Group, has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and certified by the Chair of the Worker Outreach Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Worker Outreach Work

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL
NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL
SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

WORK GROUP ON WORKER OUTREACH

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 20, 2010

+ + + + +

The Work Group convened in the Montreal Room of the Cincinnati Airport Marriott, 2395 Progress Drive, Hebron, Kentucky, at 9:00 a.m., Michael H. Gibson, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

MICHAEL H. GIBSON, Chairman JOSIE BEACH, Member WANDA I. MUNN, Member PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official TERRIE BARRIE, ANWAG GRADY CALHOUN, DCAS BUCK CAMERON, ATL*
MARY ELLIOTT, ATL JOE FITZGERALD, SC&A EMILY HOWELL, HHS J.J. JOHNSON, DCAS JENNY LIN, HHS*
VERNON MCDOUGALL, ATL ARJUN MAKHIJANI, SC&A JOHN MAURO, SC&A*
KATHY ROBERTSON-DEMERS, SC&A

^{*}Participating via telephone

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Call to Order			5
Roll Call			5
Review of PROC-12			9
Finding 1			9
Kathy Robertson-Demers			9
J.J. Johnson			12
Finding 2			96
Kathy Robertson-Demers			96
J.J. Johnson			97
Finding 3			98
Kathy Robertson-Demers			98
J.J. Johnson			100
Finding 4			110
Kathy Robertson-Demers	110,	112,	129
J.J. Johnson	111,	113,	131
Finding 5			173
Kathy Robertson-Demers			173
J.J. Johnson			174
Observations 1 and 2			191
Kathy Robertson-Demers			191
J.J. Johnson			193

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S (CONTINUED)

Observation 3		196
Kathy Robertson-Demers		196
J.J. Johnson		198
Observation 4		211
Kathy Robertson-Demers		211
J.J. Johnson		211
Observation 5		212
Kathy Robertson-Demers		213
J.J. Johnson		214
Findings from Review of ORAUT-PROC-0097		215
Kathy Robertson-Demers		215
J.J. Johnson		217
Review/Discuss Objective 3 of the Plan for Effectiveness of Worker Outreach	224,	266
Public Comment		263
Terrie Barrie ANWAG		264
Administrative Detail and Calendar		290

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-1-N-G-5
2	(9:04 a.m.)
3	MR. KATZ: So, good morning,
4	everyone in the room and on the line.
5	This is the Advisory Board on
6	Radiation and Worker Health, the Worker
7	Outreach Work Group, and we are just getting
8	started here.
9	Before we go on the record, we are
10	going to do roll call, as usual, beginning
11	with Board Members in the room, with the
12	Chair.
13	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Mike Gibson,
14	Board Member, Chair of the Work Group.
15	MEMBER MUNN: Wanda Munn, Board
16	Member, Member of the Work Group.
17	MEMBER BEACH: Josie Beach, Board
18	Member, Member of the Work Group.
19	MR. KATZ: And do we have any
20	Board Members on the line?
21	(No response.)

- Okay. NIOSH ORAU team in the
- 2 room?
- MR. CALHOUN: Grady Calhoun,
- 4 NIOSH.
- 5 MR. JOHNSON: J.J. Johnson, NIOSH.
- 6 MR. McDOUGALL: Vern McDougall,
- 7 ATL.
- 8 MS. ELLIOTT: Mary Elliott, ATL.
- 9 MR. KATZ: And apologies to ATL
- 10 again. I slop you in there with the NIOSH
- 11 ORAU team.
- 12 And the same, on the line, NIOSH
- 13 ORAU/ATL?
- MR. CAMERON: Buck Cameron, ATL.
- 15 MR. KATZ: Okay, and then SC&A
- 16 members in the room? Joe Fitzgerald is here,
- 17 but he is making copies for us.
- 18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Kathy
- 19 Robertson-Demers, SC&A.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Arjun Makhijani,
- 21 SC&A.

- 1 MR. KATZ: And SC&A folks on the
- 2 line?
- 3 DR. MAURO: John Mauro, SC&A.
- 4 MR. KATZ: Very good. HHS
- officials or contractors to the feds: HHS or
- 6 other agencies in the room?
- 7 MS. HOWELL: Emily Howell, HHS.
- 8 MR. KATZ: And the same on the
- 9 line?
- 10 MS. ADAMS: Nancy Adams, NIOSH
- 11 contractor.
- MS. LIN: And Jenny Lin with HHS.
- 13 MR. KATZ: And finally, there are
- 14 no members of the public in the room, but do
- we have any members of the public on the line?
- 16 MS. BARRIE: This is Terrie Barrie
- 17 with ANWAG.
- 18 MR. KATZ: Welcome, Terrie.
- MS. BARRIE: Good morning.
- 20 MR. KATZ: Okay. Well, welcome to
- 21 everybody, and we'll get started.

1	Mike, it's your agenda.
2	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. I guess
3	everyone's got a copy of the agenda. We are
4	going to start out with the review of PROC-12,
5	the Issues Matrix. Joe should be back
6	momentarily with copies of that for us.
7	Then, we are going to look at
8	SC&A's review of the Objective 3 of our Plan
9	for Effectiveness.
10	Then, we are going to review the
11	current format of the way we are tracking
12	public comments, just take another look at it.
13	There's really no specific issue, but just
14	thought we would take a look at it while we
15	are here together.
16	And then, we will open the line up
17	after that for some claimant, advocate, worker
18	comments, public comments.
19	Then, we will discuss any issues
20	that may arise from that or that may arise
21	that any members may have that they want to

- 1 discuss. Then, we should be ready to close
- 2 out for the day after that.
- 3 MR. KATZ: Perfect timing. Joe
- 4 just walked in the room with the matrices.
- 5 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, not all the
- 6 copies, but certainly enough to get started,
- 7 and we will get some more copies.
- 8 MR. KATZ: Thank you.
- 9 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So, Joe's
- 10 handing out the matrix of -- SC&A took a
- 11 review of the OCAS PROC-12 and made a list of
- 12 some of the issues and items they want to
- discuss, and they have put it into a matrix.
- So, we will turn it over to SC&A,
- 15 and they can go through the matrix. Then, we
- 16 can just have some discussion of each issue.
- 17 MR. KATZ: And let me just, I
- 18 forgot to say, but for folks on the line,
- 19 except when you are addressing the group,
- 20 would you please mute your phones? And if you
- don't have a mute button, *6 will work. And

- then you use *6 again to take it off of mute.
- 2 Thank you.
- 3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. This
- 4 is Kathy Robertson-Demers.
- I am just going to go down through
- 6 the matrix items or the findings and
- 7 observations that we had in the Procedure
- 8 Review. I would assume that we are going to
- 9 explain our finding and then allow NIOSH the
- 10 opportunity to respond.
- 11 Okay. The first finding was the
- 12 procedure does not provide direction for
- 13 tracking, trending, evaluating or responding
- 14 to worker input.
- 15 Our primary concern with this was
- 16 that the procedure lacks direction for
- 17 evaluating and responding to worker comments
- and incorporating substantive comments into
- 19 the technical work documents. It does not
- 20 provide clear direction on the disposition of
- 21 worker input.

1 There is no explanation provided 2 with regard to extracting substantive comments worker outreach meeting minutes 3 consideration in technical work documents. 4 There 5 is no requirement for capturing substantive comments from meetings 6 primarily information-giving 7 that information-giving/gathering, 8 such as workshops, townhall meetings, et cetera. 9 10 procedure does The current not discuss how comments provided by workers are 11 evaluated to determine their potential impact 12 technical work documents and how 13 14 comments are resolved. In fact, post-meeting activities receive only passing mention in 15 PR-12. 16 17 unlike the functional And 18 interface that existed with Procedure ORAU-97, there is no functional interface between the 19 20 worker outreach procedure and the implementing documents for preparing Site Profiles and SEC 21

1 Evaluation Reports.

2 example, For there was an interface between PROC-97 and PROC-31, which 3 the Site Profile Development Procedure, 4 5 that interface required that, with the Site Profile development, you went back to the 6 worker outreach comments and considered those 7 comments in the development of a Site Profile, 8 and -97 also referenced out to PROC-31. 9 So, 10 that interface is no longer in existence. So, that is kind of where we stood on that finding 11 and an explanation of what that finding is all 12 13 about. 14 MR. KATZ: Thank you, Kathy.

15 J.J., do you want to comment?

Procedure MR. JOHNSON: 12 addresses action items, and action items are identified based upon professional judgment of the HP at the respective meetings. meetings there are ORAU HPs that, if there are

NEAL R. GROSS

action items, the interface between the two

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 1 can come up with an association of updating
- 2 Technical Basis Documents.
- Any action item that is identified is put into a tracking system. The tracking system provides an initial date, what the item is, who generated the item, whether it was identified by somebody in the audience or it was an observation for needing some additional information.

10 Through the process of identifying the item, there's coordination between the HP 11 12 t.he individual who is t.he technical and Through that effort, there is 13 document owner. 14 agreement as to when the item is to addressed, and what timely manner, based upon 15 level of effort, schedule, and the type of 16 17 item.

We can also identify whether you can update the item on a routine basis, and the concurrence of whether the item is to be closed and how it is to be closed is concurred

18

19

20

21

- 1 between the HP and the individual who the
- 2 action item is assigned to.
- 3 MEMBER BEACH: Jay, I just have a
- 4 question. Who takes on that responsibility if
- 5 an HP isn't at a meeting?
- 6 MR. JOHNSON: In accordance with
- 7 Procedure 12, we assign or we have individuals
- 8 who go out to the meetings and those
- 9 individuals are part of the DCAS HP group.
- 10 That individual is responsible for, and with
- the editor and minutes writer, to come up with
- 12 action items associated with the meeting. And
- 13 those action items are then incorporated into
- 14 the tracking system.
- 15 MEMBER BEACH: I just always have
- 16 a problem when I see something, a procedure
- that says, professional judgment, because each
- 18 individual has different professional
- 19 judgments. So, how would you ever have any
- 20 consistency when it's professional judgment?
- 21 MR. JOHNSON: Well, I think

1 professional judgment does have its 2 flexibilities, but that is why an individual particular 3 working on а assigned, and they have the experience behind 4 them, the knowledge of what they are working 5 therefore, the intuitiveness 6 on, and understand what the issues are and how to pick 7 those issues up. 8

MEMBER BEACH: Okay. So, now that you brought up a particular site, how will you have consistency amongst other different Because if you use a person at one sites? site because of their experience and knowledge of that site, and then you have another person at a different site, I quess the consistency issue and the professional judgment call in a procedure leads me to believe that, between the sites, even between individuals, it is not going to be consistent. I am wondering if we couldn't spell that out a little more.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, in my response

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 1 I have provided that.
- 2 MEMBER BEACH: I saw that, too.
- 3 MR. CALHOUN: It would be almost
- 4 impossible not to use professional judgment.
- 5 Because if you have ever been to one of these
- 6 meetings, I mean, it ranges from something
- 7 very specific like the TLDs on this board were
- 8 never read or they didn't have film, all the
- 9 way to, my cousin Bob used to come work in
- 10 here at this place and ate nuts and berries,
- or even something more nondescript.
- 12 It would be impossible, in my
- opinion, to nail that down any further than
- 14 professional judgment. Unfortunately, we are
- 15 kind of stuck with professional judgment when
- it comes to listening to what people have to
- 17 say about the site, trying to weigh that with
- 18 what we have heard and what we haven't heard,
- and see what that impact is going to be on the
- 20 document.
- 21 I have been to a lot of these

- outreach meetings myself, a lot of them. I don't know how you can spell out, well, we're going to look at this and track this, or we're not going to track this; this doesn't quite meet the threshold of what we're going to
- I'm all open for suggestions. I

 don't know what the options would be, other

 than saying, you know, we've got trained,

 qualified people doing these outreach meetings

 and you have got to rely on those people for

 determining what is substantive and what is

 not.

MEMBER MUNN: Well, there is another kind of tangential aspect to that, too. That is the fact that, from the outset, when we tried to establish a QA program for how we were going to address procedures and the activities that were undertaken, we said from the beginning that it was going to be necessary to evaluate each item on the impact

6

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

track.

- that it had, the severity of the issue that
- 2 was before us.
- One has to prioritize in some way
- 4 the information that pours into us because all
- 5 information is not equal and all sites are not
- 6 equal. The situations would vary enormously,
- 7 depending upon the magnitude of the comment in
- 8 terms of its impact on the rest of the
- 9 program, either at that site or complex-wide.
- 10 It is hard to imagine eliminating
- 11 judgment in --
- 12 MEMBER BEACH: And I don't think
- 13 I'm saying eliminate it. I just want to make
- 14 sure that it is consistent throughout and
- things aren't missed based on one person's
- 16 professional -- I just want it to be
- 17 consistent, I guess is what I am looking for.
- 18 I mean I understand professional
- 19 judgment. It is important. I just wanted to
- 20 make sure it was consistent.
- MR. JOHNSON: Well, to attempt

- that, I have indicated that I am going to put
- 2 some additional guidance in the procedure.
- 3 MEMBER BEACH: I did see that.
- 4 MR. JOHNSON: That was in green.
- 5 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.
- 6 MR. JOHNSON: So we are going to
- 7 follow through on that.
- 8 MR. KATZ: I'm sorry. Just for
- 9 the record, Phil Schofield, Board Member, has
- 10 joined us.
- Welcome, Phil.
- 12 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Thank you.
- 13 MR. KATZ: And why don't we, Kathy
- 14 and Wanda, if you can slide down a little bit,
- then Phil can come to the table. Otherwise,
- we are not going to be able to hear him.
- 17 MEMBER MUNN: Keep him in the
- 18 corner over there.
- 19 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Hey, I spent a
- 20 lot of time in the corner.
- 21 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, I know. We all

- 1 know about the corners, don't we?
- 2 MR. KATZ: Sorry. Sorry for
- 3 interrupting. I just wanted to catch that.
- 4 Thanks.
- 5 Sorry, Kathy. Go ahead.
- 6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I have a
- 7 couple of questions.
- 8 How do you determine what isn't
- 9 actionable? What process do you go through?
- 10 MR. JOHNSON: As I indicated, the
- 11 action item is determined based upon the
- 12 professional judgment of the individual in
- 13 review of the minutes, being there at the
- 14 meetings, and conferring with the individual
- that supported writing the minutes, along with
- 16 the HP associated with the respective site
- 17 which might be an ORAU HP.
- 18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I am
- 19 getting a little ahead of myself. I guess one
- 20 of the concerns I have is, in going through
- OTS, we have action items numbered up to 11.

- 1 There's things out there, and we have 118
- 2 meetings.
- 3 MR. JOHNSON: Well, you are
- 4 looking at a lot of historical stuff that you
- 5 asked to have put into the open list. We're
- 6 working on that. And it's impossible to try
- 7 to take an older system and a newer system and
- 8 backfit it. We are trying to gather that
- 9 information. The two systems are not
- 10 compatible with each other.
- 11 So, the action items that you are
- 12 referring to with regards to historical
- meetings are likely not going to that.
- 14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I think it
- 15 was a mix of some historical and some more
- 16 current meetings.
- 17 MR. JOHNSON: Very few historical
- or mostly probably historical ones that you
- 19 have identified, but more recent, newer ones
- 20 from other meetings.
- 21 MEMBER MUNN: Is it possible as we

- 1 go through these action items that we can zero 2 in on that one that we were discussing at the time and clarify at this meeting what 3 outstanding action items are? 4 current So 5 that, what is being carried over is not quite as unclear to the rapid reader as the format 6 that we have right now? 7 Perhaps I'm the only one that had 8 difficulty in trying to identify 9 10 myself what on the table right now as is opposed to what was considered an action item 11 and has, even though it says action item 12
- well, but it is not clear to me exactly what the crucial outstanding action items on each 15

closed there, it's not -- I'm not saying this

- of these items is to me right now. 16
- 17 don't know whether it is just format or whether this is an issue that may 18 not be closed in your view, and it is being 19 20 closed in someone else's view.
- 21 But if we can, as we address each

NEAL R. GROSS

13

14

- of these today, if we can be very specific
- 2 about what outstanding action items we now
- 3 have on each of these findings, it would
- 4 really be helpful.
- 5 MR. JOHNSON: Perhaps if Kathy can
- 6 be specific with her questions, then I could
- 7 be specific with my answer.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Well, I think
- 9 part of the issue is that this first finding
- 10 kind of spills over into other areas. At
- 11 least I thought Kathy was trying to explain
- 12 some issues, other issues, and how little
- 13 effect, you know, what needs to be addressed
- in this first finding.
- DR. MAURO: This is John Mauro.
- I have a question that goes toward
- 17 this, I think. When you have your minutes of
- 18 a meeting captured in some level of detail --
- 19 I have to admit I haven't looked at the OTS
- and the level of granularity of the minutes,
- 21 but I presume that embedded in that are a

- number of comments, suggestions, questions, et
- 2 cetera, offered-up information by the people
- you are speaking to, either individually or in
- 4 a group.
- Is there any provision to create a
- 6 log? That is, what I mean by that is, once
- you say there's a question, let's say someone
- 8 raises a question similar to the way questions
- 9 sometimes are raised at the full Board meeting
- 10 during the open sessions for the public. And
- then, effectively, a log is maintained. Ted
- 12 is maintaining a log of these things, and
- then, later on, the Board responds back on how
- they are being dealt with.
- 15 Is there a provision for that in
- 16 your procedure to sort of, as you act on any
- 17 given item that is in your minutes, is there
- any provision in your procedure for requiring
- 19 a log be maintained of what the follow-up
- 20 actions were? Or does it really just stop at
- that point? That is, you have logged it in,

- in the OTS and from there, it is used as
- 2 people see fit to use, which is a little
- 3 looser in terms of how to deal with these
- 4 things.
- 5 What I am hearing is, if there was
- 6 some kind of log of what is being done, you
- 7 know, that goes with each item, to the degree
- 8 to which you could itemize them sometimes is
- 9 kind of blurry. But, anyway, that is what I
- 10 am hearing is, is there any need to have such
- a log and tracking of followup to the material
- that is captured in the OTS?
- 13 MR. JOHNSON: Let me try to refine
- 14 that. We don't have a log. We have minutes.
- 15 We attend. We listen. We take notes. And
- 16 during the session or at the end of the
- 17 session, if we have any identified salient
- issues that we need to follow through on, they
- 19 are placed in the Outreach Tracking System.
- 20 In that system, there is a time basis by which
- it is inputted; it's identified when it should

- 1 be completed. It is assigned to an
- 2 individual. It is documented as to what the
- 3 issue is. And on a periodic basis, the HP
- 4 will check with the person who the issue is
- 5 assigned to and see what the progress is.
- In the results section of the
- 7 action item, you can either type information
- 8 in there as to what the status is or you can
- 9 actually copy and paste emails in there.
- DR. MAURO: Oh, okay. So, in
- other words, in practice, you are, in fact,
- 12 logging in and tracking. Is that written up
- in the procedure, in PROC-12?
- 14 MR. JOHNSON: It is in the
- 15 procedure, yes.
- 16 DR. MAURO: Oh, okay. All right.
- 17 Thank you.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Could I follow up
- on what Josie was asking about? I want to
- 20 focus on the worker, the information-gathering
- 21 interviews, right, are they always initiated

- 1 by somebody that is writing like a TBD or are
- they initiated from ATL or NIOSH or ORAU?
- 3 Because information-gathering is initiated
- 4 generally by somebody that is writing a
- 5 document, right?
- 6 MR. McDOUGALL: Yes, basically,
- 7 today, most of the information-gathering
- 8 meetings that are taking place today are in
- 9 support of a petition evaluation, in
- 10 preparation for a Petition Evaluation Report.
- So, the HP, the NIOSH HP who is
- 12 working that particular petition requests us
- to go out and arrange for the gathering of the
- information he needs.
- 15 A good example of that is in the
- 16 last couple or three months the GE Evendale
- 17 meetings. They had a specific, the Board had
- 18 a specific request of NIOSH. NIOSH asked us
- 19 to go out and facilitate that.
- 20 DR. MAKHIJANI: So, does the HP
- 21 who requests that meeting attend the meeting

- 1 to make sure --
- 2 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
- 3 DR. MAKHIJANI: It's that specific
- 4 HP who attends the meeting?
- 5 MR. JOHNSON: As far back as I can
- 6 recall, even back when we were doing the Site
- 7 Profiles, the NIOSH HP who was responsible for
- 8 that document was, I think in nearly every
- 9 single instance, at that meeting.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: And do they make
- 11 their own notes or do they just rely on your
- notes? And how do they get back to the HP?
- 13 MR. JOHNSON: I think they do
- 14 both. I think they make their own notes. I
- have been in meetings with Grady, and I know I
- 16 can recall him taking notes.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Right.
- 18 MR. JOHNSON: But they also have
- 19 access to our minutes.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: So, there should
- 21 be two sets, normally, from each of these

1 information-gathering meetings, there should 2 be two sets of documents that arise from that, A set of notes that was taken by the 3 specific 4 requesting $_{
m HP}$ who had a 5 questions -- I mean we do this all the time, We have a specific set of questions, and 6 we want to make sure they are all answered. 7 We try to make sure that we go through them. 8 And if the person is there themselves, then, 9 10 presumably, if they have made notes, they have made some effort to make sure that all their 11 questions were answered. 12 13 is that posted on the SRDB? 14 Or how does that work? How do you reconcile the --15 If there are notes 16 MR. JOHNSON: 17 taken, then those notes can be easily worked 18 with having looked at the minutes, once they 19 are developed, to see if those components are 20 addressed in the minutes or the notes can be given to the person developing the minutes to 21

- 1 ensure that those issues have been fully
- 2 addressed.
- Now, when the minutes are
- 4 developed, it is pretty much a complete
- 5 dissertation of the meeting itself.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Now that doesn't
- 7 show up in the procedure anywhere. Does each
- 8 requesting HP make their own notes --
- 9 MR. JOHNSON: No. Of course not.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: -- and then you
- incorporate that into the minutes?
- MR. JOHNSON: No, it's not. No.
- 13 It is just good business practice.
- 14 DR. MAKHIJANI: I don't understand
- 15 that.
- 16 I'm just interested in the
- 17 functional aspect of this thing. If you have
- information-gathering meetings, and then the
- 19 HP has a set of questions, they make notes to
- 20 make sure that they have the information they
- 21 need. Then, there are two things that I think

- should happen, and maybe I'm wrong, and I should be happy to be corrected.
- One is, when the HP actually uses
 that information in the document, there should
 be some reference to his notes from which he
 worked, because they are his notes and his
 understanding of what happened at the meeting.

 There should be some way of making sure that
- those notes were reflected appropriately, that they are posted.

And then, the second track of that would be getting back to the worker and making sure that the HP is properly using the information, that he understood what went on properly.

And there are a lot of different ways to do that. We have our own way of doing that, and you prepare these minutes.

But I would think that the notes
taken by the originating HP would be the most
document in a way operationally for the

NEAL R. GROSS

11

12

13

14

15

- 1 preparation of the TBD or Evaluation Report or
- whatever is happening.
- 3 Does the procedure specify that
- 4 the originating HP be present? I mean, if
- they are always present, that is wonderful. I
- 6 mean, that is a big concern that is allayed,
- 7 and maybe it should just be mentioned.
- 8 But this operational thing is
- 9 puzzling because I did not know that the HP
- 10 made their own notes and that you reconciled
- 11 those notes. Do the workers ever see those
- 12 notes?
- 13 MR. JOHNSON: Let me just say that
- if they have notes -- the procedure doesn't
- 15 require them to take notes because we have
- 16 minutes, and then the minutes are reviewed by
- 17 the HP.
- 18 So, if he has or she has notes,
- 19 they can compare those notes to the minutes to
- 20 verify that the points of interest that we
- 21 have are addressed in the minutes.

1 If they have any issues, 2 issues, that they want to follow, they address 3 those. action 4 DR. MAKHIJANI: Do the 5 refer both ways? There's a action items for the HP to pay attention to 6 7 that from the meeting and arose the preparation of the document and 8 a set of action items that gets back to the workers in 9 10 terms of their questions and informs them as to how the minutes were used in the ER? 11 JOHNSON: 12 MR. There's no distinction between the two. 13 14 DR. MAKHIJANI: Because I am not aware of action items that refer to an HP, but 15 I'm not comprehensively aware of the action 16 17 items; Kathy and our team is. 18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Perhaps one 19 of the questions is once you kind of institute

do

comments get integrated into the Site Profile

these

how

action

items,

20

21

substantive

1		- lo -	CEC	
1	anu	LIIE	ン正し	process?

2	MR. JOHNSON: Earlier I indicated
3	that the OCAS HP be at the meeting.
4	Associated with the OCAS HP is an individual
5	who is assigned by ORAU to be the technical
6	document owner. Between those two individuals
7	and the assignment of the action item and the
8	closure of the action item, if it requires to
9	be something to update the Technical Basis
10	Document, the closure will identify that,
11	along with the coordination with the Technical
12	Basis Document owner.
13	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. And
14	how are the Technical Basis Document owners
15	getting access to the historical comments
16	which may be of relevance since the release of
17	the last version of the TBD?
18	MR. JOHNSON: Well, if we are

NEAL R. GROSS

talking three years ago, those items should

there were issues that were identified at that

have gone through the WISPR system.

19

20

21

And if

- 1 point in time justifiable to update the
- 2 Technical Basis Documents, they should be out
- there, and they should be in the cover letter
- 4 of the technical document as to where the
- 5 information came from and when it was updated.
- 6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: The front,
- 7 the summary page of the TBD?
- 8 MR. JOHNSON: Of the Technical
- 9 Basis Document, TBD or technical document,
- 10 right.
- 11 MR. McDOUGALL: Kathy, just one
- 12 point. Any minutes, if the minutes or the
- 13 source documents for any of these concerns,
- 14 any minutes from any meeting going back to
- 15 2003, if they are not in the OTS, they are
- 16 certainly online. They are on the NIOSH
- 17 website. It is not like they are hard to
- 18 find. So, if you wanted to see the minutes
- 19 from a meeting from 2004, 2005, they are right
- there on the NIOSH website.
- 21 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Or on the

- 1 SRDB?
- MR. McDOUGALL: And/or, yes. But,
- 3 as a default, they are all on the NIOSH
- 4 website. So, the worst thing, the worst case
- 5 scenario is you just go to the public website,
- and there they are. There's 100-and-some-odd
- 7 sets of minutes out there.
- 8 MS. ELLIOTT: And as of yesterday,
- 9 the final minutes for all the historical
- 10 before June 2007 are in the OTS.
- 11 MR. KATZ: That's great.
- 12 MR. JOHNSON: Another issue about
- 13 the OTS is that anything that goes in as a
- 14 document automatically goes into the SRDB
- 15 associated with that particular site.
- 16 MEMBER MUNN: In my simplistic
- mind, I am attempting to go through the action
- items that we have before us. And as I see, I
- 19 believe, a very simple way to address my first
- 20 concern, which is how to address what is still
- 21 an outstanding action item.

- 1 If we are going to look at this
- table at all, I am not sure, am I fouling up
- 3 the process here by referring to the outreach
- 4 program?
- 5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: It was more
- 6 meant as a guidance to do this meeting than
- 7 anything else.
- 8 MEMBER MUNN: Well, good. Good.
- 9 All right. Because that's what I'm trying to
- 10 do, is get through the meeting.
- 11 Under NIOSH responses, there are a
- 12 couple of things that I don't understand in
- 13 Item F1. One of the things is I do not
- 14 understand the marking after Action Item
- 15 Source, and there are two parallel lines about
- 16 halfway down the page where the first space
- 17 occurs. Additionally, to aid in identifying
- 18 the source or initiator for the item, an
- 19 action item source --
- 20 MS. ELLIOTT: Those are quotation
- 21 marks.

1	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes.
2	MEMBER MUNN: That's a quote?
3	MS. ELLIOTT: And they transferred
4	somehow weird into the
5	MEMBER MUNN: All right. All
6	right. So that is just a typing thing.
7	On the next page is where I see
8	the first indication of what my reading tells
9	me is an outstanding action item. And it is
10	near the bottom of the page on page, what is
11	numbered 4 here.
12	It says, Action, and then follows
13	some specification as to what actions are
14	going to be taken. And then, on page 5, it
15	again says, Action and again some
16	specifications. Similarly, on page 6.
17	It seems to me if we, at the very
18	least, would bold the word action in each
19	case
20	MEMBER BEACH: Well, those actions
21	came up through J.J., you guys worked on

- 1 those, right?
- MR. JOHNSON: Right. What I did,
- 3 I did not have this.
- 4 MEMBER BEACH: Sure. Sure. She
- 5 just took care of that.
- 6 MR. JOHNSON: So, what I did is I
- 7 just took what I had and went through,
- 8 addressed the respective findings and
- 9 observations. And then, anything that I was
- 10 going to do in support of trying to heal or
- 11 address that finding or observation, I put it
- in green.
- 13 MEMBER BEACH: Right.
- 14 MR. JOHNSON: Green is what I am
- going to do to update the procedures.
- 16 MEMBER MUNN: I understand, and I
- 17 understand that that is a fine method of
- 18 differentiating, except that, quite often, we
- 19 don't get the coloring when we are -- it
- 20 depends on what format we are looking at,
- 21 whether we have the color or not.

