUNN: Right. Correct.
5	MEMBER LEMEN: That was for 0057,
6	though.
7	CHAIR MUNN: OTIB-0057. Correct.
8	Now that brings us to where I have suggested
9	we break. Are we ready for a 10-minute quick
10	break or do we want to before we do that,
11	let's do the one thing that Steve had asked us
12	with respect to discussing the OCAS and ORAU
13	documents for review, additional ones.
14	Let's do that before we have the
15	break because I am afraid we are going to lose
16	Dr. Lemen here very quickly and I would like
17	for us to at least take a look at that and
18	hear what Steve has to say. What are you
19	folks looking at with respect to new documents
20	for SC&A review that you are concerned with
21	right now?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	MR. MARSCHKE: In the response to
2	one of the and I forget which ones with
3	a PROC. In the response to one of the PROCs,
4	NIOSH had indicated that it was it referred
5	us to report, RPRT document Number 44, and
6	that led us to think, well, are there other of
7	these RPRT documents out there which are
8	technical in basis that maybe would benefit
9	from an SC&A review.
10	So I went onto the O: drive, and I
11	got a list of this is a list that is
12	available. I think the date stamp on this was
13	January of 2009 and there is a list here of
14	well, I don't know of all the RPRT
15	documents that were issued as of that date,
16	plus, I think, RPRT 44 wasn't on that list,
17	but I added it.
18	Many of these report documents are

19 purely administrative from NIOSH's point of 20 view and, clearly, are outside of the realm of 21 SC&A performing any kind of review on and I

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	have indicated that in the right-hand column
2	with an N, which are not applicable for SC&A $$
3	review.
4	There are some of them which,
5	again and this is almost purely by a review
6	of the title of the RPRT document which I
7	think these have a potential for an SC&A
8	review, and these have been indicated with a P
9	in the SC&A in the right-hand column.
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: What document are
11	you referring to, Steve?
12	MR. MARSCHKE: This is did I
13	send this to everyone? I forget.
14	CHAIR MUNN: Yes. Steve sent an
15	email on the 23rd.
16	MEMBER ZIEMER: What is the
17	document called?
18	CHAIR MUNN: I mean, on the 18th.
19	It is just an email a note to me saying at
20	next Tuesday's meeting SC&A would like to
21	review, et cetera. It is from Steve. The

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	subject is, re: Procedures Committee Action
2	Items for 3/23/10, email March 18.
3	MR. MARSCHKE: And what I am
4	looking at, Paul, is an attachment to that
5	which was a Word document that had this table
6	in it.
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay.
8	CHAIR MUNN: And I didn't get the
9	attachment, frankly, Steve.
10	MEMBER GRIFFON: Would it be ORAU
11	RPRT? That's the name of it.
12	CHAIR MUNN: That is the name of
13	it, 0044. I didn't get the attachment. Just
14	have your message.
15	MR. MARSCHKE: That is the gist of
16	it. I can read some of the titles of the
17	documents that we think may be potential for
18	SC&A review.
19	CHAIR MUNN: Does NIOSH have any
20	specific feeling, one way or the other, about
21	having these items in SC&A's purview for

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 review and, if so, we would sure like to hear 2 it.

3 MR. HINNEFELD: There were а couple that, I think, are formalizations of 4 5 White Papers that were presented during the Y-12 Evaluation Report discussion. 6 So there has been a fair amount of review on those already 7 8 in the Y-12 Work Group.

9 So you pick out the ones that are 10 Y-12, have Y-12 in the title. I think those 11 are the ones that came -- They were generated 12 out of that effort.

13 So I mean, I think they have been 14 vetted and essentially accepted in that venue, 15 although SC&A could check against that menu to 16 see whether there was review and so on and 17 essentially agreement on those.

18 That is the only thing I would 19 say, is I think those, I think, have been 20 reviewed. Let's see if I can read these now.

21 CHAIR MUNN: There seemed to be

1	special interest in 0044.
2	MR. MARSCHKE: Forty-four was
3	brought up there, because that was really what
4	turned us on to this. It was in response of -
5	_
6	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes. I think
7	0044 is an appropriate one. I think I agree
8	with Stu on the Y-12 ones, that we have looked
9	at those during the SEC Evaluation and, if we
10	need to further look at those, I would argue
11	that it should be to finish out the Site
12	Profile Review of Y-12, not in the context of
13	the Procedure Review.
14	CHAIR MUNN: And 0044 is in the
15	category, because it is purely a technical
16	document?
17	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, and it
18	doesn't seem to be site-specific. It is a
19	technical document, an overarching document, I
20	believe.
21	DR. MAURO: In fact, before this

