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

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROCEDURES REVIEW

+ + + + +

MONDAY SEPTEMBER 19, 2011

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee convened in the Zurich Room of the Cincinnati Airport Marriott, 2395 Progress Drive, Hebron, Kentucky, at 9:00 a.m., Wanda I. Munn, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

WANDA I. MUNN, Chair PAUL L. ZIEMER, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official ISAF AL-NABULSI, DOE*
ROBERT ANIGSTEIN, SC&A*
ELIZABETH BRACKETT, ORAU Team*
STU HINNEFELD, DCAS
JENNY LIN, HHS*
STEPHEN MARSCHKE, SC&A
JOHN MAURO, SC&A
MUTTY SHARFI, ORAU Team*
SCOTT SIEBERT, ORAU Team*
ELYSE THOMAS, ORAU Team*
BRANT ULSH, DCAS

*Participating via telephone

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

Welcome/Roll Call/Introductions4
Database Questions & Comments5
OTIB-007074
PER's Status75
Review of OTIB-2 Open Items122
TIB-0010 Review144
Carry-Over Items: 0TIB-21-04
OTIB-52 Rev. 1
Overarching Issues191
Unresolved Action Items

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	9:00 a.m.
3	MR. KATZ: We have an agenda. It
4	should be on the web, under the Board webpage,
5	and Wanda, it's your agenda. Take it away.
6	
7	CHAIR MUNN: Thank you. I think
8	we've all been spending a little time trying
9	to get more up to speed and a little more
10	familiar with our new database, which I
11	understand, we're supposed to call an
12	application, but which I'll probably continue
13	to call a database.
14	On our CDC Board review system, we
15	had hoped this time, to be able to provide a
16	summary, as we had done with our former
17	database that we used, because it gives us all
18	a better feel for what our totals are, and
19	what progress we've made in recent time.
20	But I have been unable to do so,
21	and I believe Steve has been unable to do so,
22	also.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	There are that's one of the
2	things that we've asked for, that apparently,
3	has not yet been incorporated into the
4	background programming, what we are now
5	calling the Board review system.
6	Steve, is there anything you want
7	to say to us about where we are and what we
8	can expect, what we have outstanding that we
9	anticipate is going to be done, hopefully, the
10	next time we meet?
11	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, what I'd like
12	to do is I sent an email to Wanda on
13	Saturday, the earlier part of the evening, and
14	I think there was identified in here about
15	five things, which we identified, we would
16	like the Board review system to do, that
17	currently, it's not capable of doing.
18	One of them is the old the first
19	one is the old summary table that Wanda has
20	been talking about. We would like to be able
21	to generate that old summary table.

I have -- I can probably get you a

1	copy of what it looks like, if you need it,
2	but I think we've talked about it quite a few
3	times in the past, and
4	CHAIR MUNN: I don't think that's
5	necessary. I think most of us remember what
6	it looked like. It was just a very handy
7	thing to have
8	MR. MARSCHKE: Exactly.
9	CHAIR MUNN: at the beginning of
LO	each meeting.
11	MR. MARSCHKE: There is a couple of
L2	other things. I can just read these off and
L3	then maybe, go back to the Board review
L4	system, itself, and we can give examples of
L5	what I'm talking about here.
L6	The second one was what was called
L7	the SC&A findings report, that at one time,
L8	was working on the Board review system, and
L9	now, it doesn't seem to be working. So, it

Then the third thing is, I don't

may be nice to get that back.

know of any way to save the history to either 22

19

20

1	a PDF file or to make a hard copy, so that we
2	can, you know, send it to someone who doesn't
3	use the Board review system, but maybe they
4	are reviewing a procedure for us, or something
5	like that. So, we found that very handy to
6	have.
7	A couple of other nagging problems
8	was the photo-active findings column. If you
9	look at the main screen, there is a column
10	called 'photo-active findings'.
11	I think we have to talk about that
12	amongst ourselves and see what we want to put
13	in there. Right now, it doesn't seem to be
14	giving correct results, or current results.
15	The last thing I
16	CHAIR MUNN: Do you want to expand
17	on that a little?
18	MR. MARSCHKE: Okay.
19	CHAIR MUNN: What do you think it
20	is giving us?
21	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, I don't know

what it's giving us.

1	DR. ULSH: Actually, I can tell
2	you.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
4	DR. ULSH: It has to do with the
5	definition that we want to use for a number of
6	active findings versus total findings.
7	CHAIR MUNN: Right.
8	DR. ULSH: In my mind, the active
9	findings is total minus closed.
LO	CHAIR MUNN: Correct.
L1	DR. ULSH: But then you have to
L2	determine, what about in abeyance? Is that an
L3	active a finding that's in abeyance, is
L4	that an active finding or not?
L5	CHAIR MUNN: It's not active for
L6	us, in terms of actionable item for us. But
L7	it isn't completely closed, as long as the new
L8	document, which changes it, has not come out.
L9	DR. ULSH: I agree, but do you want
20	in abeyance findings to come up when you click
21	on the total active findings?
22	(Simultaneous speaking.)

1	MR. MARSCHKE: There is two
2	problems here. This is a bigger problem,
3	here.
4	First off, let's get rid of the
5	first problem. The first problem is, let's go
6	get this first document, OTIB-54. It shows a
7	total number of findings of being 26. The
8	total active findings of being 26.
9	CHAIR MUNN: Now, hold on, where
10	did you go to get OTIB-54?
11	MR. MARSCHKE: I did a sort on
12	total number of active or total number of
13	findings, or total number of active findings,
14	whichever one you want, and I sorted it on
15	that.
16	So, basically, OTIB-54 is now here,
17	up here at the top of my screen.
18	CHAIR MUNN: Okay, well, I'm not
19	going to do that sort, but I'd like to get
20	that up on my screen, and everybody else's
21	screen.
22	MR. MARSCHKE: If I click on OTIB-

1	54, and we come into the details, we can see
2	basically
3	MR. KATZ: Closed findings.
4	MR. MARSCHKE: a lot of closed
5	findings, a lot of findings in abeyance.
6	So, the column is not summing
7	correctly. Regardless of what it's summing,
8	it's not summing it correctly.
9	If it's just summing total minus
10	closed, it's not doing that.
11	So, that is the first thing that
12	needs to be fixed, and then like Brant says,
13	then we need to define what do we mean by
14	active, and I guess I kind of disagree.
15	I think we should basically have
16	active should be the ones which this
17	Subcommittee is actively working on, and so,
18	we can use this as a tool, to then decide
19	which procedures we want to focus on.
20	CHAIR MUNN: Right.
21	MR. MARSCHKE: And so, then I would
22	take the total number of active findings and I

1	Pluow	subtract	011t	റിറകേറി	Т	Pluow	subtract
1	would	Subtract	Out	CIOSEG.		would	Subtract

- out in abeyance. I might even also subtract
- 3 out transferred.
- 4 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
- 5 MR. MARSCHKE: Or maybe even
- 6 addressed in some other findings.
- 7 So, you know, but it's -- and that
- 8 would give us the total number of findings,
- 9 which we are actively searching for agreement
- 10 on.
- DR. MAURO: Steve, I've got a
- 12 question. This is also this category where
- we've made a finding. It's in there, but it
- 14 really has never been addressed by the Work
- 15 Group, hasn't come up yet.
- 16 MR. MARSCHKE: That's an open
- 17 finding.
- DR. MAURO: That's an open finding?
- 19 So, we don't -- at that -- now, would you
- 20 place that in the third column?
- MR. MARSCHKE: It's active.
- 22 DR. MAURO: The active column,

	1	because	it's	really	not	active,	because	W
--	---	---------	------	--------	-----	---------	---------	---

- 2 haven't done anything, but it's just a
- 3 definition.
- 4 MR. MARSCHKE: Well, it's active,
- 5 in that we -- it's not on as active --
- DR. MAURO: We knew about it, okay.
- 7 Good, I just wanted to make sure, that was
- 8 another sub-category.
- 9 DR. ULSH: So, wait a minute. That
- 10 is in or out?
- 11 MR. KATZ: That's in.
- DR. ULSH: That's in?
- 13 MR. KATZ: That's in the active
- 14 column.
- MR. MARSCHKE: So, basically --
- 16 MR. HINNEFELD: Aren't we at some
- 17 time, going to want to know what -- how many
- 18 findings on each category?
- 19 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, we are.
- 20 MR. HINNEFELD: Why don't we just
- 21 put it on that page? Why don't we -- rather
- than develop a set of rules for what is active

1	and what is not active, and then, try to
2	remember that later on, and then once you've
3	got the active findings, pulling that up, and
4	then you can't find the ones that we haven't
5	even discussed yet, if they're all in the
6	active number
7	DR. MAURO: That is the summary
8	table, the one that I mean
9	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, the summary
10	table is basically if you go through all
11	214 documents that are in here and sum those
12	all up, that's what that's what we want on
13	the summary table.
14	MR. HINNEFELD: So, you want
15	essentially two different tables, here?
16	MR. MARSCHKE: We want this is
17	not really a I don't consider this a table.
18	This is basically the screen, the first
19	screen, the home screen of the review system.
20	And so, you know, unless you tell
21	me a way I can print this out and summarize
22	this and print this out, I don't consider this

1	really to be a table.
2	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
3	DR. MAURO: So, it's two different
4	things we're talking about.
5	One is, this is an open screen to
6	help us enter the world, and decide where we
7	want to navigate ourselves to, as opposed to
8	the summary table, which is really a way to
9	sort of summarize, here is where we are,
10	unless at the end of the day, here is what
11	we've accomplished. So, it's two different
12	things, then.
13	CHAIR MUNN: Correct.
14	MR. HINNEFELD: So, do we plan to
15	navigate from the summary table?
16	DR. MAURO: Yes.
17	MR. HINNEFELD: No.
18	DR. MAURO: No? Then not from the
19	summary, from this table.

HINNEFELD:

going to navigate from this table, wouldn't

you want to find the -- you might to find the

MR.

20

21

22

Then if you're

1 findings that you have not yet dis-	scussed,
---------------------------------------	----------

- 2 absolutely.
- 3 CHAIR MUNN: That we want to
- 4 address, correct.
- 5 MR. HINNEFELD: That you have not
- 6 yet discussed.
- 7 CHAIR MUNN: Correct.
- 8 MR. HINNEFELD: You said we have
- 9 several documents, we've not yet discussed.
- 10 Let's talk about those, and if it's active,
- 11 you don't know. If you're using active and
- inactive, it's one of several categories,
- 13 inactive.
- 14 If you're going to navigate from
- the table, be specific in the table, and then
- just go there, and then you know, that can be
- 17 your summary table. You just need a way to
- 18 print it, right? I mean --
- DR. MAURO: I'm with you.
- MR. HINNEFELD: I don't understand.
- 21 The purpose of this table is to show -- it
- 22 can show work accomplished and work remaining.

1	If you want to show that, but if
2	you do that in a table, then you should have a
3	navigable table, that shows all the
4	specificity, because you're going to want to
5	do that.
6	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I agree, you are
7	absolutely correct, with respect to our needed
8	ability to be able to pull out things that we
9	have not addressed at all, and I have never,
10	in my mind, viewed the summary table as being
11	a navigable table, that we were going to work
12	from, no.
13	MR. HINNEFELD: Okay.
14	CHAIR MUNN: It is simply a report
15	for us to look at, each time we sit down to
16	say, "Okay, does this look any different than
17	it did last time," and have we really
18	accomplished anything? That's the only thing
19	that is used for.
20	But yes, in terms of being able to
21	pull out the distinctive, what's in abeyance,
22	what is what is transferred and what is

1	truly active and that we have not looked at it
2	yet?
3	We need some way to be able to see
4	those things, now.
5	DR. ULSH: Okay, we can, and you
6	have the architecture in place, right here,
7	status filter.
8	Now, I'm not saying that it's
9	working or not, but theoretically, at least,
10	you could pull up any status you want and see,
11	you know, those findings, theoretically.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: What you basically
13	want to click on, you click on 'open', and
14	this is what it gave me, when it did the sort
15	on open status, and I don't know why it is
16	giving me this, to tell you the truth.
17	I could see, for IG-001, why it's
18	giving me these open ones, but why is it
19	giving me the TBD-6000? Why is it giving me -
20	- I could see why it's giving me this one,
21	because it has an open one associated with it.

to

seems

be

Ιt

22

giving some

1	documents,	and	then	again,	why	is	it	giving	me
---	------------	-----	------	--------	-----	----	----	--------	----

- this document, TIB-13, because it doesn't seem
- 3 to -- you know -- and it doesn't list any open
- 4 ones underneath it.
- I don't know how this -- if we want
- to use that, we have to understand how it's
- 7 working.
- 8 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
- 9 MR. MARSCHKE: And right now, I
- don't understand how it's working.
- 11 CHAIR MUNN: Are we due for another
- 12 visit from the gurus, or do you need to be
- 13 spending another day, working with the folks
- 14 who are expert on this table, I mean, on this
- 15 application?
- MR. KATZ: We'll just ask a bit,
- 17 but TBD-6000, what is your question about
- 18 that, because actually, that --
- 19 MR. MARSCHKE: Why is it here? I
- 20 sorted on the --
- MR. KATZ: It's a document.
- 22 MR. MARSCHKE: I sorted on open

4	c:
⊥	findings.

- 2 MR. KATZ: Yes.
- MR. MARSCHKE: And basically, it
- 4 reduced the total number of findings from 214,
- down to 23 documents, which I assume, these 23
- 6 documents are the only ones that have opened
- 7 comments in them.
- 8 This one, IG-1, it lists --
- 9 MR. KATZ: Right.
- 10 MR. MARSCHKE: -- half dozen or so,
- 11 open comments.
- 12 MR. KATZ: So, is your question for
- 13 --
- MR. MARSCHKE: The question is, why
- is TBD-6000 here? It doesn't list any open
- 16 comments in here.
- 17 MR. KATZ: It doesn't list any, but
- it does have one open comment. I mean, it's
- 19 accurate, in that it's showing there --
- MR. MARSCHKE: Well, I believe all
- of the TBD-6000 comments were transferred to
- 22 the TBD-6000.

1	MR.	KATZ:	Well,	they	are,	and
---	-----	-------	-------	------	------	-----

- that's why it shows that.
- MR. MARSCHKE: So, why is this --
- 4 again, why is this showing up on this screen,
- on a sort for 'open'?
- 6 MR. KATZ: Okay, I mean, well,
- 7 because it is open with the TBD-6000 Work
- 8 Group.
- 9 MR. MARSCHKE: But it's not in this
- 10 database.
- 11 MR. KATZ: This database has
- 12 everything in there, doesn't it?
- 13 MR. MARSCHKE: If I pull up this
- 14 TBD-6000 --
- 15 CHAIR MUNN: It should have all 14
- 16 findings in it.
- 17 MR. MARSCHKE: It should have all
- 18 14 findings in it, and they should be all
- 19 identified as transferred, none of them
- 20 identified as being open.
- DR. MAURO: So, it's more of a
- 22 matter of us understanding the terminology and

1	how it's intended, and we're not quite sure
2	MR. MARSCHKE: That's the first
3	step, is to understand what they're doing
4	here.
5	MR. HINNEFELD: This reporting is
6	listing the open findings for documents that
7	have open findings, but it keeps the list of
8	the name of the other documents, as well,
9	isn't that what it's doing?
10	So, then we're back aren't we
11	back, then, to an accounting issue of what's
12	open and what's closed, because this is called
13	or what's active or not, because it's
14	listed as an active, one active finding, but
15	when in fact, we would say it doesn't have any
16	active findings, because
17	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, that's the
18	thing I talked to before.
19	I mean, basically, we don't
20	MR. HINNEFELD: I don't know how
21	it's accounting. The accounting is the
22	MR. MARSCHKE: This is the area

4	⊥ 1 ⊥	
T	tnat	

- 2 MR. HINNEFELD: This is reported.
- 3 We know about that error.
- 4 MR. MARSCHKE: And then this
- 5 question here is, it did -- it's not basically
- 6 listing all the documents, because now, it's
- 7 only -- if you look on the upper left --
- 8 right-hand side, it's only listing 23
- 9 documents.
- DR. ULSH: So, how did it get down
- 11 to 23?
- MR. MARSCHKE: It went down,
- 13 somehow, it edited out about 190 documents,
- and went from 214, down to 23.
- MR. HINNEFELD: Now, do we know
- 16 that?
- 17 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I think we do.
- MR. MARSCHKE: You're going to go
- 19 down to the bottom of the screen, the bottom
- of the first screen, basically, and you can
- 21 see, there is only two pages --
- MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, there is only

	1	two	pages	there,	you're	right.
--	---	-----	-------	--------	--------	--------

- 2 MR. MARSCHKE: Two pages, so, there
- is -- a lot of the documents are gone, but
- 4 what is the -- but what the criteria is for
- 5 getting rid of these documents and keeping
- 6 them, I don't know.
- 7 CHAIR MUNN: Obviously, the open
- 8 means something to the -- and probably the
- 9 right thing.
- 10 If we go back to the first
- 11 question, about TBD-6000, when you just ran
- 12 down those quickly, I think the -- I think
- that is probably an error, because when we get
- down to the bottom, the very last one was not
- really and truly a finding. It was a test.
- 16 You see, there are only 13
- 17 findings, there.
- 18 MR. MARSCHKE: Right.
- 19 CHAIR MUNN: And what looks like
- 20 that, probably is finding 14, there.
- MR. MARSCHKE: Probably.
- 22 CHAIR MUNN: It says test one. So,

1	that one appears, and even it says
2	'transferred'.
3	MR. MARSCHKE: Even after that, it
4	says transferred. So, it shouldn't show up as
5	12.
6	CHAIR MUNN: It shouldn't show up.
7	MR. MARSCHKE: I don't know what it
8	is counting. I don't know what it is sorting
9	on, and I don't know what it is counting, when
10	it does the total active findings.
11	I don't know how it's making that
12	count, and when it does a sort, I don't know
13	how it's doing the sort.
14	DR. MAURO: Is it possible that the
15	person that is you know, once the frame
16	work goes up, in whatever form it's in, I
17	mean, all the data is let's assume for a
18	moment that all the data is in here.
19	It's just a matter of, there has to
20	be a person that is going to take all this
21	stuff to bin it, and load it up and populate

the database, in a way that they sort of

1 understand, what is it we're trying to	1 ui	iaerstana,	wnat	LS	エし	we re	trying	LO	ac
--	------	------------	------	----	----	-------	--------	----	----

- Is it possible, this person is
- 3 actually doing the mechanics, and it's
- 4 difficult for them, because they're not living
- 5 in this meeting and understanding all the
- 6 nuances.
- 7 MR. MARSCHKE: I'm sure that's the
- 8 problem, yes. I'm sure that is what the
- 9 problem is.
- 10 MR. KATZ: Sure.
- 11 MEMBER ZIEMER: Steve, the first
- page of the thing says that there are only 13
- 13 findings. What page are you on, that shows
- 14 14? I am looking at it, and it says there is
- 15 13 findings for TBD-6000. How did you get to
- 16 where you are?
- 17 MR. MARSCHKE: I did a sort. Do
- 18 you see where it says 'status filter' here,
- 19 Paul?
- 20 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
- MR. MARSCHKE: I did a sort and I
- pulled down 'open', and I sorted on 'open'.

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, but you list
2	total findings as 14, and if you go back to
3	the I am at the initial tracking page, and
4	it lists number of findings for TBD-6000 as
5	13.
6	DR. ULSH: I've got 14.
7	MR. MARSCHKE: I've got 14.
8	CHAIR MUNN: Are you in documents
9	under Board review?
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, documents
11	under Board review.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: I don't know.
13	CHAIR MUNN: Are you in there?
14	MEMBER ZIEMER: I'm under all the
15	documents. I am filtered.
16	CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: All documents, all
18	Work Groups.
19	DR. ULSH: Hey, Paul, do you have a
20	button the right that says 'clear'?
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, and I just did
22	it.

1	MR. KATZ: Just clear it.
2	MEMBER ZIEMER: I just did.
3	DR. ULSH: And it still says 13?
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, let's do it
5	again, then. Yes, it still says 13.
6	DR. ULSH: That is very strange.
7	MR. KATZ: Yes.
8	CHAIR MUNN: So, the Chairman of
9	the Work Group gets the correct number?
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: Do you have 14 up
11	there?
12	CHAIR MUNN: No, the Chairman.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, you're talking
14	about the TBD, the 6000 Work Group?
15	CHAIR MUNN: The Chairman of the
16	Work Group. It's the right number.
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
18	MR. MARSCHKE: It goes to the
19	chart.
20	MEMBER ZIEMER: I want to get this
21	down to a lower number. I don't know what I'm
22	looking at, that is different.

1	MR. MARSCHKE: I don't know, I just
2	went out and came back in and I get 14, Paul.
3	So, I don't know how you have 13.
4	CHAIR MUNN: Still, mine is 14.
5	MEMBER ZIEMER: But my opening page
6	doesn't let's see, document title. What is
7	your second document?
8	MR. MARSCHKE: ID-1.
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: My second one is
LO	OCAS-IG-1, right.
11	MR. MARSCHKE: You've got 24 total
L2	findings?
L3	MEMBER ZIEMER: Twenty-four.
L4	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, and seven active.
L5	MEMBER ZIEMER: And 13 active.
L6	MR. MARSCHKE: I got seven active.
L7	CHAIR MUNN: No, I've got seven
L8	active.
L9	MR. MARSCHKE: You're looking at a
20	different version of the
21	MR. HINNEFELD: How can he be,
22	though? He's got the

1	MR	MARSCHKE:	Т	don't	know
_	1,11/	1.1CT/OCTIT/Fi •		UUII L	17110 M •

- 2 MEMBER ZIEMER: I don't know, I'm
- 3 just looking at what I opened.
- 4 CHAIR MUNN: Well, I'll bet you
- 5 opened the first one, the interim one, which
- 6 is where I started --
- 7 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, how did I get
- 8 to that?
- 9 MR. MARSCHKE: Okay, yes, that's
- 10 right.
- 11 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
- MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, okay, you did
- 13 that.
- 14 MEMBER ZIEMER: How did I get to
- 15 that, and then --
- 16 CHAIR MUNN: You took the first
- 17 train, instead of the last train.
- MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, you're in the
- 19 old one.
- Just close it, close that one, all
- 21 together. So, down here, Board review system,
- that's what we're using, now.

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay, I have to
2	MR. MARSCHKE: You hit that one,
3	yes.
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: I went to document
5	control, and that was
6	CHAIR MUNN: The one that we have
7	always used in the past.
8	MR. HINNEFELD: That is version
9	two. We're on version three, now.
LO	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay, I've got it
L1	now.
L2	MR. HINNEFELD: When I click or
L3	TBD-6000 and open the findings, there are 13.
L4	CHAIR MUNN: There are 13? There
L5	should be
L6	MR. HINNEFELD: Plus a test
L7	finding.
L8	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, now, I
L9	understand it and am seeing the report.
20	MR. HINNEFELD: The test finding is
2.1	the 14 finding.

CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

1	MR.	HINNEFELD:	Which	is	 that's	3

- just got the clean-up thing, that would be --
- 3 you know, they were testing something about
- 4 the system.
- 5 CHAIR MUNN: But it says
- 6 'transferred' also, and therefore, we
- 7 shouldn't have the one active.
- 8 MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, I don't --
- 9 MR. KATZ: That is the test
- 10 finding.
- MR. MARSCHKE: Well, it depends on
- 12 how they define active, you know. If you
- define active, that's what we started here, is
- 14 -- it shouldn't be one. It should either be
- 15 14 or zero.
- 16 CHAIR MUNN: Or zero, one or the
- other.
- 18 MR. MARSCHKE: Either transferred
- in or out, as active.
- So, I don't know what they're --
- 21 how they're doing their count.
- 22 CHAIR MUNN: So, Steve, can we just

1	say, you still have five those five that
2	you indicated, are going to hang us up at one
3	time or another.
4	There are five issues that need to
5	be worked out.
6	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, and then there
7	was well, the sixth one, we just we
8	talked about, was and I didn't have that on
9	my list, because I don't think I knew about
10	it, was this question of, what does it sort
11	now, when you do a sort a status filter?
12	Why are some of the documents sorted out? Why
13	are some of the documents that don't seem to
14	have issues in that status, included?
15	MR. KATZ: So, Steve, can you just
16	can't you just come down here, spend the
17	day working it, until you've gotten through
18	all the kinks, with them?
19	DR. ULSH: Well, we did that
20	before.
21	MR. KATZ: I know.

DR. ULSH: Steve came in town and

1		11	_	7 4 1	_		7	7 4 1
1	we	naa	a	list,	а	very	long	IIST.

- MR. KATZ: I know, and you got
- 3 through a bunch.
- DR. ULSH: A bunch of them.
- 5 MR. KATZ: Right.
- 6 DR. ULSH: This is an iterative
- 7 process.
- 8 MR. KATZ: Right, I know.
- 9 DR. ULSH: It's taking too long.
- 10 MR. KATZ: Right.
- DR. ULSH: But I mean, we're much
- 12 closer today, than we were, but there's still
- these lingering issues.
- MR. KATZ: I know, and that's what
- 15 I'm saying, I'm saying, where do we put them
- 16 to bed?
- DR. ULSH: Well, the problem is, is
- that if Steve comes in town and we say, "Here
- is all the issues," they're not going to
- 20 program it real-time. It's not like by the
- 21 time Steve leaves, everything is hunky-dory.
- MR. KATZ: Okay.

1	DR. MAURO: There is no inter-
2	active online, where Steve can work with your
3	software people, and just continue
4	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, what we can do
5	I mean, I we can we have been given a
6	list of problems now, and you know, if you can
7	go back, you can say, one of these have been
8	worked off, and then we can test them.
9	MR. KATZ: Right.
LO	MR. MARSCHKE: Because I can test
L1	it.
L2	DR. MAURO: Right, just like we're
L3	doing now.
L4	MR. KATZ: But see, the thing is
L5	that just giving them a list, doesn't seem
L6	like enough. It seems like it needs sort of
L7	hand-in-hand work.
L8	So, whether you have to be here
L9	presently, or whether you need to be on the
20	phone with them, when they're working on it,
21	it seems like they need actual interactive
2.2	real-time help, to know what they're doing.

1 It seems like it's more	than	just
---------------------------	------	------

- 2 routing out a 'to-do' list, I think.
- MR. HINNEFELD: Let's set that up,
- 4 by phone. Brant or I will be the person
- sitting with the developer, and we'll be on
- 6 the phone with Steve.
- 7 MR. KATZ: Right.
- 8 MR. HINNEFELD: And we'll show to
- 9 the developers, what we're seeing, what we
- 10 expect to see.
- DR. MAURO: Yes.
- MR. HINNEFELD: And say, now,
- you've got this stuff to do, let us know when
- 14 you're done, and we'll have another phone
- 15 call.
- MR. KATZ: Right.
- 17 MR. HINNEFELD: Because doing it
- 18 the -- this is --
- 19 MR. KATZ: There is no point in
- 20 doing it here.
- 21 MR. HINNEFELD: There is no point
- in doing it here.