1 Ι suggesting simple а very am 2 clerical way to help, I hope, identify what we are doing as opposed to what we have done. 3 And if you used "Action" in bold, regardless 4 5 of what color we are using it in, anything that follows tells us what action is 6 going to take place. it is 7 Then, simple thing to, at the end, when any one of 8 9 those action items is taken care of, to also 10 bold Closed at the end of it, so that it will be easy for anyone glancing at it 11 in any format to see that an action item has been 12 addressed and closed. 13 14 I'm just talking clerics here, but is that feasible to ask that we do 15 that in the future? 16 17 MEMBER BEACH: I think the timing, 18 J.J. sent those out the day before Kathy got them, threw them in a document, so that we 19 20 would have them for today. 21 But the action items, we haven't

- 1 really discussed them as a group. They are
- 2 great that you guys came up with your own
- 3 action items, but there might be some
- 4 additions that we decide, and it may change
- 5 that form also.
- 6 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, it may.
- 7 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.
- 8 MEMBER MUNN: But, if it's all
- 9 right with everyone else, then I will be
- 10 quiet.
- 11 (Laughter.)
- 12 If it's patently clear to everyone
- 13 sitting at this table exactly what everyone is
- doing, and Wanda is the only one that doesn't
- 15 understand that, then Wanda will shut her
- mouth.
- 17 But I am just trying to identify
- the easiest, most clear way for anyone who
- 19 picks this particular document up in the
- 20 future to understand the format. To me, that
- is an easy formatting to do. If it's not

- 1 sustainable, fine.
- 2 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: It's
- doable.
- 4 MEMBER MUNN: Good.
- 5 MR. CALHOUN: And I agree with
- 6 you, Wanda. I think it seems like we should
- 7 get the action items, respond. If you accept
- 8 them, you accept them; if you don't, you
- 9 don't. And we'll decide to agree on that or
- 10 not. Then, if we have new items, we will do
- 11 them. That is the only way to get through
- 12 these meetings, you know.
- 13 MEMBER MUNN: It seems so to me.
- MR. CALHOUN: Yes.
- MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Do we want
- 16 to go through the list of action items? Do we
- want to let J.J. do that, his list, and then
- 18 discuss any additional?
- 19 MR. JOHNSON: Well, I can go
- 20 through them.
- 21 Professional judgment, again,

- 1 professional judgment is expected as a method
- of determining appropriate impact and follow-
- 3 through resolution of action items. And that
- 4 was the expectation of the procedure.
- 5 To enhance that, I have proposed
- 6 that additional guidance be placed in the
- 7 procedure for action items, and those items
- 8 are, the response will address action items'
- 9 commitment date, based on priority, workload,
- 10 level of effort, or resolution.
- 11 The response will be reviewed for
- 12 technical adequacy. The response will
- 13 designate whether a technical document
- 14 requires an update. And the response will be
- 15 coordinated to effect completion, whether it
- is an update of a document response to an
- 17 individual or et cetera.
- 18 MEMBER MUNN: The response will be
- 19 coordinated? I quess I understand everything
- 20 except the response will be coordinated to
- 21 effect completion. Coordinated with whom?

1 MR. JOHNSON: Coordinated to 2 either update a technical document, provide a response to an individual. It's a closing-out 3 activity. 4 5 MEMBER MUNN: Okay. So all of the actions in the response will be coordinated, 6 essentially is what we are saying? 7 8 MR. JOHNSON: Right. 9 MR. CALHOUN: Between the HP and 10 the document development team, I would say, something like that. Is that --11 12 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. 13 MEMBER MUNN: Perhaps I'm just not understanding the language properly. 14 DR. MAKHIJANI: Did you want it up 15 there in the process part? 16 17 MEMBER MUNN: No. This raises the 18 second issue in terms of handling the matrix, for me in any case. 19 Will we attempt, are we 20 going to attempt at this meeting to resolve these action items or at least to define the 21

1 status for them, since the action item status

2 for the entire issue is open?

each of these goes along, 3 this going to continue to be considered? 4 Is 5 action item going to continue to considered a completely open item or are you 6 identifying a separate status for it? 7 Is there going to be a discussion of it here and 8 9 some response from the SC&A team and from the 10 Members of the Board as to whether this is acceptable to do, and if so, what we are going 11 to call the status of it if it is acceptable, 12 but we have to wait to see the fruition of it? 13 Wanda, maybe you want 14 MR. KATZ: to, because not everyone here is familiar with 15 how Procedures deals with those categories, 16 17 why don't you sort of lay out the framework 18 that you use in the Procedures Subcommittee for them to consider? 19 20 MEMBER MUNN: That is essentially

NEAL R. GROSS

what I was referring to.

21

In the Procedures

- 1 Review Subcommittee, where we have multiple
- 2 procedures to deal with all the time with
- 3 multiple findings, literally hundreds of
- 4 findings, what we attempt to do -- and I know,
- I am sorry, this is old stuff for you, Mike --
- 6 but what we attempt to do is just what I
- 7 outlined.
- 8 We start with the finding. We ask
- 9 for NIOSH to respond to the finding. When
- 10 NIOSH responds to the finding, then the
- 11 responses to that single finding are discussed
- 12 at length in a setting like this one and we
- 13 come to a conclusion of what the status of
- 14 that is.
- In some cases, SC&A accepts that
- 16 response, that's fine, and that finding is
- 17 closed. If SC&A does not accept that
- 18 response --
- 19 MR. KATZ: Well, just to clarify,
- the Subcommittee, not just SC&A, has to accept
- 21 the finding.

1 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, yes. But it's 2 a rare occasion when NIOSH and SC&A agree on a finding and the Subcommittee does not. 3 But if this body sitting here now 4 the discussion that occurs 5 in this meeting as being acceptable for closure of 6 that particular action item, it is closed. 7 Ιf they do not accept it, then one of the other 8 entities, either NIOSH or SC&A, is charged 9 10 with an action item where they are to come back to the body with a response to whatever 11 12 the issue is. 13 In that case, we do not consider 14 that action open. As soon as we have addressed something -- only items that have 15 been unaddressed are considered open. 16 17 have addressed it, then, if there is something 18 going on with it, we call it in process. 19 If you are going to get back to me 20 with a notation of here's the change that's going to occur in the procedure, then that 21

- item and our record will go into in abeyance,
- which means we're done with it until we see
- 3 the response to what has been agreed to.
- 4 Something that is actively being
- 5 addressed and there is no response to right
- 6 now is in progress.
- 7 And in some cases, we decide that
- 8 this particular finding should not be
- 9 discussed in this forum; it should be in the
- 10 hands of the work group that is assigned to
- 11 that site or to that activity, and we will
- transfer to that organization, to that group,
- until they have completed their review of it,
- 14 at which time they advise us of how it is
- being closed. And we then close the item.
- So there are a half-dozen modes of
- 17 approaching an action item the way we do it in
- 18 our complex matrix. What I am suggesting is
- 19 that not necessarily that specific form of
- 20 process be addressed here, but that we
- 21 consider something like it.

1 So that the next time we have this 2 matrix, I can pick it up and very easily, by looking in a status column by each action item 3 underneath the findings, I can identify in my 4 5 own mind where we are with that. Then, I can look at it and see who owes what or whether it 6 is, in fact -- I won't even look at anything 7 if it's closed. 8 9 it's closed, the history Ιf 10 here, which I think is vital for all of us. It's certainly vital for me. If I can't look 11 back at the history six months from now and 12 see what we did at this meeting, then I am 13 14 completely at a loss because I have no memory at all of what I have done when I was sitting 15 here or what I said when we were talking about 16 17 this. 18 But the bottom line is Ι am 19 suggesting that adopt we some type of 20 differentiation as we go through these things, and that we normally go through them in a 21

- 1 fairly constructive manner, so that we all
- 2 know what to expect. And when we see this
- later, we will instantly remember what we have
- 4 done rather than rehashing it.
- 5 MR. FITZGERALD: Maybe the
- 6 importance is the context is the
- 7 responsiveness as a procedure. I mean some of
- 8 these new approaches or maybe some
- 9 modifications we talked about might not be
- 10 tested until they are actually used.
- 11 MEMBER MUNN: True.
- 12 MR. FITZGERALD: I mean I don't
- 13 think we should conflate whether or not they
- 14 end up demonstrating effectiveness, but we
- 15 talked about whether it is responsive as a new
- 16 procedure or a revised procedure.
- 17 MEMBER MUNN: We have to keep in
- 18 mind, at least I have to keep in mind, what
- 19 our purpose is here, what exactly are we
- 20 trying to accomplish. And I don't think it's
- 21 perfection, but in my mind it is some level of

- 1 quality assurance with respect to how we
- 2 approach worker outreach.
- 3 MEMBER BEACH: I think that is a
- 4 great idea. Wanda, who takes responsibility
- for that? Because I know in some groups SC&A
- 6 updates these, and in some NIOSH may take that
- 7 role. I guess it is important to establish
- 8 who is going to do that --
- 9 MEMBER MUNN: It is.
- 10 MEMBER BEACH: -- so they can
- 11 start tracking it while we are going through
- 12 this.
- 13 MR. KATZ: I think in most cases
- 14 SC&A does the matrices. Even with our
- 15 Procedures database, SC&A has someone who sort
- of does the paperwork part of it or electronic
- 17 work of updating that database.
- 18 MEMBER MUNN: What we have tried
- 19 to do is establish a point of contact, one in
- 20 the agency and one in the contractor
- 21 organization. So that, when anyone else has a

- 1 question, they have a go-to person to ask the
- 2 specific question of.
- 3 MR. FITZGERALD: But I think it is
- 4 a secretariat-type function, though.
- 5 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, it is.
- 6 MR. FITZGERALD: Because, really,
- 7 it is for the Committee or for the Work Group.
- 8 And the Work Group, in the end, has to agree
- 9 with the nature of this.
- 10 MEMBER MUNN: True.
- 11 MR. KATZ: So, in Procedures, we
- 12 do this in real-time. We have this database
- that eventually all the Work Groups will be
- 14 able to use and it gets updated as you go
- 15 finding by finding. So, this finding now is
- 16 closed; this finding now is in abeyance; this
- 17 is in progress. We do it as we go through
- 18 each one, and then there's no sort of after-
- 19 action needed. It is all taken care of during
- 20 the meeting. That is nice.
- We are not quite ready to, I

- think, roll that out to other work groups,
- 2 but --
- 3 MEMBER MUNN: It still has a
- 4 couple of rough edges.
- 5 MR. KATZ: Yes. So I think it
- 6 would be great if SC&A would just keep the
- 7 matrix up on the status of items, Kathy, since
- 8 you have already gotten the ball rolling with
- 9 developing a matrix.
- 10 MEMBER MUNN: If that will work,
- 11 it seems like a straightforward way to
- 12 approach it.
- 13 And my concern, my personal
- 14 concern, is that the next time I pick this up
- 15 I won't remember what we did or what we said
- 16 unless there is a notation of some sort to
- 17 remind me.
- 18 MEMBER BEACH: I think it is a
- 19 great idea. It works very well in 6000, in
- our Work Group 6000. Otherwise, we would all
- 21 be in trouble.

- MR. FITZGERALD: I think the
 comment you made earlier about not leaving an
 action or an issue without at least knowing
 the disposition of it --
- 5 MR. KATZ: Yes.
- 6 MR. FITZGERALD: -- is a good one.
- 7 Because I think leaving it until the end of
- 8 the meeting would be really confusing.
- 9 MEMBER BEACH: Well, that just
- 10 brings us right back. I was looking at
- 11 Finding Number 1, and the first finding says,
- 12 the procedure does not provide direction for
- 13 tracking, trending, evaluating or responding
- 14 to worker input.
- 15 When I look at J.J.'s action
- items, I see that some of those are addressed
- and possibly taken care of, but some of them
- are still not clear in my mind how those three
- or four items are going to be addressed by
- 20 those action items.
- 21 So, I guess I would like to talk

- about that, to make sure that those items are
- 2 covered with those action items or possibly
- add more to those actions. I think you have a
- 4 good start here, but I just want to make sure.
- 5 And I am kind of curious. You
- 6 say, additional guidance will be placed in the
- 7 procedure. I'm curious to where in the
- 8 procedure are we going to see that, if you
- 9 have gone that far to look at that?
- To me, just for my mind, it seems
- like the direction of tracking hasn't been
- 12 answered. Trending has somewhat been
- answered. The response to work, I think the
- 14 last bullet covers that, but it doesn't really
- 15 give me a lot of information.
- 16 I am a real procedure person. So
- 17 I want it spelled out a little bit clearer for
- 18 me when I read it. But that is just my
- 19 opinion. I don't know where everybody else
- 20 sits.
- 21 MEMBER MUNN: Well, the problem

- 1 with that is it may not turn out to be the
- 2 best place to put it.
- 3 MEMBER BEACH: I don't even know
- 4 where it is being put.
- 5 MEMBER MUNN: Yes. But, in my
- 6 mind, if I could identify, if this body agrees
- 7 that these actions are the appropriate actions
- 8 to address that portion of the finding, then
- 9 this simply goes into abeyance essentially.
- 10 MEMBER BEACH: Sure.
- 11 MEMBER MUNN: And until NIOSH
- 12 comes back to us with --
- 13 MEMBER BEACH: I understand.
- 14 MEMBER MUNN: -- this is what we
- 15 have done and this is where it is going to
- 16 go --
- 17 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.
- 18 MEMBER MUNN: -- then, it can be
- 19 taken off the board.
- 20 MEMBER BEACH: Sure.
- 21 MEMBER MUNN: But I guess my

- 1 feeling is, if in the initial response we
- 2 attempt to get too definitive, then we
- 3 postpone the initial response sometimes longer
- 4 than we need to.
- 5 But just identifying what is going
- to happen, not necessarily where and when, but
- 7 what is going to happen, puts it in a
- 8 different framework for this group, as I see
- 9 it.
- 10 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. Well, for
- 11 me, direction for tracking the first one, how
- is it covered by those action items?
- 13 MR. JOHNSON: For tracking, it is
- 14 part of the tracking system. So that is the
- 15 tracking, the tracking system. So that is the
- 16 tool that we use --
- 17 MEMBER BEACH: So OTS?
- 18 MR. JOHNSON: Well, OTS is the
- 19 overall Outreach Tracking System. There's a
- 20 lot of components in there, but we have a
- 21 specific area for tracking issues.

1	Almost any of the fields, I have
2	been instructed or told that any of the fields
3	in the Outreach Tracking System can be pulled,
4	and you can develop an ad hoc report that will
5	show that.
6	Now the tracking aspect for
7	issues, any of those deals can be identified
8	and tracked.
9	MEMBER BEACH: But can I go to the
10	Procedure 12 and find directions for tracking?
11	Would it give me directions for tracking the
12	comments? I guess I am looking for, what's in
13	the Procedure 12, which is what we are
14	discussing, that answers that specifically?
15	MR. JOHNSON: The procedure
16	addresses tracking. The procedure has an
17	attachment that shows and provides guidance
18	for
19	MEMBER BEACH: That is Attachment
20	A, correct? Because I have that up, and it
21	was really, I thought it was kind of vague.

- 1 It gave you, if that is where you are talking
- 2 about --
- 3 MR. JOHNSON: It is. In one of my
- 4 responses, I indicated that the tracking
- 5 system was very simplistic, but it could be
- 6 self-driven with regards to the information
- 7 that you put into it.
- Now I can write a detailed
- 9 procedure to address it to the nth degree, but
- 10 I don't think it's necessary. I can address
- 11 more about the tracking system, and we have
- 12 talked about it. I can put in there, you
- 13 know, I will be willing to listen to what you
- 14 would like to see in there with regards to the
- 15 tracking system more than what I have.
- 16 MEMBER BEACH: So what we are
- 17 discussing is worker comments for situations
- 18 that come up at these meetings. And to me,
- 19 that is an important part of what we are doing
- 20 with this procedure, unless I am missing
- 21 something.

1	So, to me, it needs to be more
2	clear. And I don't want to tell you how to do
3	it exactly. But when I look at this and there
4	are two places that say anything about
5	tracking and it's vague, it just seems like
6	there needs to be a little more robustness in
7	the procedure.
8	MR. JOHNSON: I think when it
9	comes to each of the respective sections that
10	deal with an HP being at the meeting, there is
11	discussion in that section that talks about
12	identifying action items and putting them into
13	the tracking system. Then, the attachment
14	addresses and just identifies the respective
15	parts of the tracking system itself.
16	I can go and amplify the
17	discussion for the tracking system.
18	MEMBER BEACH: Anybody else?
19	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: The procedure is
20	probably understood by the health physics
21	people. Okay? But if there's a body that is

- charged with oversight and advising the program, we need to be able to see it in the procedures, so we understand it, not just --
- 4 and I appreciate professional judgment and all
- 5 that, but we are supposed to be in the weeds a
- 6 little bit and see how things are done. It
- 7 seems to me there is a lack of clarity there
- 8 in the procedures.
- 9 MR. JOHNSON: Well, as I
- 10 indicated, I can address in a little bit more
- 11 detail than what I already have the process
- for the tracking system that I have in here.
- I mean I will take that action on.
- 14 MR. CALHOUN: I think, first and
- 15 foremost, our procedures have to be functional
- 16 for us. Okay? We want you guys to understand
- 17 them.
- 18 This Work Group and this topic is
- one of the most subjective topics that we will
- 20 ever cover. It is more subjective than the
- 21 Procedures Group. It is way more subjective

- than any of the actual scientific health
 physics-type subjects that we cover.
- Basically, what we are coming down 3 here to is a process and how you would like to 4 5 see our process run versus how we are running Certainly, we are open to any 6 the process. recommendations, but if we are going to go 7 back and forth and back and forth on how you 8 think it should be done against how we think 9 10 it should be done, I don't ever see these

things being closed out.

11

- 12 It has to be loose, this type of I go 13 procedure. My philosophy is, when these worker outreach meetings, 14 I want respond to that individual immediately and be 15 I don't want to carry notes anywhere 16 17 because I want that person to be satisfied 18 that they have got an answer from me.
- So the number of comments that are actually applicable to a TBD that would cause us to change something are very, very few, but

1 we have to make the procedure such that it is

2 workable for us.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Like J.J. is saying, I am sure he is open to trying to clarify that a little bit, but we really need to keep that in mind as we go through this whole process here of, We want a procedure that is what's our goal? workable and that we can incorporate the comments of people and make the TBDs better and make the people feel like we have dealt with their comments and given them appropriate response.

DR. MAKHIJANI: I'm totally Now confused by the last part of what you said. still informationam focusing on these gathering meetings, you know. Like when we prepare our reviews, my point of reference, just to be clear, is when we review a TBD or an Evaluation Report, we do interviews. We have these questions. Then we develop the questions because we think they are going to

- 1 affect our review. Then, when we write the
- 2 review, we publish the summary along with the
- 3 review, and we indicate the points at which
- 4 there is a contact between the substance of
- 5 what was said and our review.
- 6 So that is my point of reference.
- 7 Maybe you don't agree that it is the right
- 8 point of reference. I would be happy to be
- 9 corrected.
- 10 But if a health physicist has a
- 11 question, a set of questions to be answered,
- and you are initiating a meeting, how can the
- 13 result, how can the TBD or Evaluation Report
- 14 not be affected by the outcome of the meeting?
- Because you started off with health physicist
- 16 questions that you didn't know the answers to.
- 17 MR. CALHOUN: I agree with you.
- 18 That is a very specific type of meeting,
- 19 though, and this document covers all of them.
- 20 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, that is the
- 21 meeting I want to understand.

- 1 MR. CALHOUN: This document covers
- 2 all of the meetings.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I know that.
- 4 MR. CALHOUN: So I agree with you
- 5 on that one.
- 6 DR. MAKHIJANI: That's the meeting
- 7 that a lot of the unhappiness -- so there are
- 8 two kinds of non-subjective from the -- well,
- 9 they are subjective, but they are less
- 10 subjective or there is a kind of a criterion
- 11 by which you can evaluate whether you were
- 12 successful or not.
- 13 So a worker gave you some
- 14 substantial information. Say incidents are
- 15 not being recorded or the special hazard
- 16 incident investigation's index is incomplete.
- 17 And I can give you three examples, or
- 18 whatever.
- 19 It happened at Savannah River
- 20 Site, and it is an open issue and we are
- 21 discussing it. It is very complicated.

1 Workers often have expressed, 2 quoted in our review, that they did come, they did listen; the meeting was great. 3 think 4 your process of your organizing 5 meetings, and so on, is great. I mean it 6 People come. People say stuff. 7 have the be able room to to express themselves, and they have said that. 8 And I think that is wonderful. 9

But, ultimately, a lot of people are unhappy that the technical substance of what they gave isn't reflected in ORAU's or NIOSH's work. And so long as that unhappiness is more than some one odd party who may feel aggrieved or, you know, they got denied or specific thing that is not technical, generally speaking, but is about their personal claim, I would say that from a substantive point of view there's some problem in translating in how that judgment is being exercised, either in preparing the minutes,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 1 because they are not reviewed by all the
- workers who were present and what they said,
- 3 to see if the things they said were important.
- 4 I don't know where -- you know, there are a
- 5 lot of gaps there, I think.
- 6 So the minutes are not reviewed by
- 7 all the workers. So they may have said some
- 8 very important things that they think that are
- 9 not in your minutes.
- 10 Because they don't all get -- just
- 11 the leader of the group gets to see them. You
- don't have the tapes for reference later on
- because you destroy the tapes.
- 14 The minutes are not included in
- the document being prepared by the person who
- 16 originated the meeting. So there is no point
- when that document gets public that the worker
- 18 who made a comment who feels aggrieved can
- 19 see: I said X and really X was considered in
- 20 the preparation of the Evaluation Report. It
- 21 does acknowledge incidents are not, and here

- 1 is how we are going to do the dose
- 2 reconstruction, even though the incident
- indexes -- because incidents were very common
- 4 and we have bioassay data. Some response.
- 5 So I am kind of thinking that
- 6 there are gaps both ways. There's technical
- 7 things that in this particular type of meeting
- 8 it cannot be that you initiate a meeting
- 9 having technical questions and have a
- 10 satisfactory meeting, and the outcome of that
- 11 meeting is not reflected in the Technical
- 12 Document. It has to be reflected in the
- 13 Technical Document because the technical
- 14 questions started the meeting.
- MR. CALHOUN: I would agree that,
- if there is something that comes out of that
- 17 meeting that needs to go, that would change
- 18 the TBD, yes. I would think, though, if
- 19 there's things that don't change the TBD, we
- 20 should get back with the claimant somehow and
- let them know that they are not in there.

1 Because we certainly don't want to clog up the

TBD with this is why we didn't include that.

No, no, I'm not 3 DR. MAKHIJANI: 4 saying that. My own personal experience from the unhappinesses that are expressed to me 5 about this process, as I have heard, and they 6 have been cited in our review, so it is not 7 just my sort of subjective thing. 8 said, 9 people have we have given you the 10 references and quoted, is, we said technical

> I am not talking about unhappiness about personal claim, somebody who а And I agree that, if you go to the denied. Advisory Board meeting, then a lot of a personal claim, comments about they appropriately referred to NIOSH, doesn't even get involved in all of that. Basically, you know, Stu Hinnefeld will be there, and he will take the person aside and refer them to the appropriate person,

things that are not reflected in the document.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 that's done.

2 issue is The biq when somebody something technical, people took off 3 their film badges at work, for example, a big 4 5 issue that comes up quite often, doesn't find it reflected in some way in the 6 And back to the HP that 7 tracking system. originated a question about film badges, if 8 9 the purpose of the meeting is to inform the HP 10 about question that he didn't have answers to, how can that meeting not be reflected in the 11 ER when it is done? 12 TBD or That. is the 13 question I am having. 14 I don't know the answer to a question and I go to a tank farm worker and 15 say, okay. How do you fix the transfer boxes, 16 17 then if that question is important to me, and

reflected in the document, right? What did -
MR. CALHOUN: See, I would say

that sometimes -- I am not aware of too many

an answer to it, then it should be

18

- 1 meetings where the sole purpose is I'm going
- 2 to go out here and find information that I
- don't have, other than when we interview folks
- 4 for, say, ER.
- 5 Like I am familiar with Brookhaven
- 6 because we just did that two weeks ago. So,
- we go through and we look and ask them, hey,
- 8 what do you think about this, what do you
- 9 think about that.
- 10 The majority of the other
- meetings, at least that I have been associated
- 12 with, are kind of a free-form meeting that
- 13 says, you know, it is a presentation of an SEC
- or it is a presentation of a new TBD, which
- doesn't happen very much anymore.
- 16 And if somebody, for example, said
- 17 to me or in the meeting, hey, you know, we
- have badges that weren't worn; how do you deal
- 19 with that. If I give him an answer, and he is
- 20 satisfied with that answer, it is not going to
- 21 go anywhere other than that.

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: How could you give 2 him an answer to that? If a worker says, we weren't wearing badges, isn't it something for 3 the Evaluation Report person to take --4 5 MR. CALHOUN: Well, what I would do is I would talk to that individual, and I 6 will 7 just give you an example, say, well, we didn't wear badges. 8 Or one thing that has come up before is, our supervisors 9 10 made us take badges off. Well, one of the things that we 11 in 12 have done the past is that we have 13 evaluated that person's dosimetry report. what we have found, in very few cases, but we 14 have found it, is that, as the end of the year 15 is coming up, all of a sudden, they go from 16 17 getting 500 millirem a month to none. is an indication to us that there is an issue 18 So, then, we will make a judgment 19 there. 20 accordingly.

NEAL R. GROSS

Now

Ι

can explain that

21

kind of

- approach to somebody. And after that, it may not need to go any further than that. Because that is one of those items that has been
- 4 brought up time and time and time again at
- 5 many sites.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Actually, this is
- 7 a huge thing that you have just said. Have
- 8 you actually found cases -- because we have
- 9 looked and we haven't found cases like this.
- 10 Now, if you have actually found cases like
- this, this is a matter far beyond your getting
- 12 back to the individual and saying, your dose
- 13 reconstruction is fixed. This is a matter
- 14 which is a generic matter and has been raised
- 15 as a generic matter at a number of sites
- 16 fairly frequently.
- Now we have all had a very hard
- 18 time actually verifying these things as a
- 19 general matter. If you found specific
- 20 examples, I would think that this thing needs
- 21 to be reflected in an Evaluation Report and a

- 1 TBD and should become a much bigger deal.
- 2 MR. CALHOUN: And it may be. I
- 3 don't know. I don't know what site that was
- 4 from.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: But that has to go
- from the interview process into a document
- 7 preparation process.
- 8 MR. CALHOUN: But if it has
- 9 already been addressed in the TBD and I
- 10 explain it to that individual, the only thing
- 11 that I would have to do is either tell him
- 12 that we have addressed this -- what's the
- other option, just responding to him after the
- 14 meeting and saying, this has been addressed
- 15 and it's in this document?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: No, no, I'm not
- 17 faulting your response to the individual and
- 18 giving them satisfaction or finding some way
- 19 to look at their claim. I mean that's fine,
- and I would do the same. I agree with you.
- 21 What I am saying, as I said, we

1 are not concerned about the individual claim 2 not being attended to properly. I think that you are doing that. I think NIOSH does that. 3 I think the Advisory Board now has a process 4 individuals who 5 making sure that aggrieved about their personal claims 6 right, 7 having been done there are So there are a lot of avenues for 8 procedures. 9 that. 10 The thing that I have always been concerned about in my role in this, and I 11 think our review of your procedures, has been 12 13 when there are generic concerns or something

when there are generic concerns or something that affects an individual claim that is indicated to be a generic concern, like this particular example we are talking about, which is a generic concern beyond the individual case. How does that materially affect what

20 And a lot of workers feel that it 21 should materially affect when they are not

NIOSH is doing or ORAU is doing?

NEAL R. GROSS

14

15

16

17

18

19

- 1 being heard, even though they are saying
- 2 technically important things.
- And the second point about what
- 4 you said that surprised me is we started the
- 5 discussion with me thinking, obviously
- 6 wrongly, that HPs have questions that they
- 7 need answers, and they ask you to organize
- 8 meetings. Some meetings, not all meetings,
- 9 some meetings are organized for the purpose of
- 10 answering HP's questions as they prepare a
- 11 document.
- MR. CALHOUN: That's generally in
- 13 the Evaluation Report process that I have
- 14 witnessed personally.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.
- 16 MR. CALHOUN: That is when that
- 17 happens most often.
- 18 DR. MAKHIJANI: What I am saying
- 19 is, in that particular specific instance, we
- 20 have a chance to make sure that we know
- 21 exactly what was said and have a procedure

1 that documents that. And then, we have a 2 chance to see whether the person who requested actually 3 meeting is usina information and it can also be documented and 4 5 can be very transparent, so the workers who You know, a worker would not 6 came can see. well, I said people, supervisors, were 7 making us take off the badges, and how come 8 isn't addressed 9 that question in the 10 Evaluation Report. You know, we spend a lot of time --11 Well, generally, in 12 CALHOUN: MR. 13 Evaluation Reports they are clean, 14 actually goes down, at least the ones that I have been associated with, and it will list 15 the interview and what was said and how it was 16 17 used in the document. 18 Now what I am wondering is let's 19 just use either that explanation or another 20 one that comes up is missed dose. I always got zeroes, but, you know, what happens? 21 If I

- 1 explain to that individual in the meeting how
- 2 missed dose is taken into account when a dose
- 3 reconstruction is done, what would you think I
- 4 need to do in addition to that?
- 5 MR. KATZ: Can I help here, just
- 6 ask a question? Because I think I'm
- 7 understanding what you are saying, but I'm not
- 8 sure of the difference here.
- 9 I think what I am hearing Grady
- 10 say which relates to what J.J. presented is,
- if in one of these meetings a worker raises an
- issue that is already dealt with generically
- in the TBD, like missed dose, then they get an
- 14 explanation. It doesn't even ever make it
- into the tracking as an action issue because
- there is no action to be taken. It is already
- 17 addressed generically in the TBD. And really,
- 18 it is only an education function to have the
- 19 worker understand how that is already handled.
- 20 But if a worker raises an issue
- 21 that is not handled in the TBD or the SEC

- 1 evaluation, that would go in as an action
- 2 item. Then, you would see in the tracking
- 3 system how it gets dealt with. That is where
- 4 the professional judgment is applied, as to
- 5 whether that requires a change in the TBD or
- 6 requires just a response back to, you know,
- 7 this doesn't affect the TBD because X, Y, Z,
- 8 or what have you.
- 9 DR. MAKHIJANI: Sure.
- 10 MR. KATZ: So it seems like the
- 11 tracking system will only reflect those issues
- 12 raised in the meeting that are actionable
- 13 because they might impinge on an actual change
- 14 that could be needed for the TBD or the SEC
- 15 evaluation or whatever.
- I mean that's what I heard, and
- 17 correct me if I'm --
- MR. CALHOUN: Yes. Yes, that is
- 19 how -- the times I have been involved in
- 20 these, and like I said, my participation is
- 21 somewhat limited in ERs because I have only

- 1 been involved in one. It has been at
- 2 Brookhaven. And I point to Joe because Joe
- has been with me on a couple of them, at least
- 4 on the phone.
- Now the other outreach meetings
- 6 that I have gone to, and I have gone to -- and
- 7 I call them outreach because anytime we go
- 8 out and present something, we are reaching out
- 9 to the public. And I have been involved with
- 10 the presenting of an SEC, and I have been
- presenting of new TBD documents, when we used
- 12 to do that when it was an initial version of
- 13 the TBD. And in those cases, you had to make
- the judgment as to whether or not the item was
- 15 going to be an action item and would cause us
- 16 to change something in our Technical Basis
- 17 Document.
- 18 MR. KATZ: But just to link things
- 19 together with what is coming later, we are
- 20 going to be talking about evaluation of
- 21 Objective 3, which gets into this matter of

- 1 how contributions from workers are actually
- taken into account in DCAS documents.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes.
- So, I mean, it seems to 4 MR. KATZ: 5 then. when SC&A does its work on evaluation of Objective 3, it is going to be 6 looking at the tracking system and the final 7 and the original transcripts 8 documents minutes, I should say, of these meetings. 9 10 if there's stuff missing, in other words, if stuff 11 there's in the minutes that would suggest to SC&A it should have been an action 12 13 item and it never made it in the tracking 14 system as an action item, that would be of
- And then, likewise, if there's an action item that doesn't get reflected in a document the way SC&A views it might have been, that would be another item of interest when SC&A does its evaluation of that.
- 21 Does that make sense?