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	meeting because I sent it off to Joyce
2	Lipsztein, our internal dosimetry specialist,
3	and I said, Joyce, will you take a quick look
4	at this; is this something new and something
5	important. Her response to me was,
6	absolutely, this is new, and it is very
7	important.
8	So of all the list there, that is
9	the only one where we took a pretty close at
10	it to see are we dealing with something here
11	that is of some importance overall to the
12	program.
13	The other items have been very
14	correct. They turn out to be mainly site-
15	specific. Looks like a lot of them are Y-12,
16	and may turn out that there really is nothing
17	there for us to do.
18	CHAIR MUNN: So for the purposes
19	of this discussion, can we just limit
20	ourselves to 0044?
21	DR. MAURO: That is certainly fine

- 2 MEMBER GIBSON: Well, what about Are they site-specific? 3 37 and 42? MR. MARSCHKE: I don't think they 4 5 are site-specific, but they are more -- Forty-6 two is like a software quality assurance, a validation and verification. 7 So it. is а 8 little bit of a different animal than what we are kind of -- all the QA/QC type of thing. 9 10 Thirty-seven, aqain, is errors tracking and reporting, and again it kind of 11 12 falls in the range of quality assurance. So it is not so much of a technical point of view 13 14 from a dose reconstruction or health physics or that type of thing, but it is -- I thought 15 16 it was error tracking and quality assurance, 17 which I know sometimes we used to get involved in at some point. So that is why I put the 18 19 potential for those two. 20 So those two are a little less
- 21 technical than 0044. Really, those are the

1

with me.

only three that are still up for discussion. 1 2 MEMBER GIBSON: It looks like the 3 error tracking or reporting would have to go toward data quality, too, which we have had 4 5 some concerns with. б MR. MARSCHKE: Yes. I don't know 7 what that one says. 8 MEMBER GIBSON: In my view, there's a couple of the titles, even some that 9 SC&A has marked no, that I think might be 10 useful as we look at the quality issues in the 11 12 Dose Reconstruction Subcommittee. 13 Ι sure we need SC&A to am not review them, but they might be informative to 14 other issues that we are dealing with. 15 But I 16 would support a review. At this point, I would 17 just support a review of 44, and the other one, like I said, might be 18 for our 19 information. I am not sure we need SC&A to 20 review those.

21 CHAIR MUNN: Well, and validation

1	of software, frankly, falls outside of my
2	perception of what we need to look at most
3	specifically. Is it the feeling of the
4	Subcommittee that at this juncture, without a
5	great deal of debate, we could simply agree
6	that 44 would be a reasonable procedure for
7	SC&A to undertake to review?
8	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: That seems
10	reasonable. Do you know what the date is on
11	that one when it went into effect?
12	MR. MARSCHKE: Forty-four?
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
14	MR. KATZ: We can get that.
15	MR. HINNEFELD: That is not 0044.
16	MEMBER ZIEMER: I just wondered if
17	it was fairly recent.
18	MR. MARSCHKE: It is fairly
19	recent.
20	CHAIR MUNN: We are checking.
21	That is the imperial we.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 5/22/2009, MR. MARSCHKE: one 2 year. All right. 3 CHAIR MUNN: Hearing no objection, SC&A is authorized to proceed 4 5 with a review of RPRT-0044. б Does anyone have any fragment of wisdom to pass along before we break for 10 7 8 minutes? If not, we are on break until five 9 minutes after the hour. 10 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:55 p.m. and 11 12 resumed at 3:06 p.m.) Let us go ahead and 13 CHAIR MUNN: 14 restart with our 2:45 item: provide responses 15 for OTIB-0054. That is a carryover for NIOSH. 16 I don't know that we DR. ULSH: 17 have anything to report on that. Elyse, do you have anything on that? 18 19 No. We have started, MS. THOMAS: 20 but we don't have our responses complete yet. 21 CHAIR MUNN: All right. We will

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 carry it.

2	The next item: Certify OTIB-0014
3	and ORAU TIB-0014 are correctly noted on the
4	database. That is an SC&A action.
5	MR. MARSCHKE: What was the intent
6	of that, Wanda? Refresh my memory.
7	CHAIR MUNN: Apparently, we had
8	some discrepancy on how these two documents
9	were listed on the database. I guess I would
10	have to go back and check. We carried that
11	over for a couple of meetings since, as we all
12	repeatedly said, we were unable to do anything
13	to the database in November.
14	MR. MARSCHKE: We have OCAS TIB-
15	14, and we have that here and we have three
16	issues associated with it. Now ORAU TIB-0014
17	
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: This would carry
19	over, actually, back in October was a carry-
20	over as well. So this goes back a ways. I
21	don't see it in November.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	CHAIR MUNN: No, I don't think we
2	had the database to work with in November. So
3	we had to suspend belief on many things. It
4	may be necessary to check transcripts of
5	earlier meetings to see what the issue might
6	be. Steve is trying to sort for the numbers
7	to see what we come up with.
8	MEMBER ZIEMER: TIB-0014 in August
9	was awaiting a NIOSH response, according to my
10	notes from August. That was TIB-0014.
11	CHAIR MUNN: And not OTIB-0014.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: I have October. I
13	have virtually the same thing for TIB-0014,
14	NIOSH needs to provide input.
15	Oh, OTIB-0014 was SC&A reviewed
16	it, and we did not find any I think this
17	was transcript; let me see what it says.
18	OTIB-14 has to do with the issue was
19	particular care must be taken when assigning a
20	construction worker to a given category of
21	exposure due to highly diverse nature of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

exposures that some construction workers
 experienced.