1	DR. MAURO: Yes, we shouldn't be
2	doing this here.
3	MR. HINNEFELD: This should have
4	been you know, we should get this wrapped
5	up.
6	MR. KATZ: Right.
7	MR. HINNEFELD: And it just it's
8	going to require us, either Brant or me, to
9	dedicate some time to working with the
10	developers, between you know, not waiting
11	for the next meeting to be coming up on it.
12	MR. KATZ: No.
13	MR. HINNEFELD: To start right
14	away, next week.
15	MEMBER ZIEMER: Question here.
16	MR. KATZ: That sounds good.
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: I'll ask both Steve
18	and maybe John.
19	TBD Appendix BB is a good example
20	of one where there is a Work Group that is
21	looking at all of these findings, and have
22	several iterations past the finding, in a

1	matrix,	right	now.

- DR. MAURO: Yes, that's right.
- 3 MEMBER ZIEMER: And in fact, you
- 4 guys have updated that.
- DR. MAURO: We saw it yesterday.
- 6 MEMBER ZIEMER: Now, of course, we
- 7 said we would ultimately like to be able to do
- 8 that, here, and I think logistically, we
- 9 could, in principle.
- DR. MAURO: We could, yes.
- 11 MEMBER ZIEMER: But the way -- this
- 12 shows that as transferred, but within what
- we're doing, there is different -- you know,
- there is closed items and so on.
- 15 Can we work within the system, as
- 16 it is here, where they're all marked
- 'transferred', or is there a way to indicate
- here, that this is being worked on, say, by
- 19 the TBD-6000 Work Group, and have it still
- 20 there, as an active item? Do you know what
- 21 I'm saying?
- MR. MARSCHKE: I know what you're

_		
	sayıng,	Paul.
_	Bay III 9,	raur.

- 2 MEMBER ZIEMER: Because we want to
- 3 -- we said we want to people to be able work
- 4 in this system, but if everything they do
- 5 shows that it's being transferred out, then
- 6 it's -- it looks --
- 7 DR. MAURO: Well, you're posing a
- 8 question which transcends what -- I mean, so,
- 9 ultimately, what we'd like to be able to do,
- 10 not only for TBD-6000 --
- 11 MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
- DR. MAURO: -- but for every Work
- 13 Group.
- 14 MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
- DR. MAURO: Whereby, there is a
- 16 coupling, so, that it becomes fully
- 17 integrated.
- 18 MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
- 19 DR. MAURO: But I think that we're
- 20 still at a point where we still have to get
- 21 this one fixed, but the next step -- let's say
- we get this thing -- get this all cleared up.

1	The next step, I would imagine, if
2	you wanted to, basically, open another window,
3	where you can go into TBD-6000 world, and work
4	on it, there is really no reason you know,
5	in principle, it can't be done, but I think
6	that's another change of the page.
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, I agree. It
8	just occurred to me that at some point, we'll
9	have to have a way to work within this, and
10	each item will have a different status, than
11	transferred, in terms of its own matrix.
12	That Work Group will have, you
13	know, closed or in-process or
14	MR. HINNEFELD: An action that
15	we'll start adherence to this TBD-6000, and
16	we will start to load the TBD-6000 piece of
17	this.
18	In other words, there will be a way
19	to log on to this same system, look at TBD-
20	6000, 6001 Work Group, on the first filter,
21	where it says 'Work Group filter', and it will
22	bring up the documents that have been

1	transferred from this group, because that will
2	be the first thing.
3	We'll get there, because we've got
4	those.
5	DR. MAURO: Right.
6	MR. HINNEFELD: And we can also
7	then, start working on adding the findings
8	from, you know, the matrix on TBD-6000, or
9	whatever is being discussed there.
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: So, you can take
11	this and hit the right filter, and then it
12	would move it into that Work Group's realm.
13	DR. MAURO: Another domain.
14	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, think of it as
15	sliding it, this table, into the table for
16	6000 Work Group.
17	CHAIR MUNN: Let's wait just one
18	minute, here. I certainly don't want to hold

But when we first started out with

want to happen, ultimately.

22 this, it was our philosophy that our big

up this train, because that is exactly what we

19

1	problem had to do with getting all of the
2	complete information and item history into the
3	hands of the Working Group that was going to
4	deal with it.
5	We still haven't worked out that
6	basic problem, yet. The fact that we have the
7	Chair of the Work Group we're talking about,
8	sitting at the table right now, makes it easy
9	for us to talk about TBD-6000.
10	But I am thinking about all of the
11	other transferred items that we have.
12	We had agreed that in almost all
13	cases, transferred items were going into a
14	Work Group where the total number of findings
15	was relatively small. That is, small enough
16	to be easily handled by our standard Excel
17	matrix, not the kind of burden of information
18	that we have, here.
19	I would suggest that before we
20	start working on the Work Group's end of it,
21	we get this part of our project, where we want
22	it, before we start the next one, simply

1	because I don't think our original philosophy
2	has changed, with respect to the complexity of
3	what the Work Group has to deal with, with
4	respect to what we're dealing with, here.
5	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I agree with
6	that Wanda, and I just wanted to make sure
7	that as we finish sort of polishing where we
8	are, that there is a capability of doing this
9	transfer, and apparently, it's already built
10	in, to go for
11	MR. HINNEFELD: This was in this
12	this design, for this application was
13	intended to serve the same function
14	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
15	CHAIR MUNN: For everybody.
16	MEMBER ZIEMER: Correct.
17	MR. MARSCHKE: Let me ask now, how
18	would this work, if like the Work Group
19	decides that okay, they received this
20	transferred finding, from the Procedure
21	Subcommittee, and now, they bring it up into
22	their screen, and they work on it, and they

_	-	
1	close	¬ +
_	CTOSE	エし・

- 2 CHAIR MUNN: And they send us an
- 3 email, telling us that they closed it and
- 4 giving us their history.
- 5 MR. MARSCHKE: Okay, so, and it's
- 6 closed, and this -- and basically, this work -
- 7 this Subcommittee, then, has -- accepts the
- 8 closed status?
- 9 CHAIR MUNN: Exactly.
- 10 MR. MARSCHKE: So, basically, one
- 11 status is working for the finding? There is
- 12 not like a -- you know, it's not like we have
- 13 to keep -- I know we talked about this at one
- 14 time, and we wanted to keep -- we discussed
- whether or not we had to keep a Subcommittee
- 16 status and a Work Group status, and whether or
- 17 not they were the same or separate, and
- 18 because if Paul's Work Group shows that, you
- 19 know -- he works on this, and this was closed,
- theoretically, he has the capability of coming
- in here and he can add -- he can change the
- 22 status.

1	He can come in here, or somebody in
2	his Work Group can come in here and change the
3	status on here, add a little note and say,
4	"This was changed by the TBD Subcommittee,
5	during their meeting on such-and-such, and
6	it's closed."
7	And so, in theory, there is they
8	can do that, with what they have available
9	here, now
LO	MEMBER ZIEMER: Either that, or it
11	stays in the other document, as a closed item.
L2	DR. MAURO: Yes.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: And at some point,
L4	for example, you could ask for the status of
L5	transferred items, and what is the status of
L6	13 transferred items from TBD or yes, TBD-
L7	6000, and you know, 10 are closed and three
L8	are in abeyance, or something like that.
L9	MR. MARSCHKE: That is the problem
20	we're going to have, if we have only one
21	status, we're going to lose and you change
22	that status in your Work Group, then the

1	St	ıbcom	mitte	ee is	not	goin	g to	be	able	to	know	-
2	_	are	not	goin	g to	be	able	to	do	a s	sort	

- are not going to be able to do a bolt
- when they do a sort on transferred, that
- finding is not going to show up --
- DR. MAURO: Let me say something.
- 6 MR. MARSCHKE: -- because it's not
- 7 a transferred finding anymore. It's a closed
- 8 finding.
- 9 MEMBER ZIEMER: I know, but you
- 10 could list the status of transferred findings,
- is what I'm saying.
- MR. MARSCHKE: Because you don't
- 13 know which findings are transferred anymore.
- Once they've been closed, there is no longer a
- 15 transferred finding.
- 16 DR. MAURO: I think what he means
- 17 is --
- 18 MEMBER ZIEMER: No, I'm saying you
- 19 leave it -- you leave this forever as
- transferred, possibly. We don't have to solve
- 21 this, now. I just want to --
- 22 MR. MARSCHKE: But that was the

1	catchi-22 we got filto, when we tarked about it
2	last time.
3	CHAIR MUNN: And I'm working purely
4	from memory, which is never a safe thing to
5	do, but my memory was, we had agreed that this
6	Subcommittee would retain control of the final
7	status, that the Work Group would notify the
8	Subcommittee, that they had closed it and how
9	they had closed it, and that we would retain
LO	the authority to change what goes into the
11	actual database, itself. Now, that was my
L2	memory.
L3	DR. MAURO: Let me say something.
L4	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
L5	DR. MAURO: Yes, I was there also,
L6	from the beginning, as you recall.
L7	What happened is this. There are a
L8	number of procedures, whether they were
L9	generic or site-specific, that we reviewed, as
20	part of the Subcommittee, and we have
21	findings, okay, and that became our domain,
22	and it turned out that there's 550 findings

1	for	about	105	procedures,	and	that	is	the
2	worl	d we cr	reated	d.				

3 Then we realized that we're going to have to keep track of all of this, all 4 right, and also, we realized, oh, 5 some 6 these really are --Ι mean, we have to remember, I'm going someplace with this. 7

For our own purposes, within our 8 own domain, we had to come to grips, well, 9 10 what are we going to do with the fact that TBD-6000, or whatever it is, is here, and we 11 have it in our database, but the reality is, 12 it probably never really should have been. 13 should have never been triggered under 14 15 Subcommittee. It's really something that 16 belongs to the Rocky Flats, or it belongs to TBD-6000, but it is here. 17

So, is there anything we can do
that adds value, since it's here and we've got
a new database?

So, as just a service, we say,
"Well, we'll keep track of it," and we do.

1	But now, here is where I'm going with this.
2	The fact that we've done that and
3	that for within our domain, we're going to
4	keep track and we did the transfer, and as you
5	said, when that eventually is resolved, they
6	will inform us and we can close it. That's
7	for purposes of our domain.
8	But remember, Paul's domain, with
9	Appendix BB, for example, in TBD-6000, and
10	these sorts of things, these have a life of
11	their own.
12	They're unfolding. They're being
13	added to. They're changing. They're active,
14	and I don't and I think that it's
15	dangerous, to start to think somehow, this
16	Subcommittee is going to enter that world.
17	I think that all the Subcommittee
18	is we've got our 500-and-so findings, and
19	we're tracking them, and if we designate one
20	as transferred, it's transferred, and yes,
21	when that group is finished, they let us know

and that's it.

1	If it starts to grow, in other
2	words, if all of the sudden, there is another
3	dozen findings associated with a particular
4	OTIB, that grows, in that other domain, I
5	don't think we try to grab after that.
6	We leave it alone. I think we have
7	to do that, otherwise, it's going to be all
8	consuming, and we're going to self-destruct.
9	I think we just stay within our
10	boundaries. We have a boundary now, I think
11	550 comments that we have been actively
12	tracking. Let's just track those. The ones
13	that are transferred, let's designate them as
14	transferred. They have been transferred,
15	documented and then I agree, at some point,
16	let the other Work Group let us know we've
17	closed it, we documented it on this date, we
18	were advised that this is closed and we closed
19	it. We're done. That is it.
20	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, that could
21	DR. MAURO: Why do more than that?
22	MR. MARSCHKE: Because some of the

1	other Work Groups wanted to take advantage of
2	this database.
3	DR. MAURO: That is a new database.
4	That is a new domain that we want to create,
5	that is spinning off from this database.
6	I think we've got to keep it clean,
7	because if we want to spin off another I
8	mean, look, I'm just giving you my opinion.
9	If you want to spin off another
10	function, because this turns out to be a
11	convenient platform, great. But right now,
12	from our perspective, that is a meta issue.
13	That transcends, what our mission is, here.
14	That goes off into a bigger
15	mission, which goes to the whole Board, as a
16	whole.
17	Do we want this to be the platform,
18	upon which other domains orbit, so, that they
19	could track too, because it's a convenience,
20	but I think that is a question that is so big,
21	we can't even talk about it.
22	Just to talk about a one Site

1	Profile, or one OTIB, or whatever it is, and
2	somehow say, "We're going to use this as a
3	launching point to track something else,"
4	which I think is what you guys originally
5	tried to do, and it was a nightmare.
6	I mean, you really
7	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, this is
8	DR. MAURO: Are you biting off too
9	much?
10	MR. MARSCHKE: This is still set up
11	to do that. I mean, if you go back and look
12	at I mean, this the way this database
13	has been set up is, that you can you know,
14	I can't remember where it is, but on the
15	opening page
16	DR. ULSH: The first Work Group
17	filter.
18	MR. MARSCHKE: Work Group
19	filter, here, it's all set up. You can select
20	whichever Work Group you happen to be in
21	DR. MAURO: Okay.

MR. MARSCHKE: -- and you will get

1	a database tailored
2	DR. ULSH: Of your stuff.
3	MR. MARSCHKE: of your stuff.
4	DR. MAURO: Right.
5	MR. MARSCHKE: But it's all going
6	into the same, and pulling data out of the
7	there is not like two-dozen databases out
8	there, each one separately. There is one big
9	database, all 550 issues are in one big
10	database. It pulls out the ones, which are
11	identified for your particular Work Group or
12	Subcommittee.
13	DR. MAURO: That is here.
14	MR. MARSCHKE: That is what this is
15	designed for.
16	DR. MAURO: Well, what happens if
17	there is another Subcommittee that
18	MR. MARSCHKE: That is right there.
19	DR. MAURO: I know, but that has
20	its own life, and they find new issues
21	CHAIR MUNN: Well, hold on, let's
22	test this, right now.

1	Let's test the Work Group on TBD-
2	6000, and see if it shows that it has these
3	transferred items.
4	DR. ULSH: It doesn't.
5	DR. MAURO: It doesn't.
6	CHAIR MUNN: It doesn't?
7	DR. ULSH: I just looked.
8	CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: The cell is here.
10	DR. MAURO: The shell is there.
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: But the question I
12	was raising originally is this. Suppose we do
13	that, and it and you know, we're beyond the
14	shell, and these items come up. Am I working
15	on this, as it is, or am I in a new domain,
16	where I can assign different categories,
17	besides the transferred one?
18	MR. MARSCHKE: If I were to put my
19	IT hat on, I would assume you're working as a
20	as is.
21	There is one big data, but with an
22	IT hat on

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: But when this comes
2	up for me in the TBD-6000 Work Group, it's not
3	a transferred item. That is the point I was
4	making.
5	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, and if this
6	MEMBER ZIEMER: That this has got
7	to show up in a sort of a parallel
8	universe, do you see what I'm saying, Steve?
9	MR. MARSCHKE: It's been
10	transferred to you. It's not transferred from
11	you.
12	MEMBER ZIEMER: No, no, I know, but
13	if I change if I change that, suppose, I
14	change this to in abeyance, for our Work
15	Group, for whatever we're doing at the moment,
16	and that is the status of it for us, where
17	does it show up in the system? That is all
18	I'm asking.
19	MR. HINNEFELD: That can be
20	designed.
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
22	MR. HINNEFELD: That can be

1	designed.
2	MEMBER ZIEMER: And I don't think
3	we have to solve that today. It's just the
4	issue of, if we can work in this platform, and
5	update the matrix, and show its status, so
6	that for ideally, if someone says, "Oh,
7	it's transferred, I can click on that and move
8	into the transferred item and see what the
9	group is doing with it," that's all I'm
LO	asking.
L1	MR. HINNEFELD: If you'll recall,
L2	when we designed this
L3	MEMBER ZIEMER: That is what I
L4	thought we were doing.
L5	MR. HINNEFELD: we have a status
L6	for things that you would receive. It's
L7	called imported.
L8	That was the status we invented for
L9	exactly that situation, and so, the design
20	MEMBER ZIEMER: But it's still
21	showed here as transferred.

MR. HINNEFELD: Now, it may not be

1	built	this	way,	but	the	desian	initially	7

- 2 envisioned a Work Group or Subcommittee
- 3 specific status.
- In other words, this would always
- 5 be -- it was always be --
- 6 MEMBER ZIEMER: Imported.
- 7 MR. HINNEFELD: -- in this one, and
- 8 it would come to life as imported --
- 9 CHAIR MUNN: In the other one.
- 10 MR. HINNEFELD: -- in TBD-6000.
- 11 MEMBER ZIEMER: And I can have my
- 12 own categories.
- 13 MR. HINNEFELD: And so, that would
- 14 be the TBD-6000 specific status, which can
- 15 then go to --
- MR. KATZ: Closed.
- 17 MR. HINNEFELD: -- the various ones
- 18 on the list.
- 19 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay, I think the
- 20 concept is there.
- MR. HINNEFELD: So, it's set up to
- 22 be that way, whether the data table has

1	actually	been	built	that	way	or	not,	I	won'	t

- 2 swear to, but we'll just tell them to build
- 3 them that way.
- DR. MAURO: Let me just ask you a
- 5 question. Now, the TBD-6000 is off and
- 6 running, and they have in front of them, a
- 7 tracking system, for their issues. Some of
- 8 those issues that they're tracking are the
- ones that have been transferred to them.
- MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
- DR. MAURO: And now, it's in front
- of them.
- MR. HINNEFELD: Right.
- DR. MAURO: And they have not only
- those, they have a whole bunch of others, that
- 16 are being added to --
- 17 MEMBER ZIEMER: We have the SEC
- 18 tracking, which is not --
- 19 DR. MAURO: Right, so, what I'm
- 20 getting at is, there has got to be a clean
- 21 boundary, and I think you just defined it,
- 22 fine.

1	We say transferred. It's
2	transferred. It's been accepted. It's
3	accepted, but it's over there, now, it's not
4	with us anymore.
5	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
6	DR. MAURO: It has a life of its
7	own, over there, and we should in other
8	words, we don't look back again. We try to
9	keep this active, whatever is going on there.
10	MR. HINNEFELD: I would we were
11	arguing that, just like you were saying a
12	while ago, I would argue against trying to
13	capture all the work from the other Work Group
14	
15	DR. MAURO: Not now.
16	MR. HINNEFELD: over here.
17	DR. MAURO: Maybe two years from
18	now.
19	MR. HINNEFELD: You know, ever.
20	You can write a report to do that.
21	DR. MAURO: Never, never.
22	MR. HINNEFELD: You know, we could

1	
2	DR. MAURO: I was afraid that's
3	where you were headed, that's all I'm saying.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: No, I agree, we
5	could have our developers write a report that
6	would do that, but you don't want to be
7	messing with this
8	DR. MAURO: Right, you don't want
9	to mess with this.
10	MR. KATZ: This is supposed to be a
11	work tool, to make our jobs easier
12	DR. MAURO: For us.
13	MR. KATZ: not more difficult.
14	DR. MAURO: Exactly, right.
15	MR. KATZ: Although we would
16	DR. MAURO: So, we're in violent
17	agreement on this.
18	MR. HINNEFELD: We started on an
19	issue, we never quite resolved, because I
20	distracted the conversation, which was what is
21	the total finding and what is the active
22	finding?

1	DR. MAURO: And that shall start.
2	MR. HINNEFELD: So, I was guilty of
3	taking us away from it, but we never really
4	resolved, what statuses we wanted to call
5	active and which ones therefore, which ones
6	are inactive, of the list, and if you click or
7	the filter, you click on the status filter,
8	you can see all the statuses.
9	And so, we can decided which ones
LO	you think should be considered active
L1	findings.
L2	DR. ULSH: Yes, there are the
L3	categories. You've got total, that is
L4	regardless of status. Which one of those do
L5	you want to subtract out, to be left as an
L6	active finding?
L7	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, the first
L8	question is, if assuming, you're going to work
L9	within the confines of the present structure -
20	- now, Stu suggested that we add more columns.
21	I mean, so, that is also an option.
22	But if we want to work within the

	1	present	structure	of	the	first	screen	here
--	---	---------	-----------	----	-----	-------	--------	------

- 2 basically, these four columns, you know, then
- 3 we have to decide what we want to include as
- 4 this active category.
- 5 MR. HINNEFELD: I suggest that the
- 6 additional column is not thinking about the
- filter. If you've got that filter there, that
- 8 accomplishes the same thing as a navigable
- 9 report with all of the columns.
- 10 MR. KATZ: Right.
- 11 DR. MAURO: I mean, I've got a
- 12 simpler question. What even -- you have total
- 13 findings. What you're really saying is,
- 14 "Well, what is the status of all of those
- 15 findings?"
- 16 You could call them -- you know,
- 17 some have not been opened yet. Some are
- 18 active and opened. Some are in abeyance.
- 19 Some have been -- in a funny sort of way, if
- you're going to tier down and be nested, you
- 21 don't even need this separation of total
- 22 factors.

1	It gives me, here are our findings.
2	There are a total of 14 that everybody reads.
3	There are 14 findings, and in theory, one
4	could go in and say, "How many of those now,
5	have been closed?
6	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, we want to use
7	it as a tool for assigning work, John.
8	DR. MAURO: Right.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: So, one of the ways
10	that you could use this as a tool for
11	assigning work is, is Wanda can come in here,
12	or Stu can come in here, or Brant can come in
13	here, and they click on if the thing would
14	stay still, click on 'active', and find out
15	how many
16	DR. MAURO: The distinction on
17	active is only these are the ones that are
18	not closed.
19	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, that is the

- inc. Managemer. Well, that is the
- 20 way it is, right now. That is what it -- that
- 21 is what we're trying --
- 22 CHAIR MUNN: We don't know.

1	MR. MARSCHKE: to figure out,
2	what do we want, as active?
3	DR. MAURO: We should have a
4	definition.
5	MR. MARSCHKE: And we can use
6	well, the thing the advantage of having
7	this column here is that we can look at this
8	and say, "Okay, OTIB," assuming it's working
9	correctly, "OTIB-54 has 26 active findings.
10	Let's focus our efforts on OTIB-54."
11	DR. MAURO: Right.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: And let's get those
13	numbers down. So, that is the advantage of
14	having this additional column.
15	DR. MAURO: That other column,
16	that's good. This is all we're inventing
17	it, and we're comfortable with it. I guess,
18	each of us has our own perspective on how
19	information should be managed and disclosed,
20	and I just now, it's just a matter of what
21	do you prefer?
22	CHAIR MUNN: So, we do have to get

1	а	definitive	answer	about	what	this	particul	ar
---	---	------------	--------	-------	------	------	----------	----

- list of total active findings means, until we
- 3 have the definition correct.
- DR. ULSH: Right. Can you click on
- 5 the status filter, again, so, it drops down,
- 6 all the different statuses?
- 7 So, I don't really care, what
- 8 number you want in there. You just have to
- 9 decide. Tell me what columns to --
- 10 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, exactly.
- 11 MR. HINNEFELD: Can I ask a
- 12 question? You view the screen, in terms of
- the work assignment. You view this as a tool
- 14 for this --
- 15 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
- 16 MR. HINNEFELD: -- Subcommittee?
- 17 CHAIR MUNN: Correct.
- 18 MR. HINNEFELD: For this
- 19 Subcommittee?
- 20 CHAIR MUNN: Correct.
- 21 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay, then move
- 22 abeyance to closed.

1	MR. KATZ: Right.
2	MR. HINNEFELD: And then take it
3	out of active
4	DR. MAURO: Yes, right.
5	MR. HINNEFELD: because this has
6	got nothing to do with abeyance.
7	DR. MAURO: I mean, I'm thinking
8	MR. MARSCHKE: Then you want to
9	take transferred out, as well.
10	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
11	MR. MARSCHKE: Right.
12	DR. MAURO: Under active, why would
13	you have closed?
14	MR. MARSCHKE: We don't. Everybody
15	agrees, closed is out.

- DR. MAURO: In abeyance, for our
- 17 purposes, that is closed.
- 18 MR. KATZ: No, you have open in-
- 19 progress, imported, and that's it.
- MR. HINNEFELD: That's it.
- 21 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, it is.
- MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.

1	DR. ULSH: Open, in-progress and?
2	MR. HINNEFELD: And imported.
3	MR. KATZ: And imported.
4	CHAIR MUNN: Correct, yes.
5	MR. HINNEFELD: Total, active?
6	MR. MARSCHKE: I mean, I think
7	there is if you use this as a tool, I would
8	think NIOSH would want to use this as a tool -
9	_
10	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, we'll keep
11	our own.
12	MR. KATZ: Yes, they keep their
13	own, right.
14	MR. HINNEFELD: We'll take the
15	filter, you know, abeyance we'll get the
16	abeyance findings and we'll do it ourselves.
17	MR. MARSCHKE: Oh, okay.
18	CHAIR MUNN: Very good.
19	DR. ULSH: Open, closed, in
20	progress, plus imported?
21	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
22	DR. ULSH: And that's it, active.

1	CHAIR MUNN: And the
2	DR. ULSH: That is all we need.
3	MR. KATZ: Right.
4	DR. MAURO: This is how you do it.
5	When you do things by Committee, this is how
6	you do it.
7	MR. HINNEFELD: Oh, yes.
8	DR. MAURO: That's all there is to
9	it, and we live with it.
LO	MR. MARSCHKE: The other thing I
L1	wanted to point out is, this doesn't seem to
L2	be working.
L3	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, that's the
L4	report. The SC&A findings were just it's
L5	the summary findings report, that used to give
L6	it started with like it was like a group
L7	by data finding, right?
L8	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
L9	MR. HINNEFELD: It was grouped by
20	data finding and it said how many from that
21	data were the total number and how many are
22	open and that put them in all of the

1	categories.
2	CHAIR MUNN: Correct, and I found
3	that a very handy tool
4	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
5	CHAIR MUNN: in making reports
6	to other
7	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, this is
8	different than the summary report. This is
9	different than the this is different
10	CHAIR MUNN: I understand.
11	MR. MARSCHKE: Okay.
12	CHAIR MUNN: All right.
13	MR. HINNEFELD: But what I was
14	discussing was what you would get, right?
15	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, exactly.
16	MR. HINNEFELD: Okay, remember what
17	it looks like.
18	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, simple, short.
19	DR. ULSH: Are we to the point
20	where it would be useful for me to sum up the
21	open items on the corrections that need to
22	be done here?

1	CHAIR MUNN: It would be very
2	helpful for you to sum
3	DR. ULSH: Okay, here is what I
4	have. One problem is that we can't yet link
5	attachments.
6	CHAIR MUNN: Right.
7	DR. ULSH: The second problem is,
8	the definition of active versus total, and we
9	just talked about what that means.
LO	CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
11	DR. ULSH: The third problem is
L2	that the SC&A findings report is not working.
L3	Another one is, we need the ability
L4	to save findings history to PDF or hard copy,
L5	and another one is the status filter, we don't
L6	know what is going on, how the documents are
L7	screened out.
L8	Those are the problems that I have
L9	listed. Have I missed any?
20	MR. MARSCHKE: The summary table.
21	That is different from the findings table
22	SC&A's basically, it's Wanda's summary

1	table.
2	MR. HINNEFELD: The summary table
3	is not don't call it the SC&A summary,
4	because we'll get confused. It's just
5	basically
6	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, the summary
7	MR. HINNEFELD: the sum of
8	Wanda's summary table, for lack of a better
9	CHAIR MUNN: Wanda's?
10	MR. HINNEFELD: I guess it would be
11	more
12	CHAIR MUNN: That will be fine.
13	MR. KATZ: Electrons.
14	DR. ULSH: Wanda's summary table?
15	Have I missed any other issues?
16	CHAIR MUNN: I don't believe so.
17	MR. MARSCHKE: The database, itself
18	needs to be cleaned up.
19	DR. ULSH: Yes, okay.

