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

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

WORK GROUP ON SAVANNAH RIVER SITE

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY NOVEMBER 10, 2010

+ + + + +

The Work Group convened via teleconference at 1:30 p.m., Mark Griffon, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

MARK GRIFFON, Chairman MICHAEL GIBSON, Member JAMES LOCKEY, Member PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official DAVID ANDERSON, Law Offices of Bob Warren ROBERT BARTON, SC&A
MEL CHEW, ORAU
HARRY CHMELYNSKI, SC&A
JENNY LIN, HHS
MICHAEL MAHATHY, ORAU
ARJUN MAKHIJANI, SC&A
JOHN MAURO, SC&A
ROBERT MORRIS, ORAU
JAMES NETON, DCAS
LAVON RUTHERFORD, DCAS
TIM TAULBEE, DCAS
BOB WARREN, Law Offices of Bob Warren

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

Roll Call	4
Update on Action Items	9
Scheduling Discussion	78
Petitioner Comments	84
Public Comment	90
Adjournment	104

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(1:31 p.m.)
3	MR. KATZ: This is the Advisory
4	Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Savannah
5	River Site Work Group. This is going to be, I
6	think, a relatively brief call because we're
7	really sort of trying to get on track with
8	what's been accomplished and what work needs
9	to get to be assigned for a full Work Group
10	meeting to happen some time down the road.
11	Let's start with roll call, with
12	the Advisory Board Members.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Mark Griffon,
14	Advisory Board Member, Chair of the Work
15	Group. No conflict.
16	MEMBER LOCKEY: Jim Lockey,
17	Advisory Board Member. No conflict.
18	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Phil Schofield,
19	Work Group Member. No conflict.
20	MEMBER GIBSON: Mike Gibson,
21	Advisory Board Member. No conflict.

- 1 MR. KATZ: I don't think I heard
- 2 Brad. Is Brad on the line? There's one Work
- 3 Group meeting I think he couldn't meet and
- 4 this might be it.
- 5 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I think he's
- 6 traveling this morning.
- 7 MR. KATZ: Right, okay. Well,
- 8 then let's go to NIOSH ORAU team.
- 9 DR. NETON: This is Jim Neton,
- 10 NIOSH. No conflict.
- DR. TAULBEE: This is Tim Taulbee,
- 12 NIOSH. No conflict.
- MR. RUTHERFORD: LaVon Rutherford,
- 14 NIOSH. No conflict.
- DR. CHEW: Mel Chew, ORAU team.
- 16 No conflict.
- 17 MR. MORRIS: Robert Morris, ORAU
- 18 team. No conflict.
- 19 MR. KATZ: Okay, welcome all of
- 20 you. SC&A Team?
- 21 DR. MAKHIJANI: Arjun Makhijani,

- 1 SC&A. No conflict.
- 2 DR. MAURO: John Mauro, SC&A. No
- 3 conflict.
- 4 MR. CHMELYNSKI: Harry Chmelynski,
- 5 SC&A. No conflict.
- 6 MR. BARTON: Bob Barton, SC&A. No
- 7 conflict.
- 8 MR. KATZ: Very good. Federal
- 9 officials and contractors for the feds: HHS or
- 10 other departments?
- 11 MS. LIN: This is Jenny with HHS.
- 12 MR. KATZ: Good. How about any
- 13 members of the public?
- 14 MR. WARREN: Bob Warren and David
- 15 Anderson from the Law Offices of Bob Warren in
- 16 Black Mountain.
- 17 MR. KATZ: Okay. Did you say Bob
- 18 Warren and David Anderson?
- MR. WARREN: Anderson, yes.
- 20 MR. KATZ: David Anderson. Any
- other members of the public?

1	Okay, Mike, it's your agenda. Let
2	me just ask everyone on the line, please, mute
3	your phones and if you don't have a mute
4	button, use *6 because if everybody stays
5	muted, the phone will be much, much more
6	audible for everyone who is speaking and
7	listening.
8	MR. MAHATHY: Mark and Ted, this
9	is Mike Mahathy from the ORAU team.
10	MR. KATZ: Thank you, Mike.
11	MR. MAHATHY: You're welcome.
12	MR. KATZ: Glad to have you.
13	Mark?
14	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Thank you, Ted.
15	Yes, I realize there's a great amount of
16	interest on Savannah River SEC. There's I
17	was the 25th caller to join the call. I do
18	want to say, as Ted said up front, that this -
19	- I was trying to schedule a full Work Group
20	meeting for Cincinnati, but realized that we
21	may not have may not be far enough along

with some of the action items to make it worth 1 did feel that 2 while. But I it worthwhile scheduling this call at least to 3 4 update and make sure we're on the same page 5 with actions and to just get some hard 6 deadlines and set a meeting hopefully not too long after the full Advisory Board Meeting 7 next week in Cincinnati, where we can go into 8 9 depth into the individual findings and So my intent here is to go 10 hopefully resolve. through -- SC&A put a draft memo out. 11 12 Ted, was this available the public or has this not been cleared? 13 I don't 14 know. Ted? 15 I'm sorry, Mark. MR. KATZ: I was I'll have to check on that. 16 I'm not on mute. 17 sure that it was available to the public or 18 not. 19 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. 20 Basically, I think everything we're 21 here we'll keep those on the call informed,

1 but it's basically a memo outlining all the 2 findings from the matrix we've been working 3 from and it outlines the action items, whether it be NIOSH, SC&A action items to move toward 4 5 a path forward on resolution of some of these findings. 6 So I intend, in this meeting, just 7 to go -- mainly go through the action items, 8 9 you know, and just because I don't want to repeat the same discussions at the next Work 10 Group meeting in Cincinnati on the substance 11 of the findings. I think we're going to have 12 13 to go through these in depth and it would take 14 a fairly long time. But I don't think we're 15 far enough along on some of them to do that today, so I want to stick to really getting 16 17 the status updates, updates on the actions,

21 Laying it out that way, I -- maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

make sure they're clear, make sure things are

on a path to be completed and then schedule

another meeting.

18

19

20

I can ask SC&A to 1 just take the lead from 2 their and I assume Tim Taulbee will memo probably be interjecting just 3 to make sure we're all in agreement on the actions going 4 5 forward. Tim Taulbee for NIOSH will 6 interjecting, if that's okay. 7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. This Arjun from SC&A. To go over the first item, 8 9 NIOSH had two reports on thorium, the first one after 1965. We have completed an internal 10 review of that and are going over it. 11 12 little bit delayed going to the DOE, but that should happen very soon. So in a few weeks, 13 14 the Work Group will have that. 15 We were also to review Report 44. That I believe has been done and is at the 16 17 DOE right now. That's the first item. John Mauro had wanted me to kind of write down our 18 19 findings at this stage and I have reviewed our 20 thorium 1965 report. It's just some details 21 that are hanging there that it hasn't gone to

- the DOE yet. But these are our findings. Our
- 2 principal author of this review was Joyce
- 3 Lipsztein and I'm the main reviewer.
- 4 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. Let's
- 5 just avoid discussion on the -- the summary of
- 6 the findings is there which is useful.
- 7 DR. MAKHIJANI: Right.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Hold off on
- 9 discussing those.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Right, right. Of
- 11 course, NIOSH will get the full report.
- 12 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: We'll get the
- 13 full report, right.
- 14 DR. MAKHIJANI: The one kind of
- 15 question I have for NIOSH is, in the 1964 time
- 16 frame and then in the 773A Building before
- 17 that, if I remember right, there was thorium
- 18 handling and process. There are bioassay data
- 19 from 773A. There was reprocessing of thorium
- target rods in 1964, several tons per day,
- 21 four tons if I remember right. But we haven't

1 seen any approach to dose reconstruction for 2 anything other than the 300 area in the period And I'm wondering of the '65 from NIOSH. 3 whether NIOSH intends to give us something. 4 5 DR. TAULBEE: This is Tim Taulbee will address 6 with NIOSH. We those in I don't want to get 7 response to your report. into the details of why we did not include the 8 9 1964 reprocessing and it really has to do with the uranium-233 product 10 was the that All of the thorium 11 extracted. from the dissolved rods, as well as the mixed fission 12 13 products as a result of that irradiation were 14 directly sent to the tank farms so there was 15 really no exposure from the canyon directly into the tank farms. 16 17 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, there's also 773 bioassay data with 18 Building positive 19 report, it bioassays. In your says all bioassays are below detectable, but we didn't 20 21 find that and all bioassays are from 773A, so

- obviously, there was thorium work going on over there and there were positive bioassays and we have seen nothing about that.
- And we haven't done any analysis 4 5 of that. All you're going to see from us is -- on those counts -- is that we haven't seen 6 anything from you. There's going to be no 7 analysis of those things from us because we 8 9 were just tasked with reviewing your reports and of course, after reviewing them, we found 10 that quite a bit of thorium exposure, at least 11 12 thorium handling and processing was not 13 covered.
- DR. TAULBEE: Like I said, when we get your report and I hope identified this in your report --
- DR. MAKHIJANI: We have.
- DR. TAULBEE: If this is missing,
- then we will respond to it at that time.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: It's in the
- 21 summary, so there will be, on this count,

- there will not be more than there is in the
- 2 summary.
- DR. TAULBEE: Okay.
- 4 DR. MAKHIJANI: I don't know where
- 5 Mark wants to go with that.
- 6 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I'm here. I'm
- 7 sorry. NIOSH was calling me on the other
- 8 line.
- 9 DR. MAKHIJANI: Mark, I was just
- 10 having an exchange with Tim Taulbee that in
- 11 regard to the 300 -- and I understand that
- 12 they want to see our full report before
- 13 commenting, but in regard to the thorium
- 14 processing that was done in the pre-1965
- 15 period in 773A where there are positive
- 16 bioassay samples and there was in 1964 and
- 17 '65, we are not going to say anything and we
- have no analysis of that. We weren't tasked
- 19 with that. We're only reviewing what NIOSH
- 20 has done. And in the course of reviewing the
- 21 thorium documents we found that a lot of