We had indicated that as transferred to the review of OTIB-52. So I don't understand what the --

б CHAIR MUNN: I had thought there was a confusion between OTIB-14 and TIB-14, 7 8 the ORAU document with a similar number, but 9 our only concern was whether or not it was only 10 shown correctly and there was one document -- we don't have an ORAU TIB-14. 11

12 MR. MARSCHKE: I mean, that is 13 nothing -- the numbering scheme -- ORAU 14 doesn't make TIBs.

15 CHAIR MUNN: No, that couldn't be 16 right.

17 MR. MARSCHKE: TIB has got to be 18 an OCAS TIB.

19 MR. SIEBERT: That is not

20 necessarily true.

(202) 234-4433

21 MR. MARSCHKE: No?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Part are called ORAU MR. SIEBERT: 2 TIBs or OTIBs. 3 Yes, but for the MR. HINNEFELD: vernacular we use here, Scott, is that if we 4 5 are looking at ORAU TIB, we call it an OTIB, because that is the shorthand in the title. 6 7 SIEBERT: MR. Okay. Ι am just 8 making sure there is clarification. 9 MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, you got it 10 right. We just call them here OTIBs because that is the initials in the title, whereas, 11 12 our TIBs, the initials in the title are TIB. 13 MR. SIEBERT: Sure. I just think, 14 happened you know, OTIB-14 to be environmental type stuff, low exposure, and I 15 16 didn't know if that might tie in. MARSCHKE: 17 MR. TIB-14 is here. TIB-14 has to do with Rocky Flats internal 18 19 dose co-worker. 20 CHAIR MUNN: And we haven't even 21 touched that one.

1	MR. MARSCHKE: So far.
2	DR. MAURO: That is Lockey.
3	Transfer this to Lockey?
4	CHAIR MUNN: No. It hasn't even
5	been addressed yet.
6	MR. MARSCHKE: We haven't talked
7	about this TIB-14, there is nothing talked
8	about at the Subcommittee level.
9	DR. MAURO: Does Rocky have an
10	active Work Group or that is closed?
11	MR. HINNEFELD: No, they do not
12	have an active one.
13	CHAIR MUNN: It is closed. So
14	OTIB-14, we have noted correctly. Right?
15	MR. MARSCHKE: OTIB-14 has one
16	issue associated with it, and it was to
17	transfer it to OTIB-52.
18	CHAIR MUNN: OTIB-52. So that is
19	all right, I am going to take this off of
20	my action item list because it appears to me
21	that that is done properly. The only thing

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	that we have that means we still haven't
2	opened the item that NIOSH hasn't addressed,
3	but that is just along with all other open
4	items. All right.
5	The next item I have is a
6	carryover, reporting on the status of TIB-10-8
7	for a possible closure.
8	DR. ULSH: I don't have anything
9	on that, Wanda. Elyse, do you know anything
10	about 10-8?
11	MR. HINNEFELD: That is ours.
12	DR. ULSH: Never mind, Elyse.
13	MS. THOMAS: Okay.
14	MR. MARSCHKE: This is the Monte
15	Carlo runs that was made. I am bringing it
16	up, but I am sure it was. Basically, we had
17	asked to look at the Monte Carlo runs that
18	confirmed the Attila runs that you guys made.
19	I guess what we are waiting on or at one
20	point NIOSH was going to give us those runs,
21	the MCNP runs, and we were going to look at

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 them. That is what we are waiting on under 2 here. 3 CHAIR MUNN: Another carryover, right? 4 5 The next item, to approve the transfer of Work Group TBD-6000 Finding 6 to 6 us and set its priority. I think we sent the 7 8 material to you when Dr. Ziemer transferred 9 that item over to us. I have to have your approval before I can sign the yes, we have 10 received it and accepted it note back to Dr. 11 Ziemer. 12 13 Is there any concern over our 14 acceptance of that item and inclusion on our 15 Anybody have a problem with that? database? If not, then I will consider myself authorized 16 17 to sign and return the transfer notification to Dr. Ziemer. 18 This is an incoming? 19 DR. MAURO: This is incoming. 20 CHAIR MUNN:

21 DR. MAURO: So this is -- what?

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	Issue 6 on TBD-6000?
2	CHAIR MUNN: Correct.
3	DR. MAURO: That is coming in
4	here, which probably I am not sure what
5	that deals with.
6	CHAIR MUNN: I will get that to
7	you, John.
8	DR. MAURO: Our review of TBD-
9	6000?
10	CHAIR MUNN: Yes. You should have
11	it, yes. Okay.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: Do we add it to the
13	database?
14	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, we will be
15	adding it we now officially need to add it
16	to the database.
17	DR. MAURO: Yes, Task 6 or
18	Issue 6.
19	CHAIR MUNN: Correct. The next
20	item, OTIB-70. Responses are due from NIOSH.
21	DR. ULSH: We have recently picked