HINNEFELD:

MR. MARSCHKE:

MR.

findings.

20

21

22

are test

So, there are --

There

1	MR. MARSCHKE: There are test
2	findings. There are duplicate documents. For
3	example, OCAS-TIB-0006 is in there, as well as
4	OCAS-TIB-006.
5	DR. MAURO: And they're the same
6	thing.
7	MR. MARSCHKE: And they're
8	basically the same document.
9	CHAIR MUNN: The same thing we had
10	with 13, right?
11	MR. MARSCHKE: And there is a DCAS-
12	TIB-13 and the OCAS-TIB-13.
13	So, basically, there is duplicate
14	documents. There is test case findings that

- DR. ULSH: Okay, I've got that.
- 17 CHAIR MUNN: That sounds like it,

need to be cleaned out of the database.

- 18 at least covers the most pressing items, and I
- 19 would request, if there is any possibility at
- 20 all, that we can prioritize those, I would
- 21 request that we move our ability to get a PDF
- or hard copy, up to the high point in the

1	list, if you possibly can, because that
2	affects our ability to transfer these things
3	in a trackable way, to the Work Groups.
4	You know, the Work Groups all know
5	that they have this, and they know what it is,
6	but I can there is no easy way for me to
7	transmit that to them, in any electronic or
8	hard copy form.
9	DR. ULSH: I've got that at the
10	highest priority.
11	CHAIR MUNN: Excellent, thank you.
12	DR. ULSH: Okay. Now, that leaves
13	us with one question, that we me, with one
14	question.
15	At one point during the discussion,
16	we had talked about expanding this to TBD-6000
17	Working Group, and then we talked about maybe
18	not doing that.
19	It's not clear to me, what the
20	status of that is. Do we want to do that or
21	wait?

MR. HINNEFELD: You and I can talk

1	to Tom and Jim.
2	DR. ULSH: All right.
3	CHAIR MUNN: At this juncture, I
4	think we are fortunate that the Chair of that
5	Work Group knows, how to pull these items out,
6	and may even figure out a way to insert that
7	into what we now have as as a slot for that
8	that Work Group.
9	But doesn't have anything in it. It
10	may be our test case, or how we do transfer
11	those things, imported. So, we'll see if that
12	works.
13	All right, are we happy with what
14	we have to do, now, and we're going to make a
15	few phone calls, next week, and get started or
16	some interactive
17	MR. HINNEFELD: Steve, do you know
18	what your schedule is like, the next week or
19	two?
20	MR. MARSCHKE: I'm in the office
21	every day, except for this Wednesday.

CHAIR MUNN: Good.

1	MR. HINNEFELD: So, Brant can
2	contact you, and I guess, that is still
3	involved with this.
4	CHAIR MUNN: Good, okay, all right,
5	let's go on then, to the next item on the
6	agenda, OTIB-70 issue, that is the one percent
7	residual period finding that we talked about
8	so much, and that we covered so thoroughly, I
9	think, in full Board at the Norton meeting.
10	We discussed that a lot. My
11	understanding, NIOSH has agreed to do that in
12	the document. The question really is, where
13	are we with the changes in the document? Is
14	that underway?
15	DR. ULSH: It is underway. They're
16	not finished yet.
17	CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
18	DR. ULSH: But you accurately
19	summarized it. We agreed to the change, that
20	SC&A advocated for, and it's in process.
21	CHAIR MUNN: Excellent. Then we
2.2	don't have anything to worry about with that.

1	The PER's being added to the
2	database, has any discussion taken place, with
3	regard to how we're going to do that, when
4	we're going to do that, who is the lead and is
5	it underway?
6	MR. MARSCHKE: They've been
7	DR. MAURO: Go ahead.
8	MR. MARSCHKE: The five PER's that
9	we've talked about recently, within the last
10	year or so, at this Subcommittee, have the
11	the timings have been added to the database.
12	They are in the database, now.
13	The PER's in question are PER-8,
14	PER-9, PER-12, PER-18 and PER-20, and after I
15	got Wanda's agenda here, I made sure that
16	those comments have been added.
17	If you go down, for example, PER-8,
18	basically, it identifies that no specific
19	issue. SC&A identified no specific issues in
20	that, and it was discussed in March 22 nd
21	meeting.
22	CHAIR MUNN: Hold on, just a

1	moment.	Let	me	try	to	get	it	on	my	screen,
---	---------	-----	----	-----	----	-----	----	----	----	---------

- 2 here, even though --
- DR. MAURO: So, this feature is
- 4 working nicely? You go in, you find all the
- 5 comments for every review we've done?
- 6 MR. MARSCHKE: This part of the --
- 7 DR. MAURO: I mean, it's always
- 8 nice to say there is some nice things, right?
- 9 MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, this one works
- 10 fine. This one -- we're good.
- 11 CHAIR MUNN: Okay, started on
- 12 PER's.
- MR. MARSCHKE: One of the -- Hans
- 14 Behling is not in the database, or Hans
- 15 Behling is not one of the people who can --
- so, all these PER reviews are being credited
- 17 to Kathy Behling.
- DR. MAURO: That's fine.
- 19 MR. KATZ: That makes sense,
- 20 because Hans doesn't do this.
- MR. MARSCHKE: Sure, so, yes, Hans
- is not on the computer. So, that is why he is

4		2	1 1	J . 1 . 1
1	nor	าท	The	database.

- So, he is not one of the people
- 3 that we can pick from. So, Kathy Behling,
- 4 you'll see, is basically the --
- 5 CHAIR MUNN: So, when I sorted
- 6 here, on PER's, I got the three that we had
- 7 done earlier, and not the ones that you just
- 8 told me about.
- 9 So, obviously, I'm not sorting this
- 10 properly.
- 11 MR. MARSCHKE: What did you do to
- 12 sort?
- 13 CHAIR MUNN: Let me --
- MR. MARSCHKE: Go back to the main
- 15 page, Wanda. Are you on the --
- 16 CHAIR MUNN: No, Board review,
- 17 right?
- 18 MR. MARSCHKE: Go down to where it
- 19 says "documents under Board review."
- 20 CHAIR MUNN: Now, if we sort for
- 21 PER's?
- 22 MR. HINNEFELD: PER's is there.

1	It's on a standard window, so, that it pulls
2	the most recent.
3	CHAIR MUNN: All right.

- 4 MR. MARSCHKE: It's on there. Now,
- if you go down to PER-8, is the one I've got
- 6 up on the screen.
- 7 CHAIR MUNN: Okay, three, four,
- 8 five, six, okay. So, we've got eight, six,
- 9 nine, 12, 18. I don't see 12 on there.
- 10 Eighteen is there, and 20. Did you say 12, or
- 11 did you say --
- MR. MARSCHKE: Yes.
- MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, it's on there.
- 14 They're not exactly in numerical order.
- MR. MARSCHKE: Twelve is strange,
- 16 because it has four numerics.
- 17 CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
- 18 MR. MARSCHKE: It's PER-0012.
- 19 Everybody else has three digits. This one has
- four digits, for some reason, but it's there.

21

22 CHAIR MUNN: That is one of our

1	other things that we talked about, when we
2	were talking about 13.
3	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes.
4	CHAIR MUNN: We were talking about
5	whether we were all going to have two zeros or
6	whether this was going to have three
7	designators, not two zeros.
8	I thought we had come to the
9	conclusion that we were going to have three
10	numbers, two of which might be zero, but we
11	wouldn't have 00, we wouldn't have four
12	numbers, or more.
13	DR. MAURO: I think we've got to
14	call it what it is.
15	MR. MARSCHKE: Whatever I think
16	whatever the document is identified as, should
17	be in the database. I mean
18	MR. KATZ: Right.
19	MR. MARSCHKE: NIOSH has their
20	document identification scheme, and so, you
21	know, whatever the standard identifier is, for
22	a particular document, that is what we should

1	use.
2	DR. MAURO: Otherwise things will
3	get lost. Yes, we have to go, just tracking.
4	You know, you define it the way you define
5	it, that's what we use.
6	CHAIR MUNN: Well, I certainly
7	don't want to lose anything, but I will have
8	to revisit, I guess, our discussion about 0013
9	and 013, and whether those are actually three
10	different documents that we had, or whether
11	okay.
12	DR. MAURO: Absolutely, whether
13	that is just an error in loading the data,
14	because we thought it was two different ones,
15	when in fact, it really is the same.
16	CHAIR MUNN: That was one that
17	DR. MAURO: Oh, yes, and I don't
18	I just assumed that was an error in data, you
19	know, loading that was
20	CHAIR MUNN: Well, it was the
21	DR. MAURO: treated as separate.

CHAIR MUNN:

22

That was one of the

1	things we were supposed to be checking on, for
2	this time.
3	DR. MAURO: Yes.
4	CHAIR MUNN: Okay, all right.
5	Okay, all right, so, those are loaded?
6	MR. MARSCHKE: They're loaded. I
7	want to go over with the Subcommittee, and
8	make sure the Subcommittee agrees with the way
9	I've done the statusing.
10	Basically, for PER-8, there really
11	SC&A didn't come up with any findings, and
12	so, I put this one in, saying that saying
13	as much, and I identified it as closed.
14	Now, it was my understanding that
15	there is work remaining on the PER evaluation.
16	We have to do the case evaluations. But I
17	don't think we keep this open, for that.
18	DR. MAURO: Right.
19	MR. MARSCHKE: So, this one is
20	this one is then being shown as closed. PER-9
21	

DR. MAURO: Before you leave that,

1 there was one comment that regarding this
one, that Paul had mentioned, perhaps I wasn't
3 sure what regarding transfer over to the
4 Science Committee, because there was something
5 very important that came out of here, and had
6 to do with the IREP model, which doesn't
7 where
8 MR. MARSCHKE: I think the IREP
9 model comes up in another one.
DR. MAURO: Oh, this wasn't the one
11 with the IREP issue?
MR. MARSCHKE: This one isn't that
one with the IREP issue. Well, it does talk
14 about IREP. It does mention IREP, there. I
have to go back and look at that.
DR. MAURO: Okay.
MR. MARSCHKE: But I know one of
18 the I think it was nine, I know one of
these was this one here, was transferred
no, that is not the
DR. MAURO: There are a couple of

them. Actually, I think a couple of them were

1	which go toward, leave this domain leave
2	our world and
3	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, the other
4	question is
5	DR. MAURO: The ICD code number for
6	the lymphoma, that was an issue that was not
7	to be I don't think it was our within
8	our purview, but we raised it and closed it.
9	It goes someplace else. It has to do with, I
LO	guess, the Department of Labor and their
L1	designation.
L2	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, right.
L3	DR. MAURO: And then there was
L4	another one, which is another PER, that had to
L5	do with how the Probability of Causation
L6	was calculated, and you know, the fact that
L7	maybe there were I remember this very well.
L8	I don't remember the numbers.
L9	Another issue that goes more towards the
20	Science Group, where whether or not some
21	questions were raised, why are the outcomes of
22	the PoC's seem to be unusual, and I don't want

1	to	go	into	details,	which	was	something	that

- was more toward questions regarding IREP, both
- of which were felt -- the latter, I believe,
- 4 Paul, you actually mentioned something that
- 5 might be of interest to the Science Group, and
- 6 I don't know if you recall.
- 7 We were coming up with PoC's that
- 8 seemed to be too high --
- 9 MR. HINNEFELD: John, wasn't it
- 10 that -- it was an identical -- essentially,
- 11 the identical case, except --
- DR. MAURO: The age.
- 13 MR. HINNEFELD: -- one person
- 14 started exposure --
- DR. MAURO: And that's it.
- MR. HINNEFELD: -- at 20, and one
- 17 started exposure at 40.
- DR. MAURO: Forty, yes.
- 19 MR. HINNEFELD: And exposure time
- 20 was the right -- exact same time, so, one was
- 21 20 years older when diagnosed --
- DR. MAURO: Exactly.

1	MR. HINNEFELD: than the other,
2	and the testing came out the same.
3	DR. MAURO: Right, it was a lung
4	cancer, and we
5	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, the question
6	was
7	DR. MAURO: We raised the question
8	
9	MR. HINNEFELD: The question of
LO	whether it should or not, was what should be
11	going to the
L2	CHAIR MUNN: That was the question.
L3	MR. HINNEFELD: Science Group
L4	and
L5	DR. MAURO: That was it, yes. I
L6	only I'm not trying to address that issue,
L7	now.
L8	MR. MARSCHKE: This is what we say
L9	in here. You're right, John, it was on eight,
20	and this is and we did mention, again, back
21	in March of this year, we had a meeting, and
22	we did mention, actually Stu mentioned the

1	same	thing,	as	being	actively	considered	by
---	------	--------	----	-------	----------	------------	----

- 2 the Science Subcommittee.
- 3 DR. MAURO: Right.
- 4 MR. MARSCHKE: And do we have any
- 5 issues that remained open on this overarching
- issue, and we said, "No," basically, then for
- 7 the purpose of our Subcommittee, it's closed.
- 8 Ted agrees.
- 9 DR. MAURO: Closed.
- 10 MR. MARSCHKE: Wanda says it's
- 11 closed. Therefore, I made it closed.
- 12 We didn't identify it as
- 13 transferred. The transcript identifies it as
- 14 being closed. So, what -- but we do, in this
- 15 history here, we do identify that -- it as
- 16 being actively considered by the Science
- 17 Subcommittee.
- I don't identify what as being --
- 19 what this technical issue is, but you can go
- 20 back to the transcript. The transcript goes
- on for like 50 pages, covering the discussion
- that went on, here.

1	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, right.
2	MR. MARSCHKE: And I've identified
3	the pages in the transcript, so that you can,
4	if you want to, find out what was exactly
5	transferred, you can go there.
6	DR. MAURO: This is a very valuable
7	
8	MR. MARSCHKE: So, the question is,
9	is it
LO	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, it is very
L1	valuable.
L2	MR. KATZ: So, the transcript date
L3	is what?
L4	MR. MARSCHKE: This is for the
L5	March 22, 2011 Procedure Subcommittee meeting.
L6	MR. KATZ: Okay, because we have a
L7	Science Work Group coming up, and I want to
L8	send them this transcript.
L9	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, that has to go to
20	them.
21	MR. KATZ: Okay.
22	CHAIR MUNN: And this is one of

1	those where
2	MR. KATZ: So, that's my action
3	item. I am going to send that to the Science
4	Work Group.
5	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
6	MR. KATZ: That transcript.
7	CHAIR MUNN: Thanks, Ted.
8	MEMBER ZIEMER: A question, though,
9	that is I mean, I'm wondering, Wanda, the
10	intent of this, closed for us, and and in
11	essence, saying that it's an overarching
12	issue, looks an awful lot like a transcript.
13	DR. MAURO: It sure does.
14	MEMBER ZIEMER: I know we used the
15	word 'closed', but
16	MR. KATZ: I think that is closed -
17	_

- 19 but --

18

- I think it's fine. 20 MR. KATZ:
- MEMBER ZIEMER: But transfer items 21
- are also, in a sense, closed for us. 22

NEAL R. GROSS

MEMBER ZIEMER: It's closed for us,

1	MR. KATZ: Closed for us, right,
2	but not and I
3	CHAIR MUNN: Now, this would be
4	MR. KATZ: My predilection would be
5	just to close them for us, these transfer
6	things, too, but this is fine for this one.
7	This will be taken care of.
8	I'm going to send the Science Work
9	Group the transcript. They'll pick it up and
10	we don't have to worry about it here, anymore.
11	CHAIR MUNN: We have taken that
12	same stance, Paul, when we have said, "This is
13	something that Jim is looking at. He is
14	taking care of the overarching issues."
15	We will not continue to work on it
16	here, because it's full scope for the entire
17	complex.
18	DR. MAURO: So, the rationale would
19	be, it's been transferred. We know it's
20	transferred. It's been done. So, as far as
21	we're concerned, it's been closed.
22	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

1	DR. MAURO: I guess when something
2	is transferred and we don't we're not we
3	haven't really transferred it, yet.
4	CHAIR MUNN: Well, when something
5	is transferred, there is work that the other -
6	- that someone else is going to do, that needs
7	to come back to us.
8	DR. MAURO: Right, right.
9	CHAIR MUNN: When we're talking
10	about overarching issues, those are going to
11	be resolved
12	DR. MAURO: We need to come back.
13	CHAIR MUNN: at level that's not
14	in this
15	DR. MAURO: Got it.
16	CHAIR MUNN: in this purview.
17	DR. MAURO: Okay.
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: And in fact, as I
19	look at it, I'm not even sure it was a
20	finding.
21	DR. MAURO: Yes.
22	MEMBER ZIEMER: It said no specific

1	issue	was	ident	ified,	but	SC&A	rais	ed	a
2	concer	n							
3]	OR. MA	URO: V	ery go	ood po	int.		
4		I	MEMBER	ZIEMI	ER:		about	tł	ne
5	validi	ty of	the :	IREP.	Now,	that	can't	be	a
6	findin	g							
7]	OR. MA	URO: H	ere.				

- MEMBER ZIEMER: -- against here, 8
- 9 yes.
- DR. MAURO: Here, right. 10
- MEMBER ZIEMER: Down here. 11
- 12 DR. MAURO: Good.
- MEMBER ZIEMER: So, in the absence 13
- of a true finding --14
- I agree. 15 DR. MAURO: This is the
- 16 sensible way to do it.
- 17 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
- Right, right. CHAIR MUNN: All 18
- 19 right, so, Ted has the action item, to get
- Richardson, 20 that Dr. that's to great.
- Anything else on the PER database? 21 Thank you
- very much, for getting that --22

1	MR. MARSO	CHKE:	Do w	e want	t to	go
2	through the other for	ur, or (do we			
3	CHAIR MUI	ın: i	think	s it w	ould	be
4	nice to do that, e	special	.ly in	view	of	the
5	fact that I still ha	ave not	been	succes	ssful	in
6	getting the screen th	hat you	're ge	etting.		
7	MR. MARSC	HKE: O	kay.			
8	CHAIR MUN	N: I h	nave t	he PER	's he	re,
9	but I					
10	MEMBER ZI	EMER:	Hit t	he 'plı	us' s	ign
11	on the left, I think	, of the	e name	;		
12	CHAIR MU	NN: Z	And t	hen s	ometh	ing
13	magic happens.					
14	MEMBER ZI	EMER:	the	e name	PER.	
15	CHAIR MUI	NN: A	ll ri	ght, I	've	hit
16	everything else, S	ubcommi	ttee	on P	roced	ure
17	Reviews.					
18	MEMBER ZI	EMER:	No, no	ot that	- .	
19	MR. MARSO	HKE:	Try cl	licking	g on	the
20	title.					
21	MEMBER ZI	EMER:	Click	on the	e tit	le,
22	itself.					

1	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, that is what
2	does it.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Well, oh, I see, I get
4	this confused screen.
5	That's okay, I have something
6	strange going on here, but I can read it. So,
7	go ahead, Steve.
8	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, this is PER-9,
9	that had two findings. This is the one which
10	basically, let the ICD-9 codes and the finding
11	one was about the ICD-9 code, and I'm not
12	really qualified to speak on this.
13	But I sat in on the discussions and
14	the my understanding is that this has been
15	really not in this was a Department of
16	Labor concern.
17	One of the things that we did bring
18	up in here was that I believe that we
19	brought up, is that the how to advise the
20	Department of Labor that of our concern,
21	with this ICD code, ICD-9 code.
22	Again, I did the same thing on this

1	one, as I did on the PER-8. I went back to the
2	transcript. This was the this was
3	discussed, both in July 2006 or July 26,
4	2010, and January 5^{th} of this year, and
5	probably at other Subcommittee meetings, as
6	well.
7	These are the two that I went
8	through and pulled the excerpts from, and this
9	is the one I was talking about, the we will
10	we would simply, in a Board meeting, ask
11	the Department of Labor whether the advise
12	the Department of Labor that we discussed it
13	at length and we're concerned about the
14	changes in progress that had occurred in
15	diagnostic diagnosis over the last decade,
16	whether that is on their plate, as well.
17	I don't know, that seems to be
18	that is an action item for Subcommittee, and I
19	just wanted to capture that, in here.
20	CHAIR MUNN: That is good, because
21	my I do not recall having had that
22	interaction with Labor, and

1	MR. KATZ: Well, you haven't.
2	MR. HINNEFELD: This is a comment I
3	made at the time, and I'll make it now, is
4	that the whole debate is whether or not not
5	whether it people were able to distinguish
6	non-Hodgkin's from Hodgkin's lymphoma, but
7	whether they bothered, until roughly recently.
8	I mean, the ability was there, but
9	why bother, and so, the steps were not taken
10	and so, the record does not contain the
11	ability to do that. Isn't that the finding
12	we're talking about?
13	DR. MAURO: Yes.
14	MR. HINNEFELD: Okay, the
15	Congress has already answered the question,
16	about whether you're going to distinguish
17	between Hodgkin's and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma
18	in this program, based on the records provided
19	to you, and they said, you are, and they
20	decided that by making Hodgkin's lymphoma a
21	non-SEC cancer and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma an
22	SEC cancer.

1	So, the law itself separates it and
2	decides and has essentially decided for the
3	country, that we are going to decide to use
4	the records we can use, and do it.
5	DR. MAURO: Right.
6	MR. HINNEFELD: I think it's a
7	fool's errand to even suggest to DOL that they
8	do anything about it. I think you will get
9	the same answer from them.
10	CHAIR MUNN: I suspect that it is.
11	The question is, is it a waste of Board time?
12	Have we
13	MR. HINNEFELD: We've got a short
14	meeting in Tampa.
15	CHAIR MUNN: Well, okay.
16	MR. HINNEFELD: Hey, we've all got
17	to get that down, the meeting ends on Friday.
18	We've got to end on time, and catch our
19	planes.
20	MEMBER ZIEMER: They can only use
21	what records are provided to them.
22	MR. HINNEFELD: They can only use

1	the what is generated and what is
2	available.
3	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right, or even if
4	they want to distinguish, they can't always do
5	that.
6	CHAIR MUNN: No, and the only thing
7	we can do is just tell them that we talked
8	about it, and really, that is all we can do.
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
10	CHAIR MUNN: We talked about it,
11	because they have their marching orders. They
12	know what process they have to follow, and we
13	know what internally we're going to do here.
14	MEMBER ZIEMER: But even though
15	progress is made in diagnosis, all of these
16	old cases are unaffected by that.
17	DR. MAURO: Right.
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: I mean, even if
19	they're aware that changes in process that
20	have occurred in diagnosis over the last
21	decade, that is fine, for people who will die
22	in the future.

1	I'm not sure what we gather by
2	this, in going in mentioning it to Labor,
3	but I don't
4	CHAIR MUNN: I'm perfectly happy to
5	add this current discussion comment, after
6	that, and saying at this time, in view of
7	MR. KATZ: I don't think you have
8	to
9	CHAIR MUNN: what has occurred
10	since this discussion, at this meeting, it was
11	determined that would serve no purpose to
12	discuss this with Labor.
13	DR. MAURO: Can I ask a question,
14	though? I put myself in Jeff's position, who
15	has an obligation to be responsive to the
16	claimants on matters.
17	Now, and to put it simply, if it
18	turns out that judgments made regarding the
19	diagnosis of a particular cancer, at the time
20	that the person was diagnosed could very well
21	have been faulty, okay, for whatever reason.
22	Now, we find ourselves in a

1	situation, there is person that was diagnosed
2	back in such-and-such a date, but as a result,
3	this is how the dose reconstruction proceeded.
4	In retrospect, we look at it,
5	"Well, gee, there is a really good possibility
6	that that diagnosis might have had some flaws
7	to it," which at the time, weren't important,
8	but are important to this program.
9	The way I look at it is, if I were
10	Jeff, I would want to know about that, and
11	then decide for myself, or Labor decide for
12	themselves, what they want to do about it,
13	rather than us make the judgment that we don't
14	think it's going to be important to them.
15	CHAIR MUNN: No, that is not the
16	judgment that I intended to convey.
17	What I intended to convey is, we do
18	know that Labor has been as involved with the
19	with the ICRP issues, and with what has
20	transpired with the events. Labor is fully
21	aware of all of that.
22	I do not see that our saying, "We

1	talked about it and we paid attention to what
2	was going on. Have you been paying attention
3	to what goes on," that that really would be
4	all we can say, and when we already know,
5	they paid attention to what is going on.
6	They're aware of what has
7	transpired with this lymphoma issue, because
8	at that time, we didn't have the final
9	acceptance of non-Hodgkin's as being on our
10	list.
11	MR. HINNEFELD: I just think, John,
12	that regardless, I don't think you know,
13	maybe I'm being naive, I don't think any part
14	of the Administration is going to decide that
15	some you know, you're really kind of
16	altering the structure of the law.
17	The law itself divides Hodgkin's
18	and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. Everybody knows
19	what the status of the records is, or you
20	would assume that Congress would know at the
21	time that they passed that law, which Congress
22	does, and I don't think an Administrative

1	Department is going to, you know, essentially
2	act as if Congress did not know the
3	ramifications of their decision, and do such-
4	and-such.
5	Because we've done other things,
6	based on the exact wording of the language,
7	that maybe are not they're far less
8	intuitively correct than this one.
9	So, based on the exact knowledge of
LO	the of the exact wording of the statute,
L1	so, I just really don't see it. If you would
L2	like, we can go out we'll drop Jeff Kotsch
L3	a note and say, "Hey, you know, shop this
L4	around your site." But you know, make sure
L5	you guys have thought about it. It would make
L6	our Advisory Board feel better.
L7	MR. KATZ: I think send Jeff a
L8	note, give him the pages of the transcript and
L9	say, "You may want to read this discussion
20	about non-Hodgkin's, Hodgkin's. This may be

enlightening to you," or it may not. He may

already know it.

21

1	MR. HINNEFELD: He may know all of
2	this, and you're asking yes.
3	MR. KATZ: Right, but I understand
4	what you're saying, Stu.
5	MR. HINNEFELD: Okay, right.
6	MR. KATZ: Because you can't just
7	sort of do something claimant-favorable or
8	whatever that ignores the statute.
9	MR. HINNEFELD: I mean, yes.
LO	MR. KATZ: When the statue comes
11	down in black and white
L2	MR. HINNEFELD: We want them to do
L3	the things
L4	MR. KATZ: We can't do that.
L5	MR. HINNEFELD: We would want them
L6	to do things claimant-favorable, that ignore
L7	the statute, and we were told, "Well, you
L8	better not."
L9	MR. KATZ: Yes.
20	MR. HINNEFELD: Because once you
21	start ignoring the statute, where do you stop?
22	MR. KATZ: No, you're breaking the

Τ	law.
2	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Well, we have, indeed,
4	discussed this in open Board meeting, and I'm
5	sure Labor has our transcripts from our open
6	Board, and are present at our open Board.
7	So, in any case, it does not appear
8	to me, to be a Work a Subcommittee issue, I
9	agree.
10	DR. MAURO: Right, for us.
11	MR. MARSCHKE: So, my action item,
12	one, will be to add a note to this area here,
13	that states that we at this meeting, we
14	decided not to move take any further action
15	on this item?
16	CHAIR MUNN: That it was not a
17	Subcommittee
18	MR. MARSCHKE: That it's not
19	necessary?
20	CHAIR MUNN: Not a Subcommittee
21	responsibility.
22	MR. MARSCHKE: Not a

1	responsibility,	okay.