1 thorium processing that happened that wasn't 2 covered in the report. So there's going to be 3 nothing more in our report than what you see in the summary. 4 5 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Right. DR. MAKHIJANI: These 6 items are 7 not covered. CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I was going to 8 9 say, I added on the action list for that, and I did miss a little of your exchange, but I at 10 least heard Tim say that NIOSH will address 11 12 this reprocessing question in the response to SC&A's review of the supplemental ER report, 13 14 right? 15 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, and my 16 comment to that was you're not going to see 17 anything more than what you see right now. In our analysis, we have done no 18 19 dose sort of potential evaluation, exposure 20 potential evaluation. We have made a comment

in the context of the Burning Ground that, you

21

- 1 know, solvents were taken there and maybe
- there might be exposure potential.
- 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I would just
- 4 ask that NIOSH incorporate it in their
- 5 response, even though it wasn't specifically
- 6 addressed in the SC&A report. Is that fair,
- 7 Tim, outline your strategy for that --
- 8 DR. TAULBEE: That's correct.
- 9 That is where we will address that particular
- 10 issue.
- 11 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.
- DR. TAULBEE: Thank you.
- 13 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes, so that's
- 14 an added action for Matrix Item 1.
- 15 DR. MAKHIJANI: And so for Matrix
- 16 Item 2, actually the review of that started a
- 17 little bit later, but a lot of the overview
- 18 comment is the same as certain items are not
- 19 covered, actually. In the latest meeting,
- 20 NIOSH indicated that they were going to cover
- 21 reprocessing operations in the Report 46, but

- Report 46 didn't have anything about reprocessing operations. So that's sort of the main thing that's missing. And then there's the full `71 period missing.
- I would just point out the sort of gaps that we identified without going into the substantive findings of what we did analyze.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes, that's
- 9 fine.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. Matrix
- 11 Issue 3, recycled uranium, we haven't received
- 12 -- I didn't look today or yesterday --
- 13 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And Arjun, I'm
- 14 sorry.
- Tim, if you have any -- if at any point you need any clarification on items or something that you think is missing or
- 18 otherwise, please step in as Arjun is going
- 19 through these, okay?
- DR. TAULBEE: Sure, thank you.
- 21 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: All right.

- DR. TAULBEE: And in fact, on
- 2 Issue 3 is one of those. We did provide a
- 3 response to the Work Group on August 13th.
- 4 That was our documented dated July 19th, where
- 5 we did address the recycled uranium issue.
- 6 DR. MAKHIJANI: Your document
- 7 dated July 19 from August 13th: I'm not
- 8 understanding that. I'm seeing your document
- 9 dated July 19th.
- DR. TAULBEE: We didn't send that
- document to you all until August 13th.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.
- 13 DR. TAULBEE: So that's why the
- 14 two different dates, but yes. We provided a
- response to you all regarding recycled uranium
- in that document.
- 17 DR. MAKHIJANI: I'm looking at it
- 18 and all you say is TBD is being updated to
- 19 resolve this issue and Table 4.6 will be
- 20 revised. But we don't have anything
- 21 substantive.

1 Just a second here. DR. TAULBEE: 2 I believe if you go to Appendix A of that particular report. Would somebody please mute 3 whoever -- it sounds like a pencil is being 4 5 sharpened. 6 I put myself on DR. MAKHIJANI: 7 I'm trying to move away from -- yes. mute. Sorry about that. I'll try to be as quiet as 8 9 possible here. Appendix A provides 10 TAULBEE: the update of what will appear in the TBD. 11 12 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay, Ι 13 saw that you had said you are going to update 14 the TBD and I looked further than that, so --15 TAULBEE: All right, DR. it seems like it might be in Appendix A. You can 16 review --17 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, I'm looking 18 at it, there's some numbers in Appendix A. 19

NEAL R. GROSS

And I guess you provided the references up

We can begin a review of this if you

front.

20

21

- 1 want, Mark.
- 2 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I think that
- 3 should be the action. SC&A should review
- 4 these as they are outlined in Appendix A of
- 5 that report. Okay.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay, let me write
- 7 that down. I had a little bit of a mixup with
- 8 the schedule. I didn't realize my electricity
- 9 would be gone.
- 10 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I'm capturing
- 11 these too.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Thank you. The
- 13 next item is americium, curium and
- 14 californium. Regarding the actual data for
- that, we haven't seen anything from NIOSH, so
- 16 far as I know and there was one other issue
- 17 about californium spontaneous fission that
- 18 NIOSH had said, look at ICRP 68, and on that
- 19 we agree with NIOSH. So there's no issue
- 20 outstanding on that.
- 21 DR. TAULBEE: This is Tim Taulbee

- 1 at NIOSH. Again, for clarification here, I'm
- 2 not sure what our action is on that. We
- 3 addressed the californium-252 issue with
- 4 spontaneous fission in the fission fragments
- 5 and it looks like SC&A agrees with us on this.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Right.
- 7 DR. TAULBEE: I don't think --
- 8 that was the issue identified originally with
- 9 this particular issue --
- DR. MAKHIJANI: No, you see there
- 11 are two issues. The californium-252 organ
- dose factor, so it came up as part of our
- 13 review of the data, but the americium, curium
- 14 and californium are the same as all the
- 15 neptunium, polonium and so on. Is there a
- 16 coworker model for the unmonitored workers and
- 17 how are you going to address construction
- 18 worker versus non-construction worker issues?
- DR. TAULBEE: It's the same for
- 20 all of these radionuclides.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: It's the neptunium,

polonium, recycled uranium.

1

2 Now we have something on recycled uranium, but a product with the same issues. 3 Is there a dose reconstruction model? 4 And 5 does that model include construction worker versus non-construction worker data? 6 There's an adequacy of data issue and a CW versus NCW 7 issue. 8 9 DR. TAULBEE: Let me ask you this. This is, again Tim Taulbee with NIOSH. 10 it comes to the coworker models, shouldn't we 11 then, 12 combine. this particular issue Issue 11 which is your dose reconstruction 13 14 approach for exotic radionuclides? 15 DR. MAKHIJANI: I don't think so. think they have always been listed as 16 17 separate matrix items because, early on, you

NEAL R. GROSS

said you have data for these and we had begun

looking at some data. In most cases, the data

are pretty sparse, especially for construction

workers and the exotic -- exotic always being

18

19

20

21

1 a separate issue.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

I'm looking at 2 the matrix and I 3 can read the matrix item. NIOSH proposes to use measured data or coworker model estimating 4 5 dose with sufficient accuracy since data were for all 6 collected three trivalent radionuclides 7 rather than each separately. NIOSH assign result 8 proposes to а of 9 californium-252 as appropriate.

That's the context in which that other issue of californium-232 arose, but the main issue with these radionuclides is, do you have sufficient data and is there a coworker model and how are you going to apply that to construction workers. It's quite separate than the exotics issue.

17 DR. TAULBEE: Okay, that so don't get this confused again then, can we add 18 19 the title, dose reconstruction for to 20 americium, curium, californium-252 for 21 coworker models?

1	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, this is just
2	a shorthand from the matrix. I mean it's very
3	clear in the matrix.
4	DR. TAULBEE: Okay. It wasn't
5	very clear to me from reading this response.
6	DR. MAKHIJANI: It's just a title
7	and the matrix itself is a condensation of
8	items from the ER and the TBD review. I mean
9	if we want to repeat the whole matrix item in
10	every title or sentence, I'm happy to do that.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Let me ask I
12	just changed that title, just for
13	clarification, Arjun. That's fine. But the
14	substance of the let me get the action
15	correct. It's for these three nuclides, the
16	coworker model and adequacy of data question?
17	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, and for all
18	of these things there's a construction worker
19	versus non-construction worker question.
20	DR. TAULBEE: This, again, is Tim
21	Taulbee. Thanks for clarifying that title

- 1 there, Mark, because really what I think
- 2 happened here is we have two issues in one.
- 3 Yes, they're related, but only one of them we
- 4 addressed and we felt that we were completed
- 5 with our response and apparently there's
- 6 another part here that we need to respond to
- 7 still.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.
- 9 DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, what it says
- 10 here is dose construction data for Am, Cm, and
- 11 Cs, and Cf-252 organ dose conversion factors.
- 12 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And that's
- 13 fine. We don't need to harp on -- I got the
- 14 action item down and we can -- and some of
- 15 these, you're right, they repeat or the
- 16 actions are similar, so we can go through
- 17 these fairly quickly, Arjun. Go ahead.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, and the next
- 19 items are the same: coworker models for
- 20 neptunium fission products and cobalt-60 and
- 21 the same issues are involved there: adequacy

- of data and construction worker versus non-
- 2 construction worker. A8 is the same.
- 3 DR. TAULBEE: This is Tim Taulbee
- 4 with NIOSH.
- 5 Mark, if you'd like, I can give
- 6 you a little bit of update on where we're at
- 7 with those coworker models.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Sure, that
- 9 would be good.
- DR. TAULBEE: We are currently
- 11 assessing the neptunium and fission products
- including the cobalt-60 there. We had coded
- 13 all of the whole body count data from Savannah
- 14 River and we were working on the coworker
- 15 model when we discovered that there was some
- 16 data that was in a hard copy format that had
- 17 not been coded.
- To make a long story short, not
- 19 all the whole body count data that was in
- 20 NOCTS had been coded, so we're currently going
- 21 through a recoding effort from that standpoint

- and once that's done, then we can begin to
- 2 proceed with those coworker models.
- 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. And in
- 4 the meantime you need to also be considering
- 5 the data-adequacy question and the
- 6 construction worker, non-construction worker,
- 7 but I won't harp on that, but can I ask Tim
- 8 time lines on any of these? I know you
- 9 offered some times before. I just want to get
- 10 a sense.
- DR. TAULBEE: My sense for this
- one, because of the recoding effort would be
- 13 middle to late January.
- 14 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And when you
- 15 say this one, it's all three: neptunium,
- 16 fission products, cobalt?
- 17 DR. TAULBEE: Right, well, the
- 18 fission products and cobalt-60 are really
- 19 combined together because of the whole body
- 20 count data.
- 21 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Right.