NEAL R. GROSS

interest.

15

- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I'm okay with what you say.
- 3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So, if everyone
- 4 agrees, we will just put Item 1 in progress,
- 5 and we will wait for the changes that J.J. has
- 6 indicated here to come back to us, and we will
- 7 review them. Is that okay with everyone?
- 8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well,
- 9 there's a couple of things that aren't
- 10 addressed in these action items that came up
- 11 under Finding 1. And that is there is no
- 12 requirement for capturing substantive comments
- 13 from meetings that are designated as
- 14 information-giving or information-
- 15 giving/gathering, for example, workshops.
- 16 MR. JOHNSON: There's not a
- mechanism, and the purpose of Procedure 12
- 18 doesn't address that. The purpose of the
- 19 training is to provide information to the
- 20 personnel in attendance.
- In the past, people have asked

- questions, and the Director has personally provided feedback to the individuals on those questions. And if there are situations where individuals say, well, I know about this or I
- 5 know about that, they have been asked to
- 6 provide that information on the website or to
- 7 NIOSH through what documents they might have.
- 8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Which no
- 9 longer falls under the jurisdiction of
- 10 PROC-12.
- 11 MR. JOHNSON: Well, it's
- 12 communications at -- what doesn't fall under
- 13 PROC-12?
- 14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, for
- 15 example, I will give you an example of when I
- 16 was at the workshop, they were talking about
- 17 the release of UF6 into the work environment
- 18 which creates UO2F2, a light gas. And the
- 19 response by Larry was, yes, this is something
- 20 which should be considered in the Site
- 21 Profile. Go on, submit it to the docket.

More

+ha+

1	Okay?
_	Olza y i

14

15

16

17

18

19

doesn't go into your tracking system, as I understand. MR. JOHNSON: It did not. And it seems to me that, in that light, because there are no minutes of a training session, that in that light, guidance was provided, so the individual could turn around and provide that information to us in support of the Technical Basis Document.	2	Now that comment, as a worker
mr. JOHNSON: It did not. And it seems to me that, in that light, because there are no minutes of a training session, that ir that light, guidance was provided, so the individual could turn around and provide that information to us in support of the Technical Basis Document.	3	outreach comment, no longer goes into it
MR. JOHNSON: It did not. And it seems to me that, in that light, because there are no minutes of a training session, that in that light, guidance was provided, so the individual could turn around and provide that information to us in support of the Technical Basis Document.	4	doesn't go into your tracking system, as I
seems to me that, in that light, because there are no minutes of a training session, that in that light, guidance was provided, so the individual could turn around and provide that information to us in support of the Technical Basis Document.	5	understand.
are no minutes of a training session, that in that light, guidance was provided, so the individual could turn around and provide that information to us in support of the Technical Basis Document.	6	MR. JOHNSON: It did not. And it
that light, guidance was provided, so the individual could turn around and provide that information to us in support of the Technical Basis Document.	7	seems to me that, in that light, because there
individual could turn around and provide that information to us in support of the Technical Basis Document.	8	are no minutes of a training session, that in
information to us in support of the Technical Basis Document.	9	that light, guidance was provided, so the
12 Basis Document.	LO	individual could turn around and provide that
	11	information to us in support of the Technical
MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And what	L2	Basis Document.
	L3	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And what

happened to the comment after that? what is important. If you have got a NIOSH representative saying that's important to the Site Profile and should be considered, then what happens to that comment if it is not an action item?

I believe at that 20 MR. JOHNSON: 21 point in time everything was done that could

- 1 possibly be done at that point in time in
- order to try to support getting additional
- 3 information that the individual felt was
- 4 important enough to discuss at that point in
- 5 time, that they would likely provide that
- 6 information to NIOSH, based on the avenues of
- 7 communication discussed with them.
- 8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Last June,
- 9 I think 2009, you guys provided us with a
- 10 table of worker outreach meetings, and
- 11 workshops were on there, listed as worker
- 12 outreach --
- 13 MR. JOHNSON: That's exactly
- 14 right, as a form of our desire to inform
- 15 people, to help other folks support their
- issues within the program.
- 17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, it
- seems to me if things are coming up similar to
- 19 this example, then they need to be reflected
- 20 as action items or captured in some way. I'm
- 21 not talking about the entire worker workshop.

- 1 I'm talking about key items that are brought
- 2 up, substantive comments.
- MR. CALHOUN: So, in that case,
- 4 you would say that probably the action would
- 5 be to get back to the individual and tell him
- 6 what was done. Because the fact of the matter
- 7 is the only thing that that really does is it
- 8 may change solubility, and we are going to
- 9 assign the solubility that provides the
- 10 greatest dose.
- 11 So, you know, we address those
- 12 kinds of issues dosimetrically. I think what
- 13 you are thinking is the only outlier is that
- 14 the individual who brought up the concern
- 15 doesn't know we have addressed it, is that
- 16 correct?
- 17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, he
- 18 was given a confusing message, you know.
- MR. CALHOUN: Right.
- 20 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes, this
- 21 could --

	, , ,
1	MR. CALHOUN: I understand that.
2	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: affect
3	the Site Profile. So there needs to be a
4	MR. CALHOUN: Had an HP been there
5	to give that response, it probably would have
6	been different, but that is water under the
7	bridge. So I understand that.
8	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: There needs
9	to be a response. And if it does truly impact
10	the Site Profile, then it needs to be
11	considered.
12	MR. CALHOUN: Now I can say, off
13	the top of my head right now, that one
14	wouldn't have, but I understand where the
15	opening is, that we didn't let that individual
16	know how that is being done.
17	But short of writing down
18	everything that everybody says, you know,
19	there are going to be things that fall through
20	the cracks. We don't want to, and we are not

going to, write down everything everybody says

21

- and try to put them in an action thing.
- 2 It all comes to, again,
- 3 professional judgment. Maybe that person
- 4 should have been given a better answer. I
- 5 don't know what the mechanism is.
- 6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I am not
- 7 talking about every comment that comes out of
- 8 everybody's mouth. You know, like, for
- 9 example, DOL has really screwed up the
- 10 process, you know, that is a comment that may
- 11 not impact documents or need a response.
- But something that specific about
- 13 release of UF6 on a routine basis to the work
- 14 environment may require a response. And these
- 15 may be raised in some of those information-
- 16 giving, information-giving/gathering meetings.
- 17 MR. JOHNSON: I guess what you're
- 18 talking about is you can put anything in a
- 19 procedure, but how do you raise the level of
- 20 awareness with folks across all discussions?
- 21 And then, how do you address those awareness

- 1 issues in the process of getting back at the
- 2 individual or putting it in a TBD or,
- 3 actually, really understanding whether it is a
- 4 salient issue or not? Because somebody could
- 5 say something and it's out of my element
- 6 because I'm a particular HP for a site, but
- 7 you are talking about another site. I may not
- 8 even realize that what they are discussing is
- 9 a real issue.
- 10 So, you know, it's an awareness
- issue, not a procedure or process issue, that
- 12 I think it is.
- 13 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, there
- 14 needs to be something which indicates that
- 15 these items are captured, and that they are
- 16 put into the system.
- 17 MR. JOHNSON: But that particular
- issue now comes into a particular site. If I
- 19 put it in, I don't have a real clear way of
- 20 putting it into the Outreach Tracking System
- 21 and tracking it because it is associated with

a training session or it might be associated 1 2 with a particular discussion, but it may not be associated with any of the activities that 3 are addressed in the Outreach Tracking System. 4 Meaning, 5 if Ι put it under particular site, now I am addressing it as a 6 meeting because that is how my action items 7 8 are set up, under respective sites for 9 meetings. I don't have a separate tracking 10 system to address all those issues outside the venues that I have addressed in Procedure 12. 11 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: 12 I quess my 13 question would be, for that particular workshop, why wasn't it added as an action 14 item under that workshop? 15 don't 16 MR. CALHOUN: Ι know. Ι 17 don't know the answer to that one. I think 18 that, generally speaking, we have got a big enough umbrella that we catch all these, the 19 20 vast majority of all the important comments. I don't know how many other examples there are 21

- 1 like that. That is certainly a good example.
- You know, Larry went on and said,
- 3 well, that's important, and that's the right
- 4 thing to say. A better thing would have been
- to say, here's how we address that, and get it
- 6 taken care of at that point.
- 7 So it is all going to come down to
- 8 subjectivity. It is going to be a matter of,
- 9 even if you say, write down all the important
- 10 bullet points, some of them are going to be
- 11 missed that somebody thinks is important and
- 12 somebody doesn't. So I think that is always
- 13 going to be an issue. It is going to be
- really hard to come together on that, short of
- 15 trying to be so prescriptive that we end up
- 16 writing down everything, and I know we are not
- 17 going to do that.
- 18 MR. FITZGERALD: Isn't there
- 19 something -- I mean we are sort of going,
- 20 retrospectively trying to figure out if
- 21 there's exceptions, but there's also a

- 1 perspective where there's a consciousness now
- that these issues need to be tracked. So, to
- 3 some extent, going forward, you are going to
- 4 say, you know, a discipline for everybody is
- saying, well, we need to capture that. We now
- 6 have a system. So make sure that gets into
- 7 the system. Or, when someone says something,
- 8 you know, Stu says something and clearly
- 9 there's a hook on it, I think that
- 10 consciousness -- you're going to say, well, we
- 11 need to make sure that gets into the tracking
- 12 system.
- 13 So, I think, going forward, these
- 14 exceptions as they arise, I think people are
- going to be more conscious of them.
- 16 MR. CALHOUN: I think they are,
- 17 too.
- 18 MR. FITZGERALD: It wasn't going
- 19 to be perfect in the beginning.
- MR. CALHOUN: Sure.
- 21 MR. FITZGERALD: And I think that

- is recognized, right?
- MR. CALHOUN: Right. But, again,
- I think it is going to depend on the person.
- 4 Because, I'll tell you, in that specific
- 5 instance, if that question was asked to me, I
- 6 would give that individual an answer. If they
- 7 weren't satisfied with an answer, I would talk
- 8 to them right after the meeting, and I do that
- 9 all the time. And if they were satisfied with
- 10 it then, it is done. It doesn't go anywhere
- 11 else.
- 12 MR. FITZGERALD: Except if there
- 13 was a professional judgment on your part that
- it had it in quotations --
- MR. CALHOUN: Exactly. Exactly.
- 16 MR. FITZGERALD: -- then you would
- 17 want to --
- MR. CALHOUN: Exactly.
- 19 MR. FITZGERALD: -- because you
- 20 would make a decision to put it in the system.
- MR. CALHOUN: Exactly.

	, , ,
1	MR. FITZGERALD: Right.
2	MR. CALHOUN: Exactly.
3	DR. MAURO: This is John.
4	I was trying to listen to the
5	conversation. I hear some folks, I don't hear
6	others. So, if my question or comment is
7	misplaced at this time, please forgive me.
8	But what I'm hearing is that there
9	are two aspects of concern here. One is that,
10	of course, you capture, objectively and
11	faithfully, the information communicated when
12	you fill out your tracking system. And, of
13	course, then there is the appropriate
14	followup, followup being communicating with
15	the person that originally made the comment
16	that that is a part of making sure that the
17	person knows he has been heard.
18	But, also, it is making it into
19	NIOSH's work products. I don't know. When I
20	review Site Profiles, I don't see attachments

NEAL R. GROSS

that summarize or describe the results of the

21

- various information-gathering.
- In other words, it seems that I
- know, when we review a Site Profile, we always
- 4 try to have an attachment that summarizes, in
- 5 sometimes considerable detail, the information
- 6 we obtained from the interviews that we hold.
- 7 And I have seen these outreach meetings, that
- 8 type of thing. You are gathering information
- 9 that might be valuable.
- 10 Is there any thought to one of the
- 11 things to track is to make sure that the
- information that is captured does find its way
- as an attachment or special chapter in a Site
- 14 Profile or an ER?
- MR. CALHOUN: No.
- 16 DR. MAURO: I don't believe I have
- 17 seen that kind of thing in your work products.
- 18 MR. CALHOUN: That is not going to
- 19 happen. It is definitely not going to happen
- 20 in TBDs, you know. With ERs, you know, we
- 21 reference individual interviews and things

- 1 that we have that affect the Evaluation
- 2 Report. Interviews that are necessary or
- 3 contribute to a TBD, we also have referenced
- 4 in the TBD document.
- 5 Putting a separate attachment of
- 6 meetings and what was said and how it was
- 7 resolved, we will end up with huge, huge
- 8 documents, and they will buy us very little.
- 9 The key really is to help the
- 10 individuals, let them know that their voice is
- 11 being heard.
- DR. MAURO: I agree with that. I
- 13 thought that that was one way that could be
- 14 accomplished, to actually be on the record,
- 15 you know, that they see, oh, look, here's some
- of the issues that I brought up. And they
- 17 will actually see it in print.
- But, you're right, it might be
- 19 burdensome. I know that we are able to do it
- 20 when we write our Site Profile reviews, and it
- 21 usually ends up something that reflects what

- 1 we heard.
- But, in your case, the extent, I
- 3 would imagine the extent to which you do this,
- 4 the number of meetings, the number of people,
- 5 the amount of feedback, its complexity, it
- 6 might be a challenge. But it was a thought.
- 7 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, John. This
- 8 is Joe.
- 9 I think the other thing, too, is
- 10 the context of our interview process is
- 11 different. I mean we are looking at input
- 12 that would be relevant to our TBD or SEC
- 13 review. So that is the context of our
- 14 discussion. And we do get questions and
- 15 comments that aren't relevant, and they,
- 16 frankly, would be a question on a PIC or dose
- 17 reconstruction, which we kind of put aside and
- tell them to talk to NIOSH or something.
- 19 But we kind of parse out that
- 20 which is relevant as we go through. I think
- 21 we use that as a judgment. We take what we

- think is relevant, and that gets recorded.
- 2 I think what we were talking
- about, maybe you didn't hear, was that NIOSH
- 4 exercises that judgment as to what is
- 5 educational, what they can explain to the
- 6 individual and show accountability, and also
- 7 to draw from that which is relevant to be
- 8 captured by the tracking system that should go
- 9 into considerations for revising the TBD or
- issues that may be relevant to an SEC.
- 11 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I tell you what.
- 12 I think it is a good time for us to take a
- 13 break. So, let's take a short break. Be back
- 14 at 11 o'clock.
- MR. KATZ: What time do you have
- 16 right now, Mike?
- 17 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: 10:40.
- MR. KATZ: Okay, 11 o'clock.
- 19 I am just putting the phone on
- 20 mute. Thank you. Oh, I just hung up.
- 21 (Whereupon, the above-entitled

- 1 matter went off the record at 10:42 a.m. and
- 2 resumed at 11:00 a.m.)
- MR. KATZ: Okay. Welcome back.
- 4 We are just returning from a short break.
- 5 This is the Worker Outreach Work
- 6 Group of the Advisory Board on Radiation and
- 7 Worker Health.
- 8 We are still on Finding 1 of the
- 9 matrix.
- 10 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes, I think we
- 11 have had a healthy discussion on Finding 1
- 12 this morning. DCAS has explained their
- 13 position and what changes they are willing to
- make on the procedure for the first finding.
- So we will mark that in progress,
- 16 and we will await those changes and look at
- them when they come back.
- 18 And we will move on to Issue 2.
- 19 MR. KATZ: Oh, let me just, as a
- 20 procedure for all work groups, just remind
- 21 everyone what we try to do is have both DCAS

- and SC&A, following the meeting, send an email
- 2 to the full Work Group laying out what their
- action items are for the meeting, all of their
- 4 action items, just so that everybody is on the
- 5 same page as to who is doing what. Please be
- 6 descriptive enough in your action items so
- 7 that everyone will recognize exactly what it
- 8 is that is intended. Thanks.
- 9 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Finding 2?
- 10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Finding 2
- is: the procedure does not specify criteria
- for identifying action items or evaluating the
- 13 accuracy and timeliness of response for
- 14 resolution.
- 15 And this is very similar to what
- 16 we just discussed, but I will go through it.
- 17 Action items have basically
- 18 replaced the tracking and response to
- 19 substantive worker comments which previously
- 20 existed in PROC-97.
- 21 The appropriate determination of

- 1 action items becomes, therefore, a critical
- 2 part of being responsive to the workers and
- 3 providing appropriate consideration of
- 4 comments in the DR and SEC process.
- 5 PR-12 does not provide specific
- 6 criteria for determining action items from
- 7 outreach meetings. There is no timeframe
- 8 specified for addressing and resolving these
- 9 action items, and there is no mechanism for
- 10 determining the appropriateness or
- 11 completeness of the response.
- 12 And there were some action items
- addressed under Finding 1 which kind of get to
- 14 the heart of this issue.
- Do you want to go ahead?
- 16 MR. JOHNSON: Well, I think the
- 17 response to this has already been addressed
- through the action items that are going to be
- 19 performed under 1. And additional guidance to
- 20 be provided in the procedure to address
- 21 judgment for identifying action items, and

- additional guidance will be placed in the procedure to address action items' final
- disposition, which includes the timeliness
- 4 which has been based on the priority workload
- 5 and the level of effort resolution, to include
- 6 to its closure.
- 7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Any other
- 8 discussion on Finding 2?
- 9 (No response.)
- 10 Do we just want to mark it in
- 11 progress and see the changes?
- 12 (No response.)
- Okay. Hearing no dissent.
- 14 Finding 3?
- 15 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay.
- 16 Finding 3 is, a majority of the expected
- 17 documentation is not available in the OTS
- 18 system for meetings conducted within the
- 19 effective period of PR-12.
- 20 PR-12, in conjunction with
- 21 additional material provided by NIOSH in June

- 1 of 2009, provides description of а what 2 documentation is expected for which type of 3 meetings. And our concern was that we went and found that a lot 4 through OTS 5 documentation required under а particular meeting was absent from OTS. 6
- Again, one of our concerns was
 that there was a limited amount of action
 jitems in OTS, which did not represent the
 depth and breadth of the concerns raised by
 workers in these meetings.
- So that is where we kind of stood on that. We have put a table in our review of documents that were expected versus documents that were available.
- At the time we did the review,
 there were five meetings which we considered
 information-gathering which should have had
 meeting minutes which did not at the time.
- Now I will let J.J. kind of expand on this further. But, in their response,

- 1 NIOSH indicated that some of these gaps have
- 2 been mitigated since our review.
- 3 MR. KATZ: So, Kathy, can you just
- 4 flesh out a bit, for people who may not have
- 5 read the document, but other than meeting
- 6 minutes, what other kinds of documents?
- 7 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: There's
- 8 sign-in sheets. There's letters that go out
- 9 inviting individuals to the meetings. There's
- 10 follow-up documentation, for example, for one
- of the action items, emails. There's
- 12 correspondence. Of course, the final meeting
- 13 minutes. It's that type of documentation that
- 14 is associated with the organization and
- 15 follow-through of the meeting.
- MR. KATZ: Thanks.
- 17 MR. JOHNSON: Well, since the
- 18 review, we have put an extreme effort into
- 19 addressing one of the concerns you brought up
- 20 about historical data out of WISPR. And
- 21 because of that, we were, to some degree,

- deficient in trying to keep up with the update
- 2 of newer information into the Outreach
- 3 Tracking System.
- 4 This is a resource issue when it
- 5 comes to a large amount of information going
- 6 into a data system like this, along with the
- 7 fact of people have other responsibilities and
- 8 accountabilities, and it wasn't all in just
- 9 focusing their complete 100 percent effort
- into updating the tracking system. They have
- other responsibilities. Consequently, you try
- 12 to balance the best you can.
- 13 So, we tried to put in historical
- 14 stuff from WISPR and tried to get that up
- there, but in doing so, we failed in putting a
- lot of the newer information out there.
- 17 At this point in time, it is
- 18 pretty much caught up, but, you know, we are
- 19 still looking at it.
- 20 MR. McDOUGALL: I think, Kathy, if
- 21 you went to look at it today, and I encourage

- 1 you to look at it in the next few weeks, I
- 2 think you will find the database in a lot
- 3 better shape than it was when you looked at it
- 4 before.
- Now, having said that, one of the
- 6 issues that J.J. addressed in here is that you
- 7 are looking at minutes. You are looking for
- 8 minutes, and minutes are probably the most
- 9 important thing in any one file.
- 10 Please understand it takes a long
- 11 time to get minutes developed, and especially
- through the DOE classification review. So, if
- 13 you are looking for minutes of a meeting that
- is only four or five months old, you are
- 15 probably not going to find them there.
- 16 Sometimes they are a lot older than that.
- 17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS:
- 18 Historically, you guys have allotted, I think,
- 19 90 days for turnaround of meeting minutes?
- 20 MR. McDOUGALL: Well, the problem
- 21 with that is you rarely get the first draft of

- the minutes back from DOE in 90 days.
- 2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I thought DOE
- 3 was turning things around in two weeks most of
- 4 the time.
- 5 MR. KATZ: In certain categories.
- 6 I don't know what the situation is with
- 7 meeting minutes and interviews.
- 8 SC&A, what's your experience with
- 9 getting your interviews cleared?
- 10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, that
- is what I was going to turn around a question
- on you. What's your process for submitting to
- DOE from the time you have generated them?
- 14 MR. McDOUGALL: Well, our process
- is that Mary develops the minutes and gives
- the draft to Grady, and Grady sends it to DOE.
- 17 MR. CALHOUN: Yes, Tim Taulbee
- 18 does that now. I don't know what the
- 19 turnaround time is in general, but I would say
- it is usually, unless they are swamped, it is
- 21 usually not more than a couple of weeks.

- 1 There are some sites that are difficult.
- 2 Pantex is one.
- And I'm guessing now because I
- 4 have been out of it for a few months, but I am
- 5 guessing it's a couple of weeks. I might even
- 6 be able to actually pull up a tracking
- 7 spreadsheet here and find out how long it has
- 8 been taking.
- 9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, is it
- 10 going to the DOE site or is it going to DOE
- 11 headquarters?
- MR. CALHOUN: It depends.
- 13 MR. McDOUGALL: The Paducah -- the
- 14 minutes of our December meeting with the
- 15 Paducah Steelworkers Union aren't back yet
- 16 from DOE.
- 17 MR. KATZ: From when? Sorry.
- 18 MR. McDOUGALL: From December.
- MR. KATZ: From December?
- 20 MR. CALHOUN: I don't think they
- 21 went. I don't know. I will have to check.

- 1 That's hard for me to believe, because if they
- are that long, man, pound on me and I'll get
- 3 an answer, because that's too long. For
- 4 meeting minutes, that's way too long.
- 5 MR. McDOUGALL: And, actually,
- 6 even the GE Evendale, which shouldn't be
- terribly challenging, as far as I know are not
- 8 yet --
- 9 MR. CALHOUN: Yes, those would
- 10 certainly go to HQ for GE Evendale.
- 11 MR. KATZ: And how long ago was
- 12 that: GE?
- 13 MR. McDOUGALL: They were
- submitted to DOE in late August or, actually,
- one of them in early August.
- 16 MR. FITZGERALD: I think, in
- general, we have had some worse experiences at
- 18 the sites. Some of the sites are a lot slower
- 19 than that, than headquarters.
- 20 MR. CALHOUN: Right, I agree with
- 21 that.

- 1 MR. FITZGERALD: With
- 2 headquarters, we tend to have much more
- 3 influence.
- 4 MR. CALHOUN: I agree with you.
- 5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And that's
- 6 my experience with headquarters; it's a couple
- of weeks. With the field offices, it could be
- 8 up to a year or so.
- 9 MR. FITZGERALD: I think in the
- 10 field you just get put in a queue with
- 11 everything else that they are doing, and who
- 12 knows what else they're doing?
- 13 MR. KATZ: So, do you have a
- 14 tracking system for when it is submitted to
- 15 DOE and when it comes back?
- MR. McDOUGALL: We do now, yes.
- 17 MR. KATZ: That sounds like a good
- 18 idea.
- 19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. As
- far as the turnaround, well, I will save that
- 21 for a later time.

1 MR. KATZ: Just so I'm clear, if 2 you are moving on, what is the disposition of this finding, then? It sounds like they --3 Well. 4 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Ι 5 actually had another question. MR. KATZ: Oh, okay. 6 Sorry. if I 7 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Now can remember what it was? What are your plans 8 9 for update of OTS from here on out? 10 have any other plans to do any more updates? 11 MR. JOHNSON: Updates like information updates, data updates? As we go 12 13 along, there will be --14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, Ι mean for historical. 15 Is that complete? did I hear you say up to 2007? 16 17 MS. ELLIOTT: 2007. Yes. June There is one site where we did not receive 18 19 anything on the DVD that ORAU provided, and I 20 have got to go searching for that. It is the Kansas City one. But, otherwise, most of the 21

- things that are supposed to be in there for
- 2 historical meetings are in there now.
- You know, we didn't have the files
- for a while. I don't know what happened to
- 5 them between when I left and when I received
- 6 that DVD.
- 7 The other one is, I think, a
- 8 meeting that happened after the ORAU contract
- 9 was terminated, and I don't know what became
- of what they did with that.
- 11 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: The other
- 12 question I had was, is it possible to get
- 13 unredacted meeting minutes up there? Because
- in some cases we have the redacted meeting
- 15 minutes.
- 16 MR. JOHNSON: It depends if we
- 17 have the unredacted. We may only have the
- 18 redacted.
- 19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, this
- 20 is on OTS. So it would be --
- 21 MR. JOHNSON: You mean from the

- old system, from WISPR or -- what is the
- 2 question?
- MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, there
- 4 are some sites where you just have the
- 5 redacted meeting minutes without the names.
- 6 MR. JOHNSON: Right. We have a
- 7 little bit of a mix in there right now,
- 8 meaning some with redacted and some with
- 9 unredacted. And lately, we have just been
- 10 putting the unredacted out there. So, if we
- 11 have the unredacted we could put them out
- 12 there.
- 13 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay.
- 14 MEMBER MUNN: Did I miss
- 15 something? What is the unredacted data? What
- is the meeting data that you mentioned?
- 17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, a lot
- of times, we will use that to figure out the
- 19 meeting --
- 20 MEMBER MUNN: Well, you are
- looking at it for content, right?

- 1 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes, and
- who said what, and whether we need to go back
- 3 and interview them.
- 4 MR. JOHNSON: Sometimes in the
- 5 minutes, though, because if it is kind of like
- a townhall meeting, they may not be able to
- 7 keep up with the names.
- 8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. I
- 9 understand.
- 10 MR. JOHNSON: So, therefore, you
- 11 are not going to have names associated with
- that, but you will have a sign-in sheet.
- 13 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Are you
- 14 satisfied with that?
- 15 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Unless you
- 16 want us to go back and look at it.
- 17 MR. KATZ: Can I make a suggestion
- 18 for that?
- 19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.
- 20 MR. KATZ: It sounds like this is
- 21 -- I think Kathy said that they are now

- 1 caught up, and that these should be in the
- 2 system. So, I think maybe just for
- 3 completion's sake, this would be in abeyance,
- 4 because abeyance is basically what you say in
- 5 terms of disposition when conceptually
- 6 everybody agrees with the solution or that
- 7 something has been done, but you just want to
- 8 see the final product.
- 9 So it makes sense, I think, for
- 10 SC&A to have a look and see that things are in
- order. And at that point, then SC&A can come
- 12 back and say things are in order and we can
- 13 close the issue.
- 14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. Sounds
- 15 good.
- MR. KATZ: Thank you.
- 17 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Finding 4?
- 18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay.
- 19 Finding 4 was broken up into subcategories.
- 20 So I am going to throw three sets of comments
- 21 at you, and then we will discuss them.