- 2 MR. KATZ: And you can make a note
- that we'll send -- we're going to send a note
- 4 -- the Agency will send a note to DOL, just
- 5 referring them to the transcript, so, they are
- 6 aware of what the Subcommittee has discussed
- 7 on this topic.
- 8 MR. MARSCHKE: Okay, I'll do that.
- 9 MR. KATZ: Sure.
- 10 MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, okay, I'll do
- 11 that. The second one -- issue on PER-9, was
- to do with smoking, and again, that one, I
- 13 think, was -- we decided it was -- is an
- 14 overarching scientific issue that is beyond
- 15 what ICRP is capable of dealing with today,
- and that the -- basically, since it's beyond
- 17 the state-of-the-art, there is nothing we can
- 18 do. So, this issue also was closed.
- 19 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I believe that is
- 20 so, and we --
- 21 DR. MAURO: That had to do with the
- 22 thoracic lymphoma issue, that's on how the

1	smokina	miaht	complicate	the	problem.	then

- and who knows what it has to deal with, yes,
- 3 yes.
- 4 MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, the issue was
- 5 up here, had to do with the lymph nodes and
- 6 the upper respiratory tract.
- 7 DR. MAURO: Yes.
- 8 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I think that does
- 9 take care of that.
- 10 MR. MARSCHKE: PER-12, I think this
- 11 was basically one where we agreed, concluded
- 12 that the selection and screening criteria
- discussed in PER-12 are scientifically sound.
- 14 So, really, there was no issue
- 15 here, and so, the only thing that remains is
- 16 to select the claimants for --
- DR. MAURO: Cases.
- 18 MR. MARSCHKE: -- cases, for dose
- 19 reconstruction. So, that one was, again,
- 20 closed.
- 21 PER-18, there were five issues, and
- they all were transferred, and I'll just open

_	one of them, because they ie all the they
2	all have the same.
3	They were discussed again in March,
4	and it was decided that these should be
5	transferred to the Los Alamos Working Group,
6	and so, they've all been given the status of
7	being transferred.
8	Now, whether or not that has
9	actually occurred, I have no I don't know,
LO	but that is a that is what we agreed on
L1	CHAIR MUNN: That has not formally
L2	occurred. The Los Alamos Work Group Chair,
L3	Mark, knows about it, but it's only been
L4	conversational. I do not have a hard copy or
L5	PDF to hand to him.
L6	But he I have advised him,
L7	personally. I will take this as an action
L8	item, to get that
L9	MR. KATZ: Yes, it would be good to
20	do it in some hard copy, but
21	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I will
22	MR. KATZ: when you take email -

1	-
2	CHAIR MUNN: I always do that and -
3	-
4	MR. KATZ: LANL Work Group has work
5	to do, had a not this Board meeting, but
6	the next Board meeting, which will be
7	MR. MARSCHKE: Part of the May
8	MR. KATZ: The May one, right, so,
9	this should be on their agenda.
10	CHAIR MUNN: Okay, I will have that
11	action item, too.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: The last one we
13	talked about was PER-20. PER-20 had three
14	findings against it.
15	The first two had the same
16	resolution. One has the first one has to
17	do with stability class for uranium, what was
18	assumed in the calculations.
19	It was decided at the March 22^{nd}
20	Subcommittee meeting, that the Blockson Work
21	Group should be reconstituted, and to address
22	these two issues, the first two issues.

1	The third issue had to do with
2	radon, which the consensus was that the
3	that was no longer an issue. That had been
4	resolved.
5	DR. ULSH: Were you saying that the
6	Blockson Work Group could be reconstituted to
7	deal with two issues, but one of those issues
8	has now been
9	MR. MARSCHKE: No, it's the
10	MR. HINNEFELD: He said the third -
11	_
12	MR. MARSCHKE: The third issue had
13	been
14	DR. MAURO: So, the first two
15	issues had to do with like Site Profile
16	related?
17	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes.
18	DR. MAURO: How are you going to do
19	the dose calculations?
20	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes.
21	DR. MAURO: For the non-presumptive
2.2	cancers?

1	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
2	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes.
3	DR. MAURO: Okay.
4	CHAIR MUNN: And your Chair has
5	been very reluctant to reconstitute that
6	group, but we'll see that it is done in the
7	foreseeable future.
8	MEMBER ZIEMER: You mean Dr.
9	Melius? Which Chair?
LO	DR. MAURO: Blockson.
L1	CHAIR MUNN: Blockson.
L2	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, but
L3	CHAIR MUNN: I have not talked to -
L 4	_
L5	MR. KATZ: The Work Group Chair.
L6	CHAIR MUNN: The Work Group Chair
L7	is sitting here, and has not done anything
L8	about having Dr. Melius reconstitute it.
L9	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay, I'm what I
20	was asking, the action to reconstitute must be
21	Dr. Melius?
22	CHAIR MINN: Ves it is

1	DR. MAURO: This could be
2	important, because the
3	CHAIR MUNN: Right.
4	DR. MAURO: It had to do with the
5	way the uranium internal dose is calculated,
6	and the assumptions made, which is something
7	that we all agree can be done, and it's part
8	of the partial dose reconstruction, and we had
9	some questions, which I believe you folks feel
10	pretty strongly about, related to this matter,
11	that are open.
12	They're open here, and they do have
13	a play on reconstructing doses to workers,
14	where you are going to do a partial dose
15	reconstruction.
16	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, this is only
17	going to matter for somebody who has lung
18	cancer, who wasn't who was there for less
19	than a year.
20	DR. MAURO: Less than a year?
21	MR. HINNEFELD: If they're there
22	for a year, they're in the SEC.

1	CHAIR MUNN: They're in the SEC.
2	DR. MAURO: Well, it's Type M. The
3	issue was Type M, versus
4	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, I know, but
5	and so, all of the lung cancers are paid,
6	through the SEC
7	DR. MAURO: Right, right.
8	MR. HINNEFELD: by
9	DR. MAURO: That's it.
10	MR. HINNEFELD: So, that's it.
11	DR. MAURO: That's a done deal, and
12	the other cancers that might be non-
13	presumptive, are they affected in any way, by
14	
15	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, no, because
16	the assumption is now the finding number
17	two is saying that one of .02 might not be
18	appropriate.
19	Well, that will be more favorable
20	for any of the non
21	DR. MAURO: I got you.
22	MR. HINNEFELD: because they're

_		
1	all	systemic.
_	$\alpha \perp \perp$	Dybccillite.

- DR. MAURO: So, this becomes --
- 3 MR. HINNEFELD: And so, that will
- 4 be actually -- .02 is more favorable than the
- 5 alternative.
- DR. MAURO: Right, I understand.
- 7 MR. HINNEFELD: Or for non-
- 8 systemic, so, this will only matter for lung
- 9 cancers that were there for less than a year.
- DR. MAURO: I agree.
- MR. HINNEFELD: And we can probably
- 12 find out in a day --
- DR. MAURO: I agree with you.
- 14 MR. HINNEFELD: -- if there are
- 15 any.
- 16 CHAIR MUNN: And maybe whether
- 17 there is a such a claim.
- DR. MAURO: Yes.
- 19 MR. HINNEFELD: You know, I think
- this affects nobody.
- DR. MAURO: I agree, I see what
- 22 you're saying, that's right.

1	CHAIR MUNN: The actual, yes.
2	DR. MAURO: Well, how do we put
3	that to bed, then? Is there a mechanism that
4	we could do?
5	MR. HINNEFELD: We can find out of
6	there are any lung cancers that have less than
7	
8	DR. MAURO: And if there are not
9	MR. HINNEFELD: less than a year
LO	
L1	DR. MAURO: then we end it.
L2	MR. HINNEFELD: Any lung cancers
L3	that didn't get paid through the SEC will
L 4	MR. KATZ: Okay, well, why don't we
L5	find that out, before we bother Dr. Melius
L6	with
L7	DR. MAURO: Yes, absolutely.
L8	MR. HINNEFELD: We can find it out,
L9	this week.
20	DR. MAURO: Yes.
21	MR. HINNEFELD: I mean, that is
22	simple.

1	MR. KATZ: So, if you'll let me
2	know, you'll let me know, I will communicate
3	with Dr. Melius, if we need to, but not if
4	not if this is a moot issue.
5	DR. MAURO: Right.
6	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, question on
7	that, though, suppose there are none, but next
8	year, there is a claim that comes in? Do you
9	have to reconstitute a Subcommittee at that
LO	point, to deal with this, or
L1	CHAIR MUNN: It was only a Work
L2	Group.
L3	MEMBER ZIEMER: I mean, a Work
L4	Group? Do you know it seems like there
L5	ought to be a simpler way to handle this.
L6	MR. HINNEFELD: Paul, this is a
L7	dose model claim. We could probably even
L8	determine of it's going to matter for somebody
L9	who is there for less than a year.
20	You know, we could do, well, what
21	if they were exposed to dose model Class Y or
22	

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Check the other
2	side of your
3	MR. HINNEFELD: at one year,
4	right.
5	MEMBER ZIEMER: If it makes no
6	difference
7	MR. HINNEFELD: And if they're not
8	going to be compensated for one year at Class
9	Y, then I guess, it makes no difference to
LO	anybody.
L1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
L2	MR. MARSCHKE: Do you want to
L3	change the status of this these two, from
L 4	transferred to in progress, while NIOSH goes
L5	and evaluates
L6	MEMBER ZIEMER: Or in a
L7	DR. MAURO: Yes.
L8	CHAIR MUNN: That would be
L9	MR. MARSCHKE: evaluates whether
20	or not there, you know what the effects
21	would be?
22	CHAIR MINN: Yes please

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Or are they in
2	abeyance?
3	CHAIR MUNN: That would be a very
4	intelligent thing to do. The jovial
5	suggestion to reconstitute the Blockson Work
6	Group was made very late in one of our
7	meetings, as I recall, and
8	MR. HINNEFELD: After our self-
9	control
LO	DR. MAURO: Yes, our self-control,
L1	right.
L2	CHAIR MUNN: After your self-
L3	control.
L4	MEMBER ZIEMER: If all else fails,
L5	send it to a Work Group.
L6	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, so, it appears to
L7	be in order for us to pursue this more
L8	circumspectly, before we proceed and attempt
L9	to reconstitute the Work Group.
20	MR. KATZ: Less joviality.
21	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
22	MR. KATZ: Right, okay.

1	CHAIR MUNN: Thank you.
2	DR. MAURO: This is a new category
3 iss	ue that it's interesting.
4	We disagree on some of the science,
5 as	it applies to this particular site, but it
6 doe	sn't matter there is good reason to
7 bel	ieve that it's irrelevant, and for that
8 rea	son alone
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: We don't spend a
10 lot	of time on it.
11	DR. MAURO: We don't need to spend
12 a l	ot of time on it, and the Work Group, or
13 the	Subcommittee, has the authority to close
14 it,	because it's gotten the information it
15 nee	ds to say it's irrelevant, and the only
16 you	know, waiting for us, for NIOSH to come
17 bac	k and say, "It's irrelevant."
18	CHAIR MUNN: We have checked, and
19 it	is indeed, irrelevant, yes, just that
20 ver	ification would seem to be the only true
21 cir	cumstance that we need to verify.
22	That being said that is all the

1	PERs you mentioned, Steve, correct?
2	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes. Is this the
3	wording agreeable, Stu, or
4	CHAIR MUNN: We must get back to
5	this issue on the reconstructions, and report
6	back to the Subcommittee. Why don't you say,
7	report back to the Subcommittee, whether there
8	is any relevance?
9	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, I can't spell
10	relevance.
11	CHAIR MUNN: R-E-L-E-V-A-N-C-E.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: Thank you.
13	CHAIR MUNN: Okay, or you can do
14	revelance, if you would like.
15	MR. KATZ: I think that one is a
16	mistake that's easy to make.
17	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, it is.
18	MR. KATZ: When you're typing fast.
19	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
20	MR. KATZ: Does anyone want a
21	break? You're been at this for an hour and a

half.

2	got Liz Brackett on, right now.
3	MR. KATZ: Oh, okay.
4	DR. ULSH: Until 11 o'clock, only.
5	MS. BRACKETT: Actually, no, for
6	only 10 more minutes. My appointment is at 11
7	o'clock. I have to leave in 10 minutes.
8	MR. KATZ: Okay.
9	CHAIR MUNN: Then we better get to
10	OTIB-2, very quickly.
11	Liz, it sounds to me as though you
12	may have the bucket to carry.
13	DR. ULSH: Well, actually, the deal
14	on these items, were that NIOSH and ORAU were
15	going to check to see that all of the findings
16	that were for OTIB-2, had been addressed in
17	replacement procedures.
18	Liz did that and we found that they
19	had been, and I believe that SC&A agreed with
20	that assessment. So, this could be pretty
21	quick.
22	CHAIR MUNN: And I want to thank

DR. ULSH: Well, the OTIB-2, we've

1	all of you who were involved in getting all of
2	the information about OTIB-2 out in such a
3	timely manner, so that we had an opportunity
4	to look at it, before we came here today,
5	including Dr. Lipsztein's notes. That was
6	most helpful. Thank you.
7	So, do so, how do you want to
8	proceed then, Brant?
9	DR. ULSH: Do you want us to walk
10	through them, or
11	CHAIR MUNN: It might be a good
12	idea to go through them very briefly, without
13	since we already have the information in
14	our hands.
15	DR. ULSH: Okay.
16	CHAIR MUNN: I assume that everyone
17	here has taken a look at these documents that
18	were provided for you last week.
19	MEMBER ZIEMER: Are these the ones
20	from Joyce?
21	DR. MAURO: Yes.
22	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, from Joyce.

2	want to walk through those findings?
3	MS. BRACKETT: Okay.
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: What are the dates
5	on the Joyce? I had them, but I want to put
6	them up.
7	MS. BRACKETT: I have them in two
8	separate documents. I don't know how you
9	wanted I've got an open items list and an
10	in abeyance list. Can I just go through the
11	lists that way?
12	DR. ULSH: Sure.
13	MS. BRACKETT: A lot of them were
14	more related to writing style or things that
15	were included in OTIB-2.
16	So, I don't have specific
17	responses. I just noted that that wouldn't
18	necessarily carry over to another document,
19	and that other documents would need to be
20	looked at separately.
21	For example, on the open items
22	list, the first one is 12, and that was

DR. ULSH: All right, Liz, do you

1	writing style. It also mentions surrogate
2	nuclides. Those aren't used anymore.
3	OTIB-2 was a very early document
4	and not everything we needed was in IMBA, and
5	so, we used surrogates, but since that time,
6	IMBA has been updated and we no longer use
7	surrogates for anything.
8	Finding 13, again, it was more of
9	the writing style, and so, the procedure was
10	not complete, in terms of required data. So,
11	that should be that goes away with the
12	revocation of that OTIB.
13	Fifteen, it says let's see,
14	SC&A's review has identified that the
15	procedure is not sufficiently prescriptive to
16	minimize the need for subjective decisions to
17	apply it to OTIB-18, which is more or less,
18	the replacement for this, has a section
19	devoted specifically to applicability. It
20	tells you who it applies to, and under what
21	circumstances and what dates.

Finding 16, it again, mentions

1	subjective decisions, and so, again, the
2	response is OTIB-18 has more information for
3	the dose reconstructor, to determine if it's
4	applicable to a particular person.
5	Finding 17, it mentions
6	CHAIR MUNN: Missing data.
7	MS. BRACKETT: missing data on
8	new parameters.
9	CHAIR MUNN: Where the claimant
10	must be monitored.
11	MS. BRACKETT: Well, in this one,
12	the assumptions that were made in OTIB-2 are
13	not used anywhere else. OTIB-18 has a
14	completely different set of assumptions.
15	So, and OTIB-18 has been reviewed
16	independently of this. So, I think anything
17	there would have been addressed separately. I
18	don't think that we had the same issues with
19	OTIB-18.
20	Finding 18
21	CHAIR MUNN: The last one.
22	MS. BRACKETT: it talks about

1	fractional retentions being incorrect. These
2	same tables that were used for look-up were
3	not used for OTIB-18. So, this wouldn't carry
4	over to OTIB-18.
5	That was everything on the open
6	items list, and if you want to talk about
7	those, or we can go through all of the
8	abeyance, in abeyance.
9	CHAIR MUNN: It might be a good
10	idea for us to take a look at how many in
11	abeyance findings we have. There's one, two,
12	three, four, five, six, seven, eight, we have
13	a slug of them, don't we?
14	MS. BRACKETT: Well, we can go over
15	those, I just didn't know if you wanted to
16	discuss the responses to the open items,
17	first, before doing these, or if you want me
18	to do something else.
19	CHAIR MUNN: I would like,
20	personally, to see the open items. Paul?
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
22	CHAIR MUNN: I think the open items

-				
			_	_

- 2 MEMBER ZIEMER: Those are the
- 3 critical ones.
- 4 CHAIR MUNN: -- are -- it's much
- 5 better for us to take a look at things we
- 6 haven't looked at before.
- 7 So, yes, please, I would prefer
- 8 open items, which starts with --
- 9 MS. BRACKETT: Well, that is what I
- 10 just -- I just went through all of the open
- 11 items.
- 12 CHAIR MUNN: Twelve and 13, yes,
- 13 you did.
- MS. BRACKETT: Right, that was
- 15 everything under open items.
- 16 CHAIR MUNN: I got them, yes. I
- 17 see that now, and so, the abeyance ones are
- not that numerous, but yes, let's do abeyance,
- 19 then.
- MS. BRACKETT: Okay.
- 21 CHAIR MUNN: Sorry, total
- 22 confusion.

1	MS. BRACKETT: Oh, no, that's fine,
2	I just didn't know if you wanted to discuss
3	the open items first, since I've closed
4	since I went through those.
5	CHAIR MUNN: Well, if anyone has
6	any question or comment, with respect to what
7	we just heard
8	MEMBER ZIEMER: So, everything in
9	OTIB-2, now is handled, in a sense, by OTIB
10	CHAIR MUNN: Eighteen.
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: 18, correct?
12	MS. BRACKETT: Well, in the sense
13	that they're both efficiency methods for
14	getting claimants on quickly.
15	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right, right.
16	MS. BRACKETT: OTIB-18 would be
17	used now
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right, and the
19	issues on writing styles are immaterial.
20	You'd have to say, okay, what is the writing
21	style of 18, as the second question.
22	MS. BRACKETT: Right.

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: And then there are
2	sections that deal with issues that were
3	raised.
4	So, I guess in a sense, you close
5	all of this out, and focus on the 18, right?
6	DR. MAURO: Yes, SC&A's
7	recommendations to close all of those.
8	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
9	DR. MAURO: And they're being dealt
LO	with appropriately in 18
L1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Through 18.
L2	DR. MAURO: if they have not
L3	already been appropriately dealt with.
L4	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
L5	DR. MAURO: Because 18 is active.
L6	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right, it seems to
L7	me, that makes sense, to do that, just close
L8	them all out.
L9	CHAIR MUNN: I certainly would
20	DR. MAURO: For the reasons
21	CHAIR MUNN: For the reasons
22	DR. MAURO: that was just

1	explained.
2	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, yes. We have the
3	NIOSH responses and the Subcommittee is
4	willing to accept them, I believe, no
5	objection from SC&A or anyone else.
6	MR. MARSCHKE: So we're talking
7	about the open closing the open items
8	MR. KATZ: Yes.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: or all those ones
10	
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: All those ones that
12	Liz went through
13	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
14	MEMBER ZIEMER: we would close
15	them.
16	MR. MARSCHKE: Okay.
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: And I suppose we
18	can put a note in that
19	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, let's just work
20	all this out and then

MUNN:

CHAIR

responses.

21

22

her

include

And

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Or the responses
2	MR. MARSCHKE: The responses have
3	been included in the responses are in the
4	database. Liz's responses are in the
5	database. SC&A's response is not in the
6	database, but we just have one generic
7	response, saying we agree with everything.
8	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: But I don't know if
10	we need to add that, or we just add the
11	MR. KATZ: I think you put that
12	note in that the Subcommittee concurs, and
13	they're closed.
14	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
15	CHAIR MUNN: Subcommittee concurs,
16	closed.
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: On all of those,
18	yes.
19	DD MAIDO: And in the bound it
	DR. MAURO: And we just heard it,
20	too, it's on the record.
20 21	

1	DR.	MAURO:	The	record	is	complete.
---	-----	--------	-----	--------	----	-----------

- 2 MR. KATZ: Yes, I mean, just
- 3 filling in the --
- DR. MAURO: Oh, yes, right.
- 5 MS. BRACKETT: Okay, so, should I
- 6 go on to the in abeyance items, then?
- 7 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, please.
- 8 MS. BRACKETT: Okay, finding number
- 9 one, this one, again, it addresses writing
- 10 style. So, again, you'd have to look at the
- 11 new documents, to make sure that the writing
- 12 style is okay.
- 13 Finding two, this one says the
- 14 document uses critical information and
- 15 historical data without providing references.
- So, this is also specific to OTIB-
- 17 2. I don't know if it carried over to OTIB-
- 18 18, because it wasn't specific, as to what
- 19 critical information and historical data were
- 20 missing.
- DR. MAURO: Liz, this is John
- 22 Mauro. Can you hear me okay?

	MD. BRACKEII. 165.
2	DR. MAURO: Yes, the question I
3	have is, when this particular item was put in
4	abeyance, I presume it was put in abeyance
5	because we all agree that yes, maybe better
6	references or citations would be needed to
7	help clarify.
8	So, we agreed, that that would
9	help, and usually, it's left in abeyance until
10	of course, the document is revised to include
11	the material, which is the way in which we put
12	things in abeyance.
13	But now, we have a different
14	circumstance, namely, now, we really are
15	deleting OTIB-2, and you are replacing it with
16	OTIB-18.
17	So, I guess the question is, and
18	it's not unlike the other ones we just talked
19	about, does it become irrelevant now, because
20	you may not even use that material, and if you
21	do, you make appropriate reference to it. I
22	guess that's the way in a way, we're I

1	quess	we're	trying	to	say,	what	do	we	do	with

- 2 the -- in abeyance?
- 3 Do we close those, also?
- 4 MEMBER ZIEMER: It seems to me,
- 5 these first two are the similar to the other
- ones that you referred to OTIB-18, and close
- 7 these out.
- DR. MAURO: That is where I was
- 9 headed.
- 10 MS. BRACKETT: Okay, finding four,
- 11 again, is writing style. So, this would be
- 12 closed and you'd go to OTIB-18.
- 13 Finding five, it discusses the use
- of assumptions that were used in OTIB-2, that
- 15 are not carried over to OTIB-18. It's
- 16 percentages of maximum permissible body
- 17 burden, and this doesn't enter it all into
- 18 OTIB-18. So, that goes away.
- 19 Finding six, I believe if you read
- 20 the details, it is actually identical to
- 21 finding five. So, again, maximum permissible
- 22 body burden is not used.

1	Finding seven is it discusses
2	solubility types. OTIB-2 gave guidance, as to
3	what solubility type to use. OTIB-18 does not
4	do this. It's based on whatever is the most
5	claimant-favorable solubility type for the
6	specific person, for the cancer that is being
7	looked at.
8	So, this doesn't carry over to
9	OTIB-18.
LO	Finding eight, fractional retention
L1	values
L2	DR. ULSH: Hold on, Liz.
L3	MR. MARSCHKE: I'm assuming that
L4	no, the Subcommittee is not saying anything to
L5	in response to Liz. I'm assuming that we're
L6	agreeing and what Liz is talking, that we can
L7	close these out?
L8	CHAIR MUNN: I think we would stop
L9	you, if we didn't feel
20	DR. MAURO: Yes.
21	CHAIR MUNN: that it was
22	correct.

1	MR. MARSCHKE: Okay.
2	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
3	MR. MARSCHKE: I just wanted to
4	make sure of that.
5	DR. MAURO: Yes, and SC&A would
6	also do the same, that is, we're our
7	silence means acknowledgment.
8	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: Okay, that is what I
10	wanted to make sure, the silence meant
11	concurrence and that they are closed.
12	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
13	MS. BRACKETT: Okay.
14	CHAIR MUNN: Of course, in some
15	cases, I guess we're not recording what
16	NIOSH's response actually is, in these, since
17	there were
18	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, they are the -
19	-
20	CHAIR MUNN: You're getting it?
21	Okay, good, you were typing faster than I
2.2	anticipated.

1		MR. MAF	RSCHKE: We	ell, the	ere is no	t -
2	- what Li	z is s	saying has	alrea	dy been	
3	basically,	has alr	eady added	that.		
4		If you	look at th	ie		
5		CHAIR	MUNN:	Not i	n the	in
6	abeyance.					
7		MEMBER	ZIEMER:	She sa	id that	in
8	four.					
9		MS. BRA	ACKETT: Ye	es.		
10		CHAIR I	MUNN: Wel	l, I k	new that	it
11	has been in	the				
12		MR. MA	ARSCHKE:	Even	in the	in
13	abeyance or	nes, she	e has had	it s	he is ri	ght
14	on the ball	•				
15		CHAIR I	MUNN: I	see, o	cay. Go	sh,
16	you're					
17		MS. BRA	ACKETT: Y	es, I w	ent thro	ugh

19 CHAIR MUNN: Thank you so much.

everything and put responses to all of these.

- So, yes, then all we have to do is say the
- 21 Subcommittee agrees, closed.
- MS. BRACKETT: Okay, so, there is

NEAL R. GROSS

1	just two more. Finding eight, this is
2	actually identical to finding 18, which was in
3	the open items. So, this it has the same
4	response. It has to do with values being
5	taken from a table, and those are no longer
6	used.
7	Then finding nine, let's see, oh,
8	it mentions that it's arbitrary to use three
9	to four days post-intake to calculate
10	fractional retention.
11	OTIB-2 assumed an acute intake.
12	OTIB-18 assumes a chronic exposure, which is
13	one of the reasons why we wanted to eliminate
14	OTIB-2. That was, again, very early. It was
15	an assumption that we made early on, and have
16	changed our basic approach to assessment since
17	then, and we assume a chronic exposure.
18	So, that finding is no longer
19	applicable to what's being done.
20	So, and I have to go, because I'm
21	going to be late for my appointment. I'll be
22	back, after lunch, if anything else comes up.