- DR. TAULBEE: And the neptunium,
- 2 yes, along those same lines.
- 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I do want to
- 4 keep all of this in mind in terms of setting
- 5 up our next meeting as well.
- DR. TAULBEE: Yes, certainly. I
- 7 understand.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Thank you.
- 9 That brings us to -- did we do eight, Arjun,
- 10 or is that separate?
- 11 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, eight is the
- 12 same unless Tim has a separate update for
- 13 that.
- 14 DR. TAULBEE: I do have a separate
- 15 update for that. Again, this is Tim Taulbee
- 16 with NIOSH. In this particular case, we've
- 17 done some additional investigation as to the
- 18 magnitude of this particular work and we got a
- 19 report that's in draft and that's actually in
- 20 comment resolution now that it's been drafted.
- 21 And we're now proposing to develop a coworker

1	model for this. Even though we have limited
2	polonium bioassay, we believe that virtually
3	everybody who was exposed to this material
4	during the short campaign was monitored for it
5	and we have their particular data. And this
6	is a case of a small number of workers and
7	we've cross-compared names versus the bioassay
8	roster that we have for polonium and
9	everything seems to match.
10	So again, this is a draft report
11	that will be coming. It's currently in
12	comment resolution. I expect that we'll have
13	this done early to mid-December is when we'd
14	be able to commit that to the Board.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Can I ask
16	this is Mark Griffon, can I ask, Tim, if your
17	position is that you monitored everyone, is no
18	coworker model being proposed?
19	DR. TAULBEE: That's correct.
20	That's our current thoughts along this, but
21	please keep in mind this is a draft and that

- 1 could change once it goes through our comment
- 2 resolution internal here.
- 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Sure, and I'm
- 4 sure you're aware of past efforts in this
- 5 regard, so I'm sure Jim Neton and others have
- 6 talked to you about it, but it's always the
- 7 concern of, are you sure that everyone
- 8 involved in the particular campaign was being
- 9 monitored, including the maintenance people
- 10 that might have went through, others, you
- 11 know.
- DR. TAULBEE: Yes, I understand.
- 13 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Anyway, keeping
- 14 that in mind.
- DR. TAULBEE: Okay. Yes, sir.
- 16 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Item nine,
- 17 Arjun?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, let me take
- 19 item nine in two pieces. NIOSH's response to
- our review of TIB-75. And just to recall, our
- 21 review of TIB-75 had two pieces in it. One

a technical information bulletin in 1 was 2 general where the assertion that claimant data 3 representative of the whole worker are population was examined and NIOSH's specific 4 5 examples from various sites were gone over. 6 NIOSH has responded to And that piece of our analysis, but the time we were 7 asked to review this in the specific 8 was context of Savannah River because that was a 9 part of the basis in the Evaluation Report of 10 NIOSH saying that we can use this claimant 11 data for construction-worker SEC at Savannah 12 River site. 13 So we have also examined that in 14 TIB-75, our review of but NIOSH has not 15 responded to that part. it 16 And the that is reason 17 relevant, not just for this matrix Issue 9, but for all the matrix issues that we've been 18 19 discussing previously is that we found that 20 the general proposition that non-construction 21 worker internal exposure would bound

1 construction worker internal exposure was not 2 Ιt has general proposition, correct. а 3 although it does sometimes for some groups. And that you have to parse construction worker 4 5 data by area and job type because some job 6 types have much lower exposure potential and some have much higher and some areas have much 7 higher. 8 9 Ιf do the ratio of you 10 construction worker to non-construction worker by area and job type, they're often quite a 11 We have not seen any 12 bit more than one. 13 to that, in general, not just 14 relation tritium. Tritium, to we are 15 analyzing and there is a separate action item on that for us. 16 17 DR. TAULBEE: Again, this is Tim Taulbee with NIOSH. And this is an effort 18 19 that has been underway and I think in my 20 September email to you, Mark, I had indicated 21 that I expected this particular early stage, a

1 response to this particular part of 2 issue would be released by the end of October. 3 That has not happened, obviously. But we are still working on that report and I do expect 4 5 that that report will be available by the end 6 of the month early December. This or specifically addresses the construction trades 7 workers non-construction trades 8 versus 9 workers, issues raised by SC&A in the context of tritium at this point because that's where 10 we have the most data. 11 12 It's going to boil down to our 13 method of evaluating whether there's 14 difference between the two populations and 15 what I'm going to be looking for is buy-in from the Advisory Board that the method that 16 17 proposed to make this evaluation adequate, is appropriate and if you all agree 18 19 to that. Once that occurs, if you do agree 20 with it, then we can address the other issues 21 such as uranium and plutonium for construction

1	trades workers versus non-construction trades
2	workers. And it's really kind of I was
3	hoping to have this report out earlier, but
4	due to resources and priority issues, we've
5	not been able to get that report out just yet.
6	DR. MAKHIJANI: I don't know that
7	we have crossed wires here, because I
8	understood from our action items that you were
9	going to put up a larger tritium database and
10	that we all agreed, as you mentioned, Tim,
11	that we would hold off on the other
12	radionuclides until we had looked at tritium
13	and that it was for us to revisit our
14	conclusions about tritium from the TIB-75
15	review with this larger database which we have
16	done. Our review is now essentially complete.
17	I have gone over it and it has either gone to
18	the DOE or will go to the DOE in the next few
19	days.
20	And so are you doing a parallel
21	sort of approach to this? We had suggested we

- 1 roll up all the reactor areas. We've done
- that. We've looked at whether the larger
- database if we have the same conclusions or
- 4 not as before and I can tell you that
- 5 generally the conclusions are about the same.
- And we had some questions about the database,
- 7 too.
- DR. TAULBEE: I think this is
- 9 going to be an issue that's going to be a very
- 10 lengthy discussion when we get your report and
- 11 when you get ours, because I don't think our
- 12 conclusions are matching.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Right, right, but
- 14 I thought that we were going to go first and
- then you would review that and now we'll have
- 16 two sort of competing reports. I mean it
- 17 doesn't matter to me, but that was my
- 18 understanding is that we were reviewing the
- 19 database that you would put up and that you
- 20 would respond to that. But it's fine.
- 21 Whatever Mark and the Work Group wants.

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. I mean it
2	seems like it's far along on both parts, so I
3	don't think we I think we should stay with
4	what we got right now.
5	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, right. Fair
6	enough.
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And do both in
8	the meeting. So I have two actions that SC&A
9	is completing. I guess it's in the final-
10	review stage.
11	DR. MAKHIJANI: It's done.
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And NIOSH will
13	respond to the CW and NCW issue in a separate
14	response probably by early to mid-December,
15	right?
16	DR. TAULBEE: That's correct.
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.
18	DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I think we can
20	move on to ten, Arjun.
21	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, okay.

1	Tritides, as you see there, we participated
2	with NIOSH in a tritide-related document
3	review. Interviews have been cleared and they
4	are being finalized, reviewed by interviewees,
5	finalized. We were supposed to ask Joyce
6	about two specific tritides and their
7	solubility, lanthanum-nickel-aluminum tritide
8	and palladium-rhodium tritide, if I'm reading
9	this right, and we couldn't find any
10	information about or data on the solubility
11	of these two tritides. We didn't look a whole
12	lot, but I consulted with Joyce and we had
13	nothing ready to hand so we're waiting for
14	NIOSH for this.
15	On the dose reconstruction model,
16	we were waiting for NIOSH to issue its dose
17	reconstruction report and hear how you
18	distinguish between CW and non-CW. We're not
19	saying it applies in all cases.
20	So that's where we are. We have
21	just this one action item outstanding that

1 interviewees have to still respond. There 2 will probably be another round of DOE review after that. 3 Okay, this is Tim 4 DR. TAULBEE: 5 Taulbee with NIOSH. We're at basically the same, maybe a little bit farther behind than 6 you are with the interviews. We're still in 7 the of documenting those 8 process and 9 finalizing them. We have not sent them back to the interviewees for their review yet. 10 I was surprised that you all have, but okay. 11 Well, you know, I 12 DR. MAKHIJANI: 13 haven't talked to Kathy about this in a couple 14 of weeks, so that was my understanding. Kathy 15 did review this document before I sent it out. It says they have not yet been reviewed by 16 17 interviewees. I can't tell from here if they have gotten them, but I presume they have. 18 19 DR. TAULBEE: Okay. So once we 20 get ours documented, we'll send them back to 21 the interviewees, as well, to get them

1 finalized.

With regards to the two tritides 2 that are listed. 3 I do have one update, Mark, that you should be aware of on the lanthanum-4 5 nickel tritide. The Savannah River Site is actually conducting a solubility study on that 6 particular material in conjunction 7 with Lovelace. And those results are expected by 8 9 the end of the year, at least that was their schedule that I heard back in the August time 10 Whether that occurs or not by the end 11 frame. 12 of the year, I don't know. I have not gotten an update from the site, but they are actually 13 14 analyzing lung solubility of the that 15 particular material. 16 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. And

Arjun, if I'm understanding item 2 correctly,
you might have said this while I was making
notes and I might have missed it, that you did
-- when you say SC&A has found no information

NEAL R. GROSS

21

1	DR. MAKHIJANI: I just asked
2	Joyce, you know. She is sort of our go-to
3	person on this, whether there's any ICRP data
4	and so on and she looked some and couldn't
5	find any.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay, all
7	right. So I think that's pretty clear. The
8	actions there are pretty clear, right?
9	And the third item, Tim, the model
10	for tritides, obviously, is dependent on some
11	of this other work. Is that what is the
12	expectation with regard to your approach?
13	DR. TAULBEE: Our approach is,
14	once we get these interviews finalized, we'll
15	be writing up a report on the particular metal
16	tritide exposures at the Savannah River Site.
17	And I don't have a time line for that yet.
18	I'm kind of backlogged here a little bit with
19	the interviews and many of these other reports
20	we're trying to get out. So I don't have an
21	idea. My gut tells me it will be after the

- 1 February Board meeting before we would have
- 2 something resolved on metal tritides for
- 3 Savannah River.
- In other words, given the time
- 5 lines --
- 6 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: No, that's
- 7 fine. I was just making notes. I wasn't
- 8 shocked or anything.
- 9 DR. TAULBEE: Okay.
- 10 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: But you're not
- 11 necessarily waiting for this Savannah River
- 12 Lovelace study or is that a factor in this?
- DR. TAULBEE: It is a little bit,
- 14 yes. Well, not really.
- 15 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: If it's
- 16 available, you'll consider it, right, that
- 17 kind of thing?
- DR. TAULBEE: That is correct,
- 19 yes. That is correct. That's a better way to
- 20 say it. I think once we make the interviews
- 21 available to the Board Members as well, I