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	this one up. So it is in progress, but we are
2	not done with it yet.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Are we properly
4	showing here that it is in progress?
5	MR. MARSCHKE: Which one is it?
6	CHAIR MUNN: OTIB-70.
7	DR. MAURO: This would be a nice
8	one to engage at so many sites.
9	CHAIR MUNN: Really and truly,
10	this will be a biggie.
11	DR. ULSH: Would you like me to
12	assign some priority to that over other items
13	on the agenda?
14	CHAIR MUNN: I think it would be
15	wise to do so, given the amount of interest
16	that has been expressed in it in other
17	meetings.
18	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, we have
19	CHAIR MUNN: The old facilities,
20	and there is, as you can see, a handful of
21	items involved there.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	MR. MARSCHKE: Fifteen issues, all
2	open.
3	CHAIR MUNN: There is a lot, and
4	since they are am I remembering correctly?
5	These are all AWEs?
6	DR. MAURO: Its most applicability
7	is AWE. It has to do with how you deal with
8	residual period. In general, the residual
9	period is a big deal at AWE sites.
10	DR. ULSH: Okay. We will give
11	that attention.
12	CHAIR MUNN: Thank you. PROC-
13	0042, Finding 6 to be formulated and added to
14	the database, SC&A.
15	MR. MARSCHKE: PROC-42.
16	MEMBER ZIEMER: This is a problem
17	with the workbook that Ron Buchanan pointed
18	out, and the scaling factor.
19	MR. MARSCHKE: Oh, okay. It is
20	still outstanding.
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: That was one where

(202) 234-4433

1	the issue didn't appear as a finding but it
2	did show up in the report, and SC&A was going
3	to add it as a finding, I believe.
4	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, I remember.
5	Now that you remind me, Paul, I remember it,
6	and it slipped through the cracks. It was not
7	done.
8	CHAIR MUNN: I think that is why
9	the language says "to be formulated."
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right. The other
11	part of it was that I think ORAU indicated
12	that the notebook wasn't used in the way that
13	perhaps that Ron Buchanan noted. They never
14	scaled the dose downward.
15	MR. MARSCHKE: That is correct.
16	They never used the negative scaling factor.
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
18	MR. MARSCHKE: I remember that.
19	So, basically, we could we will add it. We
20	will discuss
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: But SC&A was

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS

1	supposed to make it an official finding. It
2	was just an observation, and I think SC&A was
3	going to revise their maybe they were going
4	to revise the report.
5	MR. MARSCHKE: No. I think the
6	issue was in the report, Paul.
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes. It was in
8	the report, but it wasn't a finding.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: It never got
10	carried over into the database. Basically, we
11	did this in two steps. We wrote the report.
12	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay. It wasn't
13	in the matrix then. Maybe that was the deal.
14	MR. MARSCHKE: And then we wrote
15	up the yes, then we had made the database,
16	and we converted everything over from the
17	reports to the database.
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right. Okay.
19	MR. MARSCHKE: And sometimes we
20	we missed this one.
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, that was it.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. MARSCHKE: And so we just have
2	to go back and add this, and we can add the
3	discussion that was presented. I remember
4	discussing this either in November or October
5	or last time we met. We can add that
6	discussion, and essentially well, then we
7	will leave it to the Subcommittee to but it
8	sounds to me like it is pretty well you
9	know, since NIOSH doesn't use the workbook in
10	that manner, it is almost a no, never mind.
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right, and that
12	way we can put it to bed.
13	MR. MARSCHKE: Exactly. We will
14	add it, and then the next time we meet we will
15	close it. I guess that is a carryover.
16	CHAIR MUNN: Does anyone have
17	anything else before we address administrative
18	issues and schedule?
19	DR. ULSH: I already talked to
20	Wanda about PROC-95.
21	MR. HINNEFELD: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	CHAIR MUNN: Are we ready to look
2	at calendar?
3	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
4	MR. KATZ: Did you get dates from
5	Dick, Wanda, before he left?
б	CHAIR MUNN: He said the one that
7	I was aiming for, which is May 12th, would be
8	fine for him.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: Wanda?
10	CHAIR MUNN: Yes?
11	MR. MARSCHKE: There is one thing.
12	Again, Russ sent responses to PROC-95, and we
13	did look at those, and we do have and I
14	don't know that I sent to the Work Group or
15	the Subcommittee yet the NIOSH has gone
16	through or SC&A has gone through those, and
17	we do have recommendations.
18	They are not either in the
19	database or they are not in they have not
20	been sent by email to the Subcommittee because
21	we just kind of got these at the last moment.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1	If you want I mean, the first
2	one we have the file here. We can put it
3	up on the screen, or we can just wait until
4	next time, and I can update the database and
5	send it to the Subcommittee so that
б	DR. ULSH: Yes, that is what I was
7	asking about on the first one. I didn't think
8	we had covered this.
9	CHAIR MUNN: Well, all I had was
10	to provide responses for PROC-95. There were
11	two, and to load responses into the database
12	and assure the paragraphs were numbered
13	properly for TIB-13.
14	Elyse said that that was her job
15	to do and that she would do it this morning.
16	Elyse, are you still there?
17	MS. THOMAS: Yes.
18	CHAIR MUNN: Did I misunderstand?
19	MS. THOMAS: No, that is correct.
20	I have not put our responses in the database
21	because I just got access recently.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes. The database
2	has not been updated with either the NIOSH
3	responses or the SC&A recommendations, and
4	nobody has seen the SC&A recommendations
5	except for what is up here on the screen right
б	now. So the question is do we want to go
7	through these at this obviously, Paul and
8	Mark will be kind of left in the dark.
9	CHAIR MUNN: And so will Dr.
10	Lemen.
11	MR. MARSCHKE: And Dr. Lemen.
12	MEMBER GRIFFON: I don't know.
13	The recommendations that I see from NIOSH are
14	to basically defer them to other places. So I
15	don't see any big deal in closing these items
16	out.
17	MR. MARSCHKE: Our recommendation
18	for 95-1 was to close it; 95-2 was to transfer
19	it to OTIB-19.
20	MEMBER GRIFFON: Right, which is
21	what NIOSH is recommending, too, and 3 is