1	CHAIR MUNN: That is great. Thank
2	you, Liz.
3	MS. BRACKETT: Okay, thanks.
4	CHAIR MUNN: We really appreciate
5	you getting this into the database for us,
6	too.
7	MS. BRACKETT: Okay, thank you.
8	CHAIR MUNN: Bye-bye.
9	MS. BRACKETT: Bye.
10	CHAIR MUNN: Okay, she said that
11	was all, but I still show 12. Did she cover
12	12? So, 12 is in abeyance?
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: Twelve, I show as
14	open.
15	CHAIR MUNN: Mine says in abeyance.
16	MR. MARSCHKE: I might have changed
17	it.
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: This is OTIB-2-12?
19	CHAIR MUNN: OTIB-2-12, but it's
20	another one of those writing styles, which
21	would seem to go away automatically.
22	MEMBER ZIEMER: How could we both

1	have different things?
2	CHAIR MUNN: I don't know.
3	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, 12 is on the
4	open list, that Liz
5	CHAIR MUNN: That she covered?
6	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, yes.
7	MR. HINNEFELD: That Liz submitted.
8	CHAIR MUNN: That she submitted.
9	DR. MAURO: And we went over those.
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: But hers is showing
11	in the database as in abeyance. That is what
12	puzzles me.
13	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
14	MR. MARSCHKE: Might be operator
15	error on my part.
16	CHAIR MUNN: That's all right,
17	we've already hit it. So, it's now
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, yours shows
19	in abeyance, too. Did you just change it?
20	MR. MARSCHKE: I just changed it.
21	So, you might have to refresh, and I changed
22	it to the wrong thing. So, yes

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay.
2	MR. HINNEFELD: Because I haven't
3	refreshed, and mine still says
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: I haven't, and mine
5	still says open.
6	CHAIR MUNN: Now, as a quick
7	double-check, when Steve gets through there,
8	it let's go back to our let's go back to
9	the original Board report, and see if it shows
LO	all those good things, closed, for OTIB-2.
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: Mine shows six
L2	items open, Wanda, on your list.
L3	CHAIR MUNN: I show six on my list
L4	right now?
L5	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
L6	DR. MAURO: Really fast, now.
L7	CHAIR MUNN: It is.
L8	DR. MAURO: I mean, it's moving in
L9	slow motion, now, it's really moving. That is
20	great.
21	CHAIR MUNN: It really is. Well,
22	it was very helpful to have Liz already

- 1 have posted those things on the database,
- 2 itself. That is extremely helpful.
- MR. MARSCHKE: Okay, one is closed.
- 4 Two is closed. Three is closed. Four, five,
- 5 six, seven, eight, nine, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14,
- 6 15, 16, 17, 18. Okay, now, you want to go
- 7 back to the --
- 8 CHAIR MUNN: Right.
- 9 MR. MARSCHKE: -- original data
- 10 screen and see, documents under Board review.
- 11 OTIB-10.
- DR. MAURO: Two.
- 13 MR. MARSCHKE: OTIB-2, I should
- 14 say.
- 15 CHAIR MUNN: Right.
- 16 MR. MARSCHKE: The one on the
- 17 bottom, there, it's showing basically, again,
- 18 I don't know if the count is strange. I don't
- 19 know what it is counting.
- MR. KATZ: That's okay, we're going
- 21 to fix that.
- 22 MEMBER ZIEMER: Active findings.

Т	CHAIR MUNN: Mine is refreshing,
2	now.
3	DR. MAURO: But they're all closed,
4	now?
5	MR. MARSCHKE: The status all
6	showed closed for each of the findings.
7	DR. MAURO: And they're showing six
8	that are active.
9	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
LO	DR. ULSH: And that number should
L1	be changing.
L2	CHAIR MUNN: Okay, that's
L3	interesting, because I still my refresh
L4	says I have to resend the information,
L5	which you previously submitted.
L6	We'll just ignore that, and we'll
L7	know that it doesn't come up, immediately, and
L8	we all need a break. Back at 11 o'clock, is
L9	that okay? Very good, whoever is on the line,
20	we'll be back at 11.
21	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
22	matter went off the record at 10:48 a.m. and

1	resumed at 11:02 a.m.)
2	MR. KATZ: Folks on the line, we're
3	just rejoining you. Procedures Subcommittee,
4	Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health.
5	Wanda?
6	CHAIR MUNN: We've just come back
7	from a short break, and then next item on our
8	agenda that we have listed is TIB-10 review.
9	We had an action item to have a
10	report from NIOSH, regarding their review of
11	Bob Anigstein's report, that he gave us last
12	time, I believe.
13	Is NIOSH ready to comment on that,
14	now?
15	DR. ULSH: Well, not quite yet.
16	The status on that one is corresponded with
17	the author of TIB-10, Greg Macievic. He has
18	given me back some draft responses, but I'm
19	not ready to send those out, just yet.
20	CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
21	DR. ULSH: Should have it by next

22

meeting, though.

1 CHAIR MUNN: Okay, so, we're going
2 to carry that over?
3 DR. ULSH: Yes.
4 CHAIR MUNN: Are we?
5 DR. ULSH: Yes.
6 CHAIR MUNN: Well, if I could
7 remember what I did with my pen, I'll make a
8 note of that.
DR. MAURO: Have this one.
CHAIR MUNN: I covered it up. The
11 other carry-over items that we had from
12 earlier was TIB-21-04, a response on the
13 partial and year issue. SC&A wanted ar
opportunity to take a look at that, and do we
15 have a report?
MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, we do. I have
17 to find it. Give me a second.
CHAIR MUNN: All right, that's
19 fine.
MR. MARSCHKE: I believe it's in
21 actually, I think I sent an email, alerting
the a while back, alerting the Subcommittee

2	believe it's four.
3	Basically, I asked Ron Buchanan to
4	look this over, and we got received from
5	Elyse, back this was back in it says it
6	was back in July 2010, some information, and
7	in the March 22^{nd} this would be NIOSH
8	will provide a response.
9	I believe NIOSH did provide that
LO	response. I forwarded it to Ron Buchanan, and
11	Ron looked it over, and you can see, Ron's
L2	review reply here, that is in the database.
L3	We're missing actually, we're
L4	missing the NIOSH response. Let me see if I
L5	can find that.
L6	CHAIR MUNN: That should be
L7	attached to the file, shouldn't it, to the
L8	March comments?
L9	MS. THOMAS: Yes, hi, this is
20	Elyse. I agree with Steve on the sequence of
21	events that occurred.
22	It's just that until the linking is

that we had -- NIOSH had responded and I

1	completed, I can't attach that full response
2	that was sent out electronically.
3	So, it's on my list, and as soon as
4	you know, the linking works, then the full
5	NIOSH response, that SC&A reviewed, can be
6	included in the database.
7	CHAIR MUNN: That was one of the
8	original five we had listed, wasn't it, Elyse?
9	MS. THOMAS: Yes, I think it I
LO	think the response includes some tables, and
L1	if you without attaching them, they run all
L2	together and it's very difficult to make any
L3	sense out of.
L 4	CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
L5	MS. THOMAS: So, we might as well
L6	wait for the linking.
L7	CHAIR MUNN: That's fine, but we
L8	MR. HINNEFELD: That was sent out
L9	on July 11 th , so, we're
20	CHAIR MUNN: July 11 th , so, we
21	should actually have it, right?

MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, it said that

1	there	was	an	attachment,	but	it	wasn't
---	-------	-----	----	-------------	-----	----	--------

- 2 attached. Well, maybe this is a copy that
- doesn't have the attachment.
- Yes, okay, I'm looking at a -- I am
- 5 looking at Steve's --
- 6 MR. HINNEFELD: Response.
- 7 MEMBER ZIEMER: -- response, yes.
- 8 MR. MARSCHKE: This is what Elyse
- 9 was talking about.
- 10 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
- MR. MARSCHKE: This is Brant's.
- 12 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, let me go back
- 13 to Brant's original one. I was looking at
- 14 your response to Brant's.
- MR. MARSCHKE: And this is the --
- this is the attachment that Elyse was talking
- 17 about, here.
- 18 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, no, I've got
- 19 that here, yes.
- 20 MR. MARSCHKE: You can see, it's
- 21 all full of tables and -- which are not easily
- 22 put in form, or can't be put into the

1	database.
2	CHAIR MUNN: That is what it was,
3	okay.
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: Tables have to be
5	put in as attachments or are linked, or how do
6	we
7	CHAIR MUNN: Well, we have to
8	MR. HINNEFELD: The problem is,
9	when you try to cut and paste a table into a
10	response field, you have to
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, I understand.
12	MR. HINNEFELD: it's all
13	obliterated, and so, we need to attach the
14	Word file.
15	Each one of these have a space here
16	for an attachment, so
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
18	MR. HINNEFELD: What will happen is
19	
20	MEMBER ZIEMER: You'll plug it in

MR. HINNEFELD: It will put it in

there.

21

1	there, and it will hook into this Word file.
2	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
3	CHAIR MUNN: And what was the date
4	that was sent, you said?
5	MR. HINNEFELD: July 11th.
6	MEMBER ZIEMER: July 11 th .
7	CHAIR MUNN: July 11 th ?
8	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, right.
9	CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
10	MR. MARSCHKE: Ron's conclusion
11	was, basically, he sensed further analysis
12	would not provide additional resolution and
13	the magnitude of the influence of the partial
14	year data on the coworker dose is relatively
15	small. We recommend that this issue be
16	closed.
17	CHAIR MUNN: All right.
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ron's
19	response to the document that
20	MR. MARSCHKE: Right, yes.
21	CHAIR MUNN: All right, any
22	objection to closure?

Τ	MEMBER ZIEMER. NO ODJECTION.
2	CHAIR MUNN: The Subcommittee
3	agrees. Item closed. Thank you very much.
4	That is very nice to have that off the list.
5	We still have the issue of the
6	outstanding linking issue, or problem, that
7	goes on, but I think Elyse is keeping track of
8	that, pretty closely, and when that occurs,
9	hopefully, all of this will magically happen.
10	MS. THOMAS: Yes, I think they're
11	very close to, you know, getting it to work
12	properly. So, it should be very soon.
13	CHAIR MUNN: Good, good. All
14	right, in my efforts to be clever, I have lost
15	my Board review system. There it is. One
16	item down.
17	The next item on my list was the
18	linking list that Elyse and I were going to
19	put together.
20	I haven't even spoken to Elyse
21	about this, but so far as I know, we have the
22	same list.

1	I have OTIB-1, OTIB-47-2, OTIB-19,
2	of course now, we'll add OTIB-21-04 to that.
3	Are there others that you have on your list,
4	that still need to be watched for our ability
5	to transfer into the application, Elyse?
6	MS. THOMAS: No, Wanda, I have the
7	same list.
8	CHAIR MUNN: Okay, that is very
9	good. Then all we can do is just wait for
10	this to happen.
11	The next item that I have is TIB-
12	013. The action items were a re-write of
13	three and four, that SC&A were going to
14	undertake, and the status response on five,
15	from NIOSH.
16	Do we have a re-write on three and
17	four available to us?
18	MR. MARSCHKE: Wanda, we had a re-
19	write the last actually, at the last
20	meeting, we had a re-write.
21	So, I think we did this at the last

-- and we discussed the three and four quite

2	CHAIR MUNN: We also discussed that
3	numbering system problem.
4	MR. MARSCHKE: And the numbering
5	system problem, with the whether it was
6	DCAS, TIB-13, OCAS-TIB-13 or 013 or 0013, or
7	what it was.
8	So, we had quite a long discussion
9	on this, and Bob, actually did do a re-write
10	of actually three, four and I think he it
11	was even five, which was done in the last go-
12	around, and so, I don't know that there is
13	anything more to add beyond that.
14	CHAIR MUNN: The last three?
15	MR. MARSCHKE: Let me see, I'm just
16	trying to get the
17	CHAIR MUNN: It appears that July
18	13^{th} , SC&A has essentially withdrawn the issue.
19	So, three is now closed, and four?
20	Four says four and six are the
21	same technical issue, is what the comment was
22	there, and if that's let's see, six is

extensively, at the last meeting.

2	claimant-favorable approach, to develop a
3	correction factor for organs in the lower
4	torso, and that is closed.
5	So, are we correct, that four is
6	the same issue, to the extent that it also can
7	be closed? The procedure underestimates the
8	maximum correction factor to be applied to the
9	badge readings.
10	Therefore, the procedure does not
11	provide adequate guidance for defining the
12	claimant-favorable assumptions.
13	That was the last
14	MR. MARSCHKE: That was the last
15	one that was
16	CHAIR MUNN: thing we had from
17	SC&A. Does NIOSH agree, that item four, which
18	is shown as in process, is the same as item
19	six, which is closed?
20	MR. HINNEFELD: I believe that was
21	our original comment.
22	MR. MARSCHKE: Four was in

doesn't represent a scientifically valid or

1	progress. Basically, yes, we got to be
2	careful of circular reasoning, here.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I know.
4	MR. MARSCHKE: I think we decided
5	to close six, and keep four open, as an one
6	of them has to be resolved.
7	CHAIR MUNN: Right.
8	MR. MARSCHKE: They're both the
9	same, but one of them has to be resolved. So,
10	I think we decided to close six and keep four
11	open.
12	MR. KATZ: We did.
13	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
14	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
15	MR. MARSCHKE: So, that is why four
16	is shown as in progress.
17	CHAIR MUNN: And so, we have

reading of the finding, that the predominant

essentially, an action item that is due from

HINNEFELD: Well, the

on four

NIOSH, on four, correct?

MR.

substantive entry I read

18

19

20

21

22

last

1	difference between what the TIB contains and
2	what SC&A says it should contain, in terms of
3	the geometric adjustment, based on
4	Mallinckrodt exposure geometry, has to do with
5	the orientation and geometry of the badge, the
6	angular dependence of the badge, rather than
7	anything that's specific about Mallinckrodt
8	CHAIR MUNN: Correct.
9	MR. HINNEFELD: geometry.
10	CHAIR MUNN: Right.
11	MR. HINNEFELD: So, our last
12	substantive comment says, well, this really
13	goes in the overarching issue category,
14	because the appropriateness of using a
15	dosimeter badge reading is broader than just
16	geometries at Mallinckrodt. That is our last
17	substantive response.
18	And so, to me, it sounds like this
19	transfers to overarching issues, but you know,
20	I don't know how you want to do that. That's
21	the way it sounds to me.
22	Now, I'm not 100 percent sure that

1	SC&A agreed with our reading of that being the
2	basis for the difference. That may be and
3	I don't recall if you did or not.
4	There is no substantive entry after
5	the recommendation to go to overarching
6	issues, so we indicate that.
7	So, I don't know, but whether we
8	interpret that correctly or not.
9	CHAIR MUNN: Do we need to have
10	retain an action item for next time, for SC&A
11	to revisit this again, and see that they agree
12	that this is an overarching issue, and would
13	go to the Science Issues Group, rather than
14	close it?
15	We can't close it because it's the
16	same as 06, but is it appropriate to have that
17	outstanding
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: It seems to me, it
19	makes sense. Actually, the original finding
20	is a little bit vague on which
21	DR. MAURO: Yes, I agree.
22	MEMBER ZIEMER: what the actual

1	concerns were, you know, does it have to do
2	with geometry? Was there
3	DR. MAURO: I mean, on face value,
4	I agree with what Stu said, but I hate to jump
5	to a conclusion, because I am not there may
6	be more to the story.
7	MR. HINNEFELD: There may be more
8	to it than that. It seemed that way to me,
9	because it had to do with I mean, in one
10	case, there was if I'm not mistaken, there
11	was I think Bob ran MCNP modeling of the
12	geometry, and in that, he accounted for the
13	badge being you know, the orientation of
14	the badge.
15	And so, you define an orientation
16	of the badge, and we knew that model is
17	directly vertical.
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
19	MR. HINNEFELD: And the source
20	being, you know, somewhat displaced
21	vertically, you would have a geometric, or an
22	angular dependence aspect to the badge, in

1	addition to the geometry, and he also did some
2	Bremsstrahlung carry-through you know,
3	he did his MCNP for the whole range of
4	energies, where we just did the geometry.
5	And so, it's not clear to me that
6	the badge angular dependence accounts for all
7	of it or not.
8	DR. MAURO: Yes, Bob, could you tie
9	in? Yes, Bob, it's John, can you hear me
10	okay?
11	Yes, Bob, it's John, could you call
12	in? He is not hearing me. Bob? I hear him,
13	but he couldn't hear me.
14	MR. HINNEFELD: Okay, if Bob you
15	know, if we catch him cold, he may need some
16	time to refresh his memory. So, it may be
17	better not to try to get him on the line.
18	DR. MAURO: So, we'll take that and

21 action item for next time.

CHAIR MUNN:

have an action item on that.

MR. HINNEFELD: And maybe just send

NEAL R. GROSS

19

20

We'll just have an

1	а	note,	there	is		yes,	you're	correct,	it'	2
---	---	-------	-------	----	--	------	--------	----------	-----	---

- 2 badge geometry, or no, there is more to it
- 3 than that.
- 4 CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
- 5 MR. HINNEFELD: And then, I quess
- there is a certain magnitude. I can't believe
- that a geometry, a Bremsstrahlung component,
- 8 through -- it's going to be that terribly
- 9 significant, in terms of dose numbers.
- 10 DR. MAURO: I think the combination
- of a low-energy photon coming at a high angle
- might be a problem.
- 13 MR. HINNEFELD: And in terms of
- 14 badge dependence?
- DR. MAURO: Yes, yes.
- MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, that -- yes,
- 17 well, it's got to go through more filter than
- 18 you would expect, so, yes.
- DR. MAURO: Right.
- 20 CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
- DR. MAURO: But I'll talk to Bob,
- 22 and we'll find out if it's -- if it turns out,

1	it's	in	his	opinion,	yes,	there	is	nothing
---	------	----	-----	----------	------	-------	----	---------

- 2 about this problem -- I think this is the
- 3 question.
- 4 There is nothing about this that's
- 5 unique to this site.
- 6 CHAIR MUNN: Specific.
- 7 DR. MAURO: It's overarching and
- 8 it's dealt with by the --
- 9 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, right.
- 10 MR. KATZ: Can I ask a question
- 11 about that, though?
- 12 It's not clear to me, even if it's
- 13 not specific to a site, is -- is the goal
- 14 always to punt this to the -- I mean, we
- 15 didn't even have a Science Issues Work Group,
- 16 until recently.
- I mean, is there a reason to send
- it there, as opposed to deal with it, here?
- 19 MR. HINNEFELD: Well, the idea, I
- 20 mean, the noble concept is that this -- it may
- 21 affect other documents, besides this one,
- 22 where we've encountered it.

1	Therefore, we resolve this issue
2	and make sure that it's resolved once.
3	MR. KATZ: No, I agree and then
4	getting to the
5	MR. HINNEFELD: That's the noble
6	issue. Now, my personal issue is to get it
7	off the table.
8	MEMBER ZIEMER: They don't all
9	necessarily go to the Science Issues Group.
10	For example, the 10 to the minus 6
11	
12	MR. HINNEFELD: Resuspension.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: resuspension
14	factor, the point was, there is another
15	document on that topic, and it's not specific
16	to the site.
17	Whether there is another document
18	on the topic, is there a film badge, you know,
19	geometry issue, or is it does there need to
20	be a document discussing those kind of
21	parameters?
22	But it's not necessarily the

-	a	1- 1	2.1		overarching.
1	SCIANCA	nıır	7 -	7 0	OMERSTONING
		Duc	エし	T (2)	OVCIAL CITITIO.

- 2 MR. KATZ: No, I understand it's
- 3 overarching.
- DR. MAURO: Yes, I mean, we think
- 5 about OCAS-IG-001, the big book on external
- 6 dosimetry. That is sort of like your -- the
- 7 base on whichever you build.
- Now, I don't recall whether or not
- 9 that subject is discussed or not. It may be,
- or maybe alert the reader to it, that you need
- 11 to take -- I don't remember, it's been awhile
- 12 since I read that.
- 13 But I mean, in theory, it could go
- 14 toward that, you know, that particular
- 15 procedure, and whether or not that adequately
- 16 provides quidance, because we -- we run into
- 17 this all of the time.
- 18 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, it's a continuing
- issue, and for that reason, I had thought that
- 20 it was one of those, that's on this list, I
- 21 had thought, the badge geometry thing, because
- 22 we keep talking about it.

1	MR. HINNEFELD: It comes up here,
2	and it comes up in dose reconstruction.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Everywhere, yes.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: And a lot of
5	overarching issue things have come up in dose
6	reconstruction, or a number, maybe not a lot,
7	but some have.
8	CHAIR MUNN: Well, quite a few.
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: So, if it is
10	overarching, where does it go is that your
11	question
12	CHAIR MUNN: That's the real
13	question.
14	MEMBER ZIEMER: To the cloud.
15	MR. KATZ: Yes, my I just wasn't
16	assuming that everything goes to the other
17	Work Group, now, that we've established
18	just because this is overarching.
19	CHAIR MUNN: Right.
20	MR. HINNEFELD: Right, it goes to
21	the to-do list in the sky.
22	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, and if it is on -

1	- if it's already on Jim Neton's list, which I
2	believe it is, then we can close it on the
3	basis, or the fact that it isn't overarching.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, that would
5	still obligate a transfer, though.
6	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, the fact that
8	it's on the list, doesn't necessarily mean
9	that somebody is working on it.
10	CHAIR MUNN: No, right.
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: Could I ask a
12	question, here? It says re-write of three and
13	four, but three was closed already, wasn't it?
14	CHAIR MUNN: Last time.
15	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, this is an
16	item
17	CHAIR MUNN: That was the
18	MR. HINNEFELD: that was carried
19	in the last meeting.
20	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, that was a carry-
21	over. We had three and four on my carry-over

list --

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, I see.
2	CHAIR MUNN: and it got carried
3	over.
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay.
5	CHAIR MUNN: I carried over some of
6	the
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: I got you.
8	CHAIR MUNN: The ones we had last
9	time.
LO	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay.
11	CHAIR MUNN: Instead of taking
L2	three off.
L3	MEMBER ZIEMER: I got you.
L4	CHAIR MUNN: The next time we have
L5	it, we will see it as only as item four,
L6	and as SC&A looking at it.
L7	MEMBER ZIEMER: And five also is
L8	closed, right?
L9	CHAIR MUNN: Now, five, status of
20	response on five, we could I don't believe
21	we
22	MEMBER ZIEMER: It shows here as

1	being	closed.

- DR. ULSH: Yes, that is what I
- 3 have, and that is my recollection. This is
- 4 the issue about the height of persons, we said
- 5 it's 60 to --
- 6 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, we argued whether
- 7 it was 60 or 61, or 60?
- 8 DR. ULSH: Yes, and I think we
- 9 closed that last time.
- 10 MR. MARSCHKE: I think that was
- 11 closed.
- 12 CHAIR MUNN: All right.
- DR. MAURO: I got a hold of Bob.
- 14 He is going to call in.
- 15 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, actually, the
- 16 document says it was closed.
- 17 CHAIR MUNN: It does?
- 18 MEMBER ZIEMER: On July 14th.
- 19 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, now, I see it.
- 20 MR. KATZ: Well, let me just go
- 21 back real quick, to John, or could -- you had
- gone out of the room, and John, I was going to

1	say something.
2	But for issue four, which you just
3	spoke to Bob about, but if you would just send
4	me a copy you were going to look back into
5	how big of an issue that is, how much there is
6	there, in terms of the angular dependence
7	question.
8	If you would just send me an
9	encapsulation of it, in an email, then I will
LO	see that that goes to the Science Work Group,
L1	Jim with a question, is this on their
L2	plate, and if it's not on the plate, then we
L3	can figure out whether they want it on their
L4	plate.
L5	But because they're going to have
L6	a Work Group coming up in a month or so, I
L7	want to make sure we pony up everything we
L8	can, that they're considering taking on.
L9	All right, so, if you would just
20	send me an email with that, that would be
21	great, and just put a reminder, this is a
2.2	guestion for the Science Work Group, and then

1	T 1 7 7	distribute	- la
1	т.тт	aistribute	ullat.

- DR. ANIGSTEIN: This is Bob
- 3 Anigstein. I just joined, SC&A.
- 4 CHAIR MUNN: Hi there, Bob.
- 5 Welcome.
- 6 MR. KATZ: Hi Bob.
- 7 DR. ANIGSTEIN: Hi, thank you.
- 8 John Mauro called me to say there was
- 9 something about angular dependence.
- 10 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
- 11 MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, Bob, this is
- 12 Stu Hinnefeld, and it's -- I'm talking largely
- 13 from memory here.
- But one of the findings, and this
- may not be convenient to you, but this is from
- 16 the Mallinckrodt -- special geometries of
- 17 Mallinckrodt.
- DR. ANIGSTEIN: Yes, the original
- 19 TIB-13.
- 20 MR. HINNEFELD: Right, and there
- 21 was a finding in there, finding four, where
- 22 your comment -- I believe you were the

1	reviewer and commenter, was that the
2	adjustment that we provide in the TIB, you
3	could not replicate. You got a different
4	adjustment, and I forget all of the ins and
5	outs of it.
6	DR. ANIGSTEIN: Well, first of all,
7	we did it with MCNP.
8	MR. HINNEFELD: Right, I remember
9	that part.
LO	DR. ANIGSTEIN: And that was done
L1	with ATILLA, right away.
L2	MR. HINNEFELD: Right.
L3	DR. ANIGSTEIN: We had a different,
L4	and I believe we also used a somewhat now,
L5	honestly, I think it was done four years ago.
L6	MR. HINNEFELD: Right.
L7	DR. ANIGSTEIN: So, I'm not sure
L8	whether we used the same geometry.
L9	I think the problem now, I'm
20	going really from memory. The problem was
21	that with the the way the ATILLA was done,

it wasn't that the ATILLA per se is wrong, but

1	the way it was done was that they produced a
2	whole bunch of results for with the target
3	organ being at various places, and then they
4	think they used something like Crystal Ball,
5	to do a Monte Carlo sampling, and we didn't do
6	that.
7	We simply took the organ that would
8	be most affected, let's say if he was holding
9	working right alongside the uranium ingot,
10	you know, that was the same geometry that
11	was illustrated in the TIB, the ingot was
12	cylinder and horizontal axis in the horizontal
13	plane, and it was from left to right, you
14	know, a center on the body, and we would take
15	a point, just I guess we probably took the
16	HP-10, so, we just in the skin, just under
17	the skin, right opposite the cylinder, at the
18	nearest point.
19	And then we calculated dose there,
20	and we calculated the dose, or the fluence to
21	the film badge, putting the film badge up
22	above and slightly to one side, where a lapel

1	would go, and then we also took into
2	consideration the angular dependence on the
3	film badge, because the film badge was assumed
4	to be in the vertical plane that was facing
5	forward, and the photons were coming in,
6	sometimes at a very steep angle.
7	So, we used the angular dependence
8	in ICRP-74, and folded that into the photon
9	fluence conversion, now converting it to dose,
10	and so, we got a total factor of about I
11	think we we got something about, and I'm
12	going from memory, something like seven,
13	without the angular dependence, and then, with
14	the angular dependence, it went up to 10.
15	So, the angular dependence didn't
16	play a huge role. The main thing was the
17	geometry.
18	MR. HINNEFELD: Okay.
19	DR. ANIGSTEIN: They were still
20	significant, but the bigger factor was the
21	geometry.
22	MR. HINNEFELD: Okay, so, then our

1	response will need to be a little more
2	expansive than what we proposed.
3	DR. ANIGSTEIN: Excuse me?
4	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, our
5	recollection was that the bulk of the
6	difference was due to angular dependence, more
7	so than the geometry
8	DR. ANIGSTEIN: No, no, that's
9	actually not correct.
LO	MR. HINNEFELD: The bigger
11	difference
L2	DR. ANIGSTEIN: That's not my
L3	recollection.
L4	MR. HINNEFELD: to the geometry
L5	and the different methods
L6	DR. MAURO: That would make it
L7	applicable to this particular problem, then.
L8	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, yes.
L9	DR. MAURO: Yes, so, it does become
20	·
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: Site specific.
22	DR. MAURO: It does become site

_	' - '
7	specific.
_	DPCCTTTC.