- think you'll begin to get a little better
- 2 clear view of the exposure potential in
- 3 dealing with these materials.
- 4 I know that Phil and Brad have
- 5 definitely heard all of the discussions that
- 6 we had going on and so they have a really good
- 7 feel for these, I hope.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Arjun, anything
- 9 else to add on that one?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Sorry?
- 11 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Anything else
- 12 to add on that item?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: No, no, no.
- 14 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay, go ahead
- 15 with Item 11.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Item 11, well,
- 17 NIOSH has said that they're waiting for
- 18 guidance from you. We have a partial list.
- 19 It's stated here that they got much more than
- 20 what you see here, other than what NIOSH has
- 21 published. We'll send that to DOE for review

1 by mid-November along with a whole bunch of 2 other stuff, but basically we're waiting to hear from NIOSH about a dose reconstruction 3 approach and they said they're waiting for 4 5 Board quidance. So I don't know where we are on this. 6 This is Tim Taulbee 7 DR. TAULBEE: with NIOSH. I'd like 8 to get some 9 clarification here. What we had asked for was from this list of all these radionuclides --10 Arjun, can you 11 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: 12 mute when you're --13 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, sorry. 14 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Thanks. 15 TAULBEE: DR. Okay. What we're asking for clarification here is that we have 16 17 gross alpha analysis that was done for urine, gross beta analysis and gamma as well and we 18 19 have whole body count data. So what I'm 20 asking for is these exotic radionuclides, 21 which ones are you all concerned about that

- 1 would not be covered by the bioassay methods
- that were employed at the site? I'm not
- 3 seeing any that are causing any concern to us,
- 4 so that's what I'm asking for your feedback
- 5 on.
- 6 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And I quess
- 7 that's really a question for SC&A. I'm not
- 8 sure.
- 9 DR. MAKHIJANI: You know, I don't
- 10 know what extent of investigation we should
- 11 do. To some extent, this is reminiscent to me
- 12 of the Y-12 discussion that we had and Jim
- 13 Neton is on the line. Y-12; it was said that
- there was no exposure potential and there may
- 15 have been incidents in there, but they're all
- 16 well documented and it turned out there was no
- 17 data. The SEC was partly based on that and it
- was the same kind of thing, half the periodic
- 19 table was produced at Y-12. So this seems, at
- 20 least on the surface, reminiscent of that
- 21 discussion and there's also broader Board

1 discussion, as you know, Mark. When you say 2 there's no exposure potential, what do you 3 have to do to establish that? So if there's any quidance on what you want us to do, we're 4 5 happy to do it. But there is a long list of We haven't seen data on it and 6 radionuclides. I don't know -- I'm open to where you want to 7 go with this or what you would like us to do. 8 9 Hello? Hello? 10 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Oh, I'm sorry. I put it back on mute instead of taking it 11 12 I was saying this is the listing -- all of these radionuclides were sort of short-term 13 14 campaign whereas Savannah River was in the 15 business of producing these nuclides, right? 16 Is that correct? This is Tim Taulbee. 17 DR. TAULBEE: that's correct, they were producing 18 Yes, 19 these and they had bioassay for gross alpha. They had gross beta, mixed fission products 20 21 and assay activation.

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: So NIOSH's
2	position is that the general bioassay program,
3	even though they didn't have any nuclides
4	specific necessarily for these, the general
5	program would allow NIOSH to bound them using
6	personal data, right?
7	DR. TAULBEE: That's correct.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I guess, Arjun,
9	that's where SC&A needs to weigh in.
10	DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay, my
11	suggestion would be that it might be more
12	efficient for us to see how NIOSH is going to
13	use that data because they haven't yet said
14	how they're going to use the fission-product
15	data to do dose reconstruction on construction
16	workers and maybe once we looked at that, we
17	can comment at that time. There's work you
18	want us to do now in terms of seeing whether -
19	- I mean fission product data, I imagine, are
20	largely related to the reprocessing of waste
21	tank operations and so on. If you want us to

- look at whether there's any overlap where these radionuclides were worked on and where
- 3 the fission product exposure might be, we can
- 4 do that, but -- or we can wait until we see
- 5 NIOSH's approach to fission products.
- And some of these are not fission
- 7 products. I don't know where you go with
- 8 that.
- 9 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Clearly, some
- 10 are not fission products, yes. I guess if you
- 11 think it would clarify things, once you saw
- 12 NIOSH's approach on fission products, would
- 13 that be --
- DR. MAKHIJANI: I think for any of
- them, since NIOSH is saying we have a general,
- 16 unless I misunderstood, Tim, that we have a
- 17 general sort of bioassay program. A few of
- 18 these are repeats from radionuclides we
- 19 already covered like cobalt and neptunium and
- 20 so on. And many of them are in the middle of
- 21 the periodic table, but some of them are not:

- 1 iridium-192, protactinium-231, plutonium-238
- 2 and so on.
- 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I've got to say
- 4 most of the transuranic types were covered in
- 5 earlier issues, weren't they?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, they are.
- 7 But not all.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Not all, yes.
- 9 DR. MAKHIJANI: Americium-243m
- 10 would be one that's staring at me from this
- 11 list that's in front of me.
- 12 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And U-233, I
- 13 don't think that was --
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, U-233, we
- 15 have covered that.
- 16 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Right.
- 17 DR. MAKHIJANI: Because we punted
- on uranium for the moment until we look at
- 19 tritium.
- 20 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I mean I don't
- 21 know if you can in a short statement, Tim,

1 possibly just describe how -- if you had a 2 situation where а worker were potentially exposed to one of these quote unquote exotics 3 such as U-233, not listed in other areas of 4 5 our actions, how that would be treated. I'm 6 assuming that you would use gross alpha and then assume they had potential for several 7 different nuclides and take the worst case for 8 9 internal dose. I'm not sure, though. Is that what we want to sort of get an answer 10 Arjun, how --11 12 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I'm a little worried about this because we've got a couple 13 14 of layers of problems here. We've got three 15 radionuclides that were produced in particular area of Savannah River site but 16 17 separate from the reprocessing plant and then these went through 18 some of some kind of 19 separations process to extract them and some 20 of them may not have. I'm not Ι sure. 21 haven't researched it.

1	So the first thing to establish is
2	whether the workers who worked with these
3	things, whether the bioassay data of fission
4	products that's available or gross alpha,
5	whatever, has anything to do with the workers
6	who are handling these materials. So if they
7	didn't and bioassay data is not applicable,
8	would not be applicable to these workers.
9	The second thing is we have this
10	big issue of construction worker versus non-
11	construction worker data that, in this context
12	might be particularly difficult because you
13	know, they were doing similar it's very
14	clear that they were doing similar kinds of
15	work and that their exposure potential was
16	comparable, sometimes less, sometimes more
17	than nonconstruction workers, DuPont workers.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Here's what I
19	want to ask
20	DR. MAKHIJANI: I don't know where
21	we go with that. I'm open to whatever your

1 quidance is.

2 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Here's what I My feeling 3 like to have, Arjun. is that possibly SC&A should take a closer look at 4 5 this and if you could, it might be in the 6 original report it got much more granularity, But if you can go through this 7 I'm not sure. list and sort of edit it because some of these 8 9 are already addressed in other areas of our --10 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay, sure. CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: But then also 11 12 give more -- if it's not in your original 13 report, provide a little more granularity, at 14 least some examples if one of these other 15 isotopes like U-233; if it was in a particular production little 16 give area, а more 17 specificity on why you -- I think part of the finding has to point to the issue of you don't 18

NEAL R. GROSS

it might be in your original report.

think it can be reconstructed with the data

So I think you have to sort of --

available.

19

20

21

I'm not

1 sure.

2 DR. MAKHIJANI: It's not. There's 3 no report on dose reconstruction aspects for We're just compiling a list to see 4 exotics. 5 what might have been produced, when, what part 6 of the database. documents are We haven't done anything more than that. 7 It's just very, very minimal. 8 9 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Let me ask you to edit the list a little bit, and to the 10 provide 11 extent you can, а little more 12 specificity about some of the concerns, 13 whether these were like short-term things --14 Could I request DR. MAKHIJANI: 15 that see from Tim why he thinks that 16 fission NIOSH, why they think that or 17 fission product data is applicable to so many of these things and whether they were viewed 18 19 in the same main areas for a fission product? We can do that, that's fine. 20 That's not a

problem, but normally we respond to NIOSH when

21

- 1 they say how they're going to do this. The
- 2 concern is we haven't seen that.
- 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: They are going
- 4 to provide the fission product report for the
- 5 other item, right?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Right, right.
- 7 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: If you can do
- 8 this in the meantime, it may not answer the
- 9 question, but it might move the ball a little
- 10 down the road.
- 11 DR. MAKHIJANI: Sure, we can do
- 12 that.
- 13 MEMBER GIBSON: Hey, Mark.
- 14 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes, go ahead,
- 15 Tim.
- 16 MEMBER GIBSON: This is Mark.
- 17 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Oh, Mark, hi.
- 18 MEMBER GIBSON: This issue we're
- 19 talking about sounds really familiar, almost
- 20 similar to what went on at Mound when we had
- 21 problems there with the bioassay program

1 during the production that years. Is 2 basically what we're talking about, where they 3 just tried to use bioassay sampling and didn't look at the specific isotope? 4 5 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes, Ι think 6 the question is, you know, these people were under a general bioassay program and there is 7 data, but will it sort of -- can NIOSH use 8 9 this for these particular campaigns of exotics that intermittently occurred over the years. 10 I guess that's the question, Mike. 11 Yes. So 12 it has some similarity to some of the Mound 13 stuff. Same kind of issue, but I don't think 14 far enough along to figure out we're the 15 specifics. 16 GIBSON: Right. Ι just MEMBER I'm very interested 17 wanted to say in this issue, too. 18 19 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. Okay. 20 MEMBER GIBSON: Thanks. 21 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Thank you.