1 The first comment is that there is 2 discussed no formal process in PR-6 for 3 documenting, tracking, evaluating, and responding to comments provided at workshops, 4 5 invited forums, Board meetings, or through the website docket, which were defined as elements 6 of 7 the worker outreach program in classification of worker outreach meetings and 8 types of NIOSH meetings which were the graphs 9 10 and associated handouts that NIOSH provided to the Working Group in June of 2009. 11 The procedures should specify what 12 13 documents are required in OTS for these meetings, describe how the comments provided 14 by workers are evaluated and describe how the 15 provided made available 16 comments are 17 consideration and dose reconstruction, Profiles, and SEC evaluations. 18 19 that was the other venues Okay, 20 that were included in those handouts that were provided in 2009. 21

1 MR. JOHNSON: Those were stated as -- they were agreed that they were outreach 2 efforts or outreach venues, but they were not 3 4 part of 12. And they were never 5 before you looked at PROC-97 -- those issues weren't part of that discussion. 6 7 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Let me cover the next one, and then we can get back 8 to that. 9 10 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. 11 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Because I 12 think that there are some things that are 13 outreach venues that need kind of we to and decide whether 14 discuss they should be 15 there. 16 Okay. There several are 17 additional activities that provide 18 opportunities for workers provide to 19 substantive comments, such the CATI as 20 interviews, the closeout interviews, general information by email or letters, site expert 21

- 1 interviews. There's no procedure-like process
- 2 by which general site comments or information
- 3 can be captured for consideration in technical
- 4 work documents from these sources.
- And let's stop there before we get
- 6 to the two-track system.
- 7 So there are these other venues,
- 8 and what you are saying is that they are
- 9 outside the scope --
- 10 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, they've never
- 11 been in the scope.
- 12 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: -- of
- 13 PR-12, but they are still worker outreach.
- 14 They are still considered a part of the worker
- 15 outreach program?
- 16 MR. JOHNSON: They're aspects on
- 17 which we get feedback from, sure. And I think
- 18 that's what the Director agreed to or agreed
- on, is that we believe that they were outreach
- 20 because of the information transfer associated
- 21 with them. But there was never a

- 1 consideration of them being part of Procedure
- 2 12.
- 3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I don't remember
- 4 the transcripts from that meeting in `09, but
- 5 it seems to me Larry put those examples up
- there on the board just for that reason, so we
- 7 could start putting our program together, this
- 8 Work Group, on how to track things. And he
- 9 was giving examples of outreach and what we
- 10 were going to track.
- 11 MR. JOHNSON: I believe they were
- in there that they could be reviewed, but I
- don't know that there was an agreement that
- they were going to be looked at for tracking.
- 15 I mean, we clearly had our two sides,
- information-giving, information-receiving, and
- then all others, to include the Board meeting.
- 18 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: We will have to
- 19 look at the transcripts.
- 20 MR. CALHOUN: The COIs and the
- 21 CATIS are used for individual dose

- 1 reconstructions, and we will actually change 2 dose reconstruction or develop it differently based on a CATI, if there is information 3 there, and we will also modify a DR based on a 4 5 COI, а closeout interview, if there is something there 6 that comes up about the specific case. 7 the individual has a broader-8 9 type of information, you ranging issue or 10 know, if they forward us that information, I will give that to the TBD writing group and 11 incorporate 12 they can that into the next revision of the TBD. 13 14 But every time an individual makes
 - But every time an individual makes a comment about an incident or something where he feels he was exposed, we actually will put that in the dose reconstruction report and say why we used it or why we didn't use it.
- So, COIs and CATIs, in my opinion,
 are more for individual dose reconstruction.

 But if there is something global and they

15

16

17

18

- 1 forward it to us, you know, we certainly
- 2 always have the ability to forward that to our
- 3 technical basis writing group.
- 4 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And I think
- 5 what we are talking about here with respect to
- 6 the CATIs and the COIs, and even the letters
- 7 and submittal to the dockets, are not
- 8 claimant-specific topics, but generalized
- 9 topics.
- 10 For example, if someone says, you
- 11 know, at LANL we handled einsteinium, then
- that might be important to the Site Profile,
- 13 and you need to have that information
- 14 transferred, too.
- MR. CALHOUN: What I would see is,
- 16 I mean maybe it is something as simple as, you
- 17 know, basically, what we are saying is anytime
- an HP or an interviewer sees something that
- 19 may have global impacts on the program or a
- 20 site, they can forward that information to the
- 21 site Point of Contact. I mean, I don't know

- 1 how much more detail you get than that.
- 2 MR. KATZ: Where does that
- 3 procedure go? Does that go in the dose
- 4 reconstruction?
- 5 MR. CALHOUN: Well, it would go if
- 6 it was einsteinium, you know, if that is
- 7 something that we never heard about before.
- 8 But, then, there's got to be some reasonable
- 9 assurance that einsteinium was there. If one
- 10 person says that there was einsteinium there,
- 11 I don't know if we stop everything we are
- doing and go look for einsteinium.
- 13 MR. KATZ: No, my question was
- just, where does the procedure go if you want,
- for example, your dose reconstructors to, when
- 16 they come across an issue that might have
- 17 broader significance, provide that to your TBD
- 18 team? Then, does that instruction does that
- 19 become part of the procedures for dose
- 20 reconstructors in that case?
- 21 MR. CALHOUN: Is a dose

- 1 reconstructor going to find it? It is not
- 2 likely that the dose reconstructor is going to
- 3 get that information. It is going to come
- 4 through the CATI probably or the closeout
- 5 interview, at least in those two examples,
- 6 which isn't usually the dose reconstructor.
- 7 I have gotten information, paper
- 8 information, from people, and I forward it to
- 9 the ORAU team, D team now.
- 10 MR. KATZ: I mean, what I am just
- 11 saying is that it seems like for each of these
- 12 categories, if you go through them, whether it
- 13 is a closeout interview or a dose
- 14 reconstruction interview, whether it is a
- 15 docket submission, I think the initial
- 16 question is, what is the system in place to
- 17 make sure that, when there is something
- 18 relevant, it is addressed?
- 19 So you could start with the
- 20 closeout interview. Where do those
- instructions need to be, so that you know that

- 1 a person in a responsible position will do
- that and that it will be captured somewhere?
- 3 MR. CALHOUN: Right, and in these
- 4 particular cases, those specific instances,
- they would be in the CATI procedure or the COI
- 6 procedure.
- 7 MR. KATZ: Yes, right. Right.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: And that is not an
- 9 ATL thing. It's more an -- DCAS thing, right?
- 10 MR. KATZ: Right, just like the
- 11 docket. Again, what is the system in place
- 12 for docket responses to track? Docket
- 13 submissions are evaluated and then responded
- 14 to as necessary or acted on as necessary,
- 15 right?
- 16 I mean, that is what we are
- 17 asking, in a sense. I think what Kathy is
- asking is, where are the systems if they are
- 19 not in PROC-12?
- 20 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: From these
- 21 substantive comments to integration into the

- 1 technical work document, from these sources of
- 2 outreach information.
- 3 MR. CALHOUN: From the CATI and
- 4 the COI specifically?
- 5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, I
- 6 gave quite a --
- 7 MR. CALHOUN: I think that we are
- 8 still going to have to rely on the person who
- 9 hears the information to forward it to
- 10 somebody, and they are going to have to call
- it and decide, well, this is reasonable or
- 12 it's not.
- 13 So, you know, is adding a sentence
- 14 that says, forward such information to the
- right people adequate or do we need more?
- 16 MEMBER BEACH: And I just found
- 17 that chart we were talking about earlier that
- 18 Larry put up, and it does seem like that is
- originally what some of our plan was, was to
- 20 look at all those venues. And I think Kathy
- 21 makes a good point that we should probably

- 1 look into that a little bit further.
- 2 MR. CALHOUN: Well, I mean I guess
- 3 we can explore how we would do it or if we
- 4 would change anything, since this is kind of a
- 5 new thing.
- I don't know. What do you think
- 7 there, J.J.? I don't know.
- 8 MR. JOHNSON: Well, I think, as
- 9 discussed earlier, we had information-
- 10 giving/information-receiving and the others
- 11 were things that the Work Group were going to
- look at as areas of outreach, and not at that
- 13 point concurring that we were going to address
- 14 those in a procedure or a process. Because
- 15 they are all not necessarily interfaced or
- 16 interfluenced with each other, as the CATI
- 17 versus the web, versus an email, versus a
- 18 letter, versus a Board meeting.
- 19 So, you know, it would be pretty
- 20 difficult, I think, to tie it all together.
- 21 But having said that, that was an avenue that

- 1 the Work Group was going to look at, I
- thought.
- 3 MEMBER BEACH: I think it would
- 4 probably be easier than -- to me, it doesn't
- 5 seem like it would be so difficult to tie it
- 6 all together.
- 7 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, this is
- 8 almost -- listening to you talk about it --
- 9 the Site Research Database, the O: drive has
- 10 become sort of the docket for pieces of paper,
- 11 documents that are relevant to different
- 12 subjects, different activities.
- 13 This is almost the analogue, the
- 14 equivalent, you know -- is there something
- 15 that systemizes what is captured in -- not
- 16 pieces of paper, but information that is
- 17 flowing from different sources in the system
- 18 from workers? I think that is kind of where
- 19 we are kind of gravitating to. Is there
- 20 something that you can go to that will
- 21 represent that capture, information capture in

- the larger sense, not just data capture, but
- 2 information capture of the workers?
- Right now, it is different
- 4 sources, different judgments being made in
- 5 different parts of the system, but how is that
- 6 all tied together? Does that actually go
- 7 where it needs to go?
- 8 MR. JOHNSON: Well, I guess what I
- 9 was speaking of is, in your example, what
- 10 would trigger somebody in each one of those
- 11 different areas to take and look at that
- information, feel it is relevant, and put it
- in the SRDB?
- 14 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, that's what
- is kind of interesting because SRDB has pieces
- of paper of varying relevances. I mean some
- of it -- it may be a 1,000-page document, of
- which one or two pages is really relevant for
- 19 an SEC. And I have gone through all of these,
- 20 and it is amazing, but the data captures
- 21 basically everything that touches, that has

- some relevance, even if it is relatively small, to the issue at hand.
- I am not saying we duplicate that 3 for information at large. But, certainly, the 4 5 question is what is the threshold for what in and gets captured? It seems like 6 there is a much more rigid, sort of rigorous 7 8 system for grabbing data and grabbing documentation than there is for grabbing what 9 10 may be worker input.

That's necessarily so because you have to make judgments as you hear this, but I think that is probably what people are grabbling over, what would be something that would capture without setting the threshold so low that you are not going to -- you know, there might things that would be be some relevant, but somebody in the lower parts of would the system say, you know, it's einsteinium; who cares about that?

NEAL R. GROSS

But

that might be an

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

issue

for

1 exposure potential that may actually rise to 2 an SEC significance later on. And it would be very helpful to know that somebody felt they 3 were handling einsteinium and were exposed. 4 5 that may not get into the information capture -- I'll call it information capture --6 7 because somebody made а judgment that somewhere down, and maybe it was the CATI 8 9 interview, that einsteinium, that's 10 primary nuclide; why worried about are we 11 that? 12 And we're getting into this. Tn all these SECs I have been involved with, the 13 14 worker input actually is a very important factor and may be one of the few factors that 15 is 16 comes to play because there no 17 documentation on how einsteinium was handled. 18 So I guess I am here to testify 19 that, yes, the worker input may be a deciding 20 factor on an SEC if it comes down to some of 21 recollections these that come up, and

- 1 capturing that becomes a very critical part.
- 2 But how do we do that when, in fact, it may be
- just a handful of workers that may have worked
- 4 with it, and maybe only one worker that
- 5 actually mentions it?
- You know, we go out and do these
- 7 interviews, but trying to find these handful
- 8 of workers that may actually have firsthand
- 9 experience is almost impossible. But, by
- 10 virtue of a CATI interview during dose
- 11 reconstruction somebody actually prints it up,
- 12 that would be very important.
- So, how do we do that? How do we
- 14 make sure that at least the judgments that are
- made to that level bring this into the system
- 16 somehow, so that it can be found? Maybe, as
- 17 Grady was pointing out, somebody knows to send
- 18 that over to a TBD review team or to even an
- 19 active SEC. Maybe you are doing a claimant
- 20 review or interview, and there is an SEC that
- is going on and somebody connects the dots. I

- don't know how that would be done, but that
- 2 would be --
- MEMBER BEACH: Or somebody doesn't
- 4 and it's missed.
- 5 MR. KATZ: So, I mean, just along
- 6 these lines, what I was trying to point to
- 7 earlier to make it concrete, one solution that
- 8 could be in place -- I think those need to be
- 9 in PROC-12 -- but for all these other
- instances, one, you would want to know that
- 11 the guidance is there to the person doing the
- 12 interview, that should you come across it,
- 13 right? If they don't even have that guidance,
- 14 then you have no reason to believe that it
- 15 will happen ever.
- So, one, you would want to make
- 17 sure that the quidance is there in the
- 18 procedure that applies to that individual,
- 19 whether it is the person dealing with the
- 20 docket or whether it is the person doing
- 21 closeout interviews, or whoever. So that is

one element of a solution.

2 is the the second tracking And it seems like, if you have a 3 piece. 4 tracking system already set up for worker 5 outreach, these other items, maybe when they take that action, then, they put a note in the 6 7 tracking system.

Otherwise, I don't see how Stu, or whoever, at the end of the day, when Stu wants to know how are we doing on capturing these, whether it's responding to dockets, or whatever, I don't know how he would go about that if he doesn't have somewhere to look to see what are the items that were put up for action, in a sense, if there is no formal way to capture that?

So, if you have a tracking system, that could be something you could do. So that could be -- even though PROC-12 doesn't cover everything, the tracking system might cover all of these things. They might all be put in

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 1 the tracking system.
- I'm just throwing out a solution,
- 3 a possible solution, and then having
- 4 accountability and management ability.
- 5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well,
- 6 before we get too far, let me go over the
- 7 third part because it kind of leads into this.
- 8 MR. FITZGERALD: Sure. Okay. Let
- 9 me just touch on that. We were talking about
- 10 this in the hallway, that a procedure does so
- 11 much. There's a number of facets involved
- 12 now, the procedure, plus tracking systems,
- 13 plus management oversight, and maybe the kind
- of accountability that calls for -- we're
- 15 going to be getting into this in Chapter 3,
- 16 which is the occasional sampling to see how
- 17 things are going. All those are facets of the
- 18 same thing.
- 19 The procedure by itself isn't
- 20 going to solve a lot of these issues. And I
- think that was your point, and I think that's

_		-	
1	a	aoog	one

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, there
3	is one other element to this. That is that we
4	feel there is a two-track system for obtaining
5	employee or general worker insight, expert
6	input.
7	One of these involves the worker
8	outreach and is governed by PR-12. The other
9	track is more informal and involves interviews
10	with site experts.

interviews Site expert are significant worker source of input for technical documents, but NIOSH has not selecting established a formal process for site experts, conducting interviews, assuring the accuracy of the interviews' statements, or evaluating information, reviews, and technical work documents.

The two-track system tends to give less weight to information provided in worker outreach meeting venues versus site expert

interviews. There is no assurance that the technical personnel responsible for technical document preparation are aware of and consider inputs provided at worker outreach meetings.

There is no systematic described for documenting and resolving differences in important issues that may arise from different settings. In other words, you may interview two different people, and they seemingly say opposite things. Which one is telling you factual information? Both tracks require a process for ensuring completeness and accuracy of the documented information and ensuring appropriate consideration for inclusion in a technical work document.

So, when we talk about a two-track talking about information system, we are gathered during worker outreach versus information gathered in site expert interviews. And site expert interviews are a part of worker outreach and what NIOSH does,

NEAL R. GROSS

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 and there is a concern there.

2 Well, again, I wrote MR. JOHNSON: 3 the procedures such that, you know, it was with 4 transparent regards to whether in the field or 5 individuals worked individuals were in the office environment or 6 whether they were engineers or whether they 7 were technicians. 8

And in the view that I developed the procedure there was no difference with regards to those individuals. If a person was focusing on looking to retrieve information, you would put your expectations together, all the folks that you possibly can, and address your questions to find out, you know, to support the answers to the questions that you may have.

And initially when we looked at your assessment of Procedure 97 the concern that I thought I saw in there was the fact that one was giving credence to one group,

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 1 credibility to one group more than another
- 2 group. And when it comes to this outreach
- 3 procedure, it gives credibility to all the
- 4 folks and it reaches out to all the folks.
- 5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And I don't
- 6 think within the worker outreach procedure
- 7 that we are saying that you are not reaching
- 8 out to all types of workers within that
- 9 procedure. I think the concern is that you
- 10 have got this system of site expert interviews
- 11 which are often, not always, HPs, which are
- done by the document lead, and they are given
- more credibility than worker outreach-gathered
- 14 comments.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Let me amplify. I
- think there's a point on which we haven't been
- 17 clear enough, and Kathy kind of indicated that
- 18 by hand gestures a little bit.
- 19 It is not so much the meeting that
- 20 you conduct and who's present, whether it is a
- 21 machine operator or an HP. We are not saying

- 1 that you would treat their information
- 2 differently when compiling the minutes or
- 3 anything like that. I think Kathy says that.
- 4 We're not saying that.
- 5 There are two ways in which
- 6 information is gathered for the purpose of,
- 7 from the HP's point of view, TBD/ER
- 8 preparation. A guy is writing up something.
- 9 He doesn't know whether there was egress
- 10 monitoring or what the badging procedures were
- or when an integrated badge was interviewed
- and he picks up the phone and he calls up Bob.
- 13 Bob, you were the HP. You were responsible
- 14 for X. Tell me how the badges or when TLDs
- 15 were introduced and what problems you had, et
- 16 cetera, et cetera, et cetera.
- 17 You document it. It winds up in
- 18 the Site Research Database, and it is
- 19 reflected.
- 20 So there are two ways in which
- 21 site expert information is being elicited.

- 1 Now, again, I am kind of focused only on the
- 2 gathering of information that affects
- 3 technical documents, dose reconstructions,
- 4 TBDs, ERs.
- In those, in the past at least --
- 6 I don't know how your new thing is going with
- 7 respect to doing these interviews for ERs, and
- 8 then they are being referenced, and so on. I
- 9 haven't reviewed any of that. Maybe it is
- 10 fixed.
- But it certainly was the case that
- in the past, and we have given examples
- 13 specifically and in writing where information
- 14 has been proffered and is now been used,
- whereas, other information was proffered and
- 16 not used, or information that was
- 17 contradictory.
- 18 One choice is made -- and this is
- 19 not a problem of your conducting the
- 20 interviews. It is an issue in the result that
- is proffered to the public and the workers in

terms of the Evaluation Report, and so on.

And I think some of the problem of
expressed dissatisfaction, whether appropriate
or not, arises from that perception that there
is a better credence to the health physics
community. Now maybe NIOSH has the opposite
impression, but I don't think it is restricted
to how you are doing the interviews.

It is a two-track procedure for eliciting information. When you are going to do it yourself, and you want something right now and to document something, you make sure it is used because it is something you want right now.

And that's why my previous set of questions was, are there meetings initiated by the HP and what happens to those specific pieces of information? Are they treated equivalently, and can we track them?

I think it is not about how ATL is currently doing interviews, in my opinion.

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1 MR. JOHNSON: Let me just say that 2 that wasn't my understanding of what the two-My understanding of the 3 track system was. 4 two-track system was that we were qivinq 5 higher preference to professional interviews, to like the HPs versus the outreach efforts, 6 you know, in talking with the folks out there. 7 MAKHIJANI: 8 DR. Do you mean in 9 your procedure or in fact? 10 No, in fact, because MR. JOHNSON: that's what was recently just stated. 11 12 And what I tried to put into this 13 procedure was the fact that there wasn't a 14 two-track system, and if you so desired to have a focus group of professional people, 15 then you could have that. Or if you had a 16 17 focus group of a group of people that were 18 from the site, you could have that. And there would be no difference with regards to the 19 20 aspect of retrieving information.

NEAL R. GROSS

There would be no segmenting of

21

- 1 the -- I mean you could have a professional
- 2 group. You could have a combination of
- 3 outreach based upon the people you can
- 4 retrieve information from.
- 5 The bottom line right now is that,
- 6 when it comes to outreach efforts, our
- 7 outreach efforts are focused on SEC and not
- 8 highly focused on Technical Basis Document
- 9 developments.
- 10 MR. CALHOUN: They were at one
- 11 time. They were in the development --
- 12 MR. JOHNSON: They were, and I
- 13 believe this two-track system that is now
- 14 being addressed and clarified is something
- that was part of the history, could still be a
- 16 part of history today, but is more of looking
- 17 through the rearview mirror and seeing what
- 18 was done in the past, and not what is being
- 19 done today.
- 20 DR. MAKHIJANI: I don't know,
- 21 Kathy, maybe this is something we have to look

at how these ER interviews and solicited information is being handled.

One suggestion that kind of came 3 up, and this is a different way of saying the 4 5 same thing, is really information-gathering, least I think it is important that the 6 are soliciting information 7 people you sign off on these minutes. 8 Because if that doesn't happen, and not just a representative 9 10 of them, because if that doesn't happen, they could feel that they said some things -- and 11 I'm not talking about these big meetings, the 12 I'm not talking about that. 13 townhalls. That 14 clearly infeasible, and most the information is not for gathering; it is for 15 exchanging something. 16

And the other thing is the minutes are not voluminous. The minutes from these particular meetings can certainly be published with the Evaluation Reports, looking forward.

So that, because the tracking

NEAL R. GROSS

17

18

19

20

- system is never seen by the workers, I mean it is not about us or NIOSH or you. It is about whether the workers who gave the information feel it was fairly represented and eventually used, because that is one of the problems that we are trying to remedy.
- Arjun, do you have 7 MEMBER MUNN: any suggestion how, short of every individual 8 who provides information being followed up 9 10 with a NIOSH representative to assure them that they have been heard, 11 and that their 12 incorporated information has been in the 13 considerations and the procedures that 14 taking part, short of that, do you have any suggestion for how workers who feel they are 15 being ignored can be reassured? 16 Short of 17 individual contact, how do you see that 18 happening?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: I don't think you
 can do that for all the workers who are
 gathered. That is clearly impossible.

1 I mean that is why I put kind of a 2 caveat that this should be a narrow effort, I There are lots of concerns, 3 don't think I have the experience to address 4 5 about these townhall meetings and informationgiving and the communications piece of it, and 6 I don't claim to address that. 7 So I am not addressing that. And I don't know how you can 8 resolve the dissatisfactions that may or may 9 10 not exist about that. focusing 11 Ι am just on the technical information. When the HP in NIOSH 12 or ORAU is seeking technical information, what 13 14 do you do in that case? That I don't think normally involves a large number of workers. 15 Sometimes it might. But, normally, at least, 16 17 and maybe it involves a much larger number of 18 workers than is our experience, and it might be more of a problem. 19 20 it is difficult to use in a way what becomes unvalidated information. 21 We

- 1 certainly have examples where workers don't
- get back to us, even though we have a smaller
- issue. So I just wanted to say that upfront.
- 4 And what we do in those cases is
- 5 we tell them, if you don't get back to us, we
- 6 won't use your information, and it's your
- 7 problem. If you feel the information wasn't
- 8 used, that's your problem.
- 9 And I think that can be certainly
- 10 part of the procedure. You cannot force
- 11 somebody to respond and tell you whether your
- 12 minutes are accurately representing what they
- 13 said, but you can tell them, if you don't
- respond, we won't use your information.
- 15 And I think, then, it is clear
- 16 whose responsibility it is that the
- information didn't get in.
- 18 MEMBER MUNN: But am I reading
- 19 between the words here? I am hearing you say
- 20 that what you are suggesting, because I have
- asked how do you suggest this be done, are you

- 1 suggesting, then, that the minutes of these 2 meetings be sent to everyone who is signed in for these meetings with a note that, if they 3 don't respond with respect to the clarity of 4 5 what's been said, that it won't be used? 6 that your --7 DR. MAKHIJANI: No. I'm not suggesting that this be done for all meetings, 8 for townhalls, for the meetings where there 9 10 are lots and lots of workers and to the sign-And maybe this is impractical. 11 up sheets. It's just a suggestion that, actually, in a 12 13 way doesn't affect the core of what we are 14 doing in reviewing NIOSH documents.
 - I am suggesting that in the very restricted case of when HPs are explicitly seeking information that that be documented in this way. Maybe I'm wrong and not under the right impression that this does not involve a very large number of people relative to the townhalls and the other sets of meetings.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 1 Maybe I'm wrong, and maybe the suggestion
- 2 ought not to be adopted.
- 3 MEMBER MUNN: No, I think that you
- 4 are correct that it doesn't affect a large
- 5 number of people, if this is the kind of
- 6 restriction you are putting on it.
- 7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes.
- 8 MEMBER MUNN: But certainly in
- 9 past terms, that's not the kind of restriction
- 10 that was being discussed by this body or
- 11 that's not the concern that was brought to
- this body.
- 13 The concern that was brought to
- this body is that a large number of workers
- made comments that they do not feel are being
- 16 addressed. And the whole outreach concept is
- 17 we go out to the workers, we get information
- 18 from them. We come back and we do our work.
- 19 And they don't believe they have been heard
- 20 because whatever they felt they were telling
- 21 us is not incorporated in some way in what

- they see. Now that was the premise on which,
- 2 as best I can tell, this Work Group was put
- 3 together.
- 4 So, what I am trying to ask from
- 5 you is, are you suggesting a more narrow focus
- for this particular aspect of the Work Group
- 7 or do you have a different process for
- 8 responding in some way to what we were led to
- 9 believe is a large number of workers who feel
- 10 that they are not being heard?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: I think a large
- 12 number of people feel they are not being heard
- for different reasons. Some of them may feel,
- 14 at least as I have observed people making
- 15 comments here before you, when you meet as an
- 16 Advisory Board, most people comment about
- 17 their claims, about their family situation,
- and what they went through, and which cancer
- 19 they had, and so on.
- 20 And NIOSH actually has done a
- 21 wonderful thing by appointing an ombudsman,

- and the Board has by having a procedure for
- 2 actually addressing every one of those things.
- 3 And maybe that ought to be extended to some
- 4 of these things. From what Grady said, I
- 5 think it seems to be, in form at least,
- 6 operational.
- 7 DR. MAURO: This is John.
- I have a thought.
- 9 DR. MAKHIJANI: Just hold on,
- 10 John.
- DR. MAURO: Oh, sorry, I thought
- 12 you were through.
- 13 DR. MAKHIJANI: I'm not suggesting
- 14 -- I don't know how wide a thing this would be
- in ATL's or NIOSH's bailiwick as compared to
- 16 ours, certainly wider. And I don't know what
- 17 I am suggesting is practical.
- 18 What I am suggesting is, in the
- 19 specific instances where information is being
- 20 gathered, and that has sort of been my
- 21 participation in this group, and I don't know

- about the others, but my intent always has
- been to comment on technical information being
- 3 gathered because that is what I understand and
- 4 know about and I am experienced in.
- 5 This way assures not only the
- 6 worker that they are being heard, but, from my
- 7 point of view, when I do interviews -- and I
- 8 do them quite a lot outside of the context of
- 9 this particular job. You know, I interviewed
- 10 the Director of Lawrence Livermore Lab once,
- and I sent him the notes, and I said, do you
- 12 agree. Please fix it. And he did.
- So that's the idea. Since I can
- 14 now use that interview, I know that he saw it
- 15 and he agrees with the content and fixed
- 16 whatever he didn't agree with, because I want
- 17 to use it in my work.
- 18 And that's the point. If we are
- 19 going to use something that workers say in
- 20 their work, you want to make sure that they
- 21 don't have a different idea of what they said

1 than you do.

And in a way, from a technical point of view, it is not more complicated than that.

MEMBER MUNN: So you are suggesting that, since we have two kinds of worker outreach that it is my understanding that we are supposed to address here, one is the type where we go out to try to find information, and the other is where we go out to give the information.

You're suggesting that the giveinformation part, where there is often a great
many personal comments made afterwards about
individual claims and about specific groups
and specific sites, you're not suggesting that
all of those comments be tracked? You are
suggesting only in the we are going out to get
information case, when you have workers giving
you information, that following that, you
provide them with your concept of what has

- 1 been said, and that workers are expected to
- 2 buy off on it?
- 3 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I think that
- 4 is a pretty fair summary of what I am saying.
- 5 It's, you know, I personally do not have the
- 6 wisdom or experience in that other arena.
- 7 Others in our team have commented on this, but
- 8 I personally don't have any constructive
- 9 experience to offer as to how you do all those
- other things. I mean, I think the Board, you
- all have dealt with it recently, you know, and
- 12 I have admired what you have done.
- But the complicating factor, one
- 14 complicating factor which Kathy has brought up
- is that, when you have these information-
- 16 giving meetings, something will come up, and I
- 17 really don't know how to address that.
- 18 Somebody will say something that is important
- 19 that could be used by an HP, and you do have
- 20 to exercise professional judgment; I will
- 21 agree with that. I certainly agree with that.

1 In those kinds of situations, how 2 you manage and track that, I really haven't thought about that. But, for a specific kind 3 of meeting, yes, I think you have accurately 4 5 captured what I said. 6 MEMBER MUNN: Actually, quite a somebodies quite frequently have 7 few things --8 9 Well, MEMBER BEACH: Ι have 10 question. If you have a situation like Arjun just described, where you have a particular 11 individual that has information to give you at 12 13 a meeting that you aren't particularly -- you 14 are not taking notes; you are not expecting to gather information. Have you ever asked that 15 person or taken them aside and talked to them 16 17 later, after the meeting? Is that a point 18 where you might take notes about what that person, what kind of information that person 19 20 is giving you? Or has that never happened? 21 No, that's happened, MR. CALHOUN:

- and it has happened that somebody has come to the meeting with documents to give us. You know, it wasn't that kind of meeting. And
- 4 when that happens, at least when they give us
- 5 the documents, or if they have documents at
- 6 home, we can say, try to send these to us. We
- 7 will forward those to the TBD group and say,
- 8 please incorporate or evaluate during the next
- 9 revisions of the document.
- Now is it tracked? No, it is not
- 11 tracked. I can't point to one exactly and
- make you think I'm not lying, but it happens,
- 13 not often, you know.
- 14 MEMBER BEACH: So there would be
- 15 never an instant where you might take notes
- 16 about what the person said, just for that
- 17 particular instant because --
- MR. CALHOUN: If it was something
- 19 that was like a big incident, I could see that
- 20 happening or some einsteinium or something
- 21 like that. I can't recall any that I have

1 personally done.