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

going to the report 44.

Т	going to the report 44.
2	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes. I mean, we
3	could either we had it as in progress, but
4	if you wanted to transfer it to report 44,
5	which you guys have just assigned us, then
б	that would be you know.
7	MEMBER GRIFFON: The only question
8	I would have and I don't know if Liz is
9	hanging in there, but I am a little curious if
10	maybe I am misreading that, but report 44 -
11	- it seems like that wouldn't necessarily be a
12	procedure that would guide a dose
13	reconstructor. Rather, it is a report, but
14	maybe you are using this as guidance as well.
15	It seems like it is an issue dealing with the
16	sensitive data and how to handle it.
17	CHAIR MUNN: Right.
18	MEMBER GRIFFON: Shouldn't that be
19	in the procedure, rather than just in a
20	report?

21 MS. THOMAS: I don't remember why

1

1	it was written as a report rather than it
2	is not something that the dose reconstructors
3	use. It was written for a co-worker study.
4	MEMBER GRIFFON: Right. It is
5	needed in the co-worker stuff. Yes. That is
б	true. At any rate, this is the co-worker
7	model procedure, and I thought, just as far as
8	where to deal with the issue, it seemed to me
9	it was I don't know, and I don't know
10	exactly how you deal with reports versus
11	procedures.
12	I guess as long as it is captured
13	somewhere and it is correctly done I don't
14	think it is a problem. That was the only
15	question I had.
16	CHAIR MUNN: Well, it might be a
17	problem if we are going to be looking at
18	procedures that are characterized as reports
19	at some juncture in the future, if that
20	continues to be an issue for us.
01	Tom willing to follow the

21 I am willing to follow the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	direction of the rest of the Subcommittee in
2	this respect, but because nobody but Mike and
3	I are here in person right now, I am hesitant
4	to do anything other than have the responses
5	loaded into the database at this juncture,
6	although if you Paul, how do you feel about
7	it?
8	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I kind of
9	agree with Mark, and I am willing to go ahead
10	if the others are okay with it.
11	MEMBER GRIFFON: We are not really
12	leaving the findings on the second and third
13	one. We are just transferring them to other
14	procedures, and we will still address them.
15	It is not like we are losing the technical
16	discussion.
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
18	CHAIR MUNN: So our preference
19	then is that Elyse will go ahead and upload
20	the NIOSH responses, and following that Steve
21	will magically add in the SC&A responses, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	Item 1 then will be changed to closed. Item 2
2	will be transferred, and Item 3 will go to
3	Report 44. Correct?
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
5	MEMBER GRIFFON: That sounds good.
6	CHAIR MUNN: All right with you,
7	Mike?
8	MEMBER GIBSON: Yes.
9	CHAIR MUNN: All right.
10	DR. ULSH: Steve, which one did
11	you recommend transfer to for PROC-95-2? Was
12	that OTIB-19?
13	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes.
14	CHAIR MUNN: All right. Any other
15	issues we didn't touch on? I guess we could
16	give Steve an opportunity to fill in the
17	blanks. That would be helpful.
18	MR. KATZ: We could do the
19	calendar while Steve is typing.
20	CHAIR MUNN: As much as I would
21	like to schedule a meeting of this group in

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 April, it is not going to be possible to do 2 so.

3 the week prior to the In May, meeting in Buffalo, the SEC Issues Group is 4 5 going to be meeting here on May 11th. I would if 6 suqqest that, at all possible, this Subcommittee meet the following day on May 7 8 12th. There are a couple of reasons for that. 9 One is I believe I will be able to travel that week. I am not sure. 10 The other is we would really like to have a small little 11 12 get-together the night of the 11th, if we 13 could, for Larry Elliott, and if we can set 14 our meeting in such a way that it meshes with the other meetings that are already on the 15 16 calendar.