- 1 Let's go on to 12, Arjun, if you could.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: I was on mute.
- 3 Number 12 is the incidents question. Just a
- 4 second. Internal dose incidents. We have --
- 5 have we sent -- did we send you a list of
- 6 incidents or this at DOE right now? Let me
- 7 see. No, our internal report is complete. I
- 8 will send you a list.
- 9 The short of it is that we found
- 10 many incidents and we agree that they're not
- 11 all in the Special Hazards Investigation
- 12 Index, but there are also other repositories
- 13 of incidents and we found that none are
- 14 complete. And in fact, year to year there's
- 15 lots of incidents that were not recorded and
- 16 that confirms what people have said in
- 17 interviews. It also addresses part of what
- 18 Bob Warren had been saying which is sort of
- 19 the additional item at the end of this list.
- 20 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Just to stick
- 21 to the action.

1	DR. MAKHIJANI: So the action item
2	is that this report is essentially ready and
3	it will go to the DOE for review soon and
4	NIOSH will get it and the issue will be how
5	are we going to reconstruct doses.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Do you think in
7	three weeks or so it should be through DOE?
8	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, this is
9	essentially complete.
10	DR. TAULBEE: This is Tim Taulbee.
11	Just for my own clarification, you've written
12	a report where you've identified some
13	incidents and a discussion of this particular
14	issue
15	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes.
16	DR. TAULBEE: and you're going
17	to be sending that to us. Okay.
18	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, and we not
19	only identify incidents, we've also gone
20	through documentation as to whether there are
21	databases where data and documents that

- 1 indicate whether incident compilations are
- 2 complete or not. And as indicated here, at
- 3 least in the early years through to the mid-
- 4 '60s or early '70s, incidents don't appear to
- 5 be complete.
- 6 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And we'll save
- 7 our discussion on that.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Exactly.
- 9 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Whether the
- 10 current versions will bound -- incorporate
- 11 these or bound these or -- yes, okay.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Now this report
- has been sent to the Work Group. The next
- 14 matrix Item 13, report was sent to the Work
- 15 Group on July 21st. We were asked to review
- 16 whether we were making consistent statements
- 17 with what our analysis of TIB-52 had been and
- our statements in the context of a Savannah
- 19 River SEC. We found that it didn't change any
- 20 position, that our statements had been pretty
- 21 consistent and we sent that report along to

- 1 the Work Group.
- 2 As part of this item, there's also
- 3 a logbook review. We have finished the
- 4 verification review of the four logbooks that
- 5 Tim talked about and that is currently in
- 6 internal review. I got that from Bob Barton
- 7 two days ago, something like that.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: So it should be
- 9 completed early for DOE?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. It is done.
- 11 There was a fair amount of work to be done
- and we had to go through a long QA check and
- that is all complete now and we'll be sending
- that to DOE pretty soon.
- 15 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Tim, anything
- 16 to add there, clarify?
- 17 DR. TAULBEE: The only thing that
- 18 I have to add is that there is a revision to
- 19 OTIB-52 that is in the works. It's currently
- 20 in comment resolution and so that's where that
- 21 one's at. So there will be a revision to

- 1 OTIB-52.
- 2 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Can you notify
- 3 SC&A when that's complete? Because I think
- 4 SC&A should probably -- well, I'm not sure
- 5 whether this falls under Procedures Review or
- 6 whatever, but it definitely overlaps with
- 7 this. I think you need to review it in the
- 8 context of Savannah River SEC.
- 9 DR. TAULBEE: Right.
- 10 DR. MAKHIJANI: That's the only
- 11 context we've been looking at it here.
- 12 There's a statement about plutonium bioassay
- 13 data from the Savannah River site that has
- 14 been the subject of a separate review, by us
- 15 on Savannah River site in the course of this
- 16 work. A little bit earlier, maybe April,
- 17 earlier this year.
- 18 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: So I put that
- 19 the third action of NIOSH is completing our
- 20 revision of TIB-52 and SC&A will review it
- 21 when available in the context of SRS SEC.

1 Right. DR. MAKHIJANI: Open-pan 2 burning. NIOSH is compiling air data and we 3 looked at this briefly from the point of view construction workers 4 of versus non-5 construction workers and have -- we've gotten no formal action item on this pending and I've 6 reported our brief sort of findings on this 7 update, and we hope that NIOSH will address 8 9 these issues as it proceeds with its air monitoring data review. 10 This is Tim Taulbee 11 DR. TAULBEE: with NIOSH. 12 Yes, we do have, again, the draft 13 report that is in the beginning stages of 14 comment resolution, let's put it that way. Ι 15 have seen it, but there's some more work that needs to be done on that. And it does address 16 17 most of the issues that you've listed here, but there's a new one that you issued that it 18 19 doesn't address and I'm not sure if you want, 20 Mark, if you want SC&A to expand upon it. 21 that's the issue of the external exposure

geometry of some of the workers around the burning ground area.

Our initial response was just upon the internal side for open-pan burning of contaminated solvents and the analysis of that air data. So that's all that's in this current report and that was all we were going to do at this point.

guess my preference, Mark, you're agreeable to this, would be to let us issue our report and then if SC&A, who I'm sure will be reviewing this report, would like to introduce other comments or something along the external exposure at that time, they can elaborate on what it is and then we'll address it from that standpoint, but I'd like to try the report issue as it is instead of trying to expand the scope of the current report, if that's agreeable, Mark?

NEAL R. GROSS

that makes sense, especially if you're in the

CHAIRMAN GRIFFON:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Yes,

Ι

1	final stages of review of the drafts, right?
2	DR. TAULBEE: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: So I think we'd
4	rather see it than hold it up, you know.
5	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, Mark. I
6	agree with that, too. This external exposure,
7	it just came up in the course of just looking
8	at these documents. It was some pretty
9	graphic documents about the transport of this
10	waste. So I mentioned it for the sake of
11	completeness, but I think since NIOSH already
12	is looking at geometry in the context of
13	another matrix item, this piece we'll
14	review the Burning Ground piece and put this
15	in there, but the external exposure piece
16	probably better be dealt with in the context
17	of path modeling probably. Yes, it's a
18	geometry issue.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Can I just
20	clarify that one, Arjun. Can we drop the
21	external geometry issue from this item,

- 1 assuming that it's going to be addressed in
- 2 the other section?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I think it
- 4 might actually be more efficient to do that.
- 5 I just put it here because it came up in this
- 6 context and I think it might be more efficient
- 7 to put the external exposure geometry in the
- 8 text, in the Burning Ground in the other item.
- 9 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: If you're
- 10 agreeable, I think that would work.
- 11 DR. MAKHIJANI: That's fine with
- 12 me.
- 13 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Is that okay,
- 14 Tim? Does it make sense?
- DR. TAULBEE: Yes, it does.
- 16 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. Go ahead
- 17 to item 15.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Well, 15 and 16,
- 19 we've been talking about this ICP
- 20 implications. Here we are -- this is an item
- 21 on the tritium report. We've been talking

- 1 about tritium and uranium and data adequacy
- and we agreed to do tritium first and we have
- done some of the preliminary or substantive
- 4 status in giving to you there. I believe it
- is at the DOE for review right now or may be
- 6 going in the next day or two.
- 7 DR. TAULBEE: And as I mentioned,
- 8 Mark, again, this is Tim Taulbee at NIOSH. As
- 9 I mentioned our report should be coming end of
- 10 this month, early December, most likely early
- 11 December, given the Thanksgiving holiday.
- 12 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay, so those
- 13 both are in review and should be early
- 14 December, right?
- DR. TAULBEE: Yes.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: And then the next
- 17 two items, neutron dose reconstruction, and I
- don't believe we have anything from NIOSH on
- 19 that.
- 20 DR. TAULBEE: That is correct.
- 21 The 1962 -- let's see, start with Issue 17.

Prior to '61, again, this is one that's been 1 2 pushed out, unfortunately, but we're looking at the -- post the February Board meeting 3 before we'll have anything to you all. 4 5 '62 to '71 time period, this would be matrix 6 issue 18. I do hope to get a draft, actually a report out to the Board in early January 7 concerning that particular issue. But I don't 8 9 have any clearer date other than that at this time. 10 I think 11 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. 12 we can go ahead on to Issue 19. 13 DR. MAKHIJANI: Nineteen. Yes, 14 this was a reactor incident question where a 15 worker had mentioned there was an incident in the Heavy Water Components Reactor. We looked 16 quite a bit for evidence of this. 17 We didn't find any. We went back to the worker to see 18 19 if we could get more specific information. Не didn't have any more information and so we 20 21 requested reactor investigation lists to see

- if we could find something, but basically, we
- 2 didn't find anything. If the Work Group would
- 3 like to give us more direction as to how much
- 4 to pursue this and what to do with it, because
- 5 it's not clear to us how much more to pursue
- 6 this.
- 7 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And so -- I'm
- 8 sorry, the interview didn't really give you
- 9 any leads, is that what --
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. There was
- 11 some specific information, a crack in the core
- 12 of a Heavy Water Components Test Reactor and
- 13 we didn't find any accident corresponding to
- this description. We have no date.
- 15 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: This isn't the
- 16 one -- I mean, I remember when we did the
- tour, one was mentioned there was a crack, but
- 18 I don't think it was this reactor.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I mean I
- 20 found a couple of documents indicating a
- 21 reactor named just like this, just from

1	memory. I haven't written a report or
2	anything on this since essentially we came up
3	with no firm documentation about what might
4	have happened.
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: It seems like a
6	fairly big accident that would be pretty well
7	documented and known of, you know?
8	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, so maybe
9	we'll just wait to see what we get, if we get
10	anything more from Savannah River Site records
11	about reactor investigations, to see if we can
12	find anything and let it be pending for now.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes, was this
14	mentioned in the petition or did just came up
15	afterwards?
16	DR. MAKHIJANI: No, this came up
17	in the interviews that we did in January of
18	last year in Augusta, if I remember right.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: But in the
20	interview there weren't enough specifics to
21	really

1	DR. MAKHIJANI: That's right. So
2	we did go back to the worker and ask if we
3	could get more specifics. They told us what
4	they remembered.
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I'm just asking
6	to the extent we can close this, NIOSH, in
7	your research, Tim, have you guys run across
8	any such incident that would fit this
9	description?
10	DR. TAULBEE: Not for HWCTR, the
11	Heavy Water Components Test Reactor, no, we
12	have not. We did run into some information of
13	the R Reactor, part of why it was shut down so
14	early was there was some cracking, not in the
15	core, but in the vessel itself that was
16	causing leaks. But that's as close as what I
17	can get to something like this of a crack that
18	was causing problems, but that wasn't this
19	reactor. That was our reactor.
20	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: That's the one
21	we saw in our tour, right?