2 Well, it MEMBER BEACH: Okay. seems to me, just to throw it out, my opinion 3 is, if the meetings are important enough to 4 5 take minutes and not the meetings that notes are not taken, the information-giving, then, 6 if you have a handful of individuals that give 7 specific instants of topics that they want to 8 relate to you, information that may be on an 9 10 SEC or a technical document, would it be that difficult to take those notes and then get 11 back to that person on those few incidents, 12 13 not the whole group, not everybody who signed 14 in, but on a smaller case, like what Arjun was saying, the handful of individuals? 15 I don't know. 16 CALHOUN: Ιt 17 seems like that's something I would hate to 18 commit to because certainly you are going to 19 find someplace where I'm not doing it. 20 Again, what you are doing is you are saying now we are going back to what we 21

- 1 were kind of not wanting, or you guys weren't 2 kind wanting, of is us assigning, using deciding 3 professional judgment and which should be which shouldn't, 4 used and 5 tracking those and having people sign them. don't know if it is necessary to have people 6
- I have a suggestion. 8 DR. MAURO: 9 It sounds like the problem is it is difficult 10 to be prescriptive at this point where we are 11 now regarding how we are going to deal with 12 upcoming or future outreach program, some 13 whether it is information-giving or receiving.

The idea -- it seems to me the problem is this: everyone is unique. Each one, you come back with. When you come back and you have your notes, and assuming that they are fairly complete and faithful to what has transpired, you have captured, even if it is giving information, you may come back with notes that say, well, we also obtained some

7

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sign them.

1 information. And that is all collected.

Now the problem is this: once we have collected all that information and you have it before you, you have loaded it up into the tracking system, the question becomes, what do we do with this information, who do we follow up with , what should we do.

And I think that there needs to be some kind of plan. I think it is at that point where you become thoughtful about, okay, this is what we have in front of us. What is the sensible thing to do regarding followup? It may mean that, depending on the nature of the interaction, interfacing with some union representatives that organized the meeting or maybe particular individuals.

But I suspect that in each case how you follow up and the degree to which you follow is going to have to be tailored to that particular occasion. And maybe that is all that could be committed to, that there would

NEAL R. GROSS

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 1 be some, I guess it would be a follow-up plan
- that would be generated as a product, and it
- would be recorded. This is what we believe to
- 4 be, based on what we brought home, a sensible
- 5 follow-up plan of what we should do now.
- Then you are held accountable to
- 7 that. You have a plan, things you are going
- 8 to do that are going to be different each
- 9 time. So you can't be prescriptive now, but
- 10 at least after you do it, you could sort of
- lay out what you plan to do, and then hold
- 12 yourself accountable to doing that and
- 13 recording what you have done.
- 14 So this sort of, like, leaves you
- 15 still with the professional judgment on what
- 16 you think you need to do. And I agree there
- 17 is a lot of professional judgment, but it
- 18 could be made in a collective sense. That is,
- 19 it is not one person making it; it is the team
- 20 that has brought back the basket of
- information, and they together decide what is

- the sensible thing to do, and you move forward
- 2 in a way.
- That way, you would not only have
- 4 followup that is accountable and recorded, but
- 5 it is also consistent. That is, the judgments
- 6 are being by the team, and you could view to
- 7 make sure that you are approaching each
- 8 followup with a philosophy that is consistent
- 9 with the followups that have been made in
- 10 other venues.
- 11 I mean, that is how I would deal
- 12 with this dilemma.
- 13 MR. CALHOUN: The issue is how to
- 14 put that into a document, since this is the
- document-review of this process.
- 16 DR. MAURO: But couldn't that be
- 17 something in your procedure?
- MR. CALHOUN: That's what I mean.
- 19 How do you put that into the document?
- 20 DR. MAURO: Just what I said.
- MR. CALHOUN: Do your best to get

- 1 back to people if you think something is
- important. I mean, I don't mean to be flip,
- 3 but that's what we're saying.
- DR. MAURO: All you are going to
- 5 do is commit to prepare a plan.
- 6 MR. CALHOUN: We are committing to
- 7 thinking about doing something because we are
- 8 not going to create a plan necessarily if
- 9 there is nothing to get back to.
- DR. MAURO: And you'll say that.
- 11 MR. CALHOUN: So we've got to
- write something saying we're not going to do
- 13 something, John?
- DR. MAURO: In other words, you
- 15 you'll be held accountable --
- MR. CALHOUN: Come on.
- 17 DR. MAURO: Well, in other words,
- 18 you're making a commitment that says, when you
- 19 bring this back, there will be a record
- 20 created that you folks will prepare that will
- 21 be part of your tracking system that would

- 1 outline what your follow-up activity is going
- 2 to be or what your planned activity is going
- 3 to be. And it is a way to sort of hold
- 4 yourself accountable to following up in a
- 5 systematic way and recording what that
- 6 followup is.
- 7 I guess I see that as a minimal
- 8 approach to dealing with this situation.
- 9 MR. CALHOUN: It is a minimal
- 10 approach as long as we refine it or keep it to
- only those meetings that are meant entirely
- 12 for fact-gathering and not training meetings
- or information meetings, and things like that.
- 14 Then, it's a little bit more manageable.
- DR. MAURO: Well, I mean, I would
- 16 leave it to your judgment, but when you come
- 17 back from whatever your trip is -- and it
- doesn't really matter, in my mind, what the
- 19 objective is -- but you bring back a piece of
- information that is valuable that needs to be
- 21 followed up on in some capacity. I think that

- needs to be recorded and tracked, if you feel
- that way, whether that piece of information
- 3 emerged from a giving or receiving.
- It's a judgment call, of course,
- 5 but it's okay that it's a judgment call. But
- there's a way to track it and hold yourself
- 7 accountable to achieving closure on things
- 8 that you think are important.
- 9 MR. CALHOUN: So, basically, we
- 10 put into the procedure, if after any of these
- meetings the HP DCAS, or whoever, decides that
- there's information that needs to be followed
- 13 up on, it will be.
- 14 DR. MAURO: No. The procedure
- 15 would be NIOSH would make, would review --
- 16 MR. CALHOUN: Well, DCAS, yes.
- 17 DR. MAURO: -- review the notes
- 18 that were collected.
- MR. CALHOUN: Yes.
- DR. MAURO: It's not the
- 21 individual that does this. Like I said, you

- are bringing back, after the meeting you're
- 2 bringing back your notes, which could be
- 3 copious --
- 4 MR. CALHOUN: Yes.
- 5 DR. MAURO: -- all of which is
- 6 going to be captured in your tracking system.
- 7 Then, there is a procedure by which that
- 8 material is reviewed, and it's not one person.
- 9 It's a process, just like all of your other
- 10 processes, a process that you go through that
- 11 makes judgments on what the follow-up
- 12 activities would be. And this is a commitment
- 13 that is made.
- 14 Then, that may simply be a
- 15 notation in the record that NIOSH has reviewed
- 16 all of the material that was brought back and
- 17 logged into the OTS and has determined that
- there is no follow-up action necessary. Or
- 19 you may determine these are the follow-up
- 20 actions that we feel are important, and it
- 21 becomes part of the record. And tracking

- 1 closure of those action items is on the
- 2 record.
- But, you know, as long as it can
- 4 be shown that there is accountability, that
- 5 you looked at the material, and listen, if you
- 6 make a judgment that you don't need to follow
- 7 up on anything, well, that should be
- 8 transparent.
- 9 Now there may be people who don't
- 10 agree with that, but at least you are laying
- it all out for everyone to see.
- MR. CALHOUN: But you understand
- 13 that during any one of these meetings there
- 14 may be things that we don't even take notes
- on, that we make the determination to not take
- notes on because we don't believe that they're
- 17 going to have an impact. And then to bring
- 18 home everything --
- DR. MAURO: Yes.
- 20 MR. CALHOUN: -- and then make a
- 21 determination that we don't need to follow up

on them, that could pose really a monster.

2 Well, no, I mean we're DR. MAURO: That is, when we are 3 in the same position. out there talking to people, as Joe described 4 5 earlier, and Arjun, yes, of course, we are going to make judgments, you have to, as a 6 team, on what material, what information that 7 you have heard that you think is important. 8 No one could expect more than that. And you 9 10 bring back what you think is important.

And it's true, you might have missed something important or you might have captured something that is unimportant, but all you can do is the best you can. But the idea being to collect it and then think, be thoughtful about it afterward.

If you miss something important, I mean no one could hold you accountable that someone may have made a judgment not to copy something down that turned out to be important later. I mean, I don't think anyone is going

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 to fault you for that.

MR. CALHOUN: Well, it sounds to

me that the changes that would be considered

for the procedure would still be very generic.

5 DR. MAURO: Yes. All I was trying

6 to do was not be prescriptive because it

7 sounds like it is really inappropriate, given

8 the complexity and the nuance that there is

9 and all the facets of what you are dealing

10 with. To be prescriptive may be burdensome

and inappropriate and you are going to be held

12 accountable to something that you really can't

13 be held accountable to.

So I try to step it back and make

15 it a little more general. It sounds like it

is general, but at the same time you will be

17 creating an accountability to yourself that

18 you are going to do the best you can to track

19 all this material. What that tracking will be

is to be judged, determined on a case-by-case

21 basis, but it would be in the record and

- transparent and available for everyone to see.
- 2 MR. KATZ: So, John, if I
- understand, I mean, it sounds pretty simple.
- 4 It sounds like you're just saying, after you
- 5 come back with your minutes, and so on, you
- 6 have an action plan --
- 7 DR. MAURO: Yes, but it's --
- 8 MR. KATZ: -- you know, a note in
- 9 the record, whatever you want to call it, an
- 10 action plan which the team considers and lays
- 11 out which ones are going to be actionable.
- 12 Then, the actionable items, of course, end up
- in your tracking system.
- 14 DR. MAURO: Yes, I quess it's as
- 15 simple as that.
- 16 MR. KATZ: And if there is
- 17 nothing, then there is just a memo that says,
- 18 you know, there was nothing that required
- 19 actions, whatever, but it just sort of closes
- 20 the loop on --
- DR. MAURO: I guess that's all I'm

- 1 saying. It's pretty simple. It doesn't seem
- to me very burdensome, but, at the same time,
- 3 it does create a record and accountability
- 4 that these judgments are made because the
- 5 basket of information will be there in the
- 6 OTS.
- 7 Now whether or not you want to
- 8 make the tracking system information
- 9 available, that's a different question. I
- 10 guess I am more concerned that, once you do
- 11 have the information, that it becomes
- 12 transparent of the follow-up actions that are
- 13 being taken regarding all these different
- 14 matters and you have a record of what has been
- 15 done.
- 16 I don't know. Maybe you are doing
- 17 it already.
- 18 It seems to me it is in accord
- 19 with what Arjun was talking about, but Arjun
- 20 wasn't sure of how specific it could be and
- 21 how prescriptive it needs to be. So, I just

- 1 stepped it back to say, well, don't make it
- 2 prescriptive. Just make it a system that at
- 3 least holds the organization accountable to
- 4 follow up.
- 5 MR. CALHOUN: Well, I think that
- 6 certainly, if we come back from a meeting with
- 7 something that we believe needs to be added to
- 8 the tracking system, we would add it. Now, if
- 9 somebody says that, we didn't wear TLDs or
- 10 TLDs were zero or a missed dose, they were
- 11 always zero, and how could I possibly get
- 12 zero, I don't think I need to write something
- that says that I'm not going to address that.
- 14 DR. MAKHIJANI: I agree with that.
- MR. CALHOUN: So, I would just as
- 16 soon deal with the positives and make the
- 17 professional judgment, if there's something
- that comes up that we believe is important, we
- 19 add that into the tracking system and we track
- 20 it to completion.
- DR. MAURO: Okay.

- 1 MR. KATZ: So the only thing that 2 is being said here is, after the meeting when you collect your thoughts, you write a little 3 action memo that says, here are the items that 4 are actionable --5 CALHOUN: They're actionable 6 MR. items. 7 -- if they are. 8 MR. KATZ: Or9 there were no items that were. And then it's 10 transparent. But we don't do that 11 MR. CALHOUN: right now. 12 13 MR. KATZ: You don't do that? 14 MR. CALHOUN: We don't say that there's no action items. 15 Oh, I know, but there's 16 MR. KATZ: 17 a suggestion on the table that that might be a 18 good thing do because it just gives to 19 accountability and closes the --
 - MR. KATZ: Right. Okay.

MR. CALHOUN:

NEAL R. GROSS

20

21

Suggestion noted.

1	(Laughter.)
2	That's progress.
3	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So that's 4 or
4	what do we call it?
5	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, we've
6	got some action items.
7	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Do we call it a
8	standoff or what?
9	(Laughter.)
10	MR. CALHOUN: No. I have to
11	address it at the next meeting, obviously.
12	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: In progress.
13	MR. CALHOUN: And I don't know
14	about this two-track system. I'm not sure
15	what that means, and I don't know. That
16	almost seems like that is beyond the scope of
17	this document because that's like, how do you
18	proceduralize that? Do you say, make sure to
19	weight comments from workers as much as
20	professionals. I don't know how to address
21	that in a procedure.

- 1 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: You had an
- 2 idea.
- 3 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: I think that's
- 4 one terminology that you have got to be really
- 5 careful when you say, well, we have comments
- from workers and we have comments from
- 7 professionals. You're telling those workers
- 8 they're not professionals. They are
- 9 professionals.
- 10 MR. CALHOUN: No, we're not.
- 11 We're just talking here in a group.
- 12 MEMBER MUNN: Plus, you tell the
- professionals they're not workers.
- 14 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes, yes. So,
- 15 you've got to be careful exactly how you word
- 16 it. Otherwise, one group or the other is
- 17 going to be --
- 18 MR. KATZ: The finding was not
- 19 that, about the sort of judgment that goes in
- 20 terms of weighting. The finding was about
- 21 treating them equivalently in terms of

- 1 documentation, and so for these on, other 2
- So, I had suggested for all of the 3 other venues that fall outside of PROC-12, 4
- closeout interviews, and so on, one way to 6

like we talked about, like the docket, like

- treat those equivalently in terms of handling 7
- of the information would be to track also the 8
- action items that come out of those other 9
- 10 venues in your OTS system, just as you do the
- ones that come under PROC-12. 11
- 12 And that would be responsive to
- 13 the comment that is here from SC&A, which is
- 14 treat them equally: the information. In other
- words, manage that information with equal sort 15
- of prudence or whatever you want to call that 16
- 17 tracking system.

venues.

5

- 18 MR. CALHOUN: Well, there's some
- mechanics that I don't know if we can do that 19
- 20 with, with the OTS, and I'm not familiar with
- 21 OTS all that much.

- 1 MR. KATZ: So, is that practical,
- 2 to add those other items to OTS, the action
- 3 items?
- 4 MR. JOHNSON: It would have to be
- 5 a separate system.
- 6 MR. KATZ: Because?
- 7 MR. JOHNSON: Because the Outreach
- 8 Tracking System, the focus is structured on
- 9 meetings, meetings for a particular site, not
- 10 the website, not the emails, not other
- 11 perceived venues of outreach. And if I start
- 12 doing this, it is just going to be a
- 13 haberdashery of different things in the
- 14 tracking system that will be trackable, but it
- 15 is not going to have the same meaning
- 16 associated with what the overall Outreach
- 17 Tracking System was meant to do.
- 18 MR. KATZ: So someone has already
- done some software development to produce your
- 20 OTS, right? But you're saying that you can't
- 21 like add another column that is for these

- other venues that would -- I mean, basically,
- 2 that's all you're talking about.
- Beyond the venue, I mean, it is
- 4 the same issue. You have an action item and
- 5 you want to make sure that there's followup,
- 6 what the followup was on that.
- 7 MR. JOHNSON: I am not a
- 8 programmer, so I don't know how the
- 9 intricacies go in the back of this whole thing
- 10 and how it is written and stuff like that.
- 11 And it is easy to say, yes, you can add
- 12 another column on there and just say other,
- 13 and the other could be all the other
- 14 associated items.
- I would have to go back and talk
- 16 with these folks and see what their resource
- 17 loading is in order to develop or backfit this
- thing to do something like that, and I would
- 19 have to also go back and talk with Stu to make
- 20 sure that he's in conjunction, you know, on
- 21 the same page.

- 1 MR. KATZ: Right. No, there's no 2 question, obviously, this is a management 3 decision on the part of DCAS, and it would
- 4 probably take programming.
- 5 I mean, in the Procedures
- 6 Subcommittee we have been doing a lot of this
- 7 database development work, and it does take
- 8 resources and all that. So that's clear.
- 9 I mean, my point earlier was that,
- if management at DCAS thinks it's important to
- 11 manage these other sources of information
- 12 where they impact, then if don't you have a
- 13 system, a management system, you know it is
- 14 not going to happen. I mean, if there's no
- 15 tracking, you know you have no way of having
- 16 accountability internally.
- 17 MR. CALHOUN: How about saying we
- 18 will look at the feasibility?
- 19 MR. KATZ: Yes, I think that would
- 20 be good.
- 21 MEMBER BEACH: That would be

- 1 great.
- 2 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: How cold it is
- 3 in this room.
- 4 MR. KATZ: I spoke to them, and it
- 5 seems to fluctuate. Every time I get ready to
- 6 get up and go speak to them again, it goes on.
- 7 So it seems like they have poor control over
- 8 this room. It's not in the room. But if
- 9 everybody is constantly cold, I will go speak
- 10 to them again.
- 11 We will probably break for lunch
- 12 pretty soon, and we can stand out in the sun
- 13 like lizards.
- 14 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Just give
- everybody some habaneros for lunch.
- 16 MEMBER MUNN: We're consistently
- 17 cold.
- 18 MR. KATZ: I'll speak to them and
- 19 ask them to raise it another couple of degrees
- when we break for lunch.
- 21 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, that would be

- 1 good.
- 2 MEMBER BEACH: So four is in
- 3 progress, not abeyance?
- 4 MR. KATZ: So that sounds like an
- 5 in progress.
- 6 MEMBER BEACH: In progress.
- 7 MR. KATZ: And DCAS is going to
- 8 look into the feasibility --
- 9 MEMBER BEACH: Of adding another
- 10 column or --
- 11 MR. JOHNSON: The feasibility
- 12 of --
- 13 MR. CALHOUN: The feasibility of
- including other venues.
- 15 MEMBER BEACH: Okay.
- 16 MR. KATZ: In the tracking system.
- 17 MR. JOHNSON: Tracking other --
- MR. KATZ: Other sources.
- 19 MEMBER BEACH: That might take
- 20 care of some of Finding 1 also.
- 21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. It's

- 1 12:20.
- MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: We think we
- 3 can get through 5.
- 4 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Oh, good.
- 5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Finding 5
- is, the procedure does not prescribe a process
- 7 for ensuring that worker feedback is
- 8 accurately and completely documented.
- 9 Basically, the procedure contains
- 10 no requirements for providing meeting minutes
- 11 to participants for review or for the
- 12 subsequent integration of those comments
- 13 received by workers.
- 14 And then, the other part of this
- 15 was a concern over the fact that there was no
- 16 requirement to archive the worker outreach
- 17 meeting recordings or to inform participants
- 18 upfront that the recordings would not be made
- 19 accessible to them.
- 20 MR. JOHNSON: Well, let's go
- 21 backwards and then forward.

1	The expectation is not to keep the
2	recording. And also, at the beginning, it is
3	discussed that the recording is being taken as
4	a tool in order to support the development of
5	the minutes, and that the recording will not
6	be kept. So, at that point in time, it is
7	clear that they are not going to look at the
8	recording and it is not going to be available.
9	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I guess
10	there's some verbiage, you know, in small
11	writing, and I don't know if this is stated in
12	the meeting, that it states that the recording
13	is not available through the Freedom of
14	Information Act to workers?
15	MR. JOHNSON: I don't know if it
16	goes that far.
17	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, it's
18	in the small print in the procedures.
19	MR. JOHNSON: I don't think so.
20	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And one
21	resolution of that process is to make that

- 1 statement upfront.
- 2 MR. JOHNSON: It says, this
- 3 meeting is being recorded. The purpose of the
- 4 recording is to help prepare the accurate
- 5 meeting minutes. Thus, the recording is a
- 6 tool and will be destroyed once the minutes of
- 7 this meeting have been finalized. That's what
- 8 it says.
- 9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay.
- 10 Below that, I think it says something about --
- 11 MR. JOHNSON: It asks if anyone
- 12 objects to this recording.
- 13 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I think
- it's on the next page.
- 15 MEMBER BEACH: J.J., what page are
- 16 you on?
- 17 MR. JOHNSON: Fifteen.
- 18 MEMBER BEACH: Thank you.
- 19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: It says
- 20 something to the effect of that these
- 21 recordings are not available under the Freedom

- 1 of Information Act?
- MR. CALHOUN: Yes.
- 3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And I guess
- 4 part of the reason --
- 5 MR. CALHOUN: If someone requests
- 6 a copy of the recording, the OST Team
- 7 Facilitator and OST staff representative will
- 8 explain that copies are not available for
- 9 public distribution.
- 10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. And
- I guess part of this is, if that statement
- 12 were made upfront and in the meeting --
- 13 MR. CALHOUN: Oh, during the part
- 14 that says that it is going to be destroyed,
- 15 right after that?
- MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes.
- 17 MR. CALHOUN: That doesn't seem
- 18 like a big deal, yes.
- 19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: So, that is
- 20 part of informing them upfront that, hey, this
- isn't accessible to you.

- 1 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. What were the
- 2 other issues?
- 3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, you
- 4 talked about your position on archiving the
- 5 recordings. And the other one was that PR-12
- 6 doesn't contain a requirement for providing
- 7 meeting minutes to the participants for review
- 8 or for subsequent integration of comments
- 9 received.
- 10 MR. JOHNSON: We have just been
- 11 hashing that around right now, previous to
- 12 this. It does not.
- In a townhall meeting, that is
- 14 pretty difficult.
- MR. CALHOUN: Aren't they posted
- on the web after six months?
- 17 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, they're posted
- 18 on the web.
- 19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Can I give
- 20 you kind of an example, a real quick example?
- 21 We sat in on a meeting for Simonds Saw with

- 1 NIOSH.
- 2 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Was that just
- 3 recently?
- 4 (Telephonic interference.)
- 5 MR. KATZ: Wait one second.
- 6 Excuse me. It's not such a
- 7 problem for us in the room, but for other
- 8 people on the line, someone on the line does
- 9 not have their phone muted, and other folks
- 10 are having to listen to their conversation.
- 11 So, could you please mute your
- phone, *6, if you don't have a mute button?
- 13 Press *6, and that will mute your phone.
- 14 Thank you.
- 15 (Telephonic interference.)
- 16 Hello. Excuse me. Whoever is
- 17 speaking right now on this telephone line, you
- shouldn't be speaking. Would you please mute
- 19 your phone? Use *6, if you don't have a mute
- 20 button.
- 21 Thank you.

1	Sorry, Kathy. Go on.
2	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. So,
3	the NIOSH team sat in on this meeting, and I
4	don't know if it was it was to gather
5	information for the preparation of the Simonds
6	Saw Evaluation Report, and we also sat in or
7	that meeting. We prepared our own meeting
8	minutes.
9	Now our process was to send those
LO	meeting minutes out to everyone at the meeting
L1	who we had recorded had made a comment for
L2	their reading, and we did so. And we received
L3	comments back and integrated that information
L4	into those notes that we had taken.
L5	What I am talking about here is
L6	the process for doing that and how that is not
L7	really defined in the procedure.
L8	MEMBER BEACH: Well, it was part
L9	of the 97 procedure.

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: It was part

of the 97.

20

21

а

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Worker Outreach Work Group, has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and certified by the Chair of the Worker Outreach Work Group for accuracy at this time. The reader should be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

BEACH:

Was

there

MEMBER

2 rationale for dropping that out of 12? MR. McDOUGALL: I don't recall it 3 being -- to send the minutes out to everybody 4 5 in the meeting? 6 MEMBER BEACH: No, not to everybody. 7 It was to the host. 8 MR. McDOUGALL: Right. That's 9 what we do now. 10 Oh, you still do MEMBER BEACH: that, then? 11 12 MR. McDOUGALL: Yes. 13 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. 14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, may be you do it, but it 15 is not procedure. 16 17 MEMBER BEACH: Ι quess that 18 what my question is; why was it dropped from 19 the procedure, if that is something that you 20 do? 21 We certainly have MS. ELLIOTT:

NEAL R. GROSS

1

- 1 done it.
- MR. JOHNSON: We do that.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Maybe it was an
- 4 oversight and you could just fix it. You're
- 5 doing it anyway.
- 6 MR. CALHOUN: Yes, we're doing it.
- 7 Just add it in there, but --
- 8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: We probably
- 9 wouldn't know that you do that by reading the
- 10 procedure, and how those comments are
- 11 resolved.
- MR. JOHNSON: Well, the comments
- 13 would be resolved based just by the fact that
- 14 they do a chop on the minutes, and then we
- 15 accept them. And typically, we will send them
- out, and they will say, "We don't have any
- 17 comments or the time period has expired for
- their comment, and we move forward with them.
- 19 DR. MAKHIJANI: That's the point
- 20 at which I have trouble, is the time period
- 21 has expired, plus the destruction of the

1 tapes.

2 In my book, just from the point of view of somebody who uses information given by 3 interviews, the combination of that 4 5 just from an accuracy verification So, if 6 point of view. I had interviewed somebody and taped it, thinking I'm going to 7 make an interview record summary of what was 8 said, and not send the interview back to the 9 10 person, because I had a tape, and if that person had any question as to whether I made 11 an accurate interpretation, I can always say, 12 13 okay, here's the tape. Here's what you said. 14 And it happens all the time, you We see questions about this kind of 15 know. thing in the public arena a lot. 16 What was 17 said? Do you have a tape? Give them the You're right. 18 You're accurate. tape. 19 or sometimes the tape is not clear. wrong, 20 Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

But, if you send the minutes, you

21

1 don't hear, a time period elapses, you don't 2 know whether the person agrees. The people who have made comments that you have actually 3 summarized -- and we all kind of -- you know, 4 5 it is very rare to send an interview back that any complexity where you get it back 6 saying, you did a perfect job. 7 I have no least, 8 changes. Αt I haven't been that perfect. 9 10 generally, And back you get 11 substantive changes that are more than typos and spelling mistakes, and so on; at least I 12 13 do. That has been our experience with our Also, people don't always 14 interviews also. think of everything they want to say. 15 They don't say it in the way they would have said 16 17 it, if they had some time to think about it.

But when you couple, your time's
up with the destruction of the tapes, quite
apart from whatever your other rationale might
be, from the point of view of the accuracy of

- 1 verifying of whether you got it right or not,
- I think it is a problem. You can't have both.
- 3 MR. McDOUGALL: Well, Arjun, first
- 4 of all, we have, I think, pretty good
- 5 transparency because everybody out there,
- 6 everybody who was in the meeting, everybody
- 7 who is interested in the meeting can go on and
- 8 read the minutes. And that's kind of a
- 9 backup.
- 10 And I don't recall, with the
- 11 possible exception of one time where somebody
- said something before we started the meeting,
- 13 I don't recall that anybody has ever
- 14 questioned the accuracy of the minutes.
- 15 Now the other side of that is
- 16 that, unlike your experience, I think our
- 17 experience is that, if we waited for
- affirmative feedback, even to say, I have no
- 19 comments, from everybody in the meeting, we
- 20 would never have any minutes posted.
- 21 MEMBER BEACH: But you weren't

- 1 saying everybody in the meeting? You're only
- 2 sending them to the host. So maybe one
- 3 particular person?
- 4 MR. McDOUGALL: If we insisted on
- 5 getting affirmative feedback from the host, we
- 6 would have a lot less meetings, a lot less
- 7 minutes posted.
- 8 Generally, if people don't
- 9 disagree with you, I think if people don't
- 10 disagree with you very strongly, they don't
- tell you, I don't disagree with you.
- So, we give people the opportunity
- 13 to say, hey, you got it wrong. Okay?
- 14 Actually, we give them the opportunity just to
- 15 say, hey, you got it wrong at least twice:
- 16 once when we formally send the minutes to
- 17 them, and then, forever after, when it is
- 18 posted online. And we actually go out and we
- 19 teach stakeholders to use the NIOSH website to
- look at what's posted for their own site.
- 21 And through this all, nobody ever

- 1 comes -- I don't recall one person one time,
- 2 in something that happened before a meeting
- 3 started, other than that, I don't recall
- 4 anybody who has ever questioned the accuracy
- 5 of the minutes.
- 6 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, sounds good.
- 7 DR. MAKHIJANI: The last actually
- 8 alleviates the concern a great deal. I have
- 9 integrated that piece of it in my thinking, I
- 10 have to say, because you have to post the
- 11 minutes and everybody can go and see that was
- 12 there at the meeting. And then, you are
- telling them they are going to be posted. So,
- 14 actually, that alleviates a great deal of my
- 15 concern.
- 16 MS. ELLIOTT: In all the record
- files for over 100 meetings, there was one
- 18 document, and it's posted on the OTS -- I
- 19 can't recall right now for what site -- but
- there is one document that is a response from
- 21 a union official that they had a difference

- with the minutes one time. We made it public,
- 2 not public, but we put it into the OTS to make
- 3 sure that that part was transparent, that they
- 4 did have an objection. That was before my
- 5 time, but I made sure that document was
- 6 included.
- 7 DR. MAKHIJANI: As I said, I have
- 8 not -- in a way, I kind of spoke without
- 9 putting all the pieces together in my head.
- 10 The fact that you actually -- like I don't
- 11 normally pull from my interviews. I just use
- them and refer to them or I will attach them
- to whatever I'm publishing.
- 14 Because you post everything, yes,
- then the destruction of the tapes is a lesser
- 16 issue.
- 17 MS. ELLIOTT: There are times when
- 18 discussions are summarized and not
- 19 transcripted because of discretionary issues,
- 20 but, still, we try to accurately portray the
- 21 content of the discussion.