I recognize the problem, especially that NIOSH has with regard to preparations for the New York meeting, but waiting more than essentially eight weeks for another meeting here really does put us in a

NEAL R. GROSS

(202) 234-4433

slowed down procedural process where everybody 1 2 forgets what we were talking about the last time. 3 We have a large burden of carry-4 5 overs here, and SC&A will have quite a bit to 6 do between now and then. I think probably efforts bulk 7 their be the of our may activities next time, but anyone who has any 8 9 feelings one way or the other about whether we can do a meeting on May 12th, please speak 10 11 now. is 12 MEMBER ZIEMER: This Ziemer. 13 You may recall, we are also trying to schedule 14 TBD-6000, and we are down to two dates for it, either the 10th or the 12th. I haven't heard 15 16 Bob Anigstein from vet from SC&A on his 17 schedule, and I haven't heard from John Poston So I am still waiting to hear from them, 18 yet. 19 but for the ones involved in that one, it would be Josie, Wanda, Mark, Poston and me, 20 21 and then Dave Allen for NIOSH and Dick Stein

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

But so far the 10th and the 12th for SC&A. 1 2 are both clear dates. I think, for Mark, the 12th was 3 Wanda, you said the 12th was the 4 the best. 5 best for you also. б CHAIR MUNN: Yes, it is. 7 MEMBER ZIEMER: But that was 8 before you talking about this were group 9 meeting. I suppose the 13th might also be a possibility, if we got into that. 10 11 CHAIR MUNN: There is the 12 Surrogate Data Work Group telecom that day, but it is only half a day. 13 It is in the 14 afternoon. MR. KATZ: I don't think the 13th 15 will work for that reason. 16 17 MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, that is right. That is at one o'clock on the 13th. Although 18 Dave Allen indicated he was okay to meet on 19 20 that date, I haven't got a confirmation from him that they have finished going through all 21

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	of the General Steel Industries documents that
2	were, I think, basically obtained with Dr.
3	McKeel's help. So I am not sure where he is
4	on those, but I made the assumption when he
5	said he was available that he would have
6	finished that review because that is critical
7	to the TBD-6000 meeting.
8	So that is the other piece of the
9	picture we need to be aware of.
10	MR. KATZ: Mark, if you are booked
11	on the 10th and the 12th, that would work for
12	you?
13	MEMBER GRIFFON: Not very well,
14	but I would the 11th, 12th and the
15	Surrogate, I could do. The 10th is pushing it
16	for me, other commitment-wise.
17	MR. KATZ: Okay, because for the
18	TBD-6000, we need you.
19	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, I know. I
20	know, and I don't want to miss that one or the
21	Procedures.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	CHAIR MUNN: How much overlap do
2	we have between 6000 and Surrogate Data?
3	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right now, not a
4	whole lot. The Surrogate Data is essentially
5	6000 in terms of Texas City, but TBD-6000
6	isn't handling the Texas City one.
7	Then presumably, the 6001 stuff is
8	going to be a separate Work Group, but I
9	haven't heard from Jim yet.
10	MR. KATZ: But that is correct,
11	Paul. That is correct. It is going to be a
12	separate Work Group.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: I had thought
14	initially that I think, in terms of
15	volunteers, several people who volunteered for
16	that were also on the 6000, but I don't know
17	that that has been established yet for sure.
18	CHAIR MUNN: I haven't seen
19	anything.
20	MR. KATZ: It is not out yet. It
21	is not finished yet.

1	CHAIR MUNN: So in terms of
2	people, the 6000 and Surrogate Data Work
3	Groups don't overlap very much, do they?
4	MEMBER GRIFFON: I think it is
5	just Paul and I. Right, Paul, that overlap?
6	MEMBER ZIEMER: I am on that one,
7	and I am on the SEC Work Group on the 11th.
8	CHAIR MUNN: So being purely
9	selfish here, I am still looking at May 12th
10	for this group.
11	MR. KATZ: But, Wanda, that pretty
12	much will knock out our being able to have
13	that TBD-6000 Work Group then because Mark is
14	not going to be able to do four days of Work
15	Groups that week.
16	MEMBER GRIFFON: I can't do four
17	days in Cincinnati anyway.
18	CHAIR MUNN: Well, I was going to
19	say he could just bring his bicycle. He will
20	be fine, I am sure. You can do it, Mark. You
21	are the iron man, right?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