- 2 MR. HINNEFELD: Which puts it back
- 3 in our court.
- DR. MAURO: So, there is -- well,
- 5 let me ask, go back to -- Ted posed a question
- 6 to me, that is -- would be helpful if I were
- 7 to put this together into a memo, because if
- 8 it -- as to the degree to which it needs to be
- 9 addressed by the overarching group, the global
- 10 question.
- But are we back here, now again,
- into this group?
- 13 MR. HINNEFELD: Let us read what
- 14 you provided, because -- I mean, Bob gave us
- 15 this on the phone. You guys have -- you're
- 16 right, you know, we're looking here at clear
- importance, you know.
- 18 There is a general rule,
- 19 particularly to what you're telling us -- what
- 20 you're telling us in your report, and so,
- 21 let's go back to the substantive document that
- 22 Bob gave us. Let us do that, and if at that

1	time,	we're	still	not	entirely	clear	about

- what was done or so on, and what exactly is
- 3 the origin of the difference, then we'll let
- 4 you know, and maybe you can give us a little
- 5 more explanation on it or something.
- But let's take -- we'll take the
- 7 first action.
- DR. ANIGSTEIN: Okay, but if it's
- 9 of any help, I'm going to be in Cincinnati.
- 10 MR. HINNEFELD: I don't think we'll
- 11 be ready tomorrow, Bob.
- DR. ANIGSTEIN: I'll work with you
- on that.
- MR. KATZ: So, the other thing,
- 15 Stu, is, if it looks to you then like there is
- 16 -- this is a meaty issue that might do well in
- 17 the Science Work Group, let me know.
- MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
- 19 MR. KATZ: And we'll put it on
- 20 their plate.
- DR. MAURO: Okay, so --
- 22 MR. KATZ: Or offer it to their

1	plate, at least.
2	DR. MAURO: So, in light of the
3	conversation we had, I'll put on hold
4	MR. KATZ: Yes.
5	DR. MAURO: any action I take,
6	until we get back.
7	MR. KATZ: Right, thank you, John.
8	CHAIR MUNN: All right, so, I'm
9	changing it from SC&A's action, to NIOSH is
10	going to take another look and see if they
11	need to expand on their response, correct?
12	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
13	CHAIR MUNN: Very good.
14	MR. MARSCHKE: Do we add okay,
15	what do we do we add a comment here?
16	CHAIR MUNN: I think we need to
17	say, after we'll just say, Board discussion
18	this date.
19	MR. MARSCHKE: This is TIB this
20	is four?
21	CHAIR MUNN: This is four.

MR. MARSCHKE: We're going to add a

1	comment.	This	finding		well,	obviously	it
---	----------	------	---------	--	-------	-----------	----

- 2 was discussed.
- 3 MR. KATZ: Yes, and you said DCAS
- 4 is going to re-examine SC&A comments and
- 5 report back. Bob?
- DR. ANIGSTEIN: Yes?
- 7 MR. KATZ: I'm sorry, it sounded
- 8 like you wanted to say something.
- DR. ANIGSTEIN: No, no, no, I was
- wondering, are we still on TIB-13?
- 11 CHAIR MUNN: We are still on TIB-
- 12 13.
- DR. ANIGSTEIN: Okay.
- MR. MARSCHKE: Okay, so, there it
- 15 is.
- 16 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, that's good.
- 17 Thank you. Now, before we leave TIB-13, the
- only other thing that I had on my notes to
- 19 talk about was what we touched on earlier
- 20 today, our last meeting's discussion, with
- 21 respect to the fact that we had three
- different types of TIB-13s, and there was no

1 specific taking of action.
2 But it was my understanding that we
were going to check, to see what whether
4 there were three different documents, whether
5 this is different nomenclature for one
6 document, and make sure that however we have
7 it in our in our review system, it can be
8 found without confusion.
9 We currently have it in the review
10 system as 013.
DR. ULSH: I will put that down as
12 a database clean-up issue, going in.
CHAIR MUNN: Good, okay. Thank
14 you.
MR. KATZ: So, then we're finished
16 with TIB-13, right?
17 CHAIR MUNN: I believe that takes
care of TIB-13, unless there is some other
19 item on this particular document, that is
giving anybody any pain right now.
MR. KATZ: Okay, thanks for joining

us, Bob.

1	DR. ANIGSTEIN: You're welcome. My
2	pleasure. I'll be signing off, then.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Thank you, appreciate
4	that. We are a little early. Do you want to
5	break and go to lunch now, or do you want to
6	go on to TIB-52, before we do that?
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: Let's go to TIB-52.
8	DR. ULSH: Well, that will be
9	pretty short.
LO	CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: Get it out of the
L2	way.
L3	DR. ULSH: We've received SC&A's
L4	report on that document, but we don't have
L5	responses for it, yet. So, that is pretty
L6	short.
L7	CHAIR MUNN: Okay, so, that's going
L8	to be another carry-over for next time.
L9	MR. KATZ: So, SC&A, okay.
20	MR. HINNEFELD: I solved a little
21	of the puzzle of OCAS and DCAS-TIB-13.
22	DCAS-TIB-13 apparently replaced

1 OCAS-TIB-13. OCAS-TIB	-13 -	
-------------------------	-------	--

- 2 MEMBER ZIEMER: Just a renumbering.
- 3 MR. HINNEFELD: -- is Rev. 1,
- 4 essentially. OCAS-TIB-13 was specifically
- 5 about Mallinckrodt. When it was rewritten, it
- 6 was about uranium processing facilities,
- 7 because there are others that would be very
- 8 similar.
- 9 MEMBER ZIEMER: So, does the other
- 10 one -- does that compare them?
- 11 MR. HINNEFELD: Essentially, it's
- one. OCAS-TIB-13 really can go away, because
- 13 it's been -- well, I think it's been
- 14 superceded by DCAS-TIB-13, which really would
- be Rev. 1 of OCAS-TIB-13, or whatever you want
- 16 to call it.
- 17 If the initial publication is Rev.
- 18 0, then DCAS-TIB-13 would be Rev. 1 of that
- 19 document, and part of the change was, we
- 20 changed the title.
- 21 MEMBER ZIEMER: How do we handle
- 22 that in the database?

1	MR. HINNEFELD: I don't know
2	anything about it. Here is well, what we
3	should do is this is for us to do, not here
4	in the meeting, but for us to do.
5	We need to go look at the findings
6	on the first one, OTIB-13, see what we said we
7	you know, was there anything there that's
8	in abeyance, that we said we would take care
9	of at revision, or even if not, has the
10	revision addressed any of that tried to
11	address any of those things, in which case,
12	you know, we might be able to close some of
13	the open TIB-13's, in the first place, and
14	then just and try to get those all done,
15	and just deal with the second one. The
16	first thing, though, is to make sure that we
17	don't lose something in the process.
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right, but in the
19	document, we can still indicate that these all
20	most into this other document, right?
21	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, and probably
22	should, in terms of keeping our record clear,

1	here.
2	MEMBER ZIEMER: We still have the
3	original record.
4	CHAIR MUNN: We should probably
5	just simply state, as a part of our closing of
6	the document, we probably should state that
7	this document has become DCAS-TIB-13, when it
8	when Rev. 1 was published, because of the
9	change of title of the Agency, and that they
10	can be considered to be extensions of the same
11	document, rather than change our listing here
12	in our database, to DCAS-13. It appears
13	reasonable, to me, to simply make that
14	notation, at the time that we close it out,
15	would be our final notation.
16	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, we've already
17	closed I'm not sure I understand what I
18	mean, basically, what we have now in the
19	database is, we have two documents identified,
20	DCAS-TIB-13 and OCAS-TIB-13.

has

of

six

а

OCAS-TIB-13

least

at

comments,

21

22

number

them,

of

issues

1	associated with them, many of which have
2	already been closed out.
3	So, your suggest is, we carry both
4	documents in the database, and we go back to
5	the OCAS documents and identify on the six
6	issues that were you know
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: Only in the open
8	ones, I think.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: Only the open ones?
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right? If it's
11	already closed
12	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, I would think
13	only the open ones.
14	MEMBER ZIEMER: Because the open
15	one, you I think that's what Stu was
16	saying, that you'd look at those open items
17	and say, "Does the new one cover it?"
18	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
19	MEMBER ZIEMER: And we would say
20	we would handle it like we would on a normal
21	revision.
22	If there is a Rev. 1 on something

1	else, what do you do?
2	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, Rev. 1,
3	basically what happens, if you have a Rev. 1
4	or revision, then the document itself is
5	replaced and you really don't have that
6	problem, because you don't get a new document
7	number.
8	So, you don't have two entries into
9	the database. So, you're really not going to
10	have that the problem that you're having
11	now, with two entries.
12	MEMBER ZIEMER: What do you do with
13	open items?
14	MR. MARSCHKE: They basically just
15	get carried over, but if you
16	MR. HINNEFELD: But that's what
17	you're suggesting to do, here?
18	CHAIR MUNN: Right.
19	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
20	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I wasn't
21	suggesting that. I was suggesting you carry
22	the old one and then well, okay.

1	See, what happens is, you're going
2	to lose the information on what you did.
3	DR. MAURO: Well, you don't want to
4	lose it.
5	MEMBER ZIEMER: Unless you carry
6	all of the information forward, but see, some
7	of it may not apply in the new document. That
8	is what I'm wondering about.
9	DR. ULSH: Can I break in for just
10	a second?
11	CHAIR MUNN: Please.
12	DR. ULSH: I've just got notes from
13	a couple of people, saying they've been
14	disconnected. The phone appears to be
15	disconnected.
16	MR. KATZ: Sorry, to folks on the
17	line. We got disconnected, briefly.
18	CHAIR MUNN: So, we're still
19	discussing what to do about the fact that we
20	have an OCAS-TIB-13, with two zeros in front
21	of it or one zero in front of it?
22	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, right now,

1	it's got one zero in front of it, at this
2	point.
3	I don't know, we might have
4	another. We might have a version with two
5	zeros. I don't know if this is one that we
6	have
7	CHAIR MUNN: Well, originally, we
8	had two zeros on it.
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, could I ask
10	Stu, to what extent is it a true replacement,
11	in the sense that, is it just really, just
12	a new version of that one, or is it
13	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, it expands
14	the scope, to also also, to go beyond
15	Mallinckrodt, and to consider the same make
16	the same considerations at other similar
17	sites.
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, I'm wondering
19	if there are Mallinckrodt specific issues that
20	were in the original one, then maybe they had

been closed, and you lose them completely in

the new one.

21

1	DR. MAURO: Yes, you don't want to
2	lose that.
3	MEMBER ZIEMER: You don't want to
4	lose your
5	MR. HINNEFELD: Okay, so, that is -
6	_
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: That is really what
8	I'm asking.
9	MR. HINNEFELD: So, we only have
LO	design database issue, with what do you do
11	with old versions of procedures and the
L2	actions, and the progress that was done on
L3	those.
L4	MEMBER ZIEMER: Is there any reason
L5	
L6	MR. HINNEFELD: So, that's not
L7	going to be
L8	MEMBER ZIEMER: not just to
L9	leave it in there?
20	MR. MARSCHKE: On this one, I would
21	have no problem in leaving it. Basically, you
22	have two different documents.

1	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
2	MR. MARSCHKE: They are two
3	different numbers.
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: And then those oper
5	items, you can easily say they're now covered
6	in this other document.
7	MR. KATZ: Right, right, I think
8	that's the simplest thing to do.
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: Just leave the rest
10	there, for historic purposes.
11	CHAIR MUNN: Seems logical, yes, 1
12	certainly would not want to
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: And you don't want
14	to lose the information that you've closed or
15	the issues.
16	CHAIR MUNN: Right, no, you don't
17	want to do that. OTIB-13 stays, and DCAS-TIB-
18	13 goes in.
19	DR. MAURO: And they have different
20	titles.
21	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, slightly

22

different titles.

1	DR. MAURO: Slightly, okay, that
2	helps.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
4	MR. MARSCHKE: If it was a true
5	revision and goes from Rev. 0 to Rev. 1, then
6	basically, the document number stays the same.
7	The document title stays the same.
8	DR. MAURO: It's a new Rev.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: And so, it really
10	doesn't change anything in the database.
11	DR. MAURO: So, it's real. See,
12	our problem before, we were not sure whether
13	this is a real different document, or we just
14	mis-typed in some information about the
15	designation.
16	Now, we know, it's a real, new
17	document, and we handle it as a real, new
18	document.
19	MR. KATZ: Okay.
20	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, the problem
21	before was yes, exactly, John, it was
22	whether or not there was I'm trying to pull

1	up an example, here.
2	DR. MAURO: We just did this with
3	two and 18, right? Isn't that similar?
4	CHAIR MUNN: Pretty much, similar.
5	DR. MAURO: Similar?
6	CHAIR MUNN: Similar, but such
7	different nomenclature.
8	DR. MAURO: Yes.
9	CHAIR MUNN: And such different
10	DR. MAURO: Because they're so
11	close.

- 12 CHAIR MUNN: -- identifier, that it
- was -- but since this new document has evolved
- 14 out of the original one, it's -- there is
- logic to maintaining the numerical system.
- But since it came out of Rev. 1,
- 17 it's Rev. 1 of this, really. But it's a
- 18 different document, entirely. So, that makes
- 19 sense.
- We still have no answer, we're all
- 21 blank, I guess, on the OTIB-013 designation on
- the database, as opposed to 003 -- 0013.

1	MR. KATZ: That is going to be
2	covered in the clean-up.
3	CHAIR MUNN: And that is going to
4	magically occur.
5	MR. KATZ: So, TIB-52, Brant, do
6	you think you folks will be ready for the next
7	
8	DR. ULSH: Yes.
9	MR. KATZ: meeting? Okay,
10	thanks.
11	CHAIR MUNN: Good, then there is
12	nothing to do with that.
13	Now, even though it is only 11:45
14	a.m., I do think it's wise for us to take
15	lunch now, simply because what happens this
16	afternoon is almost entirely verging or
17	administrative times of discussions, and
18	overarching issues, and the two pagers, any
19	one of which could take us more than 15
20	minutes to discuss, or to take care of.
21	So, let's revise our agenda, unless
22	you feel very strongly otherwise, and we will

1	go to lunch now, and be back at one o'clock.
2	Is that reasonable?
3	MR. KATZ: Wanda is hungry.
4	CHAIR MUNN: Wanda is hungry. Time
5	for lunch.
6	MEMBER ZIEMER: You're the boss.
7	MR. KATZ: Thank you, everyone or
8	the line, and we'll be back at one o'clock,
9	did you say, Wanda?
LO	CHAIR MUNN: One.
L1	MR. KATZ: Okay.
L2	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
L3	matter went off the record at 11:45 a.m. and
L4	resumed at 1:00 p.m.)
L5	MR. KATZ: This is the Advisory
L6	Board on Radiation and Worker Health
L7	Procedures Review Subcommittee, and we're
L8	reconvening, after a lunch break, and Wanda,
L9	it's your agenda.
20	CHAIR MUNN: I don't think we'll
21	have too much material to try to cover this

afternoon, with the exception of the new set

2	But the first item we have on our
3	printed agenda is the overarching issues.
4	At our last meeting, we had quite a
5	discussion about whether or not we were going
6	to attempt to be the body that would keep
7	track of what was going on, and our final word
8	was that NIOSH was going to talk to Dr. Neton
9	about it and have some internal discussions,
LO	and the action item is asking for a report or
L1	the result of those discussions.
L2	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, we haven't
L3	gotten terribly far with it. We agree that,
L 4	you know, we, NIOSH, are the keeper, you know,
L5	of making sure that the list is compiled and
L6	that and that nothing has dropped off the
L7	list, and all these things that we called
L8	overarching issues, get addressed.
L9	Our thought was that we could build
20	into the, you know, the application, the Board
21	review application, a sort of a dummy Work
22	Group and just call it overarching issues, and

up of two-pagers that we have.

1	deposit them there, and we've not done this,
2	seeing that the progress on the database or on
3	the application, it's isn't as complete as we
4	would have hoped.
5	But there would be a way to
6	categorize them there, and so, you would have
7	them conveniently in one place, and be able to
8	proceed from there, and then whether the Board
9	decides, or particular Work Groups decide that
10	there are certain ones that they want to take
11	on, whether it be this group, the Science
12	Issues Work Group, then they could be sort re-
13	allotted from this kind of holding overarching
14	issues areas, to the appropriate Work Group,
15	or a Work Group could just decide that we're
16	going to take on the overarching issues, and
17	we can work on them, as a body of overarching
18	issues.
19	So, it just seemed like that would
20	be an avenue for keeping track and things like
21	that, but other than conceptual things like
22	that, we've not really gotten very much

1	farther.
2	CHAIR MUNN: So, we don't need to
3	be worrying about setting anything up, at the
4	time. Eventually, we'll come to some
5	conclusion.
6	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, yes, I think
7	the key the time to me, the time
8	consuming part of the set up looks like it's
9	going to be well, once the database is
10	functioning, is going to be the overarching
11	issues from the dose reconstruction, because
12	the search will be a little more laborious.
13	CHAIR MUNN: And defining them
14	clearly is probably going to not be easy.
15	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, the you
16	need to bring with you, the original finding.
17	I mean, Paul, all of these findings, that are
18	summarized in the databases or matrices, or
19	however they're summarized, you really have to
20	rely on the original finding, the full write-
21	up of it, to really understand the meat of it.

So, we'll have to -- all of that is

1	going to have to come along, and we'll try to
2	make the set up a search system for the
3	meat of the issue, that's not particularly
4	laborious.
5	So, that's going to be a little
6	labor intensive, to get it, the point where
7	each person, each Member of the Work Group, or
8	whatever, doesn't have to do all that labor
9	and searching.
10	CHAIR MUNN: Especially in view of
11	the fact that with these issues, most of them
12	have findings from multiple sources, that will
13	need to be either all gathered, or combined
14	into one.
15	MR. HINNEFELD: And I think yes,
16	now, there is a in our 10-year program
17	review, there was a finding, or a suggestion,
18	thinking in terms of science questions, what
19	are the decisions that can really be decided
20	by science, and which ones just have to you
21	know, this science just will not the
22	information will not be available, and where a

_	policy decision is simply what s required.
2	And so, there may be some thought,
3	you know, that may be a way to approach some
4	of these things, will there ever be enough
5	information to provide a convincing position -
6	_
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right, if not, what
8	do you do?
9	MR. HINNEFELD: and if not, if
LO	we so, absent that, what will the policy of
L1	the Institute be, in terms of the dealing with
L2	that question?
L3	So, it may kind of wrap some of
L4	that thinking into this.
L5	CHAIR MUNN: How would you like us
L6	to deal personally, with this question here?
L7	Do you want me to continue to keep
L8	it as a 'what's going on' sort of issue?
L9	MR. HINNEFELD: I think a report of
20	this Working Group, until something is a
21	little more established, might be a worthwhile
22	item, to keep here, because essentially, that

2	a project meeting for a project.
3	You know, get everybody in the room
4	and remind them that hey, you know, this all
5	has to get accomplished.
6	CHAIR MUNN: There is something
7	that has to go on.
8	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
9	CHAIR MUNN: And I addition to
10	that, it gives us our current list of
11	overarching issues that helps us, when we
12	encounter the same thing repeatedly.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: Were you
14	suggesting, Stu, that in the document, that
15	there be a dummy Work Group, where we can
16	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, that is my
17	suggestion.
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: put these
19	things?
20	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, we just put a
21	dummy Work Group up here in this application.
22	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right, and then we

keeps the urgency on it, and it's like having

1	ask Dr. Melius to appoint a dummy Work Group
2	and see how many volunteers we get for that.
3	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, I'd
4	automatically be the point of contact.
5	CHAIR MUNN: I don't think we
6	should
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: No, it would be
8	good to have somewhere to bin these, though,
9	so that
10	CHAIR MUNN: It would.
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: they were
12	available, or maybe that is another category,
13	that overarching issue categories that we
14	some way to pull it out, readily.
15	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, yes, if you
16	make it a status, then you've got the whole
17	problem of what do you do with it, once you
18	start to deal with it.
19	MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
20	MR. KATZ: I think the Work Group
2.1	is a makes a lot of sense to do it

MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, I think so.

1	MR. KATZ: as that, even if it's
2	just a virtual
3	MR. HINNEFELD: A virtual Work
4	Group.
5	MR. KATZ: a virtual Work Group,
6	yes.
7	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, that could be
8	more important, that would be a better word
9	than a dummy Work Group, yes.
10	MR. KATZ: But I think to make this
11	go forward, we also need whether it's Jim
12	or somebody, we need a point person to start
13	collecting the fodder that goes in there, for
14	each of these issues, and maybe some of it can
15	come from SC&A, that where it's organized
16	on some of these, or DCAS or it's going to
17	be a joint enterprise.
18	But pulling together sort of, as
19	Wanda was saying, all of the material that
20	relates to that issue, that someone is going
21	to then, one of these groups is going to
22	thrash out.

1	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, that will be
2	one our folks, you know, so, that is an
3	assignment that I'll just have to make.
4	CHAIR MUNN: I'll carry as an item
5	that we're expecting a White Paper or some
6	type of report from NIOSH, to help us
7	establish a starting point for tracking of
8	these issues.
9	MR. KATZ: Yes, but I think this
LO	will sort of dovetail with, again the
L1	Science Work Group is meeting soon, relatively
L2	soon, and some though their issues are
L3	mostly, if not all, overarching issues, as
L4	well, that cover a lot of the same turf.
L5	So, that will help, sort of congeal
L6	it a little bit, what are the issues, and I
L7	think they will be thinking about what are
L8	their priorities, so that they're not trying
L9	to munch on it all at once.
20	CHAIR MUNN: I think so.
21	MR. KATZ: And that will help here,
22	too, because then it will be, what are the

1	priorities	for	pulling	together	the	fodder,
---	------------	-----	---------	----------	-----	---------

- 2 although -- all the discussion that has
- 3 occurred and different venues related to that.
- 4 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, that would be
- 5 very helpful, I'm sure.
- 6 MR. KATZ: Yes.
- 7 CHAIR MUNN: That's good, thank
- 8 you.
- 9 MR. KATZ: Okay, so, I'll try to be
- 10 sort of the tie with the Science Work Group on
- 11 this.
- 12 CHAIR MUNN: Appreciate that, just
- 13 appreciate that.
- 14 The next item on our list is
- 15 unresolved action items.
- 16 We have -- I probably owe the
- 17 Subcommittee a few words of apology, because I
- have outstanding, at least two transfer files
- 19 -- actions, and a couple of other things that
- I have agreed that I would do, and which need
- doing, that are now well over 60 days old, and
- 22 I have not gotten to them.

1	I am sorry for that. I will get to
2	them. I just wanted to mention that I have
3	those myself, and I don't know how many others
4	are out there, that may not have been captured
5	for some reason, in our activities here, and
6	should be tracked somewhere.
7	If any of you are aware of
8	outstanding action items that are beginning to
9	grow mold and are not appearing on our list,
10	please don't hesitate to contact me with that
11	information.
12	I am really concerned that we not
13	miss something here, because of a clerical
14	error on my part, or on someone else's part,
15	overlooking something we had planned to do.
16	One of the things that which is
17	I guess, unless somebody has something else
18	to say about that, I will use that as a segue
19	into our next action item, if anyone has some
20	thought about unresolved action items, now is
21	the time, probably to mention it to me.
22	Otherwise, I will commit to

1	somehow, getting actual written information to
2	the outstanding transfer items, that I have,
3	to the Chairs of those Work Groups, rather
4	than just simply assuming that they're going
5	to proceed with it, especially in light of the
6	fact that we don't have an easy way to get to
7	transmit the history to them all, I'll at
8	least tell them about it, and provide some set
9	of words for them.
10	The other, from my standpoint,
11	serious outstanding item, is the one of our
12	two-page summaries, where they are and how we
13	are going to get them onto the onto our own
14	database, getting them up on the web, not on
15	our database.
16	I have I owe Ted the final
17	copies of the procedures that we have already
18	looked at, and that we've agreed to the two-
19	pagers on, and we do not have any information
20	yet, so far as I know, about who is going to
21	be the point of contact at NIOSH, which
22	respect to putting that set of data up on the

1	web.
2	MR. HINNEFELD: That will be Chris
3	Ellison.
4	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, will it be Chris?
5	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
6	CHAIR MUNN: And I don't know
7	whether Chris has taken any actions towards
8	MR. HINNEFELD: No, you provided us
9	
10	CHAIR MUNN: thinking about
11	that.
12	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, I mean,
13	thinking about it? We've thought about it, a
14	little bit.
15	CHAIR MUNN: Okay, I will see to it
16	that Chris gets the information to Ted, and
17	Chris will get the information.
18	Now, the thing that is bothering me
19	most is the 13 two-pagers, which we've looked
20	at and beaten with some degree of efficiency,
21	couple of meetings ago, and which I agreed to

take home, clean up, get out to you in

1	finalized form for your approval, before we
2	submitted them to the full Board for their
3	approval.
4	Frankly, it's been more of a I
5	started that a couple of times, and each time,
6	have had formatting problems with my computer,
7	but that is no real excuse.
8	My question for you is whether or
9	not my failure to get these out in a timely
10	manner is holding up the train anywhere else?
11	Am I affecting anyone else's workload or
12	negatively impacting the work of the Board, in
13	any way, by not getting these out?
14	MR. KATZ: Well, help my memory,
15	because I thought these were all sent to the
16	full Board, as well as the Subcommittee, for
17	their opportunity to comment.
18	CHAIR MUNN: We will, but we will -
19	- we sent them to the full Board
20	MR. KATZ: No, no, I'm saying, so,
21	for their let me just so, what I thought
22	is, they would have the opportunity to

1	comment, as well as the Subcommittee, and then
2	the Subcommittee would finish them, but I
3	don't know that the Board needs to approve
4	them.
5	MEMBER ZIEMER: No, we agreed that
6	
7	MR. KATZ: That's not we agreed
8	that they would
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: We agreed, the
10	Board wouldn't you know, need to approve
11	them.
12	MR. KATZ: Right.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: But if they had
14	comments, they could.
15	MR. KATZ: Right, exactly.
16	MEMBER ZIEMER: In other words, it
17	would be distributed, but
18	MR. KATZ: So, what is
19	MEMBER ZIEMER: but it would be
20	for us to close them out, or do.