- DR. TAULBEE: No, we saw C Reactor
- 2 in our tour.
- 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. I
- 4 remember hearing something about a crack in a
- 5 vessel. It wasn't the core itself.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: So my suggestion
- 7 is this be kind of tentatively closed and
- 8 until we hear from reactor investigations,
- 9 unless you want us to do more work. I can't
- imagine what that would be.
- 11 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes, I don't
- 12 know. It's kind of a dead-end thing.
- 13 Tentatively closed, I agree.
- 14 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay, next NIOSH
- developing the model on external geometry and
- 16 I see I've put the burning ground item in
- 17 here, too, so it's in two places. I'll just
- delete it from the other place.
- 19 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Thank you.
- 20 DR. MAKHIJANI: And so we were
- 21 waiting to see NIOSH's model.

1 Again, this is --DR. TAULBEE: 2 wait a minute, I'm sorry. This is Issue 20, This is the exposure geometry for the 3 right? tank farm, okay. Where we're at with this 4 5 one, is again we have a draft report that's It's in comment resolution at this 6 written. It has been significantly delayed. 7 time. Т had expected it to be out at the beginning of 8 9 or about the mid part of October, but it's going to take a little longer due to staffing 10 and priorities. 11 12 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: So any 13 expectation? 14 TAULBEE: My expectation is DR. 15 hoping that I'm early December, but likely January. 16 Tim, 17 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And Ι think I might be stating the obvious, but it 18 19 would assume that you didn't consider the burning ground --20 21 DR. TAULBEE: No, we did not.

1 You know, what I DR. MAKHIJANI: 2 can do, Mark -- sorry, Tim. 3 DR. TAULBEE: May I go ahead? 4 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, what I can 5 do, you know, I can put the documents where we found this in a folder and send you an email 6 and Mark and send the Work Group an email and 7 you can see where this item came from and take 8 9 it where you would like. 10 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay, and it may end up we can track it as a separate item 11 12 or say that it was adequately addressed in the 13 response to 20 if that turns out to be true, 14 Is that okay on a path forward, you know. 15 Tim? 16 DR. TAULBEE: Yes, that sounds 17 fine. I'm hoping that the sooner you can get us that information, the better. 18 Before the end of 19 DR. MAKHIJANI: 20 the week, I'll create a folder and send you an

NEAL R. GROSS

email.

21

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay, thank
2	you. Put that as an action that SC&A will put
3	info related to Burning Ground area.
4	DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.
6	DR. MAKHIJANI: Next item is
7	external adequacy. We've resolved this
8	through HPAREH and OTIB-62 to review and a
9	number of other things, so we don't this an
10	SEC issue, at least we have no issue with
11	external data adequacy, so far as dose
12	reconstruction feasibility is concerned.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: The only
14	hesitancy I have here is I'm not sure the Work
15	Group closed this as an SEC issue.
16	DR. MAKHIJANI: Sorry, I think we
17	closed this as an SEC issue on the 5th of May.
18	I'll have to go back and see.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I just wanted
20	to check the transcripts, but if that's the
21	case, at the very least we have concurrence

- 1 from SC&A that it's --
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, we don't
- 3 believe --
- 4 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Face-to-face, I
- 5 would just ask that we check in again on that
- 6 and make sure the Work Group is all okay with
- 7 SC&A and NIOSH's outcome.
- 8 Okay --
- 9 DR. MAKHIJANI: And I'll look in
- 10 the transcript and try to send you, if there's
- 11 a piece, I'll send you a page reference.
- 12 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. And then
- 13 22 and 23?
- 14 DR. MAKHIJANI: We did that. We
- posted the interviews of the summary on the O:
- 16 drive on the 20th of June. And 24, there's no
- 17 action item recorded. And 25 has been merged
- 18 with 14. So that's the end of the -- other
- 19 than these additional matters --
- 20 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Twenty-two and
- 21 23, you posted these interview summaries and

1	is that as far as we got with that?
2	DR. MAKHIJANI: I mean really
3	using the interview summaries in our own
4	analysis as you heard me kind of sprinkle
5	through my comments here and you'll see that
6	in our reviews also, but since we also refer
7	to these interviews, we've been asked to post
8	interview summaries and we did that.
9	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: But I mean, are
10	all these issues raised by the petitioners
11	addressed in separate actions in our matrix or
12	do we need
13	DR. MAKHIJANI: There is a
14	spreadsheet, this is from memory from some
15	time ago, but there's also a spreadsheet that
16	is posted there with the petitioner items, if
17	I recall correctly.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay, can I ask
19	that you just provide us, Arjun, with a review
20	of those items? Now that the interviews are
21	posted and everybody can look them over, can

- 1 you provide us with a -- just run through
- those items raised by the petitioner and make
- 3 sure that we've addressed them in our matrix
- 4 here.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: I believe we have,
- 6 actually. And I'll send you something in
- 7 writing about that. This is also connected
- 8 with the next item. I will do that.
- 9 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: These are
- issues that we need to address, so we want to
- 11 make sure we don't miss any. Okay.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Initially, we were
- 13 going to do a longer report until it got --
- 14 you know, we decided to do it in pieces and we
- 15 compiled that petitioner-issued list in that
- 16 context. Yes, you're right. We will do that.
- 17 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Just provide a
- 18 memo report.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. Sure. So
- 20 the next two items, 24 and 25, there's
- 21 nothing.

1 And can I ask CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: 2 on 24, I know there was no action from SC&A. 3 I'm assuming there was no action for NIOSH, but where does the issue stand? 4 Can you just 5 flesh that out? 6 DR. MAKHIJANI: To mУ memory, Ι think this matrix item has become merged with 7 all the other internal dose items because a 8 lot of those actually have to do with early 9 work, you know, thorium work, neptunium work, 10 although neptunium might have gone on. 11 12 So I don't know -- let me look at the matrix item to see --13 14 Ιf it CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: goes 15 away, just let us know and we'll just delete 16 it. 17 DR. MAKHIJANI: Why don't I review it to see if it goes away and maybe NIOSH can 18 19 review it too. Let me see what the full 20 matrix item says. I have the matrix here. 21 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.

1 Yes, I actually DR. MAKHIJANI: 2 think this item is covered in the other items, but I'll send you something more formal about 3 4 that. 5 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: That's fine. 6 And 25 is covered in 14, right? That's right, it's 7 DR. MAKHIJANI: the same item. 8 9 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I'm going to make that go away in our future discussions. 10 11 DR. MAKHIJANI: Okay. 12 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. All 13 right. 14 DR. MAKHIJANI: And then there was 15 -- Bob Warren provided us -- he's the claimant representative, and I believe he's on the line 16 17 -- provided us with some documents and there was also some claimant information and we have 18 19 reviewed the issues relating not to the specific claimants since we believe that was 20 21 outside of our scope in this SEC review. But

we have reviewed the other documents and we

2 also reviewed the minutes of the NIOSH Outreach meeting to which Bob Warren referred 3 to see whether the issues were covered in the 4 5 other matrix items. And basically, I believe that they 6 are, a lot of them have to do with incidents 7 and whether incidents been 8 have properly 9 recorded. Some of them have to do with non-10 construction workers versus construction And some of them have to do with why 11 workers. non-construction workers were excluded. 12 that last piece, you know, is not --13 14 basically a NIOSH, OCAS, DCAS decision. And 15 we're not reviewing that except as we come up with non-construction worker issues that are 16 17 related to construction workers, according to

I don't believe that we need to add any new matrix items and if you would like, I can send you a memorandum of our

the direction from last time.

NEAL R. GROSS

18

19

20

21

1

- 1 review of these items. We do have quite a bit
- of work that we did on this. It was done
- mostly by Kathy Demers. I'd be happy to send
- 4 you something in writing.
- 5 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I think that
- 6 would be appropriate. Did you post this? You
- 7 say comments were entered into a spreadsheet
- 8 for easier tracking and sorting. Is this
- 9 available to --
- DR. MAKHIJANI: This, we have not.
- 11 We have not posted anything like this. This
- 12 has been an internal review just to give you a
- report and an update and to seek your guidance
- 14 as to where to go next.
- 15 We'll just kind of review
- 16 everything and clean it up and make sure it's
- 17 readable by third parties and then post it.
- 18 And I'll send you a memo.
- 19 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: The memo and
- 20 your spreadsheet I think would be useful.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, I will do

- 1 that.
- 2 MR. KATZ: Arjun, this is Ted.
- 3 The materials that were submitted, are they
- 4 already posted on the Site Research Database?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: You know, I think
- 6 so, but I will have to ask. I'm not sure,
- 7 Ted.
- 8 MR. KATZ: Okay, because that
- 9 probably should be done in conjunction with
- 10 this.
- 11 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Agreed.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes, sure.
- 13 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I mean this
- 14 sort of goes along with 22 and 23, but it was
- 15 sort of additional comments, right, beyond the
- 16 original piece.
- 17 DR. MAKHIJANI: Right. A lot of
- 18 it is actually around matrix Item 12 about
- 19 incidents and matrix Item 13 about
- 20 construction workers versus non-construction
- 21 workers.

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.
2	DR. MAKHIJANI: But you'll see
3	that in the memo I sent you.
4	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: All right.
5	That will be good. We need to make sure if
6	the Work Group or SC&A are not covered in
7	other items, we need to address those
8	separately, so that will be good to see a
9	formal follow up on that.
10	Is there anything we missed just
11	as far as the status updates, Arjun or Tim?
12	DR. MAKHIJANI: I don't think so.
13	DR. TAULBEE: This is Tim. No, I
14	don't think so. I think that covers it.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I guess the
16	only thing I would draw attention this came
17	up yesterday in our Fernald meeting. We did a
18	similar thing. I know that at the last full
19	Board meeting, we had heard some public
20	comment of how many Work Group meetings we've
21	had at the Savannah River Site and how long

1 this has gone on.