260

1	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.
2	MR. KATZ: Can we back up a little
3	bit on the Procedures in terms of dates from
4	the 12th?
5	CHAIR MUNN: I can't travel.
б	MR. KATZ: Before that week?
7	CHAIR MUNN: I doubt it very much
8	that I would be able to.
9	MS. HOWELL: The 14th?
10	CHAIR MUNN: I could do the 14th.
11	MR. KATZ: Oh, my gosh. But
12	considering there is a Board meeting the next
13	week, that is fairly brutal for everyone. I
14	think SC&A is getting red. I think that is
15	pretty ugly. I will do whatever anyone wants
16	myself. It is not my problem, but
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I am not
18	sure which is the most critical. We can
19	certainly have the we can have the TBD-6000
20	later, but it is going to end up in June, if
21	we do that.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	CHAIR MUNN: Or earlier I could
2	certainly I could be on the telephone for
3	TBD-6000 if it were done the preceding week.
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, the
5	preceding week, Ted Katz isn't available.
6	CHAIR MUNN: All right.
7	MEMBER GRIFFON: You had narrowed
8	it down from a lot of dates. I know that,
9	Paul. Right?
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: What's that?
11	MEMBER GRIFFON: You had narrowed
12	it down from a lot of dates.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, right, and
14	Mark, you are not available between the 13th -
15	- I had the 13th, 14th, 23rd and 27th on
16	any of those dates well, the 13th and 14th,
17	we have several people not available.
18	MR. KATZ: I am not sure that I am
19	not available the first week in May. I think
20	I am.
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, first week in

1	May? No, I am not available the first week in
2	May.
3	MR. KATZ: Oh, you are not?
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: No.
5	MEMBER GRIFFON: What were the
б	other ones again, Paul? The 13th and 14th are
7	definitely out for me. April we are talking
8	about?
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right. The 23rd
10	and the 27th I had, but the 27th was out for
11	Katz, and the 26th was out for Mark.
12	MR. KATZ: Email me. I will try
13	to make it.
14	MEMBER GRIFFON: I was going to
15	say I could do the 27th, but I can't do the
16	23rd, no.
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right. And Wanda
18	can't be available in March or April,
19	rather.
20	CHAIR MUNN: No, but I could call
21	in.

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Could call in.
2	CHAIR MUNN: Yes. I think it
3	would be all right. So?
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, the only one
5	of those maybe that would be possible would be
6	the 23rd, I guess, but you are not available,
7	Mark. You would have to call in. Right?
8	MEMBER GRIFFON: And even if I
9	could call in, I still might miss part of it.
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes. So that
11	wouldn't be good.
12	MS. HOWELL: What about the 18th?
13	MR. KATZ: So Emily is just asking
14	about the 18th in Buffalo. We are there the
15	19th, 20th, 21st.
16	CHAIR MUNN: But it is not
17	Buffalo. It is Niagara Falls.
18	MR. KATZ: Paul, do you expect
19	that this TBD-6000 meeting possibly will be
20	closing out the Work Group's work on GSI?
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: That is going to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	be very dependent on where Dave Allen is on
2	their review of the materials. I don't have a
3	hint at the moment. I guess I am going to be
4	surprised if we can close out. There's a lot
5	of issues. I would like to be able to. There
6	has certainly been pressure on us to close
7	that out.
8	MEMBER GRIFFON: Paul, what if we
9	said here that May 12th will either be TBD-
10	6000 or the Procedures Subcommittee, depending
11	on what you hear from Dave, because he may not
12	even be ready. Right?
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, that is a
14	possibility. I would say let's reserve it,
15	and then whichever.
16	MEMBER GRIFFON: Reserve the day.
17	I don't know. I would argue, if Dave is
18	ready, that is probably a little more
19	pressing, the 6000 group.
20	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, you are probably
21	correct. I am certainly open to Emily's

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

265

1	suggestion. I have no problem with
2	considering the 18th for this meeting in
3	Buffalo or Niagara Falls.
4	MR. KATZ: Niagara Falls. Mark,
5	can you handle that?
б	MEMBER GRIFFON: I guess. I am
7	just afraid, if it is an aggressive agenda,
8	you know, if we are all trying to get ready
9	for the
10	MR. KATZ: Yes. Well, it is going
11	to be a it is going to be a busy Board
12	meeting again, like the last one.
13	MEMBER GRIFFON: Right.
14	CHAIR MUNN: But then there are
15	advantages as well.
16	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, let's go
17	ahead and block off the 12th, and I will talk
18	to Dave Allen and see what we can do and let
19	you know.
20	CHAIR MUNN: So tentatively, we
21	are going to say 6000 on the 12th. Right?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. KATZ: Tentatively, yes.
2	CHAIR MUNN: Tentatively. And can
3	we go ahead and lock in this one on the 18th?
4	I know no one finds that to be particularly
5	palatable.
6	MEMBER GRIFFON: Wanda, do you
7	think, if we did the 18th at the meeting, can
8	it be arranged that we do oh, no, that
9	won't work for you anyway.
10	CHAIR MUNN: What?
11	MEMBER GRIFFON: I was just
12	thinking, if I can do it, I would have to
13	travel the morning of the 18th, and I am not
14	sure what my options are to get up there
15	early.
16	MR. KATZ: So you are saying maybe
17	a half-day?
18	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, that is what
19	I was thinking, like a noon-time start, and
20	then we get everything done a little late, but
21	you know