1 MR. CALHOUN: One reason we don't 2 tape things is because all kinds of personal things get said and then you don't know what 3 with that, and you can't actually 5 circulate that in public. So we try to make a different kind of record that is as close to a 6 transcript as possible without getting it all. 7 MEMBER BEACH: 8 Correct. So, it sounds like just noting what you are doing in 9 10 the procedure might solve that. 11 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, at least my I have to say is much alleviated, 12 concern, 13 yes, absolutely. 14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: There's really no process for discussing the --15 I mean, if we do it, 16 MR. CALHOUN: 17 is it a big deal to put it in there, J.J.? MR. JOHNSON: 18 No. Yes, if we do it, we 19 MR. CALHOUN: 20 might as well take credit for it. 21 (Laughter.)

- DR. MAKHIJANI: Thank you.
- 2 MR. KATZ: Is there more to that
- 3 finding? Are we done?
- 4 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes.
- 5 MR. KATZ: So, is that one that
- the Work Group wants to close? Or do you want
- 7 to wait and see that they have put the
- 8 sentence in their procedure?
- 9 MEMBER MUNN: In abeyance.
- 10 MR. KATZ: In abeyance, I mean.
- 11 Right.
- 12 MEMBER BEACH: In abeyance.
- 13 MR. KATZ: Okay, five is in
- 14 abeyance.
- 15 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: With that, are
- we ready to break for lunch?
- MR. KATZ: Sounds good.
- 18 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.
- 19 MR. KATZ: What time should we be
- 20 back? An hour?
- 21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.

1	MR. KATZ: Okay, it's 12:35 by my
2	watch, If that's what other people have, then
3	1:35.
4	Thank you, everyone on the line,
5	for hanging in, and we'll be back at 1:30,
6	1:35.
7	(Whereupon, the above entitled
8	matter went off the record at 12:36 p.m. and
9	resumed at 1:40 p.m.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
1 7	

1	A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N
2	(1:40 p.m.)
3	MR. KATZ: Okay. So, this is the
4	Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health,
5	the Worker Outreach Work Group.
6	We are reconvening, having
7	finished lunch here, and I think we have
8	everyone. We're missing Phil, but I'm sure he
9	will come in. I think we could get rolling,
10	yes?
11	Okay, Mike?
12	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. I guess
13	the first thing, as far as scheduling for the
14	afternoon, the first thing we will do is get
15	back into the matrix and start with the
16	observations, and we will get as far as we can
17	on that.
18	At 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time, we are
19	going to go to the phones and open it up for
20	public comment and worker comments. If
21	there's any, we will welcome those comments at

- 1 that time.
- 2 And then, if we have any time
- 3 after that, we will go back to the agenda and
- 4 plan on trying to wrap up about 3:30.
- 5 So, get back to the observations,
- 6 SC&A?
- 7 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. I
- 8 wanted to kind of go over both Observation 1
- 9 and Observation 2 at the same time because
- 10 they are very closely linked.
- 11 Observation 1 is, the procedure
- 12 does not address the possibility that
- 13 sensitive or classified information could be
- shared at a worker outreach meeting.
- 15 And Observation 2 is, the
- 16 procedure does not provide an opportunity for
- 17 workers to discuss potentially classified
- 18 information. Particularly at NNSA sites,
- 19 workers may be restricted from openly
- 20 discussing site-specific information due to
- 21 security concerns.

1 Observation 1, at a minimum, For 2 we felt that the procedure should alert worker outreach staff to submit recordings, minutes 3 and meeting notes for classification review if 4 5 have any doubt about classification status of information shared at an outreach 6 I think, from earlier discussion, 7 meeting. may 8 that be happening, but there's requirement to do so in the procedure. 9 10 For the second observation, we had 11 two concerns. Worker outreach meetings at NNSA sites can solicit classified information, 12 13 even if you don't want it to. A cautionary 14 statement should be made upfront that reminds individuals cautious 15 to be about the In other words, information they are sharing. 16 17 notification that it's an unclassified meeting 18 they should not be sharing classified information in that meeting. 19 20 for those who wish to share classified information, there wasn't a process 21

- described for them to do so in the procedure.
- 2 A lot of times, they have critical
- 3 information that can influence technical work
- documents. So, there should be an opportunity
- 5 provided to them or a statement on how you are
- 6 going to provide that opportunity to them, so
- 7 that they can, if they feel that there's
- 8 classified information they need to share, so
- 9 that they can go ahead and share that in some
- 10 capacity through the process.
- 11 MR. JOHNSON: Well, my response is
- 12 that I have got an action here that says,
- 13 provide additional quidance in the procedures
- 14 to address discussion of sensitive or
- 15 classified information prior to the beginning
- of the meeting.
- 17 Additionally, we have procedures
- that deal with the interface of personnel that
- 19 may give sensitive or classified information,
- 20 and that's under OCAS-PR-10, Data Access and
- 21 Interview Process -- or Procedures. That will

- 1 be used as a reference in here.
- MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. So,
- 3 you're saying that PR-10 is the mechanism by
- 4 which you are going to offer that opportunity
- 5 for people to share classified information,
- 6 should they need to?
- 7 MR. JOHNSON: It is the tool, yes.
- 8 MR. CALHOUN: It might not be a
- 9 bad idea to mention it in this document, but
- 10 that is really more how we deal with it once
- 11 we've got it. But as far as I know, what you
- 12 are getting at, actually offering it to them,
- 13 we generally shy away a little bit from
- saying, hey, if you want to have a classified
- interview, let's do it, because a lot of
- 16 people will just start doing it.
- 17 I think that it should be in
- there, but we need to be careful about that.
- 19 We do the same thing with CATIS, you know. I
- think that saying, hey, please don't give out
- 21 any classified information because it's an

- 1 unclassified interview. If you feel you have
- 2 information that is classified that you need
- 3 to talk to us about, we can arrange that, or
- 4 something like that.
- 5 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes, that's a
- 6 definite necessity.
- 7 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. One
- 8 site where this is of particular concern would
- 9 be, say, Pantex. You can get yourself into a
- 10 lot of trouble real quickly at that site.
- MR. CALHOUN: Yes.
- 12 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: From our
- 13 site expert interviews, there's a lot of
- 14 valuable information that comes out of those
- 15 classified interviews.
- 16 Now I thought I heard Vern say
- 17 earlier that the worker outreach meeting, it
- is submitted to DOE for classification review.
- 19 MR. McDOUGALL: They all do, yes.
- 20 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: So, in
- 21 referencing PR-10 and PR-11, in essence, you

- are dealing with that in the procedure itself.
- MR. CALHOUN: Yes, and then,
- obviously, if we had the interview, if it was
- 4 a planned interview that we had done, and
- 5 knowing that we would get or perceiving that
- 6 we get classified information, that would get
- 7 done before we even left the site. You know
- 8 how that is done.
- 9 So, yes, we couldn't leave with
- 10 that. You know what? They wouldn't let us
- 11 record it anyway.
- 12 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, and PR-11 was
- approved 4/22/2009, and our procedure was
- 14 approved a little bit later, so about
- 15 parallel. So both of those will be referenced
- in there.
- MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay.
- 18 MEMBER BEACH: In abeyance?
- 19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: In abeyance.
- 20 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay.
- Observation 3 is, there are no provisions for

- 1 soliciting comments from workers who are
- 2 unable to physically attend worker outreach
- 3 meetings.
- 4 And a method for individuals who
- 5 cannot attend worker outreach meetings is not
- 6 provided or discussed in the procedure. But
- 7 the individuals can provide comments in
- 8 writing via a letter or via the website or the
- 9 docket. However, in our early discussion,
- 10 these venues are not given the same
- 11 consideration as far as development of action
- 12 items and follow-through as worker outreach
- 13 comments. There is no formal evaluation
- tracking or resolution procedures for comments
- 15 provided in this way.
- 16 So, you've got somebody who can't
- 17 come to a meeting. They have these other
- options, but there's no evaluation of those
- 19 comments in the same manner as the worker
- 20 outreach meeting minutes.
- MR. CALHOUN: You know, that may

- 1 not be procedure-wise, but I think we get that
- done. I don't know. J.J. may know more about
- it than I do, but I don't know if I'll say
- 4 often, but it happens when we get input for
- 5 questions electronically, and Chris Ellison
- 6 ends up dealing with it. She will send them
- 7 to one of us, so that she can respond to the
- 8 person who sent the question.
- 9 Maybe we are doing that and it is
- 10 just not specified in here. But I don't know
- if all of them go through that way. I know
- docket things will go through that.
- 13 MR. JOHNSON: The docket things go
- 14 that way, but that's one of those other
- 15 outreach venues.
- 16 MEMBER MUNN: I would imagine most
- of those actually get a one-on-one response.
- 18 MR. CALHOUN: I think they do.
- 19 MEMBER MUNN: At least an
- 20 acknowledgment of receipt, if not a --
- 21 MR. CALHOUN: But I just don't

- 1 want to say for sure because I'm not positive,
- 2 but I think they do.
- 3 MEMBER MUNN: I can't imagine they
- 4 are not being responded to.
- 5 MR. CALHOUN: But we will check
- 6 that.
- 7 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, one
- 8 of the suggestions we had was to have a call-
- 9 in number.
- 10 MR. JOHNSON: Have a what?
- 11 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Have a
- 12 call-in number where people could call in.
- 13 MR. McDOUGALL: What kind of
- 14 meetings are you trying to --
- 15 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: These would
- 16 be more --
- 17 MR. JOHNSON: We've got a call-in
- 18 number, don't we?
- 19 MR. CALHOUN: I don't know. On
- 20 some of them we do. I don't know if we do on
- 21 that one.

1 MS. **ROBERTSON-DEMERS:** This 2 wouldn't be you're invited to meetings, know, when you're inviting someone. 3 This will outreach information-4 more open worker 5 gathering meetings. 6 ELLIOTT: MS. We have attempted 7 that. 8 MR. McDOUGALL: For example, 9 information-gathering meetings are usually 10 relatively small meetings, almost always under 20 people, frequently under 10 or 12. And it 11 is kind of an opportunistic kind of thing. 12 there are 10 people in Cincinnati who can give 13 14 us information on GE Evendale, for example -and I think this actually happened -- and one 15 or two were in Florida, well, you kind of make 16 17 a judgment call that what the one or two are 18 going to add isn't going to be so critical. Unless you have some knowledge that they have 19 20 something special, they are pretty much like the other folks. 21

1	You kind of make a judgment call
2	that you are not going to go to extraordinary
3	measures to get the input from other people,
4	if you can get comparable quality of input
5	more conveniently.
6	Now, having said that, in order to
7	make it convenient, we make it as convenient
8	as we can. We try to hold meetings in one-
9	story buildings and in locations that are
LO	convenient that people know about, to try to
L1	facilitate to try to remove as many
L2	barriers as possible. But, again, if you have
L3	got 10 in Ohio and one in Florida, you don't
L4	really need the one in Florida, unless they
L5	know something special.
L6	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: What do you
L7	do in the case where they do know critical
L8	information?
L9	MR. McDOUGALL: Well, actually, I
20	imagine DCAS would conduct an one-on-one
21	interview the way they frequently do, I guess

1 with --

Like we recently did 2 MR. JOHNSON: The folks that were in the 3 with Simonds Saw. area that came to the meeting, their comments 4 5 and discussions were noted. And those individuals that were in the system, in NOCTS, 6 they were contacted by ORAU and personally 7 8 interviewed with the questions that 9 provided to the people that went the 10 initial meeting. 11 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And this is some of our concern about these -- this two-12 13 track system we use. One set of comments is being tracked in OTS because it is designated 14 as a worker outreach, but in these individual 15 interviews with these couple of people, they 16 17 are not being tracked. The comments for those 18 are not being tracked. 19 MR. JOHNSON: They may not 20 tracked in OTS, but they are tracked in the

SRDB through the information that is provided

21

- 1 for those respective sites.
- 2 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: What
- 3 happens is you get a documented communication.
- 4 In that documented communication, there's
- 5 really no procedure for how to disposition
- 6 those comments provided in that documented
- 7 communication.
- 8 MR. JOHNSON: Well, in this case,
- 9 all the comments went to the OCAS HP for
- 10 review. And in the interview, he would take
- 11 all those comments into consideration. So,
- the ones that were at the meeting, he was at
- the meeting, along with the ones that were
- 14 provided through phone conversations. So,
- they didn't go on their two separate ways.
- 16 They were reviewed and consolidated, reviewed
- 17 by the OCAS HP.
- 18 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And for
- 19 those documented communications, the items
- 20 that were in the SRBD, were action items
- 21 tracked on that?

- 1 MR. JOHNSON: I have no idea
- 2 because they were part of an SEC.
- 3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, how
- 4 hard would it be to provide a call-in number
- for these people?
- 6 MR. JOHNSON: How hard would it be
- 7 to what?
- 8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: To provide
- 9 a call-in number for people who can't get
- 10 there?
- 11 MR. JOHNSON: I don't know. I
- 12 would have to check into that.
- 13 MS. ELLIOTT: A lot of it depends
- 14 upon the facility, whether it's available. We
- 15 have gone to certain places and asked if that
- 16 was possible, and until you get the facility
- 17 to see what they have, there really isn't a
- 18 way to tell. And even if they say, yes, we
- 19 have a speaker phone system, you know, it may
- not be adequate to be heard in a large room.
- 21 It probably won't be a Polycom.

- 1 MR. JOHNSON: Oh, you mean a call
- 2 to the meeting itself?
- 3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes.
- 4 MR. JOHNSON: I think we tried
- 5 that at Simonds Saw and the service wasn't
- 6 available or something.
- 7 MS. ELLIOTT: We have asked in
- 8 several different venues, and it either is not
- 9 available or what they do have is not
- 10 adequate. As in the case for Blockson,
- 11 somebody wanted to have a call-in for the
- 12 Blockson meetings. It was in their city hall
- in a big, public, courtroom-type situation,
- and there was just no way. It would not have
- 15 been even -- whoever was on the phone could
- 16 not have heard most of what went on.
- 17 But we have made attempts for
- things like this, and you can only do what's
- 19 available.
- 20 MR. McDOUGALL: But, again, if you
- 21 are gathering information, it isn't really

- that important to go to extraordinary measures
- 2 to add one more person. If you can get the
- 3 information you need from a representative
- 4 group of people, if one or two are absent,
- 5 they're absent.
- 6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, I
- 7 guess the main concern here is that you do
- 8 have other avenues, but the comments provided
- 9 to those other avenues are not being tracked
- in the same manner as the worker outreach
- 11 meeting is -- the actions.
- 12 MS. ELLIOTT: I believe in one
- 13 situation where we were -- this is not quite
- 14 the same as what you're talking about -- but
- there was an individual who couldn't come to a
- 16 meeting where we had a group of retirees and
- 17 former workers that came together. The
- 18 minutes were sent, actually, along to
- 19 everybody else, to him as well, so he could
- 20 comment. He was too ill to actually leave his
- 21 home, but he had the opportunity to see what

- was going on at the meeting, so he could add anything -- something else, if he had something pertinent to add. And we do try to
- 4 take measures to do that.
- 5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And as long the comments that are being provided in 6 that way are being treated in the same manner 7 8 as those being captured in the meeting minutes, then there is a mechanism for them to 9 10 provide comments if they can't be there. But I don't see the process by which these other 11 the websites, the docket, providing 12 venues, 13 letters Т don't see the mechanism for 14 tracking those comments and developing action items will ultimately lead to --15

MS. ELLIOTT: I can cite a specific instance where that is in OTS and you can take a look at it and see that we have made attempts to do that, as well. There was a Pinellas meeting in November of 2005, and we had several people who could not come to the

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 1 meeting that heard about it and provided
- 2 letters through the docket and also through
- mail, also, some emails through the Docket
- 4 Office, and they were forwarded on to Bill
- 5 Murray, who at the time was in charge of the
- 6 worker outreach. And Bill and the HP both
- 7 looked at that, and they are in the OTS. I
- 8 made sure to add those.
- 9 MEMBER MUNN: So that's the
- 10 missing link, apparently, is there doesn't
- 11 seem to be any word anywhere that says,
- comments received by mail, email, or other --
- 13 MS. ELLIOTT: I think I identified
- it in that manner when I put it in the OTS.
- 15 MEMBER MUNN: -- will be attached
- to the minutes or will be a portion of the
- 17 minutes and will receive the same
- 18 consideration. It sounds like a one-sentence
- 19 fix, if we agree on where the one-sentence fix
- 20 is going to be.
- 21 MR. KATZ: We discussed this

- 1 before lunch. I mean, under Finding 4, J.J.
- 2 said that they would look into the feasibility
- of adding to the tracking system for these
- 4 other venues by which you receive information.
- 5 So, that issue is in progress, and they will
- 6 look into that.
- 7 MS. ELLIOTT: If they are provided
- 8 to the team as part of the process of the
- 9 meeting, I do make sure they go in there.
- 10 MR. KATZ: No, that's great. So
- 11 you are already doing it, in part. So you are
- 12 already somehow putting that in.
- 13 And I think the reason you can do
- 14 it in that instance is because it is
- associated with a meeting. So that is already
- 16 set up.
- 17 MS. ELLIOTT: Correct.
- 18 MR. KATZ: Whereas, these other
- 19 venues, if they send in to the docket, for
- 20 example, and it is somehow not connected with
- 21 your meeting, it is not associated with your

- 1 meeting, then it doesn't end up there. But
- 2 that makes sense.
- 3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: And I may
- 4 be putting words into your mouth by saying
- that those are venues that a person who can't
- 6 physically get to a meeting can use to provide
- 7 comments.
- 8 MR. JOHNSON: There are options
- 9 that can be provided, and have been provided,
- 10 to claimants to support their feedback.
- 11 MS. ELLIOTT: Even within the
- 12 meeting, there is always something -- if
- there's a presentation, there is almost always
- a slide in that presentation that discusses,
- 15 that notes that comments could be sent to the
- 16 NIOSH Docket Office, and it gives the email
- 17 address for that.
- So, if there were to be something
- 19 to the meeting, you know, we can't make them
- 20 send an email, but at least they know that the
- 21 option is there.

1	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So we can look
2	into putting a sentence somewhere just while
3	you are doing this other stuff?
4	Perhaps we can mark 3 in progress?
5	MR. KATZ: Or actually, I mean I
6	think that one is in abeyance then, because
7	for that one it is not even a feasibility
8	it is associated with a meeting we are talking
9	about. As long as there is some instruction
10	somewhere to do that, to put it in the
11	tracking, it is already happening, is what
12	Mary is telling us.
13	MS. ELLIOTT: I try to be pretty
14	fastidious about that, if it's available.
15	MR. KATZ: Yes.
16	MS. ELLIOTT: It just took a while
17	to
18	MR. KATZ: So it's just addressed
19	in
20	MR. JOHNSON: Put a sentence in
21	there.

- 1 MR. KATZ: Yes. So it seems like
- 2 that is in abeyance.
- 3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay.
- 4 Observation 4?
- 5 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay.
- 6 Observation 4 is pretty simple. There is no
- 7 requirement for disclosure of conflict of
- 8 interest during the worker outreach meetings.
- 9 So, in other words, particularly the person
- 10 responsible for writing the document who
- 11 happens to be at the meeting does not have to
- 12 disclose conflict of interest.
- 13 So, for example, if you have
- 14 someone who is holding an SEC focus group
- 15 meeting, who is responsible for writing the
- 16 Evaluation Report, they don't have to disclose
- 17 conflicts of interest.
- 18 MR. JOHNSON: My understanding is
- 19 that -- I don't know that we have people in
- 20 these meetings that have a conflict. Am I
- 21 wrong, Grady?

- 1 MR. CALHOUN: I don't know if
- 2 you're wrong or not, but, typically, what I
- 3 have seen when we go through some of the other
- 4 meetings, they just go around the room and
- 5 just say it, you know.
- 6 As a matter of fact, I'm surprised
- 7 we didn't say it today because usually it
- 8 seems like we start out our Work Group
- 9 meetings --
- 10 MR. KATZ: No, it's not site-
- 11 specific.
- MR. CALHOUN: Oh, it's not. There
- 13 you go, yes.
- 14 And say, I have no conflict at
- 15 this site.
- 16 So I don't see any harm with that.
- 17 It seems easy enough to do, yes.
- 18 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. I will add a
- 19 sentence.
- 20 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Observation 5?
- 21 MR. KATZ: That, then, is in

- 1 abeyance.
- 2 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.
- 3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. The
- 4 Site Profile and Technical Basis Document
- 5 development procedure are ORAUT-PROC-31,
- 6 references ORAUT-PROC-97, which is the old
- 7 worker outreach procedure. That procedure has
- 8 been replaced by PR-12.
- 9 It is a little bit more
- 10 complicated than just going in and doing a
- 11 search and replace. What PROC-31 does is it
- 12 used to interface and reference back to the
- old worker outreach procedure, PROC-97, and
- 14 PROC-97 needs to reference the Site Profile
- 15 development procedure. There was an
- interaction there between those two procedures
- 17 that allowed for -- it provided direction for
- 18 looking at the worker outreach comments and
- 19 evaluating them and integrating those of
- 20 substantial nature into the Site Profile.
- So, partly the content would have

- 1 to be updated, and partly you are still
- 2 referencing the procedure that is no longer in
- 3 existence in another procedure.
- 4 MR. JOHNSON: Well, that is why we
- 5 have the Outreach Tracking System with
- 6 tracking of issues set up the way it is. So
- 7 that, when you have the OCAS HP interfacing
- 8 with the Technical Basis Document owner at the
- 9 meeting, they concur on what the action items,
- 10 tracking items are. And that individual,
- 11 then, on the OCAS ORAU side makes whatever
- 12 changes they have to make based on their
- 13 agreement. And then, when it is closed out,
- 14 it goes through and indicates that either the
- 15 Technical Basis Document was updated, no
- 16 action was taken, or individuals were provided
- 17 feedback.
- So, the connection here between 97
- and 31 doesn't make a difference anymore.
- 20 MR. CALHOUN: It should be changed
- in the ORAU document ultimately, though, to

- 1 make sure that we are not referencing a
- 2 document that doesn't exist during the next
- 3 time that they revise that.
- 4 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay.
- 5 MR. CALHOUN: And then we will
- 6 have to make the appropriate fixes, too, you
- 7 know. I don't know it off the top of my head.
- 8 So, like I said, if it is not a simple just
- 9 changing a reference, obviously, they will
- 10 need to change that when they get around to
- 11 revising that again. I don't know what the
- 12 schedule is on that.
- MEMBER MUNN: In abeyance.
- 14 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.
- MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. It
- is my understanding -- and Wanda can help me
- 17 here --
- 18 MEMBER MUNN: I'm not sure.
- 19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: -- yes, if
- 20 this not the case, but it is my understanding
- 21 from other members of SC&A that the findings

- 1 from our review of ORAUT-PROC-97 were
- 2 transferred from the Procedures Subcommittee
- 3 Group over to the Worker Outreach Group.
- 4 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, that was done.
- 5 Maybe you have received, actually, an email
- from me. I don't think you have it.
- 7 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: So there
- 8 were a total of nine findings under that
- 9 procedure, many of which were repeated in the
- 10 OCAS-PR-0012 review. And I believe eight of
- 11 those findings that were transferred are still
- 12 open, and we kind of need to have some
- 13 discussion on what you want to do with those
- 14 findings, whether you want to close them out
- 15 simultaneously with resolving the findings for
- 16 OCAS-PR-0012 or whether you want to close the
- findings out for 97 and defer it to PR-12.
- 18 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I think what --
- 19 and Wanda can help me here, too -- the
- 20 Procedures Subcommittee had in mind was, when
- 21 they see findings that are more relevant to a

- 1 specific group rather than the Procedures
- 2 Subcommittee as a whole, they send just that
- finding to the group, and that's our
- 4 objective, just to see that finding through to
- 5 closure and then send a letter back to the
- 6 Procedures Subcommittee telling them it's
- 7 done.
- 8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes, and
- 9 part of the issue was, like I said, we tried
- to integrate some of the findings from 97 into
- 11 PR-12. So there is a lot of redundancy.
- MR. JOHNSON: Well, that is what
- 13 made this review very difficult because they
- 14 were integrated. If you just had gone and
- 15 looked at PR-12 without 97, started with a
- 16 clean slate, it would have been a lot cleaner.
- 17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Some of the
- issues were relevant -- well, the ones that we
- 19 integrated into PR-12 were relevant, still
- 20 relevant, to the review of PR-12.
- 21 MR. JOHNSON: No, I am not saying

- 1 that they weren't. I am just saying that, if
- 2 you had just forgotten about Procedure 97 and
- just looked at PR-12 for its merits compared
- 4 to what you saw in the rearview mirror on
- 5 PR-97, and moved forward on that, it would
- 6 have been a cleaner slate.
- 7 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, don't
- 8 misunderstand me, but there were a lot of good
- 9 things about 97 that we were trying to bring
- out in our review that went away with PR-12.
- 11 MR. JOHNSON: Well, that could
- have been. You also have to look at change of
- 13 command, that it is a situation where outreach
- 14 didn't exist for six months, and OD decided to
- 15 take action and move in a forward direction to
- 16 start outreach again.
- 17 And so, from what WISPR was and
- 18 what we have with something that we thought
- 19 was reasonable, capable within the resources
- that we had, so that's why we have the product
- 21 we have.

1 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, what 2 is your preference? Do you want to go through these findings one at a time? 3 Just however it 4 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: 5 is going to be easiest to explain and respond 6 to. 7 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Do you want to put a new status report based upon what we 8 discussed with the other findings? I'm asking 9 10 for guidance. Currently, on 11 MEMBER MUNN: the Procedures Subcommittee's tracking list, ORAU 12 0097-2 13 PROC-0097-1 and show that are 14 changing the status to reflect that the finding is addressed in PR-12, Observations 1 15 and 2. 16 17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Right. 18 MEMBER MUNN: So, since that is the case, then if you are going to address 19 20 these issues, then from the Subcommittee's

NEAL R. GROSS

point of view, they need to be addressed in

- 1 PR-12, since I'm not sure how we want to make
- 2 the two equitable, and perhaps we can't
- 3 resolve it here. Perhaps some of us need to
- 4 sit and identify the mechanics of precisely
- 5 how we want to proceed with that.
- 6 But PR-12 is currently in a state
- of flux with respect to the Subcommittee's
- 8 findings. So how we proceed is not going to,
- 9 I think, affect much that is going on here,
- 10 other than for us to come to the conclusion
- 11 how you are going to deal with each of the two
- 12 and who's got the action. I think that is
- really and truly what it boils down to.
- I don't know what to tell you
- other than I will be glad to sit down offline
- 16 with those of you who are intimately involved
- 17 with this and talk about what we can do with
- 18 PR-12.
- 19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes, why don't
- 20 we do that? Let's put these on hold until we
- 21 can decide how to do it.

1	MEMBER MUNN: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: And just move on
3	on the agenda to the next item there.
4	MEMBER MUNN: I think that would
5	be the wisest thing to do right now because,
6	otherwise, we are going to get caught up in
7	who's on first with these.
8	MEMBER BEACH: Mike, before we
9	move on to the next topic, can we try to see
10	if we are working to the same version?
11	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.
12	MEMBER BEACH: The latest one I
13	could find was 12/3/09, but I am sure there
14	was one after that, but I don't seem to be
15	able to find it. So, maybe what I see, I've
16	got some markups. So, if anybody can look and
17	see what their latest copy of
18	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: About which doc,
19	though?
20	MEMBER BEACH: It's the Outreach
21	Draft Implementation Plan, and we are looking

- 1 at --
- MR. KATZ: No, that would be the
- 3 latest, I think.
- 4 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I just wanted
- 5 to make sure.
- 6 MR. KATZ: I didn't bring it with
- 7 me this time: my version of it.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: The one I am
- 9 looking at is SC&A looked at -- Objective 3
- was sent by Joe on May 18th, 2010.
- 11 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. So that is a
- 12 separate one then. I have that.
- 13 MR. KATZ: So I think what Mike is
- 14 referring to is actually an Implementation
- 15 Plan for Objective 3, right? Is that what you
- were referring to from May?
- 17 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: The Review Plan.
- 18 MR. KATZ: The Review Plan, but it
- is the implementing -- yes. And what Josie is
- 20 talking about, I think, is the whole
- 21 framework, right, Josie?

- 1 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.
- 2 MR. KATZ: Yes. So that makes
- 3 sense. So, Josie, I think your framework is
- 4 the correct framework still.
- 5 MEMBER BEACH: Okay, but we are
- 6 looking at the thing Joe sent?
- 7 MR. JOHNSON: But Joe transmitted
- 8 something in May, right, that was a proposal
- 9 for a path forward for reviewing Objective 3?
- 10 MEMBER BEACH: Okay.
- 11 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Do you have that
- 12 document, Josie?
- 13 MEMBER BEACH: I do. I just have
- 14 to find it again.
- 15 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I'll give that
- 16 to you, Wanda.
- 17 MEMBER MUNN: Thank you. It was
- 18 May you're looking for?
- 19 MR. KATZ: Yes, that sounds right.
- 20 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: It is dated May
- 21 18th.