2 Ι know I'm not telling anything they don't know already, but we do 3 have petitioners that are, 4 I'm sure, 5 anxious to have resolution to this. So I 6 think we really need to try to push for a face-to-face meeting to resolve many 7 all these issues in the near future. 8 I'm a 9 little concerned that some are definitely going to push out beyond the next February 10 meeting it seems, but I do want to try to 11 12 schedule something. And I'm not sure what 13 time frame we should look at. I think we 14 should go for a meeting before the next full 15 Board meeting, possibly in midto late January with the awareness that some of these 16 17 issues may not be ready by then. I don't know what others think on that? 18 19 Mark, the latter DR. MAKHIJANI: part of January and early part of February is 20

NEAL R. GROSS

going to be -- is very, very uncertain for me.

21

- 1 I would prefer the first part of January, the
- 2 latter part of February.
- 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I would say --
- 4 how about middle January or early-to-mid? I
- 5 don't think early is good.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Actually, January
- 7 is a horrible month for me, but you know,
- 8 because the second week of January is also
- 9 booked. I have the first week of January. I
- 10 could do it in the second week of January,
- third week of January starting the 18th.
- 12 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: So you could do
- it the third week?
- 14 DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. The problem
- is my schedule for the last half of January is
- 16 uncertain, but I guess I'll work around the
- 17 Working Group.
- 18 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Tim, any
- 19 thoughts on that from NIOSH's standpoint?
- 20 DR. TAULBEE: From my availability
- 21 standpoint, the third week of January is good

1	until Friday of that week, so Tuesday,
2	Wednesday, Thursday of that week. Also, the
3	first and second week of January is fine. I'm
4	kind of like Arjun, the end of January and the
5	first of February is already booked for me.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And from the
7	I mean what I gather from our discussion, a
8	lot of your actions will be complete by then.
9	There might be a few exceptions, but a large
10	degree of the work you expect to have
11	responses on these issues, right, by then?
12	DR. TAULBEE: That's correct.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I don't want to
14	schedule when we're not going to be ready to
15	have some fruitful discussion.
16	DR. TAULBEE: From my list, Mark,
17	it looks like the tritium analysis that we'd
18	have, as well as Arjun would have SC&A's
19	response of that so that can be a lengthy
20	discussion, I'm quite certain, as well as we
21	had the polonium report that will be out. The

- Burning Grounds should be out by then as well. 1 2 And I'm hoping the exposure geometry as well, and these again, I'm targeting early January 3 so if you were to schedule the 18th, 19th, or 4 5 20th, the Work Group should have a few weeks to at least have read them and we can go over 6 them and begin to address questions on them. 7 DR. MAKHIJANI: And you'll also 8 9 have our thorium report and tritium report. 10 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: How about January 17th? Does that work? 11 12 DR. MAKHIJANI: That's Martin 13 Luther King Day. 14 Oh, it is. CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: 15 That's right. How about January 18th? DR. TAULBEE: That works fine for 16 17 me.
- 18 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: How about Work
- 19 Group members? Is there anything else
- scheduled on that day, I should ask too?
- 21 MR. KATZ: January 18th is okay.

- 1 It just means people will travel on Martin
- 2 Luther King Day, but that's fine.
- MEMBER LOCKEY: Mark, what day is
- 4 that?
- 5 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: It's a Tuesday.
- 6 MEMBER LOCKEY: Tuesday isn't a
- 7 good day for me because I have clinic.
- 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: How about
- 9 January 20th?
- 10 MEMBER LOCKEY: That's a --
- MR. KATZ: Thursday.
- 12 MEMBER LOCKEY: Hold on a second,
- 13 let me check.
- 14 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: This will be in
- 15 your backyard, Jim.
- 16 Is everybody else okay with that
- 17 day?
- DR. TAULBEE: The 20th works for
- 19 me. This is Tim Taulbee.
- 20 MEMBER LOCKEY: The 20th is good.
- 21 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: It's good. Is

- 1 it still okay with you, Arjun?
- DR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. It's pushing
- 3 my envelope, but that's fine.
- 4 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Let's save the
- 5 20th and I will check in in early January on
- the actions and if it looks like we're not
- 7 there, we may push this back, but I really
- 8 want to try to push on this because, as we
- 9 know, it's been going on for a long time.
- 10 Anything else, Ted?
- 11 MR. KATZ: No, that's good. Mark,
- 12 that sounds good. I was just going to say it
- 13 seems pretty clear from the amount of material
- that we have that's going to be delivered and
- then won't be delivered, but will be delivered
- 16 soon. We're going to need certainly two full
- 17 meetings anyway, so my only question is if you
- 18 want to try to book a meeting now for after
- 19 the February Board meeting or do you just want
- to wait and see where we get with that first
- 21 meeting?

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I'm having a
2	little trouble booking that far out. I'm
3	afraid to schedule something that later is a
4	conflict. I'd like to just stick with that
5	one.
6	The last thing I would like to say
7	for our conference call here is I know the
8	petitioner took time out of their day to dial
9	in, so if you have any comments, understanding
10	that this was sort of status call. There will
11	be much more substance at the meeting to
12	discuss. If you have any comments for the
13	record now, I would give you the opportunity
14	to make those, either Mr. Warren or Mr.
15	Anderson.
16	MR. WARREN: This is Bob Warren.
17	We still are looking at we'd like to see
18	the definitions of construction worker because
19	this is really important. If it's only done
20	for construction workers who work in the
21	subcontractors in the trade, or whether it was

done, classify the workers in the front who 1 2 are doing construction. So that would be helpful if somebody would give us how they're 3 going to do that. 4 5 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: That's a good 6 point: clarification of how NIOSH is defining construction work. 7 Tim, Т think this is better 8 9 addressed when we start to talk about the construction work that follows, right? 10 This is Tim Taulbee, 11 DR. TAULBEE: 12 you're really breaking up there, Mark, due to other interference. Could you repeat that, 13 14 please? CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: 15 I was saying that the point is an important one, I think, 16 the definition of construction workers, but I 17 think you might want to address that when we 18 19 discuss coworker models and whether they bound 20 construction workers. I think Mr. Warren is asking about how it's defined, whether it's 21

1 subcontractors whether it's is it or 2 getting into those -- is it DuPont, the DuPont 3 workers as well? I think 4 DR. TAULBEE: I concur. 5 our analysis paper, as well as the tritium 6 analysis paper will help address that and we can certainly go into more details on that 7 particular issue when we discuss that 8 9 January. But it does include, it's not just the construction trades or, what do I want to 10 say, the construction trades coming out of the 11 We also included the DuPont 12 union shops. construction trades workers 13 that would 14 doing more maintenance and so forth. 15 in August, Back we've since --16 posted up the Advisory Board's I've on 17 directory under our -- I think it's your 0: drive, a description of the -- of who 18 included in those construction trades. 19 I'm 20 looking at it here as I'm speaking here to 21 make sure that it did get posted up there.

- 1 But do you remember seeing anything like that,
- 2 Mark?
- 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: You know, I may
- 4 have seen it, but is it on -- you're saying
- 5 it's on the publicly accessible?
- DR. TAULBEE: No, not the publicly
- 7 assessable one. This would be the one
- 8 internal for you and the Advisory Board DCAS
- 9 documents, and it's the tritium description,
- 10 the description of the tritium files.
- 11 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I do remember
- 12 asking for this and I'm sure I looked at it a
- 13 while ago, but I'll look at it again. I'll
- 14 need to look at it again.
- DR. TAULBEE: Okay.
- 16 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Is there any
- 17 portion of that that -- or will that -- this
- 18 report that you're going to provide for the
- 19 Work Group for the next face-to-face meeting,
- that, I assume, will be cleared for the public
- and the petitioner will be able to see that

- and see these definitions better? Is that true or not?

 DR. TAULBEE: It's currently not
- 4 but we could possibly add these job 5 titles to that as an appendix. We've got them 6 listed there can certainly add and we 7 appendix to the report. It's not finalized yet, but I will caution you that 8 9 this report is rather lengthy. The text 10 version of it is about 22 pages or so, but when you add in all of the additional data and 11 analysis that was done, it balloons to about 12
- 14 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Ιf you think 15 the description is clear without adding another appendix with exact job titles, then 16 17 that's fine. I'11 leave it up to your judgment, but you understand the concern. 18

350 pages. So it's a pretty big document.

- DR. TAULBEE: Yes, sir.
- MR. KATZ: This is Ted. Isn't there a way to just provide this information

NEAL R. GROSS

13

1 simply to Mr. Warren? Does it really 2 have to be integrated into some larger report? 3 like a relatively straightforward It seems question. 4 5 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Tim, I quess --6 I'm not asking you --MR. KATZ: You're asking me. 7 DR. TAULBEE: Ι don't know. Perhaps we could. I just hadn't 8 9 -- I don't know. Ιf 10 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: that's possible, that might be good, too. 11 That's a 12 specific question that I think needs to be 13 understood and transparent. I think everybody 14 needs to know how that is being defined and 15 some assurance that the workers, that they're concerned about in the original petition, how 16 17 they're being handled. DR. TAULBEE: 18 Okay. 19 CHAIRMAN Αt least GRIFFON: 20 consider that and see if you can respond in a

NEAL R. GROSS

response, maybe directly to

separate

21

that

- 1 issue and then it wouldn't bring the other 2 report size up to 300 pages or whatever. 3 DR. TAULBEE: Okay. Anything else 4 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: 5 for Mr. Warren or Mr. Henderson. 6 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: Can any of the public be allowed to speak? 7 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes, yes. 9 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: I'd like to 10 speak up concerning many matters that have been spoken here today. 11 12 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Can you 13 give your name? 14 PUBLIC Quite PARTICIPANT: 15 frankly, I've been working for these cases for We have claimants who 16 the last ten years. 17 have been waiting for awardments for ten years, walking around with cancer in their 18
- 20 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Can I just --
- 21 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: I want to go