MR. KATZ:

you're good, you don't

once

21

22

Board

So, the Subcommittee,

need

1	approval.	They ge	t posted.	That's	the	point
---	-----------	---------	-----------	--------	-----	-------

- when they get posted.
- 3 CHAIR MUNN: All right, we have not
- 4 -- the Board has commented on the other 13,
- 5 but I haven't cleaned them up.
- 6 MEMBER ZIEMER: The first set.
- 7 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, the first --
- 8 well, yes.
- 9 MR. KATZ: Right.
- 10 CHAIR MUNN: The first six, and the
- 11 13, they've commented. I only received -- we
- only received comments from Dr. Richardson,
- 13 and that's all.
- 14 MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
- 15 CHAIR MUNN: But we -- and we
- 16 discussed those, in our Subcommittee meeting,
- 17 and agreed some of them were going to be
- incorporated and some of them, we opted not to
- 19 deal with, but I have not gotten the clear --
- 20 the cleaned up copies back to you.
- 21 MR. KATZ: Okay.
- 22 CHAIR MUNN: And I just wanted to

1	make sure I wasn't holding anything up.
2	MEMBER ZIEMER: I'm not even sure,
3	do we need to see the clean copies, again?
4	We've agreed to the changes. I think once you
5	clean them up, they should be posted, right?
6	MR. KATZ: We post them, yes, and
7	be done with them.
8	CHAIR MUNN: All right.
9	DR. MAURO: And once they're
10	posted, I mean, just as an observation, you
11	know, not everyone can get the things all the
12	time, and maybe once they're posted, that
13	doesn't mean they can't be revised.
14	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, if there is a
15	major
16	DR. MAURO: If anybody has a
17	problem, right, so, it's not that it is
18	anything urgent
19	MR. KATZ: Yes.
20	CHAIR MUNN: There was one extra
21	step, that I it occurred to me, we have not
22	taken it in any of our deliberations, and that

2	At no point in this process, have I
3	personally gone back and checked the findings
4	that we list on our two-page document, against
5	the original set of findings. I have not done
6	that.
7	And so, since I haven't done that,
8	and I doubt anyone in NIOSH has done that,
9	then what we have here is a document, which
10	SC&A has put together for this Subcommittee,
11	and has which has not been checked against
12	the original document, to be certain of its
13	accuracy.
14	In my view, that is one step that
15	we should incorporate, into our process, in
16	some way, simply to make sure that we're not
17	missing something, before it goes out.
18	MR. KATZ: Right.
19	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, John?
20	DR. MAURO: And I agree, that would
21	be ideal, but until we're able to sort the
22	history, and I'm not sure if it's there or not

might be wise to do.

1	Steve
2	MR. MARSCHKE: You can
3	DR. MAURO: You can sort the
4	history and quickly verify
5	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, if you know
6	what procedure you're looking at, like if
7	you're looking at OTIB-25, you can pull up
8	OTIB-25, open it up and look at all the
9	history associated with it.
10	DR. MAURO: And see the whole
11	history?
12	MR. KATZ: But my suggestion is
13	that you post these, just sort of like we post
14	transcripts, before we certify them. Once
15	they're PA cleared, post these, because I
16	guess, I think so much time can go by.
17	Let's post these. You can down
18	the road, you can look, you can do that and if
19	you have revisions, we can make revisions. In
20	the meantime, they're up there and people
21	start getting the advantage of this work,
22	because I'm really I just think time, the

1	river keeps flowing.
2	CHAIR MUNN: It does.
3	MR. KATZ: And there are a lot of
4	them. There is, you know, approximately 50 of
5	them. So, I would post them, and then if
6	people want to take the initiative to do that
7	cross-checking and so on, they can do that and
8	they can be updated, just like John says,
9	they're not frozen, just because they're up
10	there.
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: And they aren't the
12	actual actions of official
13	MR. KATZ: No, right, it's just a
14	summary for the public.
15	MEMBER ZIEMER: Just the public is
16	going to
17	CHAIR MUNN: No, we said they were
18	summaries.
19	MEMBER ZIEMER: They were
20	summaries, number one. Number two, I think we
21	agreed that we wouldn't put up all the
22	findings, wording of all the findings

1	CHAIR MUNN: That is correct.
2	MR. KATZ: No, we don't.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Correct, we don't.
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: And we kind of
5	consolidated, and so, to do it on a one-to-one
6	basis may be a little time consuming, and if -
7	- it's almost like okay, if you didn't
8	expressly point out one of the particular
9	findings, is that a big deal?
LO	I mean, it's sort of the thrust of
L1	it, it's explaining, here is what we did.
L2	Here is how it was resolved, and I am I
L3	think it's fine, to have quality control, if
L4	this is a critical document, or some
L5	particular actions, but it isn't.
L6	CHAIR MUNN: No, it isn't, no.
L7	MEMBER ZIEMER: And it's just a
L8	description. It's a brief description of what
L9	we did, and if somebody says, "Well, wait a
20	minute, you didn't mention this finding," and
21	I suppose we could go back, but I mean, I
22	don't think we mentioned every finding, did

1	we?
2	CHAIR MUNN: No.
3	DR. MAURO: No, and it would be
4	more cumbersome, unnecessarily.
5	CHAIR MUNN: I thought we did
6	mention all the findings, because that is one
7	of the
8	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, no, we
9	MR. KATZ: No, we consolidated it
10	quite a bit.
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: No, the document
12	said three of the findings
13	CHAIR MUNN: Are the same thing,
14	yes.
15	MEMBER ZIEMER: They're similar,
16	yes.
17	CHAIR MUNN: But then, we say that
18	in the write-up.
19	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
20	CHAIR MUNN: We said that we
21	consolidated them.
22	MEMBER ZIEMER: Maybe we did.

1	MR. KATZ: We did.
2	CHAIR MUNN: Okay, then that is
3	that helps clarify for me. If we're if
4	you're not concerned about double about
5	checking it, after we're done, then that is
6	okay.
7	MR. KATZ: Okay.
8	CHAIR MUNN: There is no question,
9	we certainly have plenty of eyes given an
10	opportunity to look at it.
11	Now, I had asked that you take a
12	look at all of the 17 new procedures, that
13	have been sent out to us, before I went ahead
14	and sent them to the whole Board.
15	The reason I did that is to see if
16	your take on what we have here is the same as
17	mine.
18	The first thing I want to say is, I
19	really appreciate the work that has been done
20	on getting these honed down to the place where
21	they are.
22	The brevity is wonderful. The

1	format is, I think, quite is appropriate,
2	and in most cases, they are everything that
3	I saw, out of these 17, are better than 90
4	percent ready to go.
5	In looking at them, however, I
6	found a couple of things. One, we still have
7	several uses of acronyms, where I feel
8	personally that we should not use them.
9	I don't think we should use the
LO	acronyms for anything, other than the agency
L1	names which occur repeatedly, or for some very
L2	unusual things, like IREP, you know, but ever
L3	IREP, I don't think we should use, if we can -
L4	- if we possibly have the link to go ahead and
L5	spell it out.
L6	For example, in these in this
L7	set, several times, QA is used. It's
L8	identified, but it's used. I don't think we
L9	should say QA. I think we should say quality
20	assurance, because the fewer acronyms, the
21	better.

My only other complaint with any of

21

1	this is some of the language. The language is
2	still at too high a level, in many cases.
3	For example, just give you a couple
4	of things for me.
5	In OTIB-35, which was in this new
6	group that we had, finding three talks about
7	default assumptions throughout the complex.
8	Now, everybody sitting at this
9	table knows what default assumptions are,
10	knows what default means and understands what
11	a complex is.
12	But I question whether the average
13	citizen or the average claimant looking at
14	this, would know that.
15	If our target audience is indeed,
16	the average citizen and the average claimant,
17	and our assumption is that not all folks are
18	college educated, then these are the kinds of
19	words that I think we're going to have to find
20	a way about for and other in OTIB-35,
21	also, it refers to the final paragraph
22	mentions in abeyance, something to be held in

1	abeyance.
2	In abeyance means something to us,
3	but in abeyance often may not mean something
4	to somebody else.
5	We talk in several spots, we talk -
6	- we use the word surrogate, and even though
7	there is an attempt to try to explain what
8	surrogate is, I don't think it's done very
9	well.
10	It talks about gamma radiation as
11	being electro-magnetic type of radiation. I'm
12	not at all sure of that.
13	The bottom line here is, to me, the
14	language still needs some simplification work.
15	Was that a feeling that came from anybody
16	else?
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: I have the same
18	feeling in let me give you an example.
19	It's just this is the I
20	pulled this one up because I think it's a good
21	example.

maximum

is

This

22

dose

internal

1	estimates for Savannah River Site claims.
2	It's OTIB-0001, and the resolution oh, and
3	where it talks it talks about, the
4	following issues are still under review, and
5	it basically, it's quoting NIOSH, which is
6	why it's so confusing.
7	Here is what it says. Now, I'm
8	thinking of somebody in the public reading
9	this.
10	"NIOSH responded to finding 10 by
11	stating that since this procedure provides
12	guidance for inner for intentionally over-
13	estimating internal exposures to workers with
14	little or not potential for such exposure, any
15	intake value that is high based on site
16	experience would suffice."
17	It seems to me, that that's a tough
18	sentence for somebody in public to say,
19	"What?"
20	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, you know
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: And so, somehow, we
22	have to and it's not an easy thing, but

	1	it's -	it's	а	matter	of	distilling	that	dow
--	---	--------	------	---	--------	----	------------	------	-----

- 2 It doesn't even really have to explain it in
- 3 detail, you know what I'm saying?
- 4 DR. MAURO: There is so much
- 5 context.
- 6 MEMBER ZIEMER: I know.
- 7 DR. MAURO: That surrounds that.
- 8 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
- 9 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I think there is.
- 10 MEMBER ZIEMER: So, I think those
- are the challenges. Most of the statements in
- this one are very brief, and so, if they're
- brief, and you get rid of any acronyms, then
- 14 we're good.
- So, overall, this one is pretty
- 16 good. I mean, the findings are all pretty
- 17 brief, and but then we get a statement like
- that, and you guys are just stating what they
- 19 said they're going to do, but I think it looks
- 20 like it's a quote, and that is where we run
- into terrible, when we quote some of these
- things.

1	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, well, and you
2	know, we talk about ambient, we've used
3	tertiary. We've used spontaneous fission.
4	Well, that is all perfectly
5	accurate, all very exact, but it's a concern
6	to me, and frankly, when I looked at tertiary,
7	I thought, "Okay, and what would I say,
8	instead of that?" You know, there is no
9	I'm not going to be able to define a single
LO	word
L1	DR. MAURO: If you read it if
L2	you're ready to give up precision, for the
L3	sake of clarity, than that is a sacrifice that
L4	we have to all agree to make, because if you
L5	want to talk about fission, you may not even
L6	want to use the word fission, never mind
L7	tertiary fission or
L8	CHAIR MUNN: Exactly.
L9	MEMBER ZIEMER: I think that is
20	exactly right, I mean, these kind of
21	documents, what is the level your write to for
22	the general public? Is it sixth grade?

1	CHAIR MUNN: Eighth sixth to
2	eighth grade.
3	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay.
4	DR. MAURO: So, plus we have atom
5	splitting?
6	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
7	MR. HINNEFELD: Good luck.
8	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, good luck.
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: No, but it doesn't
10	
11	MR. HINNEFELD: It's hard to write
12	at 12.
13	CHAIR MUNN: I know.
14	MEMBER ZIEMER: I know.
15	MR. HINNEFELD: Because I was
16	just did a reader on a couple of these things,
17	and I'm sure if it's at 14, now, in terms of
18	grade level reading.
19	CHAIR MUNN: Scary.
20	MR. KATZ: Just leave out detail,
21	is usually the best solution.
22	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, yes, the

							_	
1		~-~ -	1		1	- h -	particular	
1	1 ()	CICI	r)\/ -	VOH	K TI()W -	1 110	pari icular	reader
_	\sim	\neg	\sim , ,	,	1 TTT O VV /	CIIC	Parcrarar	T CAACT /

- 2 you know, this thing that -- the particular
- 3 tool I'm using, you use few syllables and
- 4 short sentences.
- 5 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, well, when we
- 6 say the TIB provides a methodology, for
- 7 formulating reasonable over-estimating
- 8 assumptions, that is --
- 9 MR. HINNEFELD: You're gone.
- 10 CHAIR MUNN: That is just -- you've
- 11 lost them.
- DR. MAURO: You've lost them.
- 13 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
- DR. MAURO: So, how do you say
- that, to a 12-year old?
- 16 MEMBER ZIEMER: The Bulletin
- 17 provides a way for --
- DR. MAURO: Simplifying the
- 19 calculations.
- 20 MEMBER ZIEMER: -- for simplifying
- 21 the calculations for workers who likely would
- 22 not be compensated. It's not -- it just --

2	to all right, a methodology, for
3	formulating people don't use those words.
4	DR. MAURO: Right, yes.
5	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
6	DR. MAURO: What will happen is,
7	very often, and by the way, I like that, I
8	like that we're communicating to them.
9	The thing is, very often, the very
10	procedure itself, is within a context that
11	cannot be understood.
12	In other words, we're you know
13	what I mean? We're in the procedure itself
14	is embedded in an overall larger context, like
15	the surrogate data context, and without
16	understanding the larger context, you really
17	can't even talk about it.
18	So, I mean, it's a challenge, don't
19	get me wrong, but certainly, it can be done.
20	I have to admit, I know working a
21	little bit with Steve Ostrow and we all
22	agreed, yes, we could we thought we could

okay, no technical terms. They're not going

1	do it, and the reality is, maybe we you
2	know, it's to go where we
3	MEMBER ZIEMER: No, but that is
4	DR. MAURO: where you want to go
5	is a big one, it's a big sea change.
6	MEMBER ZIEMER: We already have
7	several paragraphs, which are intended they
8	don't have anything to do with the procedure.
9	They're intended to describe to people, what
10	all of this means.
11	DR. MAURO: For them, it's good.
12	For yes, and the
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: It works, fine.
14	CHAIR MUNN: That's fine, then work
15	on that in three meetings.
16	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, and I haven't
17	I haven't had a chance to mark these all
18	up, but that overall impression is there is
19	they're a mix of really good and

MEMBER

ZIEMER:

DR. MAURO: And then you get hit

I

with something.

20

21

22

mean, it's

2	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, now, this is the
3	reason why put on the agenda, I put our
4	discussion of this, looking at the new two-
5	pagers ahead of our item for discussion, the
6	review methods.
7	I know what we agreed our review
8	methods were going to be, but in a case like
9	this one, where we know that this group of 17,
10	as with the group of 13 before them, does not
11	incorporate quite what we want to do.
12	Would it not be wiser for some of
13	us to take a look to make some of these
14	at least some of these changes that we have,
15	on what we have here, before we send it to the
16	Board, rather than
17	MR. KATZ: Not to the Board, to the
18	oh, I see what you're saying, for the new
19	set?
20	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, yes.
21	MR. KATZ: I don't know whether
22	that matters. Are there any other because

1

correct, but hard to --

1	you're	not	going	to	get	that	much	input	from
---	--------	-----	-------	----	-----	------	------	-------	------

- the rest of the Board, anyway.
- 3 CHAIR MUNN: No, I don't think we
- 4 are, either.
- 5 MR. KATZ: I don't think that
- 6 really matters.
- 7 MEMBER ZIEMER: Maybe what to do is
- 8 to go ahead and send it out to the Board, and
- 9 that way, we're not revising it and then
- 10 revising it again.
- MR. KATZ: Yes.
- 12 MEMBER ZIEMER: We give them a
- deadline, then we'll take their input and then
- 14 we'll go through it and add our changes to it,
- or something like that.
- 16 CHAIR MUNN: Now, there are several
- of these that I feel we need to --
- 18 MEMBER ZIEMER: I think several
- 19 Board Members probably will conscientiously
- 20 review these, like David did, and that is very
- 21 helpful.
- 22 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, it is helpful.

1	No, there is no question about that.
2	DR. MAURO: I'm sorry to interrupt.
3	CHAIR MUNN: No, go ahead.
4	DR. MAURO: When these are put up,
5	on the public web, to help the public
6	understand what we might have done to
7	accomplish this on the Subcommittee, could we
8	not solicit from them, and that is, to let
9	them almost part of the introduction.
10	Now, we'd like feedback from them,
11	whether or not these are clear, and does it
12	raise more questions than answers? You know,
13	in other words, almost like engage them in the
14	process, because what we're struggling with
15	here is our ability to visualize whether we
16	think they would be comfortable with it, and
17	we certainly should do that.
18	But why can't we engage them and
19	have an opportunity for them to feedback on
20	whether or not they understood, you know, they
21	can comment on it, any aspects of these that
22	are difficult to understand

1	I don't know, just a thought, so,
2	that it becomes a positive force of outreach,
3	in a way, to try to engage the public and to
4	make sure that they understand it, and get
5	their feelings, because we have to admit to
6	ourselves, no matter how hard we try, we're
7	not going to be 100 percent effective in
8	communicating the way we'd like to
9	communicate.
LO	I'm just trying to turn a negative
L1	into a positive.
L2	CHAIR MUNN: I hear what you're
L3	saying. My knee-jerk reaction is simply, if
L4	we ask for that, then what we are going to
L5	get, I suspect, is a great deal of feedback
L6	from the better educated component of the
L7	reader who would like us to be more specific,
L8	when we have spent a great deal of time trying
L9	to not do that.
20	DR. MAURO: Yes, do the same thing.
21	CHAIR MUNN: We're trying to make
22	sure that we cover as broad an audience as we

1	can, and my guess is, the feedback from those
2	who follow what we're doing
3	DR. MAURO: And then two pages is
4	not going to work anymore.
5	CHAIR MUNN: Is not going to do it.
6	DR. MAURO: It's not going to work.
7	You're very right.
8	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, okay. So, I,
9	personally, would not think that would be a
10	good way to go, but it's worth discussion, if
11	anyone else feels they want to weigh in on
12	that.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, you can
14	always have a general statement, in the
15	introduction of this whole thing, on the
16	website, that if individuals have questions
17	pertaining to the information in any of the
18	documents, that they can, you know, contact
19	somebody.
20	CHAIR MUNN: Well, you know, we
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: Contact Ted.
22	CHAIR MUNN: We wrote the cover

1	page, long ago. The cover page is ready to
2	go.
3	MEMBER ZIEMER: No, no, yes.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: They send in
5	comments to the inbox. We've got our inbox,
6	although it's gone on the website, or on the
7	host. I mean, it's the Board's website, or
8	the Board's pages, but it's our hosted
9	website.
10	So, we'll just take it, you know,
11	have them send it to us. We can split the
12	comments, if they would like it.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I'm sort of
14	trying to steer away from
15	CHAIR MUNN: Actually soliciting.
16	MEMBER ZIEMER: actually
17	soliciting the comments, as opposed to making
18	comments or making the opportunity
19	available. If you have questions or comments
20	on any of these, please let us know, without
21	saying, "We want to find out if you think
22	we've made this understandable or not."

1	DR. MAURO: Yes.
2	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
3	CHAIR MUNN: All right.
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: I mean, I suppose
5	if somebody doesn't quite
6	DR. MAURO: They'll do it anyway.
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: know what this
8	says, they would ask, but particularly, if
9	it's someone from that site or a petitioner,
10	or something like that.
11	CHAIR MUNN: All right, then I am
12	going to go to work on the 13 that I was
13	supposed to have completed for you, two months
14	ago, and I will go ahead and send these, or
15	ask Ted to send these to all Board Members.
16	MR. KATZ: Sure.
17	CHAIR MUNN: With the understanding
18	that
19	MEMBER ZIEMER: And request the
20	MR. KATZ: So, I'm a little
21	confused. So, this is a batch of 17 that I'm
22	sending on?

1		CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
2		MEMBER ZIEMER: Is it just 17 or
3	15?	
4		CHAIR MUNN: It's 17.
5		MEMBER ZIEMER: Have I got the
6	wrong batch	n?
7		CHAIR MUNN: I believe it's 17.
8		MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, it's the group
9	that Nancy	sent on August 2 nd . Is that right?
10	August 2 nd	
11		CHAIR MUNN: One, two, three, four,
12	five, six.	
13		MR. KATZ: But then there is some
14	missing.	
15		MEMBER ZIEMER: Wait a minute, I
16	got some -	_
17		CHAIR MUNN: Thirteen, 14, 15, 16,
18	17, yes.	
19		MR. KATZ: Okay, so, I'm confused
20	about numbe	ers, here. So, we have
21		MEMBER ZIEMER: How many is that?
22		MR. KATZ: A batch of six.

2	MR. KATZ: Okay, I can certainly
3	forward the August 2^{nd} to the Board, and I'll
4	do that.
5	CHAIR MUNN: That is what it is.
6	MR. KATZ: And we have a batch of
7	six. We have a batch a 13, a batch of 17,
8	seems like we're missing a batch.
9	CHAIR MUNN: No.
10	MR. KATZ: Okay, but that would be
11	that means we have a total of 36?
12	CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
13	DR. MAURO: I thought we had more.
14	MR. KATZ: But according to SC&A,
15	because I've had discussion with SC&A about
16	these things, we have either 49 or 51, that
17	came up with different counts, but in that
18	ballpark.
19	CHAIR MUNN: That's fine.
20	MR. KATZ: So, you don't need to do
21	that it's just, the question is, where is
22	the I'll have to look and see where the

MR. HINNEFELD: August 2^{nd} .

1	missir	ng batch	is
_	IIITOOTI	19 Datti	TD .

- DR. MAURO: Okay.
- 3 MR. KATZ: There is more. We're
- 4 missing a batch from here, is all I am saying.
- 5 You don't need to do it, now.
- DR. MAURO: Okay.
- 7 MR. KATZ: But I know we're missing
- 8 a batch, because I know I was -- my count was
- 9 up to like 49, but so, we had this little --
- 10 we were off by a couple, between me and Steve
- 11 Ostrow, as to how many there are.
- MR. MARSCHKE: Well, you know,
- 13 Nancy explains, in the kind of -- in the --
- the original list had 53, and three of them
- 15 were not -- one of them was not -- two of them
- were not closed and one was a duplicate.
- 17 MR. KATZ: So, that brings it down
- 18 to 50.
- 19 MR. MARSCHKE: That brings it down
- 20 to 50.
- 21 MR. KATZ: Right.
- MR. MARSCHKE: And you're talking

-	1 .	40
1	about	49.

- MR. KATZ: Yes, that is the 49.
- DR. MAURO: And now, there are 37,
- 4 here, you said, right?
- 5 MR. KATZ: But this is only 36,
- 6 right.
- 7 MR. MARSCHKE: This is only 36.
- 8 MR. KATZ: So, there is a batch
- 9 that is missing.
- 10 MR. MARSCHKE: There is another
- 11 batch, obviously.
- 12 MR. KATZ: There is a batch
- 13 floating around, that somehow is --
- 14 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay, there was 15
- of them sent out on the 9th of July.
- MR. MARSCHKE: So, that would make
- 17 51.
- 18 MEMBER ZIEMER: The 9th of July,
- 19 I've got 15 from Nancy.
- 20 MR. KATZ: Fifteen?
- 21 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, 15, the
- 22 subject is 'transmittal of 15'.

1	MD	κ_{Λ} τ_{7} .	Right.
	MK.	VAIT.	KIGIIL.

- 2 MR. MARSCHKE: Short summaries, and
- 3 then the next one is when?
- 4 CHAIR MUNN: It must be the 13 that
- 5 I was talking about.
- 6 MR. MARSCHKE: The 17 were on
- 7 August 2^{nd} .
- 8 MEMBER ZIEMER: August 2nd?
- 9 CHAIR MUNN: Can you tell from
- Nancy's, now, that you're looking at, whether
- that includes OTIB-4, 28, 30? Is that it?
- 12 MEMBER ZIEMER: Let's see here.
- 13 OTIB-1, OTIB-2, OTIB-5, 6, 7 and 10, 17, 19,
- 20, 23, those are the OTIB's on that one.
- 15 Then there is some PROC-17 and
- 16 PROC-22.
- 17 CHAIR MUNN: I think we're talking
- 18 about the same group.
- MR. KATZ: Okay.
- 20 CHAIR MUNN: And I just had my
- 21 numbers wrong. If I said 13, and there is 15,
- 22 then it's 15.

1 MR.	KATZ:	Okay,	but	you're	still
-------	-------	-------	-----	--------	-------

- 2 missing a batch, Wanda, is what I am saying.
- 3 CHAIR MUNN: You think so?
- 4 MR. KATZ: Yes, because 36 or 38,
- 5 whatever it might be, is not in the ballpark
- of 50.
- 7 So, anyway, I'll track these down.
- 8 I think somehow there is --
- 9 MR. HINNEFELD: I think I've got
- 10 it. There is a message from Nancy, from
- 11 January 3rd.
- 12 MR. KATZ: Right, January 3rd,
- 13 there is one batch.
- 14 MR. HINNEFELD: It says there are
- 15 12 in that batch.
- MR. KATZ: Okay.
- 17 MR. HINNEFELD: And it says five
- 18 were sent previously, four were -- it said
- 19 four were submitted on September 13, 2010. One
- was submitted on September 29, 2010 and 12 are
- 21 submitted on this message, which is January 1st
- 22 -- January 3rd of 2011. There are 15 on July

1 9 th , and 17 on August 2 nd . So, that is		9 th ,	and	17	on	August	2^{110} .	So,	that	is	32	
--	--	-------------------	-----	----	----	--------	-------------	-----	------	----	----	--

- 2 44, that is 49.
- MR. KATZ: That was my number.
- 4 That was my count.
- 5 CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
- DR. MAURO: We got it.
- 7 MR. KATZ: That was my count. So,
- 8 I have all those same records.
- 9 CHAIR MUNN: All right, so, I'll go
- 10 back to that January transmittal and see if I
- 11 have missed something in there.
- MR. KATZ: Okay, in any event, my
- 13 charge will be to send a batch to the full
- 14 Board.
- 15 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.
- 16 MR. KATZ: Whatever the batch is
- 17 that they haven't received.
- 18 CHAIR MUNN: Whatever the batch is,
- 19 that they haven't received, yes. Very good.
- 20 Then, I will -- I'll go ahead and start some
- 21 work on these myself, and get the one batch
- that I have had some comment on, to get back

1	to you, and that we've worked on before. That
2	is my job.
3	Now, that comes to the end of what
4	I have listed for today's agenda, with the
5	exception of any administrative things that we
6	need to do.
7	Does anyone else have any technical
8	item or work item to add to the agenda today?
9	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, I would like to
10	mention I would like to mention one thing,
11	and I don't know if it's how you want to
12	characterize it.
13	But I sent out an email a couple of
14	days ago, regarding the fact that Rose has
15	gone through now that the database, or the
16	Board review system is up and running, I asked
17	Rose to go through the minutes of the meetings
18	from the last handful, maybe three or four
19	Subcommittee meetings, and update the database
20	to reflect changes that were made during those
21	meetings.
22	She has done that, and so, I think

1	you know, NIOSH and the Subcommittee may want
2	to and there was an email that I sent out a
3	couple of days ago, which gave the notes that
4	Rose put together, describing what she did and
5	where she did it and linking the database back
6	to the transcripts and so on and so forth.
7	Again, NIOSH and the Subcommittee
8	may want to double-check that, to see that
9	they agree with the changes that were made to
10	the database, and you know, basically concur
11	with what SC&A has done to bring the database
12	in line with the decisions that were made,
13	during the time period when the database was
14	unavailable.
15	MR. KATZ: Who is Rose?
16	MR. MARSCHKE: Rose?
17	DR. MAURO: She is a member of our
18	Gogliotti. She is a member of our she
19	is a full-time employee out of our Vienna
20	office.
21	MR. KATZ: Okay.
22	DR. MAURO: Gogliotti.