- 1 MEMBER BEACH: Is it Review --
- okay, I've got it, yes. Thank you.
- 3 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Shall I send it
- 4 to you, Wanda?
- 5 MEMBER MUNN: I think I'll find
- 6 it.
- 7 MR. KATZ: Kathy, do you have any
- 8 printed copies of that?
- 9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Just this
- 10 one.
- MR. KATZ: Okay.
- MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Do we need
- 13 to make copies?
- MR. KATZ: Well, that's what I was
- 15 going to ask. If any people want me to make
- 16 copies, I can run down there.
- 17 MEMBER MUNN: I think we are okay.
- 18 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.
- 19 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, I think so.
- 20 That's where we are, right?
- 21 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.

1	MEMBER MUNN: That's what our
2	discussion is about, right?
3	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.
4	So Joe has already left us.
5	Kathy, Arjun, do you want to pick up the
6	pieces here?
7	MR. KATZ: So, Arjun, we are
8	talking about Objective 3, the Review Plan for
9	Objective 3.
10	DR. MAKHIJANI: Oh, yes. Sorry.
11	Yes, I think earlier Kathy and I
12	were kind of discussing that we might select a
13	few of the recent examples. I mean Grady was
14	talking about the changes that have occurred
15	in these Evaluation Reports, worker gathering-
16	information meetings where you gather the
17	information, and then it is referred to in the
18	Evaluation Report, and there are SRD numbers.
19	So, a lot of the discussion at
20	least that I have contributed would be useful
21	for us to review are those minutes and to see

- 1 how they were incorporated, and you know,
- 2 maybe to talk to one or two of the
- 3 interviewees and the document preparer who
- 4 requested the meeting. Something like that I
- 5 think might constitute an example of an
- 6 evaluation.
- 7 I don't know. What do you think,
- 8 Ted?
- 9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Do you want
- 10 me to read through the bullets that we have in
- 11 here?
- MR. KATZ: Yes, please do. Please
- do, Kathy.
- 14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: We have
- 15 proposed to do the following. Does everybody
- remember what the Objective 3 was or do I need
- 17 to --
- 18 MR. KATZ: Go ahead and restate it
- 19 to get everybody on track.
- 20 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Determine
- 21 whether OCAS is giving thorough consideration

1 to information received by workers through the 2 worker efforts, incorporating outreach considerations of that material into its work 3 4 products appropriate and adequately as 5 communicating the impact οf substantive comments to the workers. 6 Okay, that was the objective. 7 And what we had proposed was to identify technical 8 worker documents issued without the benefit of 9 10 worker outreach meetings or any other form of having worker input. 11 12 So, Okav, that was one. what technical work documents were issued without a 13 14 worker outreach meeting? Identify technical 15 worker issued within 90 days 16 documents the 17 relevant worker outreach meeting for which no 18 subsequent revisions of technical work documents, such as Site Profiles, were issued 19 20 within two years of receiving any substantive

input from the outreach meeting. This would

- require that SC&A evaluate whether substantive comments were provided that deserve
- 3 consideration.
- So we have to get into review of the meeting minutes and comments provided at the worker outreach meetings.
- Identify 7 Okav. recurrent substantive worker 8 comments related to specific 9 sites from the inception of the 10 worker outreach program. Evaluate how this information was incorporated into technical 11 work documents and whether and how responses 12 were handled with the commenters. 13

identify Next, worker input provided through other worker outreach venues, including the website docket, invited forums, dose reconstruction workshops, and letters submitted to NIOSH by workers, petitioners, and other interested parties. Evaluate how this data was incorporated into technical worker documents and whether and how

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 responses were provided to the commenters.

And finally, identify substantive
site expert input collected as a part of Site
Profile and/or SEC evaluations. Evaluate how
this information was documented and
incorporated into technical work documents.

basically, taking the So. different venues of worker outreach, considering say, a sampling of the comments provided, and following it through on how it was incorporated into technical work documents and, also, how responses were being provided t.he commenter that provided those t.o substantive comments.

I now recall when I MEMBER MUNN: first read this communication that my single immediate reaction was this document is proposing a level of effort which is mindboggling to consider. There are certainly benefits to be considered in those five bullets, but if this body determines to do

NEAL R. GROSS

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- 1 this, it seems imperative that we place
- limitations on the scope of this work at the
- 3 outset. This could really take years to
- 4 complete if it were done in an extensive
- 5 manner.
- It might behoove us to consider
- 7 the possibility of evaluating these points
- 8 individually and do a cost-benefit analysis in
- 9 terms of what we achieve if we complete some
- 10 or all of these.
- 11 These are certainly wonderful
- 12 goals. I am not at all sure whether the
- 13 program in its broadest sense would receive an
- 14 adequate benefit for the expenditure of
- 15 effort. And I am not at all sure whether that
- 16 has even been considered or whether this was
- just these are things we could do or whether
- the magnitude of effort has even been thrown
- 19 into the mix yet.
- 20 As best I can tell when I read
- 21 this, it was my thought that these are

- 1 excellent goals, but I don't know what the
- 2 reaction of others was.
- DR. MAURO: Wanda, would you mind?
- 4 I would like to take a shot at that because I
- 5 am tracking our budget and report it every
- 6 month.
- 7 And you are correct, if we were to
- 8 take on a program like this, it would
- 9 definitely stress my ability to contain our
- 10 budget within the limits we have for
- 11 ourselves.
- 12 One suggestion might be, if it is
- desired by the Work Group to do something like
- 14 this, it might be like the dose
- reconstructions. You know, the Board picks 30
- 16 each year for us to look at, based on whatever
- 17 criteria that they have developed, which keeps
- 18 the cost contained and still accomplishes
- 19 quite a bit, because we get a nice cross-
- 20 section of different cases and we report back.
- 21 It accomplishes its intent.

1 Perhaps Site one or two, one 2 Profile could be selected, perhaps a recent one, that might have been done at a time that 3 was at the same time that PROC-12 has been in 4 5 place, and just look at one. 6 alternatively, this is Or, something that NIOSH could do and report back 7 Then, of course, the Board, 8 to the Board. with our help, as you see fit, could review 9 10 NIOSH's report on that matter. 11 Ι mean, so there are ways. Ι certainly would agree 100 percent that, to try 12 13 to do this on many Site Profiles or ERs, the 14 cost would be burdensome. But I don't think it is necessary that a lot of them be looked 15 at this way. 16 17 Ιt is of like the Site sort 18 Profiles, I'm sorry, the dose reconstructions. 19 reasonable sample would give insight. 20 Especially if it is picked randomly or picked under certain criteria, it might accomplish 21

- 1 what you are trying to accomplish.
- 2 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I think it
- 3 was always our intent to do a sample. A
- 4 sampling, because of the different venues, may
- 5 be easier if we pick a site or a couple of
- 6 sites.
- 7 MEMBER BEACH: I think I agree
- 8 with what Wanda said completely. I think
- 9 maybe a site, to see what the product is going
- 10 to look like, what the value is. I hate to go
- in and spend money to decide how much money we
- 12 are going to spend. Maybe just pick a site,
- one that we agree that's --
- 14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, keep
- in mind, the first bullet on there, it is
- 16 really not relevant to just one site. It has
- 17 to do with identifying sites where there was
- 18 no worker outreach meeting, but there is a
- 19 Site Profile.
- 20 MEMBER BEACH: True.
- MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: So some of

- these are broader. There's not a lot of time
- 2 commitment to it.
- 3 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, that one, it
- 4 seems like we could do that fairly quickly,
- 5 bullet No. 1. It's the Identify technical
- 6 worker document. Yes, that would be
- 7 interesting.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Well, I think
- 9 that sounds good. I think bullet No. 1 is
- 10 doable. I think it would give us an overall
- 11 picture, a good picture. But, then, we would
- 12 come up with each site that meets all the
- 13 criteria of the bullets that would be a good
- 14 candidate to look into.
- 15 MEMBER BEACH: I quess, from that
- 16 very first bullet, what if you did that first
- 17 bullet, identified the sites where there was
- worker input and where there wasn't, and then
- 19 maybe pick a site to do that had worker input
- 20 and one that didn't have worker input? I
- 21 mean, is that of value?

1	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I don't
2	know how we would gauge the effectiveness of
3	something that didn't have worker input.
4	MEMBER BEACH: Well, I guess we
5	wouldn't be able to. I was thinking of the
6	other side of it.
7	MR. CALHOUN: Is there any way to
8	keep it seems like this is going to be a
9	never-ending task. Is there any way to
10	subtract that from this Work Group meeting,
11	you know, the ongoing review, so that you can
12	close out the issues in this Work Group
13	meeting?
14	I mean we have got, with the dose
15	reconstruction evaluation, that goes on and on
16	and on. It will never stop. It seems like it
17	might be smart to divorce the on-and-on review
18	of worker input and taking some, like John
19	suggested, if that is the way you decide to
20	go, divorce that from this Work Group meeting.
21	We would start a different task or something,

- 1 so that this Work Group meeting can actually
- 2 end at some point.
- MR. KATZ: Well, I mean I think it
- 4 makes sense, at this point at least, to pilot
- 5 it here because I don't know really what other
- 6 work group would take on sort of oversight of
- 7 this.
- 8 MR. CALHOUN: Well, we first
- 9 sample, but John suggested an ongoing --
- 10 MR. KATZ: But let's just see what
- 11 comes one step at a time, is what I would
- 12 suggest.
- 13 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: And that is also
- 14 going to be a decision that the Board makes,
- if they want to separate this out.
- 16 MEMBER BEACH: Well, and this is
- 17 part of our mission. This is what we created
- 18 for this work group.
- 19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Right.
- 20 MR. KATZ: This certainly does fit
- 21 under this work group's authority.

1 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: The issues and 2 things like this on this matrix, you know, we can have another meeting to get these closed 3 But there's going to be ongoing things 4 5 to do with worker outlook for the foreseeable 6 future, I think. had another idea 7 DR. MAURO: Ι that goes along with this. It just dawned on 8 9 me. 10 For example, let's say right now there are a couple of sites that are really 11 undergoing very, very detailed investigation 12 13 or have undergone very detailed investigation. Certainly, Savannah River is undergoing a lot 14 investigation, Mound, 15 of and others like Nevada Test Site, this has been done. 16 17 What I'm getting at is there are 18 certain Site Profiles and Evaluation Reports where SC&A is intimately familiar with them. 19 20 Unfortunately, many of them are pretty old. But if 21 there is one or two that we have

basically reviewed or are close to completing 2 our review, then it just simply becomes a 3 matter of let's go into the tracking system, relatively quick 4 and quess is at а my 5 turnaround, we could say the degree to which the collection of information that is in the 6 tracking system for that particular facility, 7 as long as the timing is right, that is, that 8 the information came in and then the Site 9 10 Profile, or whatever, came out, you know, it 11 was some time period after. We could probably, my quess is --12 I mean this sounds a little optimistic, but 13 14 the people who are doing the work on quickly read different sections could 15 the tracking system data, and right off the bat 16 17 say the degree to which any particular issue

20 So, my first reaction was this is an enormous task, but, then, a light just went 21

been reflected in that Site Profile.

NEAL R. GROSS

raised or question or piece of information has

18

19

- on. For ones we already did, it is not. For
- ones we need to do in the future, yes, it
- 3 effectively would require us to review the
- 4 Site Profile the way we would normally review
- 5 any Site Profile, which is quite an
- 6 undertaking, and include as part of that the
- 7 degree to which the comments were, in fact,
- 8 captured in the product.
- 9 So, anyway, that was just another
- 10 thought. If we pick judiciously, it is not
- 11 going to be burdensome.
- 12 DR. MAKHIJANI: John, I hate to
- disagree with you on the record here.
- DR. MAURO: Okay.
- MR. KATZ: That's fine.
- 16 DR. MAKHIJANI: In the spirit of
- just thinking out loud, you know, the tracking
- 18 system is just a piece of this. The essence
- of this objective, as I see it, is to kind of
- 20 see what happened substantively to the product
- 21 that NIOSH produced.

1 Ι think don't be you want to 2 unfair. You don't want to shortcircuit that. If we do one, we should do it properly, and 3 you don't want to be unfair to the authors, 4 5 and you do want to give credit where they actually went out, took information, and it is 6 reflected. Ιf really 7 something important slipped through the cracks and some worker is 8 sad, you want to be able to reflect that, so 9 10 that you have a document. And I agree with Mike and what Ted 11 At this stage, I think you may need to 12 said. 13 do one. 14 But for Grady's concern, I think 15 you can close out the procedure review, because I think how you are going to fix the 16 17 procedure, and then this can be an ongoing or not ongoing exercise, depending on what the 18 Board and NIOSH decide. 19 It can be separated 20 from the procedure review. 21 think this one will take But Ι

- 1 some work. I think we should do it very
- 2 carefully and deliberately and be fair and
- 3 talk to the people who have done the
- 4 interviews and talk to the people who prepared
- 5 the documents, and not kind of jump to a
- 6 conclusion about what's there and what's not
- 7 there. At least that is my opinion.
- B DR. MAURO: Arjun, I completely
- 9 respect your opinion, and no need to
- 10 apologize. This is what a work group is for.
- 11 Thank you.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Thank you, John.
- 13 MEMBER BEACH: I would remind you,
- 14 the procedure is just a small part of what
- this work group is, was formed for.
- 16 MEMBER MUNN: With one
- 17 prerequisite in discussing this first bullet,
- for the slow member of the Work Group, we need
- 19 to be very clear in specifying -- I would like
- 20 to see an exhaustive list of what constitutes
- 21 your concept of a technical worker document.

1	What are we talking about? We
2	have all kinds of documents that we use that
3	are technical documents that are worker
4	documents. If we are going to set forth as a
5	goal to examine a technical worker document,
6	let us first make a list, so that we know what
7	we are talking about.
8	Are we talking about Site
9	Profiles? Are we talking about Technical
10	Basis Documents? What are we talking about?
11	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Site
12	Profiles
13	MEMBER MUNN: What's on the list?
14	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Evaluation
15	Reports.
16	MEMBER MUNN: Okay, you're going
17	to list them now, so that we will have it on
18	the record.
19	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Site
20	Profiles, SEC Evaluation Reports. The reason
21	we generalize it is because it could be a TIB.

- 1 It could be a generic procedure. I mean
- that's the three that I know of.
- 3 MEMBER MUNN: So we have three.
- 4 Anybody going for four?
- 5 MR. KATZ: Well, I'm trying to
- 6 understand. I mean I understand what we were
- 7 talking about just a moment ago on this
- 8 Objective 3, I mean this Bullet 1. I don't
- 9 have it in front of me, but I'm trying to
- 10 understand.
- 11 Are you trying to do a survey to
- 12 see how many technical documents that are
- 13 site-specific don't have, didn't involve any
- 14 component of worker outreach? Is that the
- 15 question you are trying to answer?
- 16 MEMBER MUNN: It says, identify
- 17 technical worker documents issued without the
- 18 benefit of a worker outreach meeting or any
- 19 other form of evident worker input.
- 20 MR. KATZ: So, I mean that
- 21 includes interviews of workers and all the

- 1 other different venues. Is that what you
- 2 mean?
- 3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. I'm
- 4 going to throw out an example.
- 5 MR. KATZ: Yes, please do.
- 6 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Take Sandia
- 7 National Lab, okay, first on my list. There
- 8 was no worker outreach meeting. All I want to
- 9 do is identify that.
- 10 MR. KATZ: I'm just trying to
- 11 understand. So, I mean, a worker outreach
- meeting is just one approach to getting worker
- 13 input, right?
- 14 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Right. And
- 15 then, we might go and see if there is any
- 16 documented communications associated with
- 17 that.
- 18 MR. KATZ: So, my question is, are
- 19 you trying to do some sort of comprehensive
- 20 survey, just to identify which documents might
- 21 have no worker input whatsoever? Is that the

- 1 goal of this part of the evaluation?
- 2 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I think
- 3 that mainly the goal of this particular item
- 4 was to look at whether there was a worker
- 5 outreach meeting, an opportunity for people to
- 6 provide input, or site expert interviews
- 7 associated.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Are we talking
- 9 about different bullets? I think you're
- 10 talking about the first bullet, and I was
- 11 talking about the last bullet.
- MR. KATZ: Yes. No, exactly,
- that's what I'm trying to distinguish. We are
- 14 talking about different bullets.
- MEMBER MUNN: Yes, we are.
- 16 MR. KATZ: And so, I think it
- 17 sounds like we have talked a bit about
- 18 choosing one site for what you were talking
- 19 about, Arjun.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, right.
- 21 MR. KATZ: And what John was

- talking about. This is an entirely separately
 thing.
- My only concern is that, I mean,
 you could sort of randomly pick something that
- 5 you might know about and explore them, but if
- 6 you are going to look at every, if you are
- 7 going to do a comprehensive survey to see how
- 8 many documents there are that had no worker
- 9 outreach, and then, if you are going to have
- 10 to dig into expert interviews and other venues
- 11 by which they get input from workers, I mean
- that is a horribly big job, it seems like.
- 13 And then, it is also highly
- 14 retrospective since so many of the TBDs were
- done quite a long time ago and don't have a
- lot of value for looking forward.
- MR. CALHOUN: And what do you do
- 18 with them after you identify them?
- 19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: What you do
- 20 with them is you decide whether that's okay
- that they didn't have any worker outreach.

- 1 MS. ELLIOTT: Well, the website
- 2 would be a perfect way to check all that out
- 3 very quickly.
- 4 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes.
- 5 MS. ELLIOTT: Because you have the
- 6 website that has the list of worksites. Each
- 7 worksite, you can click on the worker outreach
- 8 link.
- 9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Right.
- 10 MS. ELLIOTT: You can click on the
- 11 TBD links.
- MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Right.
- 13 MS. ELLIOTT: And the TBD front
- 14 pages have whether or not there were worker
- 15 comments from worker outreach that affected
- the TBD.
- 17 MR. KATZ: Yes, but that won't
- 18 tell you whether there was worker outreach.
- 19 That will only tell you whether there was
- anything that was actually cited in the TBD.
- 21 MS. ELLIOTT: If you go to the

- 1 worksite and click on worker outreach, you
- 2 will see whether or not there was worker
- 3 outreach.
- 4 MR. KATZ: Well, worker outreach
- 5 meeting.
- 6 MS. ELLIOTT: Correct.
- 7 MR. KATZ: Yes, which is one venue
- 8 for getting worker input.
- 9 MS. ELLIOTT: Okay, but you're
- 10 talking about whatever might be in that
- 11 review.
- MR. KATZ: But, I mean, they may
- 13 have interviewed people individually as
- opposed to doing worker outreach, and so on.
- 15 You wouldn't capture that there. So you are
- 16 not answering the whole question by looking at
- 17 that.
- 18 MS. ELLIOTT: Right, but likely
- 19 that would be in the SRDB.
- 20 MR. KATZ: Yes, that is another
- 21 source.

1	MEMBER MUNN: Which is one
2	technical document. That is why I was saying
3	from the outlet, I would like to see an
4	exhaustive list of what we are
5	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, I
6	think you go through the Technical Basis
7	Documents.
8	MEMBER BEACH: So, but to what
9	end? Okay, say we do all that work and we
10	figure it out. What are we going to do with
11	it? At this point, why do we need it?
12	MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Let me give
13	you an example, okay? Sandia National Lab,
14	Livermore, had no worker outreach. Why did
15	you need a worker outreach? Well, I cannot
16	tell you how much
17	MEMBER BEACH: Okay, now let's not
18	confuse it because I know why we needed a
19	worker outreach, but what will we do with the
20	information? How will it help Sandia if we
21	determine that they had no worker outreach?

1 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: First we 2 need to identify where there was no worker Then, we need to determine whether 3 outreach. we needed it and whether they need to go back 4 and do it. 5 6 MR. CALHOUN: You know, that's 7 tough. MEMBER BEACH: 8 Yes. last sentence 9 MR. CALHOUN: That is tough. 10 11 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. determine 12 MR. CALHOUN: You 13 whether you need to go back and do it. 14 Kathy? 15 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Or somebody to determine whether it needs 16 17 done. And in the case of Sandia, we gained a 18 tremendous amount of knowledge just from our 19 site expert interviews that indicated to me, 20 NIOSH had gone and done out а outreach meeting, the Site Profile wouldn't 21

have been deficient in the area of offsite exposures because these workers were telling

us, every one of them --

4 DR. MAKHIJANI: Kathy, I quess it 5 is my day to disagree with my colleagues. know, we're reviewing, we've reviewed all the 6 Site Profiles or we are in the process of 7 reviewing all the Site Profiles. 8 And it is part of our procedure, when we review the Site 9 10 Profiles, to do worker interviews. That is

11 how you know what you know about Sandia,
12 right? We did interviews.

Then have matrix we а comment resolution procedure for the So, what we do in practice, where Profiles. retrospectively there were no interviews, something slipped through cracks, or there wasn't an outreach meeting, it is part of our job in terms of our Site Profile review and Evaluation Report review to say that's just one of the things that happens

3

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- from our procedures, you know, you interview
- the petitioners, and so on.
- We say, well, these three things
- 4 that the petitioners brought aren't reflected
- 5 in your Evaluation Report, or whatever, and
- then it becomes part of our comment resolution
- 7 process, wherever that leads.
- 8 So, I actually don't -- it just
- 9 muddies the waters to make a list and say
- 10 these were the Site Profiles -- it muddies the
- 11 water even substantively -- these were the
- 12 Site Profiles.
- 13 Sandia was a Site Profile where
- 14 you didn't have worker outreach. And then,
- 15 you don't have anywhere there to say, well, as
- 16 part of the process, we actually did those
- 17 worker interviews, SC&A, and now NIOSH has to
- take them into account if we learned something
- 19 new.
- 20 So, if the object is to improve
- 21 the technical document, which is really the

- 1 ultimate objective, and to get worker input,
- and to ensure we have a retrospective way of
- doing that that's already there -- and you are
- 4 in the center of our team for that.
- 5 So I actually am not seeing how we
- 6 are going to benefit by identifying, unless
- 7 the Site Profile hasn't been finished yet, and
- 8 we haven't reviewed it, in which case we would
- 9 catch it in the future.
- DR. MAURO: Arjun, this is John.
- In effect, you're saying, if you
- 12 think about the Board's activities and the
- 13 role of SC&A as part of the process of
- 14 producing quality -- in a way, the way you
- 15 have described it is SC&A is inside part of
- 16 the NIOSH process, and it could be looked at
- 17 that way. And therefore, any value we add in
- terms of our own work that contributes, as you
- 19 just described, in effect, is a step toward
- 20 outreach.
- 21 I don't think that is the mission

- of this -- I'll say it this way; I think this
 work group is really on the outside of the
 process saying, listen, is there anything
- 4 about the process that's right now been
- 5 implemented that could be improved.
- So, even though what you said is
 exactly correct, that is, we do
 retrospectively capture this, and eventually,
 through this process, if there were already
 deficiencies, they are identified and they are
- But I don't think that is what we are trying to do here. We are trying to say, is there anything that could be done by way of NIOSH's protocols that could help to improve the product with regard to outreach?
- 17 I what you're So, mean, see 18 saying, and it's interesting. I think that I, 19 for feel that this should one, be 20 constructive process. That is, anything that 21 we are asked to do bу the work group,

NEAL R. GROSS

fixed.

11

- whichever one of these items that we have been covering, needs to be done in a way that is not accusatory; it is not judgmental. There
- 4 has got to be a way to do this that says,
- 5 listen, there is added value.
- 6 struggling. I'm Ι am putting position 7 mvself in NIOSH's right now 8 saying, listen, how do we qo through 9 valuable process that this work group is 10 contributing, but it not be a destructive one, where there is, you know, you should have done 11 this; you should have done that. It has got 12 13 to be a positive process.

And the feedback we give should be things that could be added to what already is being done or the documentation. It sounds like an awful lot is being done by way of outreach. And the only question really that I heard today was, you know, you are capturing all this information in your outreach program. It is going into the tracking system. What

NEAL R. GROSS

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- is not there is a log or a record of the
- 2 follow-up activities and tracking that to
- 3 completion.
- 4 I think, so in a funny sort of
- 5 way, the criticism that we are offering up is
- 6 not so much with the program, but the
- 7 documentation of the program. And that's why
- 8 we were making these suggestions that maybe
- 9 you want to add this into your procedure,
- 10 these kinds of things, because when you add it
- into the procedure, then you are sort of held
- 12 accountable to it. Right now, it sounds like
- 13 it's being done, but it is being done, you
- 14 know, on an ad hoc basis.
- So, if we were to do one of these
- things that we are talking about, it would be
- 17 just to shed light on the degree to which the
- information that was valuable was, in fact,
- 19 captured and incorporated into the product. I
- 20 mean --
- 21 MR. KATZ: Right, John.

1 Yes, I had to react to DR. MAURO: 2 your comment. No, John, so I think we 3 MR. KATZ: 4 are all on the same page about that. I think 5 we all agree that, take a TBD, or what have you, SEC evaluation, what have you, and let's 6 thoroughly look at what input was received and 7 how it was used or not used, and so on. 8 Ι think we are all in agreement about that. 9 10 This bullet 1 that Kathy is 11 talking about, here's my concern about which is really doing some sort of survey to 12 13 see, on a very narrow question -- I mean the 14 question is only, was there any worker input at all? 15 it 16 Ιt seems to me is very 17 broadly applied question that is extremely 18 narrow and has very little utility. And that 19 is my concern with it. 20 Ι Ι understand Kathy mean, 21 saying Sandia, she has concerns about what

- 1 happened at Sandia. And that's one case that
- 2 you might be concerned and want to look at
- 3 further.
- 4 But, as far as doing a survey,
- 5 that seems to me to have very little value
- 6 other than answering this simple, dichotomous
- 7 question, yes or no. In everything I have
- 8 heard, it seems like, generally, the system is
- 9 to try to get worker input in all sorts of
- 10 ways. So you are not going to find many
- 11 cases, I imagine, where simply nobody got any
- 12 worker input in any way.
- 13 It seems much more valuable to me
- 14 to dig into a couple of cases and see, what
- information did they get and how did they use
- it? All those rich questions that will affect
- 17 practice going forward and how well they make
- 18 use of worker input versus what seems to me
- 19 just a very narrow question very broadly
- 20 applied, and by being broadly applied, it is
- 21 going to take real resources to answer the

1 question.

2 Whereas, at the end of the day, so So you find out, okay, there were three 3 what? TBDs, or whatever, and one SEC -- well, there 4 5 will never be an SEC because you always have petitioner input. But, anyway, my point is --6 By definition. 7 MEMBER MUNN: -- it doesn't seem like 8 MR. KATZ: it bringing 9 has а chance of а lot οf 10 productive information into the fold after you have done all the work, and yet it is a lot of 11 trouble. 12 13 So, in my view, I just don't see a lot of value there for the buck, period, in 14 going down that road. If the Work Group has a 15 concern about Sandia specifically, that they 16 17 understand that there wasn't worker input in 18 Sandia in any form, or whatever, and wants to 19 explore that, I mean that's one thing.