NEAL R. GROSS

body --

19

1	ahead and just explain some things here.
2	You're talking about incidents. You're talking
3	about you don't have clarifications of the
4	elements. Basically, the amounts the geometry
5	of those elements and how those are workable.
6	Concerning your IMBA software, I am concerned
7	that many people, claimants, those who worked
8	in the line of duty from the 1950s on up have
9	actually not had fair or fairness in all of
10	their cases due to the fact that we look at
11	these from the epidemiology side. We look at
12	them from the geometry side. We look at them
13	from the elements to the tissues to the
14	disease. We look at them from the toxins that
15	causes the individuals under the Worker's
16	Compensation law and yet many of these
17	claimants have been waiting ten years or
18	longer.
19	And here you're discussing that
20	you don't even have the variables. You don't
21	actually have the findings of exotic nuclides

which you're talking about. You don't have 1 2 the findings concerning many of the elements 3 that should be completed probably years ago from Savannah River Site and I have their 4 5 bible which I call the site bible, it's the Site Technical Document. 6 I have every piece I have over, I would imagine, 600 7 of law. TIBs and PERs and every day there's a change 8 9 in this and a change in that. And there's a 10 conference here. And there's a conference there. 11 12 But the claimants sit back and nothing denial, 13 receive but denial, 14 denial, denial. These people, some of them 15 have been hit with plutonium, uranium, celsium, cesium, californium. 16 I know every 17 element. I can go through the book and tell you these people have been hit. 18 They have 19 received these diseases from their employment, 20 yet they sit back and they have to wait and 21 wait for you all to hold these type of

1 conferences which I've been to many, 2 especially in Augusta. And concerning the 3 fact that these exposures to these claimants were actually in those dosimetry records when 4 5 calculate when you do your dosimetry 6 records, I go back in behind and then I go individual records 7 back on the of those claimants and to the Site Technical Document 8 9 and through all of the PERS, TIBs, you name it, I go through all of these things. 10 And the correlation between the two normally comes up 11 12 I have which would be way above 13 contamination levels of what give you 14 claimant. 15 Because of ALARA and because of 16 and so you take a scenario of someone 17 being hit with certain parameters, you are able lower of radiation 18 to the rate contamination that the individuals receive and 19 20 so to get to a 50 percent causation is almost 21 an impossibility. And then under Worker's

1 Compensation of the SBM which has all the 2 toxic substances that the individual was hit 3 with that would produce а disease for awardment, it doesn't make a difference what 4 5 you turn over to you all in any form or 6 fashion. The ball game gets changed. Every time you think you have won the ball game, a 7 curve ball is thrown your way under a TIB or a 8 PER under the S plutonium ruling and the same 9 Many of them were upped on the S 10 thing. plutonium ruling and many of them were lowered 11 under the S plutonium ruling. 12 13 So it's catch-22 and the а 14 claimants dying. Their families are are 15 watching them die and here we sit talking on the phone, a bunch of jargon, God forgive me, 16 17 but it is jargon, because you sit here and the money that's paying your salaries to me should 18 19 be going to the claimants. 20 that's what I wanted to 21 today. I have many people, many people who

have worked with me and we have gone through
these things with fine-toothed combs and it's
as if whatever we find, no matter how you
document it, down to the letter of the law
with the Is and the Ts crossed, it comes to no
fruition for the claimants. Denial, denial,
denial.

And so I think you really need to look into what you are doing here at these conferences and how you all are putting this out to the public because there are public there people, are people on these listening and to me to sit here and say well, you really don't know about this and you really don't know about that, well, then the dose reconstructions could not actually be valid dose reconstructions. If you do not have concerning the tritium, the plutonium, the celsium, the cesium, the californium, you don't have actual data for certain years, coworker under trade workers, non-trade

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

workers, whatever, then no dose reconstruction 1 2 can actually be a valid dose reconstruction. 3 those Ι make just wanted to comments and I can tell you right now I am for 4 5 the claimants. They are literally sitting in 6 denial many of them. Every time something is returned, it is a denial, a denial, a denial. 7 I don't care. I've had people that have 8 9 actually had plutonium in а building contaminated that they know exactly how they 10 hit incident. Little 11 qot ___ Hector. 12 Everybody knows about Little Hector. 13 may not know about Little Hector, but we all 14 Little Hector, there's know about and so 15 things there that perhaps you all don't know that we know and that claimants know. 16 And 17 many of these old, 80-year-old widows, they terrified 18 are to even speak about what 19 happened on the Site to their husbands who 20 didn't come home for two or three days and 21 then when they did send them home, they came

1 home in such a way that some of them actually 2 didn't live very long afterwards. They won't even hardly talk because they were afraid who 3 was going to come to their front door.

It's a very sad thing to type of mindset this in that someone years after their husbands worked at Savannah River Site. But I'm quite telling you today, to sit here and hear you all say this and that about your databases and your geometry and I do your chemistry and I do your geometry and I go through the epidemiology. I go through NIOSH and DOE and DOL and cases being lost and things of that nature. There's so much that actually you all need to look into -- that I believe the claimants have a right to take their hearts before Congress and let them know what is going on because I have just numerous, numerous people who say this is unfair. Maybe this was to create jobs. This wasn't for the claimants, because the claimants aren't

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 1 getting the money. I can quite frankly tell
- 2 you that.
- 3 The claimants are not being
- 4 reparated. They're getting denial, denial,
- 5 denial. And when I see their dose
- 6 reconstructions, I know exactly what they're
- 7 hit with. When you put them in IMBA, it's
- 8 quite different when you put a dose
- 9 reconstruction through IMBA, believe me.
- 10 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.
- 11 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: I just wanted
- to make my comments. Thank you very much.
- 13 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Thank you, and
- 14 I appreciate and I do appreciate your
- 15 frustration and all the claimants waiting on
- 16 this. We have raised this a couple of times
- of the timeliness, but we also --
- 18 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: Well, many of
- 19 the claimants have waited ten years. First
- 20 filers who should not be actually -- they
- 21 should be grandfathered back to what the

1	original under the CFR 81 and 82 and the
2	CFR 30, Worker's Compensation. All of these
3	things that you look at them and when the
4	claimants came in, they came in with knowledge
5	of knowing there would be reparations for them
6	because they would receive a disease or had a
7	disease, cancer, in the line of duty which
8	would have to come up to a 50 percent
9	causation which the burden of proof was put
10	back on the claimants to bring that to be
11	able. They had to do all of it. They had to
12	get medical records. They had to do
13	everything. The very knowledge of them having
14	to do this, someone with cancer going back and
15	having to get all of this from their
16	physicians, their doctors.
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: We do
18	appreciate your comment.
19	PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: I'm sure you
20	do.
21	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: It is a

1	complicated matter, but
2	PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: No, it
3	shouldn't be complicated. It is actually A,
4	B, C, D. It is the work area to the element,
5	actually the tissue to the disease to the
6	reparation. It's a very simple A, B, C, D, E.
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.
8	PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: It's not as
9	hard as you all are making it. You're making
10	it where the claimant cannot receive their
11	awardment because when you change amount on an
12	element that maybe in 1954 might have been 4.7
13	when you were hit with plutonium and then
14	later down the road you can change that to
15	maybe 1.5 on a dose reconstruction, then that
16	claimant can never get to 50 percent
17	causation.
18	There is a lowering amount of
19	those elements where you can't get there.
20	I'll take the scenario, a woman, both of her
21	breasts removed, had a 47.17 percent by S

1 plutonium. The woman comes back and loses at 2 47.01 percent. Both breasts have 3 removed. Cancer. Been there since t.he inception of the plant from the '50s. 4 5 every building. Been in every reactor. contaminated to the limit. 6 No reparation. Denial. 7 This is what I'm saying, sir, 8 9 these claimants need to take this They need to be made aware of what 10 Congress. Congress needs to be made aware 11 is going on. that these claimants are suffering. 12 dying and they are not receiving money. 13 14 Ι think this is what And they 15 They should take it up with the should do. Congress or a federal court because under the 16 17 present system, they get lost. The cases get lost. The claimants' cases can't be found. 18 19 Or you get the wrong case, so, sir, there's many things here that need to be looked into 20 21 and maybe you need to get a team that will

1	actually go in and research why hasn't
2	Savannah River plant claimants it has been
3	put in for a special cohort facility, that has
4	been denied. That petition has been in for
5	quite some time. In fact, two petitions and
6	people have been waiting and waiting and
7	waiting and they're dying. They're dying.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I appreciate
9	the
10	PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: You all need
11	to look into your all's heart as you sit here
12	and say well, my date, the 17th, is not a good
13	date for me. And my date of February 15th
14	isn't a good day for me. Well, guess what? A
15	denial in a letter is not a good date for
16	anybody and everybody is getting their
17	denials. Denials.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I appreciate
19	your comments.
20	PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: Now I think
21	you have to look into your hearts and go back

- 1 to the Board --
- 2 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: We are going
- 3 back to the Board and we will discuss
- 4 timeliness.
- 5 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: Ten years,
- 6 sir --
- 7 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Very, very
- 8 concerned.
- 9 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: -- is a lot
- of time for people to wait to first filers.
- 11 These are first filers, sir, ten years.
- 12 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes, I
- 13 understand.
- 14 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: Ten years.
- 15 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I understand.
- 16 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: Hearing after
- 17 hearing after hearing.
- 18 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Listen, we will
- 19 be in Augusta again in February.
- 20 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: I shall be
- 21 there, sir.

- 1 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And we hope to
- 2 see you there.
- 3 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: I will be
- 4 there. I will be there.
- 5 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: We hope to have
- 6 more answers on Savannah River by then as
- 7 well. I appreciate --
- 8 PUBLIC PARTICIPANT: I don't think
- 9 you'll have the answers, sir. I think you'll
- 10 get more jargon out like you are right now,
- 11 sir. So, have a wonderful day.
- 12 COURT REPORTER: This is the court
- 13 reporter. Could the last speaker please
- 14 identify herself?
- 15 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I didn't catch
- 16 her name either.
- 17 MR. KATZ: That's okay. That's
- 18 voluntary on her part. She's not required to
- 19 identify herself.
- 20 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: All right. Any
- other comments, otherwise, we'll adjourn this

1	Work Group meeting?
2	Okay, hearing none, Ted, I think
3	we're ready to adjourn.
4	MR. KATZ: Okay, we are adjourned.
5	Thank you, everybody.
6	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
7	matter went off the record at 3:11 p.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	