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MS. HOWELL: If we could do this
2	in a half-day, then we could do it the morning
3	of the 13th.
4	MS. ADAMS: You could do two half-
5	days.
6	MR. KATZ: We could. The whole
7	prospect is seeming brutal to me, considering
8	the Board meeting, especially for you folks.
9	CHAIR MUNN: Well, rather than
10	waffle, let's go ahead and say that we will
11	meet in Niagara Falls on the 18th. We will
12	attempt to start at noon. Will noon be
13	adequate?
14	MEMBER GRIFFON: I can't answer
15	that, but I think so.
16	MR. KATZ: There are some good
17	flights.
18	CHAIR MUNN: Or if we find that
19	flights are impossible, then we can always
20	push it back to one.
21	MR. HINNEFELD: That makes more

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

NEAL R. GROSS

1	sense.
2	CHAIR MUNN: Does it?
3	MR. HINNEFELD: Afternoon start.
4	MR. KATZ: That means they have to
5	come in the night before.
6	MR. HINNEFELD: We may have to get
7	there the night before for Niagara Falls. I
8	was going to drive to Niagara Falls and go to
9	my in-laws. Instead of leaving on Tuesdays,
10	then I would be leaving on Monday. I would
11	lose the entire week before the Board meeting,
12	or the entire week of the Board meeting.
13	MS. HOWELL: If we thought it was
14	going to be a half-day, because the week
15	before it would still only be three days of
16	meeting, which it already is now, if you are
17	assuming that the TBD-6000 meeting is on the
18	12th. So to me, it is like not necessarily
19	MR. KATZ: What about Wanda, do
20	you have to be what about if you do it by
21	phone, Procedures? You can't do that?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	CHAIR MUNN: My personal feeling
2	is nothing is more difficult than trying to
3	deal with it. We did very little with the
4	database this time, and this makes the third
5	and
6	MR. KATZ: Okay, that's fine.
7	That's fine. I was just looking at the end of
8	the last week of April, which would work.
9	MEMBER GRIFFON: I hate to tell
10	you this, Wanda, but what about you know,
11	we are killing ourselves here with this
12	schedule.
13	MR. HINNEFELD: And I don't know
14	what can get accomplished in six weeks, and
15	May 12th is six weeks out.
16	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes. Then why
17	don't we push it into probably June?
18	MR. KATZ: Well, what about the
19	last week in May? Was that a no go for some
20	reason?
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: It is for me. I

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

wouldn't be available. 1 2 MR. KATZ: The last week in May is 3 no qood? Okay. MEMBER ZIEMER: And the 18th is 4 5 going to be problematic. б KATZ: Okay. Then let's MR. Looks like we are into June. 7 scratch that. 8 What about that first week in June? The first 9 week in June looks fine from my calendar. I believe I am on 10 MR. HINNEFELD: vacation Thursday and Friday of that week. 11 12 MR. KATZ: Okay. So there is 13 Monday, the 31st of May, Tuesday the 1st. 14 Monday the 31st is MR. HINNEFELD: Memorial Day. 15 16 MR. KATZ: Oh, right, right. 17 MEMBER GRIFFON: The 2nd is good for me, the best actually. 18 19 The 2nd? Yes, the 2nd MR. KATZ: would be probably best for anyone traveling, 20 21 so they don't have to do this for Memorial

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 Day. 2 MEMBER ZIEMER: I am not available 3 that week at all. DR. ULSH: I don't know if I am. 4 5 MR. KATZ: Okay, and Paul is not. The second week of June? June 8th? 6 7 MEMBER GRIFFON: Eighth or ninth 8 or 10th are okay with me. 9 MR. KATZ: Good for me. 10 DR. ULSH: I am going to have to 11 get back to you. I know I am going on 12 vacation in June. I just don't remember the 13 date. 14 Well, I will cover MR. HINNEFELD: 15 it if I need to. 16 Okay. June 8th is good MR. KATZ: 17 for you, Stu? HINNEFELD: 18 MR. Yes. 19 June 8 okay with you, MR. KATZ: 20 Wanda? Steve? Okay. June 8th, and I will 21 send an email to Dick.

1	MEMBER GRIFFON: Well, that was
2	the longest agenda item.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Not really.
4	MR. KATZ: It would have been even
5	longer if we had done this by email.
6	CHAIR MUNN: All right, June 8th,
7	Procedures in Cincinnati, and the great
8	letdown after the Niagara Falls meeting. All
9	of these outstanding items can magically be
10	addressed.
11	Is there anything else for the
12	good of the order? If not, thank you all very
13	much for hanging in there with us. We will
14	look forward to hearing your dulcet tones or
15	seeing your smiling face on Tuesday, June the
16	8th at 9:30.
17	This meeting is adjourned.
18	MR. KATZ: Thanks, everyone on the
19	line. Take care.
20	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
21	went off the record at 3:49 p.m.)

(202) 234-4433

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433