NEAL R. GROSS

question like that as being very valuable and

survey

of

а

narrow,

don't

see

а

20

21

- 1 a good use of SC&A resources or the work
- 2 group's resources. But that's just my
- 3 perspective.
- 4 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: What I
- 5 would suggest is you guys pick a site and we
- 6 go through the bullets and figure out which
- 7 ones we are going to look at for that
- 8 particular site.
- 9 MEMBER BEACH: How about Savannah
- 10 River? Anybody have any other thoughts?
- 11 MEMBER MUNN: That's a biggie.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Do you want to
- 13 pick a site where the process is closed or
- 14 where the process is open? I think that is a
- 15 decision Mike and Josie and Wanda ought to
- 16 make.
- 17 Because Savannah River is open.
- 18 It is a complex beast.
- 19 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.
- 20 DR. MAKHIJANI: I mean I have no
- 21 objection to it. I am just pointing it out,

- 1 that it is a complex beast, and it is very
- open. There are lots and lots of issues. I
- 3 was just writing the status report for the
- 4 work group to be presented at the Board
- 5 meeting. It's big.
- 6 MEMBER MUNN: I personally would
- 7 not choose it, for the reasons that you have
- 8 just stated. It's not that it's open, but
- 9 because it is extremely complex. It is
- 10 probably one of the most complex sites in the
- 11 complex.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Hanford and
- 13 Savannah River are about the most complicated
- 14 there are, I think.
- 15 MEMBER MUNN: And we know, without
- 16 even looking, that these documents were not
- 17 put together in the absence of worker input in
- those two cases that you have just mentioned.
- 19 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. Now Kathy
- 20 has done, in fairness, Kathy has done a lot of
- interviews, together with NIOSH. We have had

- 1 a lot of joint work. I don't know how you
- 2 feel about that.
- I'm not for it or against it. I
- 4 am just pointing out that it is a complex
- 5 site. There may be value to doing it that
- 6 way, to picking a complex site, so you can get
- 7 a more rich insight, or there may be value to
- 8 starting with a simpler process.
- 9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, the
- 10 only advantage to picking a site like that is
- that you will have comments from other venues,
- 12 the docket, the website, et cetera.
- DR. MAURO: But isn't it expected
- 14 that the Site Profile would reflect those?
- You see, one of our dilemmas is, let's say
- there's been a large data interview process
- 17 that has taken place at some site.
- 18 Let's say, for example, right now,
- 19 let me ask a question of NIOSH like, what site
- 20 right now has a nice, rich record of
- interviews and you have populated the tracking

- 1 system with a rich amount of information that
- 2 might be valuable to the process? Is there
- 3 one that comes to mind immediately?
- 4 MEMBER MUNN: Well, that is just
- 5 the reverse of what we are looking for.
- DR. MAURO: No, no, I understand,
- 7 but I guess what I am getting at is, it may
- 8 turn out that the only ones that have rich
- 9 information don't have Site Profiles that are
- 10 up-to-date right now and are yet to be
- 11 revised.
- 12 And then, what we find is that any
- 13 Site Profile we look at is going to look very
- 14 poor in terms of reflecting this interview
- 15 process that has been going on.
- 16 See, I don't know if it is
- 17 possible to -- we had this problem originally.
- 18 We said, well, when we did our review of
- 19 PROC-12, we said, well, what are we going to
- 20 look at. And the problem was this whole
- 21 program with tracking is relatively new. And

- so, one would have a bit of a problem finding
- 2 sites that have accommodated and have brought
- 3 to fruition all this information.
- I guess, if we could find one or
- 5 two off the Board, the work group, that would
- 6 be great. I just don't know whether or not it
- 7 could be done.
- 8 MEMBER MUNN: Let me ask a couple
- 9 of things. First of all, in our discussion
- 10 here, we seem to have narrowed our focus down
- 11 to Site Profiles. Is that what we are talking
- 12 about now? We are talking about Site
- 13 Profiles?
- MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: No, no.
- 15 MEMBER MUNN: No?
- 16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: We are talking
- 17 about the site.
- 18 MEMBER MUNN: All right.
- 19 DR. MAURO: Let me arque the
- 20 answer is yes. Because all ERs depend on --
- in the end, the main concern we have is to

- 1 make sure that the information base regarding
- 2 a given site, and what the issues are that
- need to be closed, that need to be dealt with,
- 4 and how to deal with them, is the Site
- 5 Profile.
- The ER, when you read an ER, it is
- 7 very rare that the ER stands on its own. It
- 8 almost always goes to the Site Profile as the
- 9 protocol and approach that is going to be used
- 10 to deal with all technical matters.
- 11 Even though NIOSH would be the
- 12 first to say that, well, all of our Site
- 13 Profiles are living documents. So we have got
- 14 a bit of a dilemma here. To me, the Site
- 15 Profile is the single most important document
- that needs to reflect feedback from workers.
- 17 So, I would argue, no, it is the Site Profile.
- 18 Now I am probably getting more
- 19 aggressive than I should. But what else would
- 20 you look at?
- 21 MEMBER MUNN: I'm happy with Site

- 1 Profiles myself.
- 2 MEMBER BEACH: I like the
- 3 Evaluation Report also.
- DR. MAURO: And when you do the
- 5 Evaluation Report, remember, they always
- 6 reference the Site Profile. So the source
- 7 document, the rock that the ER stands on
- 8 almost always is the Site Profile.
- 9 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Well, let's put
- 10 our thoughts on pause for a few minutes. It
- is getting to be about three o'clock. So
- let's open the phone lines up to any claimants
- or workers' advocates who are on the line who
- 14 might want to say something. Just identify
- 15 yourself and make your comments.
- 16 MS. BARRIE: Hi, Mike. This is
- 17 Terrie Barrie with ANWAG.
- 18 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Hi, Terrie.
- MS. BARRIE: How are you? And
- thank you again for allowing public comments
- 21 here.

1	I do have a few thoughts I would
2	like to share with you.
3	The most recent discussion about
4	worker outreach and the Site Profiles, and
5	Kathy had mentioned that there was no worker
6	outreach at Sandia, that also happened with
7	Rocky Flats. So you folks might want to
8	consider taking a look at the Rocky Flats Site
9	Profile.
10	The Site Profile was released
11	April 2004, and the worker outreach meetings
12	were in June of 2004, after the Site Profile
13	was developed.
14	And getting back to this morning's
15	discussions, I agree with Josie when she had a
16	concern about the definition of professional
17	judgment. And I realize that everyone needs
18	to make a call here and there.
19	But when I was at the ATL meeting
20	in Cincinnati last April, I saw or I actually
21	heard two different health physicists say

- 1 completely opposite things. So I would think
- 2 that the team would be best when deciding
- 3 which comments that they receive from the
- 4 townhall meetings is worth pursuing as opposed
- 5 to just one person making that decision,
- 6 because, you know, there's the opportunity to
- 7 have input from other people. I think that is
- 8 well worth pursuing.
- 9 The other idea or thought I had
- 10 was there was a discussion about, should every
- 11 comment be tracked, and I believe it should
- 12 be. Not every worker is aware of a worker
- outreach meeting or they couldn't attend that
- one, but they could attend a townhall meeting.
- 15 So that is about the only opportunity they
- 16 would have for submitting or writing the
- 17 letters. And I think that all of them should
- 18 be tracked and followed up.
- 19 And that is about all I have for
- 20 today. Thank you.
- 21 MR. KATZ: Thank you, Terrie.

- 1 Anyone else from the public who
- 2 would like to comment at this point?
- 3 (No response.)
- 4 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Last call for
- 5 any other workers or advocates on the phone
- 6 who would like to make comments.
- 7 (No response.)
- 8 Okay. Then we will get back to
- 9 our discussions on the Objective 3.
- 10 MR. KATZ: Yes. Can I just add
- one thought to John's thought about TBDs being
- 12 the rock?
- 13 But if you are exploring how
- 14 worker input is made use of or not made use
- of, whichever, I mean, I think there are
- 16 probably some cases with SEC evaluations, too,
- 17 that might be interesting and illustrative,
- 18 too. Some of these SEC evaluations have gone
- on for a long time in the Board's hands with a
- 20 lot of petitioner input and interested worker
- input. So, I mean, some of those may be rich

- examples, even though they are SEC evaluations
- and not TBDs.
- DR. MAURO: To respond, I agree.
- 4 I think if you pick an ER, all I am really
- 5 saying is, when you are going through that
- 6 process, you have all defined that you are
- 7 going to, in addition to all of the issues
- 8 that surround the ER and the petition, you are
- 9 going to find yourself quickly going to the
- 10 Site Profile --
- 11 MR. KATZ: Right.
- DR. MAURO: -- as part of your
- 13 overall investigation.
- 14 MR. KATZ: Right. And for
- example, with AWE, sometimes the TBD has less
- 16 weight, in effect, than all the work that gets
- 17 done afterwards, than it would with a major
- 18 DOE site.
- DR. MAURO: Yes, that's true.
- 20 MR. KATZ: So, what I am going to
- 21 suggest, because it doesn't sound like there

- 1 obvious candidate that everybody is an 2 jumping on at once, but if we can agree in 3 principle that we are going to do this focus, to begin with at least, on one site, whether 4 5 it is a TBD, or what have you, then I think a way to go forward is to agree on that in 6 principle, if the Work Group wants to, that 7 that work ought to be done. 8
- 9 Then, I think both DCAS and SC&A 10 might go back to their quarters and consider which might be a good, rich candidate to begin 11 12 I think we can task that. with. Then we can 13 send around the proposal for the sites. We 14 can do that by email and go forward without it 15 having to await another work group meeting.
- MEMBER BEACH: I was going to recommend Terrie's suggestion of Rocky Flats, go with a closed site.
- MR. KATZ: I mean one issue about
 Rocky Flats is the TBD was developed a long
 time ago, and if you are looking for value for

- going forward, you are dealing with a TBD that
- was developed under sort of an old system that
- 3 is not in place anymore and that has been
- 4 improved.
- 5 It is not giving you a lot of bang
- for your buck that way. So there may be a lot
- 7 of sort of characteristics that you find
- 8 lacking there, but that have already been
- 9 corrected. And you really want to look at how
- 10 things are being done, more or less,
- 11 contemporaneously.
- 12 MEMBER BEACH: So maybe a more
- 13 recent site like NTS?
- 14 MR. KATZ: So something a little
- 15 more recent than that.
- 16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I really don't
- 17 know how, I mean if a Site Profile was put out
- 18 when there was worker input, maybe there's
- been some applications, but how many?
- 20 MEMBER MUNN: Before we go off
- into old, old documents that were, as Ted

- 1 pointed out, processed under a somewhat
- 2 markedly different set of circumstances, I
- 3 would like to hear from Kathy a little more.
- 4 We have been beating up on her with our
- thoughts about these bullets.
- 6 And since we are focusing on the
- 7 first one now, Kathy, you have already
- 8 suggested that, from your own work, you are
- 9 aware that Sandia would be one of the
- 10 candidates for this. Do you, right off the
- 11 top of your head, have others that you
- 12 personally know of that might fit the criteria
- 13 you believe were in mind when this stuff was
- 14 first made --
- MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, that
- 16 was for --
- 17 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, and are you
- 18 still focused on the first bullet?
- 19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: There's a
- 20 couple. There's just a couple more, and I
- 21 don't remember off the top of my head what

- 1 they were. Medina and Clarksville doesn't
- 2 have the worker outreach meeting.
- 3 MEMBER MUNN: It would be helpful
- 4 for me to have some information about sites
- 5 that you are already aware of that may be
- 6 deficient in this regard, rather than have us
- 7 start trying to search and turn over all the
- 8 rocks.
- 9 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, I
- 10 guess I am a little confused here because the
- 11 first bullet, and really the second bullet, if
- we decided that we can't do anything with the
- 13 data once we have got it, there's not a
- 14 benefit to it, then do we want to go through
- 15 that survey? Do we not want to go through
- 16 that survey?
- 17 Bullet No. 2 is very similar
- because it has to do with, okay, well, you did
- 19 a worker outreach, but you released the Site
- 20 Profile right after, in too short a time to
- incorporate those comments.

MR. KATZ: See, I mean I think the
first bullet and the second bullet, they are
really not part of the framework that we are
talking about of evaluating. Those are kind
of separate questions that, to me, are very
narrow.

But, anyway, if you were going to take a site and you take a TBD, or what have you, and you fully explore; you look at what was addressed, what was not addressed, what input was received -- you are looking at the whole spectrum of questions related to how worker input is being obtained, the extent it is being obtained, and how it is being made use of or not being made use of. That is sort the full spectrum of questions that you want to evaluate as this Work Group. So you get sort of all your bang for your buck by finding a rich example and exploring it fully. Whereas, these first two bullets,

again, they are both very narrow questions.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Ι

1 wouldn't expend my resources that way, if I 2 were making the choice. I think that at least I wouldn't start that way. 3 I would start with one good horse and follow up as that 4 5 illustrates you might need to follow up on more narrow questions. 6 7 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: If you want to select a site and then look at the site, 8 that falls into the last three bullets. 9 Ιf 10 survey of you generic what is want а available, then that is the first two bullets. 11 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: I'm still almost 12 13 leaning toward thinking it is necessary to 14 look at a site that the documents are closed

leaning toward thinking it is necessary to look at a site that the documents are closed and one that is still current, both. Again, Terrie gave the example of Rocky. I still think there is value in how well that stuff, how well those documents were modified based on the worker input. That is relevant because, if there needs to be more done and more is done, it could affect claims that have

NEAL R. GROSS

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 1 already been denied. Then, once we see how
- that works, then we can look at a program that
- is currently underway to see if the program
- 4 has fixed the errors from the past.
- 5 DR. MAKHIJANI: Could I supplement
- 6 what Mike just said? I think, while there was
- 7 this problem with the Rocky Flats Site
- 8 Profile, that the Site Profile was issued and
- 9 the worker outreach meeting was done two weeks
- 10 later, that was in 2004.
- 11 Then there was an SEC petition,
- 12 and there was an enormous amount of
- 13 interaction with workers from all sides.
- 14 There was NIOSH's interactions with workers.
- 15 Some of the worker site experts were involved
- 16 with NIOSH in preparing the sites, which
- 17 caused some controversy, but, nonetheless,
- 18 they were involved and their input is there.
- 19 SC&A was involved. And the process was, you
- 20 know, the Board voted on it in a certain way,
- 21 and there is a very rich record.

1 So I would really recommend that 2 consider site, and it is useful а consider a site, where there's both been a TBD 3 and an SEC process. So some of the warts with 4 5 the TBD being issued ___ it's living document; we will go back and fix it; let's 6 have something now for dose reconstruction --7 get addressed, one way or 8 another, the 9 they are going to be, in SEC 10 process. 11 Rocky Flats, from mУ point of 12 view, is fairly contemporaneous. And then, of 13 course, NIOSH developed this whole model for 14 Super S, which was in the center and there 15 were worker interviews, site expert You know, there was a whole lot 16 SC&A review. 17 So it is a very rich site for that went on. 18 examining these kinds of questions. 19 MAURO: Arjun, Ι liked DR. it, 20 and, Mike, I like the idea. I'm coming around 21 to think about this a little differently.

1 Because what we have here is, if 2 we go back to an older site, and Rocky is as good an example as any, one of the things that 3 would be revealing is how it unfolded. 4 In 5 other words, it has a long history, and the way in which information from the workers and 6 other interested parties found its way into 7 the process, got into the process, how. 8

In other words, it is almost like a historical reconstruction of what transpired on Rocky with respect to and from perspective of information that was acquired from the workers and experts and other interested parties, and the way in which it the record and came into was taken consideration in decisions in the end. other words, it is almost like historical perspective.

Then, if you went to a current one, now I could tell you that, if you go to a current one, I know of two that I am up to my

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- 1 eyeballs in right now. One is Linde, and the
- other is General Steel. These are living,
- 3 breathing, ongoing interactions with
- 4 knowledgeable people about the site who are
- 5 continually feeding the process as the process
- 6 matures. And it is being factored into White
- 7 Papers that are unfolding in real-time.
- 8 This is an interesting
- 9 perspective. Bear with me. We originally
- 10 came into this thinking of it as a linear
- 11 process. You know, you follow PROC-12. You
- 12 go gather data. You've got the data. You
- 13 load up your tracking system, and then the
- 14 people who write the Site Profile go look at
- 15 it and use that data and follow up as
- 16 necessary, write a Site Profile.
- 17 It isn't that way. It is much
- 18 more a brief, living process, for better or
- 19 worse. I'm not saying that is the way it
- 20 should be, but I'm saying that is the way it
- 21 is.

1	The actual interactions may start
2	out with some outreach that make it into the
3	tracking system. But, then, when the process
4	becomes richer in terms of especially when an
5	SEC hits, and there are lots of interactions,
6	I am starting to think that we are actually in
7	a process that is non-linear. Unfortunately,
8	it is non-linear because of the interaction of
9	the Board and SC&A in this overall process.
10	You know, I am almost
11	contradicting what I said before. Please bear
12	with me. I'm thinking out loud right now.
13	Is it fair to think about the
14	outreach program as a self-contained entity
15	that finds its way into the process in a
16	linear manner and then is reflected in a Site
17	Profile, and, ultimately, perhaps in an
18	Evaluation Report? Is it appropriate to think
19	about it that way?
20	Then, we, as outsiders, the Work
21	Group, and SC&A as your contractor, come in

and take a look at it, and the degree to which
the process unfolded the way it is supposed to
unfold, according to the procedure. I think
that is how I came into thinking about this
when this meeting began.

And the more we talk about this example, we're trying to find examples of something we could look at, the more I realize that you probably can look at it from an historical perspective. That is how I came to this thinking with regard to Rocky, because that would be very informative, to see how it actually unfolded. So I could see that having value.

If we go to a current one, and the only ones I am very familiar with right now are the ones that are very alive and well and interactive and unfolding in real-time, that would be a very difficult one for anyone to sit in judgment of regarding where you could have improvements.

- 1 Ι not sure, but this is am 2 thought that struck me as we were having this I hope that it adds a little bit. 3 discussion. Well, John, 4 MEMBER MUNN: 5 nobody would daresay that this linear process, for goodness' sake. 6 (Laughter.) 7 I might suggest another site that 8 9 might fit many of the criteria that have been 10 today, but thrown out here hasn't been mentioned, and that is Bethlehem Steel. 11 That is essentially a closed matter now, but it 12 13 certainly, if you want to talk about outreach, 14 now there's а rich lode that you 15 consider mining. It would be a very 16 DR. MAURO: It would be a little simpler than 17 good one. 18 Rocky, for obvious reasons. mind 19 bear in that the But
- interaction was very -- the Board and SC&A was very much involved. And Arjun could speak to

- 1 that better than anyone.
- 2 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, it certainly
- 3 was.
- DR. MAURO: In the way in which it
- 5 came to life, the interaction with the
- 6 workers, and NIOSH's interaction, and the
- 7 joint meetings -- so it unfolded in a way that
- 8 it is almost impossible to segregate out the
- 9 Board and its contractor from the process, if
- 10 that is what your intention is, to try to see
- 11 what has NIOSH done in terms of its PROC-12
- and meeting its intent and whether PROC-12 is
- functioning, is alive and well, independent of
- the role of the Board and its contractor.
- 15 MEMBER MUNN: Well, it is so
- 16 relatively new that it gives us a much clearer
- 17 picture of what we would think of as current
- 18 process, as opposed to past historic process.
- 19 MR. KATZ: Are you saying
- 20 Bethlehem Steel is new compared to Rocky
- 21 Flats? Because Rocky Flats is --

- 1 MEMBER MUNN: The actions that we
- 2 have taken on it, the input.
- MR. KATZ: Just the Board maybe,
- 4 but all the work, I mean that is the most --
- 5 MEMBER MUNN: What I am talking
- 6 about is the amount of interaction and the
- 7 amount of worker outreach that was involved in
- 8 Bethlehem Steel was extensive.
- 9 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, it is
- 10 actually quite complicated.
- 11 MEMBER MUNN: It is.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Just in terms of
- 13 the history, SC&A first attended a NIOSH-
- 14 sponsored worker outreach meeting, and I was
- the one representing SC&A. It was the very
- 16 first outreach meeting we attended, and it
- 17 wasn't one organized by us. But a set of
- 18 technical observations came out of that for
- 19 SC&A which we used in our review.
- 20 The sort of upshot of that was
- 21 that Ed Walker, who was leading the Bethlehem

- 1 Steel action group, often communicated with us
- 2 and put us in contact with workers who had
- 3 more technical information.
- 4 So I think it would be very
- 5 difficult to evaluate NIOSH's process -- and
- 6 then, NIOSH was also, of course, involved --
- 7 and untangle it from what we did.
- I think it is worth evaluating, if
- 9 you want to evaluate that process, but very
- 10 unique in that way.
- 11 MR. KATZ: I think, no matter
- 12 which of these you choose --
- 13 DR. MAKHIJANI: It's going to be
- 14 tangled in a different way.
- 15 MR. KATZ: -- the untangling the
- 16 Board and SC&A, I don't think you will be able
- 17 to entirely untangle it. But you still can
- 18 look in a focused way at the questions of how
- 19 well has NIOSH been obtaining input and making
- 20 use of it or not making use of it. So you
- 21 still can look at those questions in a focused

- 1 way.
- 2 But there is lots of sort of mixed
- 3 influence in that process, and none of them
- 4 are linear, as John said. I think that is
- 5 going to be true in every case.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: No, no, I agree
- 7 with you, Ted. Certainly, I wasn't saying
- 8 don't look at Bethlehem Steel.
- 9 And in retrospect, I think you're
- 10 right. It is going to be difficult to
- 11 untangle. Rocky Flats would also be difficult
- 12 to untangle.
- MR. KATZ: Sure.
- 14 MEMBER BEACH: And at the risk of
- 15 moving forward --
- 16 (Laughter.)
- 17 -- let's decide on Rocky or take a
- 18 vote. Because I would like to see us start
- 19 with Rocky. I mean, I think we can argue all
- 20 day about it or discuss all day the merits of
- 21 all the sites, but Rocky would give us a good

- 1 place to start, I think.
- MR. KATZ: Yes. I mean, from what
- 3 I said before, I think Rocky, given all the
- 4 SEC work that happened after the TBD and
- 5 everything, I think that is a rich example to
- 6 plumb.
- 7 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: So are the rest
- 8 of the Work Group Members okay with tasking
- 9 SC&A to start on Rocky?
- 10 MEMBER MUNN: No, I would oppose
- 11 that, but it is interesting. I wondered how
- 12 Rocky was going to get back on the table.
- 13 (Laughter.)
- 14 MEMBER BEACH: And we're talking
- 15 the last three bullets here.
- 16 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, we are talking
- getting Rocky back on the table. That's what
- 18 we're talking about.
- 19 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: We're talking
- let's see if there is a problem with the
- 21 system, I believe.

1 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, that's what I 2 think. I mean the focus is 3 MR. KATZ: worker outreach, not --4 5 MEMBER BEACH: Yes. MEMBER MUNN: Today. 6 I think there needs to 7 MR. KATZ: be more sort of the methodology clarified 8 beyond these bullets. 9 It seems to me at least 10 that there is not a really clear methodology laid out yet, and I think it would be useful 11 for the work group to have that to see exactly 12 what the sort of path forward for how to do 13 14 it. it is going to take you 15 I mean, some thinking on your part to produce that. 16 17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: So 18 something like more -- we will review the 19 docket, you know, kind of a step-by-step? 20 MUNN: And how MEMBER many of 21 technical worker documents involving these

- 1 Rocky are we going to be looking at?
- 2 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: I thought
- 3 we were looking like a step-by-step?
- 4 MR. KATZ: Yes, I don't really
- 5 mean -- well, the methodology, I mean really,
- 6 yes, you have to consider what sources you are
- 7 going to for information, how you are going to
- 8 evaluate those sources of information.
- 9 I mean, I can't do it on the spur
- of the moment here, but I could explain an
- 11 evaluation methodology to you with some
- 12 thoughts.
- 13 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I see your
- 14 point, Ted, yes.
- 15 MEMBER BEACH: Starting with the
- 16 bullets?
- 17 MR. KATZ: I mean the bullets are
- not really a methodology. They are just --
- 19 MEMBER BEACH: But I mean start
- with where you are going to take that, yes.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Why don't we try

1	this on for size? I think, Kathy, what we
2	might consider as a next step to develop is to
3	tell the Working Group and NIOSH, Ted, the
4	way, how we are going to conclude when a
5	certain statement so, starting with a TBD,
6	then a lot of the technical conclusions of the
7	TBD are modified along the way. And how we
8	are going to decide which modifications arose
9	from worker inputs, with a simplest example
10	being the worker input that Super S was not
11	considered and a Super S model was developed.
12	So that is sort of Exhibit A, very simple
13	case that we have done.
14	But that is an example of what I
15	think you are looking for, right? How are we
16	going to conclude that worker input was
17	ignored on the one extreme or fully taken into
18	account and incorporated, or it wasn't
19	relevant, and therefore, justifiably, you
20	know

NEAL R. GROSS

Yes.

MR. KATZ:

21

I mean you start

- 1 at the top with your evaluation questions.
- 2 What are your very specific evaluation
- questions for this particular, if we say Rocky
- 4 Flats, what are your evaluation questions?
- 5 Then, how are you going to answer those? You
- 6 have to sort of lay out. It is a hierarchy
- 7 for an evaluation plan.
- 8 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Well, and
- 9 we have partially got that answered in our
- 10 questions under Objective 3.
- 11 MR. KATZ: Yes, right, that is
- very broad and generic, exactly. Now you have
- to just sort of lay out the details of how you
- 14 are going to go about that. Right.
- 15 DR. MAKHIJANI: And we should
- 16 translate that for Rocky and tell you, here is
- 17 what we are going to look at for Rocky Flats.
- 18 MR. KATZ: Right. Here's what
- 19 we're going to look at and how we are going to
- 20 look at it.
- But I just think that would be

- 1 helpful, so that, then, if the Work Group has
- thoughts about other ways to go about that
- evaluation, whatever, they can give you input
- 4 on that.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes.
- 6 MR. KATZ: And you will need to
- 7 have a game plan anyway before you actually
- 8 get started.
- 9 DR. MAKHIJANI: I agree.
- 10 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay. So,
- 11 are we going to pretend like we are doing it
- for Rocky and then come up with a game plan?
- 13 MR. KATZ: Oh, yes, not pretend.
- 14 I think you decided that you are going to do
- 15 it for Rocky.
- 16 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Okay.
- MR. KATZ: So that sounds good.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: I agree.
- 19 MEMBER BEACH: Well, whatever is
- 20 formulated needs to be able to be consistent.
- So, if this is the first one, the next one we

- do, it needs to be consistent, so that the
- 2 worker can --
- MR. KATZ: Well, you may learn
- 4 lessons in this first one, too --
- 5 MEMBER BEACH: Sure, sure.
- 6 MR. KATZ: -- and, then, make
- 7 improvements. But the planning part of any
- 8 evaluation study is really important for
- 9 getting good answers.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: And this is a
- 11 really new activity.
- 12 MR. KATZ: Right, it is totally
- 13 new, right. You haven't done this kind of an
- 14 evaluation before. So you are really sort of
- 15 cutting a new path here.
- 16 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Okay. So, it
- 17 looks like now they have been trying to make
- sure we got everything covered, what we have
- 19 done today, what actions we have got going
- 20 forward, and trying to get a timeframe on
- that, and see if can we just schedule another

- 1 meeting or if it is too early to do that.
- 2 DCAS is going to look at some
- 3 issues in the matrix and make some modified
- 4 statements or portions of procedures and get
- 5 back with us.
- 6 And SC&A is going to put together
- 7 a draft plan for reviewing the Rocky Flats
- 8 plant and get that back to us.
- 9 Is there anything else that I have
- 10 forgotten?
- 11 (No response.)
- So, do we have any idea from DCAS
- or from SC&A how long it is going to take you
- to have some of these actions filled and ready
- 15 for us to get back together?
- 16 DR. MAKHIJANI: Kathy, by the time
- 17 of the Board meeting, just after the Board
- 18 meeting?
- 19 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: Yes, we
- 20 probably could --
- DR. MAKHIJANI: I've got my hands

- 1 full with Savannah River. I would like to
- 2 kind of work along with you on this.
- 3 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: So we could
- 4 probably pull it together. We also need to
- 5 update the matrix, and there was one other
- 6 action item we had.
- 7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: And, J.J., do
- 9 you have any idea how long it may take you to
- 10 make some of these changes?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: I wasn't
- 12 suggesting meeting before the Board meeting.
- 13 MR. KATZ: It's not going to
- 14 happen.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: I was suggesting
- 16 that Kathy and I kind of produce an internal
- draft by the time of the Board meeting, so we
- 18 can talk at that time.
- 19 MR. CALHOUN: We don't need to get
- this done for the next Board meeting. Before
- 21 the next Work Group meeting.

- 1 MR. KATZ: Well, yes, that's what
- 2 Mike is looking for a target date for the next
- 3 work group meeting.
- 4 MR. CALHOUN: When do you want to
- 5 have the next work group meeting?
- 6 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: We are leaving
- 7 it up to you guys. What about --
- 8 MR. KATZ: In December? It will
- 9 be in December, right?
- 10 CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes.
- 11 MR. KATZ: Is the December
- 12 timeframe practical for you to be able to
- follow up on some of these items?
- 14 MR. CALHOUN: I think so. We
- 15 think so.
- 16 MR. KATZ: You don't have to put
- 17 them all to bed, but like, for example,
- 18 looking at the feasibility question for
- 19 tracking, and so on.
- 20 MR. JOHNSON: Challenging, but
- 21 doable.

1	MEMBER MUNN: December 2nd?
2	MR. KATZ: I would say, why don't
3	we push it a little later in December?
4	Because people are going to be very busy
5	preparing for the Board meeting.
6	MR. CALHOUN: And Thanksgiving.
7	MR. KATZ: Thanksgiving is there,
8	too.
9	MEMBER BEACH: So, are we thinking
10	after the holidays, like the last week of
11	December?
12	MR. KATZ: I was thinking before
13	Christmas, but not the first week in December
14	maybe, if that's possible.
15	Let's see, we already have, let me
16	tell you when we have something already
17	scheduled because that might help some folks,
18	too.
19	We have, let's see, okay,
20	actually, what we have scheduled is the first
21	week of December. So, how are people's

- calendars for the week of the 13th through the
- 2 17th?
- 3 MEMBER BEACH: Mine is good at the
- 4 last part of the week.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: I'm not available
- 6 on the 17th. I know that. I have to look at
- 7 my calendar.
- 8 MEMBER BEACH: The 16th?
- 9 MR. KATZ: The 16th? How is the
- 10 16th for people's calendars? That is a
- 11 Thursday. That is the week before Christmas
- week. How's that? Wanda, okay, and Phil?
- 13 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: No, I don't
- think I have got anything scheduled that week.
- MR. KATZ: Mike?
- 16 Kathy, is that good for you?
- 17 MS. ROBERTSON-DEMERS: That's
- 18 fine, as far as I know.
- 19 MR. KATZ: You're happy with it?
- Is that good?
- MEMBER BEACH: Yes, that's good.

- 1 MR. KATZ: Okay. So, why don't we
- do that, December 16th? That gives everybody
- 3 something to shoot at.
- 4 MEMBER BEACH: Mike, are you going
- 5 to gather up the action items and send them
- 6 out to us?
- 7 MR. KATZ: I think, Josie, the
- 8 practice is for SC&A and DCAS each to send an
- 9 email with their action items to the full work
- 10 group.
- 11 MEMBER BEACH: Okay.
- 12 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Well, see,
- 13 that's close enough to Christmas that, if
- 14 anybody wants to spend Christmas in Denver,
- 15 you can come through Denver airport.
- 16 MR. KATZ: Are you saying we
- 17 should be meeting in Denver? Is that what you
- 18 are saying?
- 19 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: I'm saying
- 20 don't go through Denver at that time.
- MR. KATZ: Oh, okay, I got you.

1	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: We had people,
2	you'll remember, a few years ago, who spent
3	from Christmastime to the first of the year in
4	the airport. They couldn't get out.
5	MR. KATZ: Are we ready to
6	adjourn?
7	CHAIRMAN GIBSON: Yes, anything
8	else for the meeting today?
9	(No response.)
LO	If not, this meeting will be
11	adjourned.
L2	MR. KATZ: Thank you, everyone,
L3	for your hard work, on the line and in the
L4	room.
L5	And have a good rest of the week.
L6	Take care.
L7	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
L8	matter went off the record at 3:31 p.m.)
L9	
20	
21	

1

2

3