1	MR. KATZ: What is her last name?
2	DR. MAURO: Rose Gogliotti.
3	MR. KATZ: Gogliotti, okay.
4	MR. MARSCHKE: I'll get it up here
5	in a minute for you.
6	MR. KATZ: Okay, thanks.
7	DR. MAURO: I have an item that I
8	was thinking about.
9	When we originally grabbed the 50
LO	or so procedures, they were grabbed because
L1	those were the 50 that were done.
L2	MR. KATZ: Right.
L3	DR. MAURO: Right, that was about a
L4	year and a half ago or so.
L5	MR. KATZ: I think.
L6	DR. MAURO: We don't know if more
L7	have been completed. I guess we don't know,
L8	since then, we've completed another three, 10,
L9	20, I don't know. I know there were about 103
20	all together, and the question is, are there
21	others that have been completed, and I guess
22	it would be nice to know, have others been

MR. HINNEFELD: There is you
guys have access to boy, I don't know if
you've got this, or not.
Yes, there is a way to know. I
can't know right now, but there are the
entire list of documents is published. So,
there are a couple of things we can include in
this publication spot.
Everybody is used to looking at one
place, so, I hate to move it somewhere else,
but we could duplicate it on the O-drive.
DR. MAURO: Well, if we can get
that
MR. HINNEFELD: Or we could look at
the
DR. MAURO: a summary table,
because when we originally I think, when we
originally came up with our listing of 50, the
starting point was that summary level table,
that said we have these many that you know,
wouldn't that be our doorway?

completed since then?

1	I mean, once that is in place
2	again, would that be our doorway to
3	identifying do we have additional I'm
4	not sure.
5	MR. MARSCHKE: I'm not sure we need
6	to go to that summary. I mean, if this total
7	active findings column is working, correctly -
8	_
9	DR. MAURO: That should do it.
10	MR. MARSCHKE: that should do
11	it, right there.
12	DR. MAURO: Yes, right, absolutely
13	right.
14	MR. MARSCHKE: So, I mean, I guess
15	it's a question, and the thing is, just hold
16	on for a little bit.
17	DR. MAURO: Sit tight.
18	MR. MARSCHKE: And you know, when
19	we get this thing here working, it will be
20	able to do that, in a snap. Otherwise, it's -
21	_
22	DR. MAURO: Got you.

1	MR. MARSCHKE: going to be a
2	difficult task to do.
3	DR. MAURO: All right.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, we would want
5	to make sure it would be like the
6	unassigned queue in this, because that would
7	be a Technical Document that has been
8	published, that no one has looked at.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, that is
10	another thing. You know, if you have
11	Technical Documents, or like we were talking
12	about this morning, you have a revision to a
13	document, if it's a major revision that you
14	want SC&A or
15	MR. HINNEFELD: No, we don't ever
16	want SC&A to review everything. What we will
17	inform the Board of is what Technical
18	Documents have been written, and the Board can
19	make what assignments
20	MR. MARSCHKE: Because we haven't
21	reviewed we haven't gotten a we haven't
22	really done that, because we were talking at

1	lunch time, and we haven't done many procedure
2	reviews in the last six months or so. So, I
3	don't know, you know, it's like you know, I
4	guess most of the Technical Documents, I
5	think, have already gone under review.
6	So, I think it's mostly an issue
7	of, has there been a major revision to
8	something or
9	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, and there may
LO	be some new stuff around.
L1	MR. MARSCHKE: And there may be
L2	some new stuff, which
L3	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, the
L4	application is designed to have you know,
L5	if you just go on the the landing page, if
L6	you go to Board review instead of picking
L7	documents under Board review, which brings up
L8	everything, there is another selection.
L9	It says 'unassigned queue', and
20	that just means documents haven't been
21	assigned to any Work Group, to review.
22	So that the design idea is that

1	will include, you know, when we publish a
2	document, it will go
3	CHAIR MUNN: It will go in our
4	queue.
5	MR. HINNEFELD: it will go to be
6	written to that unassigned queue, and then
7	periodically, the Board can review the
8	unassigned queue, to determine of there are
9	Technical Documents that warrant review, and
10	make the tasking.
11	So, Brant, that would be another
12	thing to do in the meantime, since that is not
13	the highest priority thing that we want to fix
14	on the database, we'll come up with the list
15	of we can do this by date. We can make the
16	table of contents available to you, not just
17	the table of contents. I would think we could
18	provide access to the whole set.
19	I mean, when I look on my it's
20	part of what we call the K-drive, that you
21	guys can't see, I can click on I have to
22	look at either a DCAS document or an ORAU

1	document, have to make that selection first,
2	and then I have to select the kind of document
3	I'm looking for, whether it's a TIB or a TBD
4	or procedure, and I get the entirety of the
5	published current published active
6	documents.
7	And so, it comes up by it's got
8	a document number and then the title, and I
9	would think it has the date. I can look in a
LO	minute and let you know if it has the date
L1	prepared.
L2	So, one way or another, we'll try
L3	to get an inventory of the documents.
L 4	MR. MARSCHKE: Even using this, you
L5	know, Board review system, here, you can click
L6	on again, total findings.
L7	There is a bunch of documents in
L8	here. There is 214 documents and as we talked
L9	this morning, we haven't looked. We only
20	looked at about 105 of them.
21	So, there is about 100 documents in
22	there which you know SC&A has not looked at

1	and probably don't need to look at.
2	DR. MAURO: And by choice.
3	MR. MARSCHKE: The majority of
4	then, they probably don't need.
5	MR. KATZ: But a lot of them, too,
6	I think are TBD's and things that get looked
7	at by other Work Groups. They're not captured
8	by this, because this is sort of procedure
9	oriented.
10	But they will have been looked at,
11	a lot of them. A lot of them will have gotter
12	mini Site Profile reviews from John or others,
13	because they're AWE's, and
14	DR. MAURO: Yes, many of them.
15	MR. KATZ: That is part of the
16	numbers that
17	DR. MAURO: Okay, I didn't realize
18	that.
19	MR. KATZ: that it's showing in

DR. MAURO:

than just procedures in here?

here.

20

21

22

So, there is much more

1	MR. KATZ: Yes, that's the thing,
2	is that they're not all procedures. It's
3	probably done, the vast majority, if not all,
4	the procedures, but then they're site
5	specific.
6	DR. MAURO: Because we've beer
7	binning things, in a way that really started
8	at the beginning of our contract, which goes
9	back seven or eight years now, where we made a
LO	separation between Site Profiles and
L1	procedures, and then there are procedures that
L2	are generic and there are procedures that are
L3	really extensions of a Site Profile.
L4	What happens is, there are these
L5	bins. The bin we've been working in here,
L6	really is the bin that we've been calling
L7	procedures, but it sounds like that this
L8	particular data summary captures a lot more
L9	than just the procedures.
20	MR. MARSCHKE: Go ahead.
21	DR. ULSH: Yes, it was our
22	intention to once this procedures database

1	was up and running, to load all NIOSE
2	documents in here, all of them, and then if
3	they haven't been assigned to a particular
4	one, it would show up in the unassigned queue
5	and you guys could select from there.
6	DR. MAURO: I think that is I
7	mean, having that is really getting really
8	regrouping and doing it the right way. That
9	is what you're really saying.
10	In the process of regrouping, let's
11	regroup in a way that we really throw a net
12	over the whole story, which is a good idea,
13	but of course, you catch that, doing that, you
14	catch us in midstream, operating really on a
15	subset of that, and trying to track that
16	subset, because that is really where we are
17	right now.
18	What we're trying to do is track a
19	subset of your big picture
20	CHAIR MUNN: And from the
21	Subcommittee's point of view, you're binning
22	was absolutely correct. Remember, the initial

1	the original name of this Subcommittee was
2	Subcommittee for Tracking SC&A Procedure
3	Reviews. That is what our name was, or our
4	tentative name, before we became just
5	Subcommittee on Procedures, Procedures
6	Subcommittee.
7	So, we have not had, as a part of
8	our charter, the either the need or the
9	desire to look at anything other than reviews
10	SC&A has made of NIOSH procedures.
11	DR. MAURO: But I think the
12	ambitious program that you overtook, is well
13	taken, and all we have to be cognizant of is
14	that while you're building this larger
15	framework, that we, we, can still operate
16	within a subdivision of that framework, so,
17	that we can do the things that we're mandated
18	to do.
19	But that bigger framework is a
20	great thing to have.
21	DR. ULSH: Yes, I mean, the long
22	term objective of this application was, like

1	we talked about earlier, for other Work Groups
2	and Subcommittees to use this.
3	CHAIR MUNN: Right.
4	DR. ULSH: So, for instance, the
5	Rocky Flats TBD would be come to the Rocky
6	Flats Working Group.
7	CHAIR MUNN: Right.
8	DR. MAURO: Right.
9	CHAIR MUNN: But for the time
10	being, binning it under unassigned queue would
11	be marvelous, from my point of view.
12	MR. HINNEFELD: But right now,
13	there
14	MR. MARSCHKE: Right now, there is
15	nothing in the unassigned queue.
16	MR. HINNEFELD: There is nothing in
17	the unassigned queue, but everything is in the
18	documents under review, because like Steve
19	pointed out, some of these things have zero
20	findings, and so, you know
21	MR. MARSCHKE: What I think

happened was, we were complaining, we couldn't

1	figure out how to get that move documents
2	from the unassigned queue into the procedures
3	Subcommittee area.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.
5	MR. MARSCHKE: And so, IT people
6	made it simple for us and they said, "Well,
7	we'll take everything over and put it into the
8	procedure Subcommittee," and that basically
9	allowed me to enter all the PER's that we
10	talked about this morning
11	CHAIR MUNN: Which is great.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: which I couldn't
13	do, you know, the last meeting or something,
14	or two meetings ago, whatever it was.
15	So, it solved that problem. I
16	don't know whether it messed something else up
17	in the process, but so, that is kind of the
18	history of why all of these documents are
19	basically over here into the procedure
20	Subcommittee area, and really, if you look at
21	the design of the system, they should be in
22	the unassigned queue, but it's because you

1	know, I guess operator error, I couldn't
2	figure or operator naivete, I couldn't
3	figure out how to get the documents from the
4	unassigned queue, over into the procedure
5	area. So, they did it for me.
6	MEMBER ZIEMER: But can you filter
7	them back out, now? In other words, under
8	document type?
9	MR. MARSCHKE: I can filter out
10	now, I can filter out again, I can't
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: But you can filter
12	out procedures?
13	MR. MARSCHKE: I can bring up any
14	one of these type. I can't really filter out
15	a document.
16	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay.
17	MR. MARSCHKE: But I can filter in,

MR. MARSCHKE: And some of these

you know, there's more to filter in.

MEMBER ZIEMER:

NEAL R. GROSS

those can be in an unassigned queue, too, I

suppose.

18

19

20

21

Right, but some of

1	are in there, or you can see, for some of
2	these, they haven't
3	MR. HINNEFELD: Anything with zero
4	total findings is probably not going to be
5	MR. MARSCHKE: Anything with zero
6	total findings was not reviewed by yes.
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: Couldn't, under
8	Work Groups, couldn't there be an unassigned
9	queue there?
10	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, Paul, our
11	thought was that unassigned meant it hadn't
12	been assigned to a Work Group, so, that it was
13	a document that had been generated, but wasn't
14	assigned to a Work Group.
15	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, but I mean,
16	under Work Group filter, you got all the Work
17	Groups, but
18	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, yes, you can.
19	MEMBER ZIEMER: But having a
20	category called unassigned and that tells you
21	everything else. That is all I was saying.
22	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, I guess you

1	could.
2	MR. KATZ: But in reality
3	MEMBER ZIEMER: I mean, you're
4	looking for a way to bin those unassigned
5	ones.
6	MR. MARSCHKE: Oh, I just searched
7	twice on it, and basically, they all go to the
8	tail end, and I really don't care about them.
9	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, okay.
10	MR. MARSCHKE: Because they don't
11	add up into the you know, the findings
12	don't really enter in there, at that.
13	But I am not from an operational
14	point of view, I'm not worried about where we
15	carry them.
16	If NIOSH wants to put that back
17	into, the capability back into the system, to
18	have documents into the unassigned queue, that
19	can then be and then give us a procedure
20	for moving them from one to the other, which
21	is simple enough for me to follow
22	MEMBER ZIEMER: Can you move them

1	if they're in a Work Group?
2	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes, you can. That
3	is the way you move them, and basically, when
4	you go to the unassigned queue
5	MEMBER ZIEMER: No, no, I'm saying
6	if your Work Group category includes
7	unassigned queue, then that is just like a
8	Work Group.
9	MR. MARSCHKE: Right.
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: And you can move
11	things in and out.
12	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: I mean, if you can
14	move them in and out of a Work Group, you can
15	move it in and out of something else, called
16	unassigned queue. The computer doesn't know
17	whether it's unassigned. It's just another
18	Work Group.
19	MR. MARSCHKE: Yes.
20	MR. HINNEFELD: Now, I guess back
21	to the original question, about what documents

are out there, I believe this is it, at least

1	on some date, this should have been the
2	entirety.
3	MEMBER ZIEMER: Should be
4	everything.
5	MR. HINNEFELD: So, if you look at
6	the procedures on here that have or the
7	documents that have zero total findings, that
8	would be at least a first shot at a population
9	to look at for things that might be worth
10	review.
11	MR. KATZ: Right, although a lot of
12	them are actually assigned. They were
13	assigned to Work Groups. They were Work Group
14	assignments.
15	MR. HINNEFELD: That could very
16	well be, yes. Anything Site Specific is
17	probably assigned to a Work Group.
18	MR. KATZ: Yes, so, what we really
19	need to do is an accounting of which ones the
20	Work Groups also have bit into.
21	Do that, because right now, all we
22	have in the record of what the procedures has,

1	in effect, assigned to a cell. We don't have a
2	record of what each of the Work Groups has
3	assigned to a cell and taken on, and if we had
4	that, then we would know what is left on the
5	table that nobody has looked at.
6	DR. MAURO: We just have to get
7	smart enough to learn how to use this very
8	popular tool. That is the problem. We've
9	developed something that is really complete,
10	and we just have to learn, as a multi-headed
11	organization, on how to make use of this tool,
12	and maybe there is some software work that
13	needs to be done, but it's as much us
14	learning, as it is
15	MEMBER ZIEMER: Can you pull out
16	things for more than one Work Group
17	simultaneously, or is it only I mean, could
18	you say, I want to know everything that's in a
19	Work Group, or
20	MR. KATZ: Well, the unassigned
21	queue would give you once this is done
22	properly, inputted properly, with all the Work

1	Groups, then your unassigned queue will be
2	stuff that has not gone to any Work Group.
3	That will be one batch.
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: That will be
5	Steve was saying that you can't tell if you
6	look at what has where there is no findings
7	for us, on this or no, I if it's not
8	been assigned to us, yet, but it is somewhere
9	else, can you pull those out?
LO	DR. MAURO: There are two things
L1	going on, here. There are I mean, where
L2	there is a zero and a zero, it could be that
L3	that is a TBD or an AWE that has is active,
L4	someone is working on it.
L5	But it's sitting in here, as if it
L6	has been unassigned, but in fact, it has been
L7	assigned. That is one thing.
L8	When you see zero-zero. It could
L9	be a zero-zero because it is a procedure that
20	is very much part of this work, a Work Group,
21	but it has not yet it's relatively new, but

it hasn't been -- was not reviewed by SC&A,

1	and right, that would be in here, too, is that
2	true? Do I have it wrong?
3	MR. KATZ: Right, that is in there,
4	too.
5	DR. MAURO: So, all this
6	information is in here. It's really a matter
7	but we want to sort and bin, and pose
8	questions to it.
9	For example, I would imagine you
10	would very the Board would very much be
11	interested in what are the Site Profiles and
12	procedures or whatever, that have been
13	prepared by NIOSH, but the Board hasn't looked
14	at them yet, or may not even be aware that
15	they exist? I mean, that is a possibility,
16	too.
17	MR. KATZ: Right, I mean, SC&A, as
18	easily as anyone, could go through this and
19	populate the other Work Groups with what has
20	already been taken on. Once this thing is
21	clean and working, I mean, someone from SC&A
22	could go through and say okay here is the

Т	stuff that went into Rocky Flats. Here is the
2	stuff that went into the each one of these,
3	Blockson Chemical, etcetera, and populate
4	those with all the ones that have been
5	DR. ULSH: You could like pick the
6	document and say which group it's assigned to.
7	MR. KATZ: Yes.
8	DR. ULSH: The second part of that
9	is loading in all the findings.
10	MR. KATZ: No, and the problem
11	yes, no, I am not suggesting that anyone go
12	get because in these cases, for all these
13	other ones, the matrices are Excel
14	spreadsheets or they're something like that,
15	and I'm not suggesting that anybody go through
16	all that work.
17	Just the basic accounting of
18	knowing what went where and actually was
19	worked on, not to fill it in with all of the
20	data.
21	DR. MAURO: You can't.
22	MR. KATZ: That is just not worth

1	the work.
2	DR. MAURO: It can't be done.
3	CHAIR MUNN: No, it isn't.
4	MR. KATZ: Not worth the work.
5	DR. MAURO: I mean, tomorrow is the
6	we're going to be talking Appendix BB, to
7	General Steel Industries.
8	MR. KATZ: Right.
9	CHAIR MUNN: Okay.
10	DR. MAURO: I know we have major
11	number of
12	MR. KATZ: You have major three
13	matrices for that Work Group, already, and so
14	
15	DR. MAURO: Right, correct, yes,
16	exactly.
17	CHAIR MUNN: All right, anything
18	else, and thank you, Steve, for having that
19	double-checked. That was most helpful, to
20	have all that stuff up and loaded, because it
21	was a concern that blank snot in our

abilities to use the database.

22

Thank you.

1	The last item on our agenda then,
2	is when we're going to meet next.
3	I am going to be out of the country
4	for the month of November, and I will come
5	back, I will be flying into Atlanta the day
6	before the Tampa meeting. I'll be in South
7	Africa. Don't try to call me.
8	I believe that that means anything
9	that we need to do upcoming, is not likely to
10	take place in the next month, and therefore,
11	since it's not likely to take place in the
12	next month, it also is not likely to take
13	place in December, given our Tampa meeting.
14	So, unless I am mis-reading the
15	probabilities here, it looks to me as though
16	our next meeting is likely to be January.
17	Does that agree with
18	MR. KATZ: Well, let me just say, I
19	mean, I don't know, there is plenty of time
20	for staff to get more work done on either
21	side.
22	MEMBER ZIEMER: When is the Tampa

2	MR. KATZ: The Tampa meeting is
3	$7^{\rm th}$, $8^{\rm th}$ and $9^{\rm th}$ of December.
4	So, I mean, that is you know,
5	we're most of the way through September,
6	October, November, and part of December.
7	There is plenty of time, like 54, we have 54.
8	If there is if we're lined up
9	I'm wondering what other major work there is
10	to do, but there is plenty of time that if you
11	wanted to set a procedure Work Group
12	Subcommittee meeting for that next week in
13	December, it may be too much for you folks, to
14	do it, having been in Florida that prior week.
15	But there is the week of the $12^{\rm th}$.
16	After the week of the $12^{\rm th}$, certainly, you
17	can't do it in December.
18	CHAIR MUNN: And my having been out
19	of the country the proceeding
20	MR. KATZ: Makes that hard.
21	CHAIR MUNN: Well, makes it hard
22	for me, but of course, I'm not the one who is

1 meeting?

1	doing the work. The staff is the NIOSH and
2	SC&A are the folks who have to do the work.
3	MR. HINNEFELD: So, that would
4	leave us a couple of weeks, or another week or
5	so, in September, all of October, and
6	November, such as it is. I mean, it starts
7	MR. KATZ: Then it's Thanksgiving.
8	MR. HINNEFELD: Thanksgiving and
9	Veteran's Day, November is not real
LO	productive.
L1	MR. KATZ: Yes.
L2	MR. HINNEFELD: And then
L3	MR. KATZ: Otherwise we can
L4	MR. HINNEFELD: We can I mean,
L5	we should be able to put something together. I
L6	mean, that is three months away. We should be
L7	able to get some progress going, and
L8	DR. MAURO: I have a suggestion for
L9	the December meeting. Quite a way back, when
20	we started from the beginning, we identified
21	103 procedures that became the procedures that
22	would be reviewed, that SC&A would review, we

1	used to call them Task 3.
2	This Subcommittee Work Group, and a
3	Subcommittee was convened, and I think that
4	many years have passed. We've reviewed this
5	goes to that summary sheet.
6	If that summary sheet could be
7	prepared, I think that would be a very
8	important status report to do for the
9	Board, that could be given, in December. I'm
LO	sure we'd have to see it, but I am dying to
L1	see that summary.
L2	I am not saying that this is
L3	what you know, what was on our plate, back
L4	several years ago, what was on our plate, as a
L5	Subcommittee?
L6	MR. HINNEFELD: Okay, we're talking
L7	about the report that we refer to as Wanda's
L8	status report?
L9	DR. MAURO: That would be the
20	status report, but and that story told, I
21	think that would be I think that's what
22	we're there, but and I think we're close to

1	beina	done.	auite	frankly.
_	200 2119	α_{CIIC}	quitce	, ,

- 2 MR. KATZ: Right, but it won't be
- 3 ready before the December Board meeting. The
- 4 Board meeting is the first week in December.
- 5 So, if the Procedures Subcommittee
- 6 were to get together, it would be the next
- 7 week on that.
- B DR. MAURO: Oh, I see.
- 9 MR. KATZ: So, the timing isn't
- 10 right.
- DR. MAURO: No, I wasn't saying --
- 12 that would be something that could be
- 13 presented at the Board meeting, even though
- 14 the Subcommittee --
- MR. KATZ: Well, there is no time
- 16 for a Subcommittee meeting to pull that
- 17 together.
- DR. MAURO: I thought it was just
- 19 going to be done.
- 20 MR. HINNEFELD: It would be us to
- 21 put it together.
- MR. KATZ: I see, you mean just a

1	report	of	status?
_	_ 01- 0 - 0	~ -	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ .

- 2 MR. HINNEFELD: A report of what is
- 3 in the database.
- DR. MAURO: And just say, listen,
- 5 here we are, and just --
- 6 MR. MARSCHKE: If it is available,
- 7 they can give it. If it's not available --
- 8 DR. MAURO: And that is all I'm
- 9 saying, it would be nice to see that. I think
- 10 -- I know I would be very interested, and I'm
- 11 sure the Board would be, too.
- MR. MARSCHKE: Obviously, you can
- 13 say --
- 14 MR. KATZ: You could have it as
- 15 part of your progress report.
- 16 MR. HINNEFELD: I would think we
- 17 could do it.
- 18 MR. KATZ: Yes.
- 19 DR. MAURO: We could say out of the
- 20 50, 45 are done. I mean, I don't know if that
- 21 is true.
- MR. MARSCHKE: You already got the

т	two-pagers dolle. For 50 procedures
2	DR. MAURO: Yes, but that is all
3	MR. MARSCHKE: By definition, those
4	50 are already done.
5	DR. MAURO: But what is more
6	important? I think there were over 500
7	comments. I bet you, we finished the I'll
8	say 550, I bet you we're well into 400
9	completed.
10	You know, there may be I think
11	we're really in the home stretch on this, but
12	I am not sure. My intuition tells me that,
13	and I'd like to get an idea of what that is,
14	and I think that once you do that table, we'll
15	know right away, and it would be informative
16	to everyone concerned, even though you may not
17	have a Work Group meeting or a Subcommittee
18	meeting.
19	MR. KATZ: So, back to okay, so,
20	that is good, and Stu is going to look into
21	that, whether he can report out on just the
22	numbers, where we are.

Т	MEMBER ZIEMER. Inal Would Just be
2	a table or two, right?
3	DR. MAURO: Yes.
4	MR. KATZ: Yes, it's pretty simple.
5	Wanda and Work Group, do you want to shoot
6	for December, or do you want to shoot for
7	January? That's all we're asking, at this
8	point?
9	CHAIR MUNN: Well, I could do
LO	either. If we did that next week, then
L1	essentially, what I would do is, I'd stay over
L2	on the East Coast, over that weekend. There
L3	wouldn't be any point in my flying back to the
L4	West Coast and then turning around and two or
L5	three days later, and coming back again.
L6	MR. KATZ: I'm just wondering
L7	whether your fellow Board Members can deal
L8	with that much time in one
L9	CHAIR MUNN: That is a lot of
20	stuff, right in the middle of December.
21	MR. KATZ: in one place, right.
22	CHAIR MUNN: Just before Christmas

1	time?
2	MR. KATZ: How does that look to
3	you?
4	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I can do it.
5	December is not that great, you know, the
6	previous week is pretty well shot. That third
7	week is the only breather. We don't know yet,
8	we're we have to split up. We can't be at
9	one place at Christmas.
10	So, we end up splitting it up, so,
11	I work around the schedule, but
12	CHAIR MUNN: But all that stuff is
13	displacing Christmas, personal stuff that
14	takes place in December, that makes it
15	difficult.
16	MR. KATZ: Okay.
17	CHAIR MUNN: Although, I would
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: Unless there is
19	some urgency to get something done.
20	MR. KATZ: Okay, then let's shoot
21	for January. It sounds like I'm hearing

you, Wanda.

1	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, and I have jury
2	duty starting the 17^{th} , and so
3	MR. KATZ: Of when, of January?
4	CHAIR MUNN: Of January. So, we
5	should I would prefer that second week in
6	January, if that is
7	MEMBER ZIEMER: That is okay to me.
8	CHAIR MUNN: That is good for
9	people.
LO	MR. KATZ: Okay.
11	MR. MARSCHKE: Happy Birthday.
L2	MR. KATZ: That sounds like a great
L3	day.
L4	CHAIR MUNN: So, if we did this on
L5	the 10 th ?
L6	MEMBER ZIEMER: That would be fine.
L7	CHAIR MUNN: That would be okay?
18	MR. KATZ: Then you could celebrate
L9	on your birthday.
20	CHAIR MUNN: I can bring a cake.
21	MR. HINNEFELD: The tradition in
22	the office is on your birthday, you bring in

1	the cake.
2	CHAIR MUNN: Of course.
3	MR. KATZ: Okay, do you want to
4	tentatively say the 10 th ?
5	CHAIR MUNN: The 10 th would be
6	fine.
7	MR. HINNEFELD: I think that will
8	work. I think it's a phone call, isn't it?
9	MR. KATZ: What is the date for
10	that?
11	MR. HINNEFELD: The 10 th of
12	November.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: Now, I want to look
14	at one other thing, though, because it's good
15	to piggy-back these things.
16	We've got some more GSI stuff
17	coming in the end of December, which means you
18	guys will need at least until mid January, to
19	review it, or you know.
20	DR. MAURO: Based on the previous
21	experience, one month.

MEMBER ZIEMER: I'm thinking if we

1	were early February, we could back those two
2	together.
3	MR. KATZ: Well, yes, did you say
4	it's the 10^{th} and the 11^{th} ?
5	MR. HINNEFELD: I've got that on my
6	calendar, but I think now, that was originally
7	scheduled as a trip, but I think that we're
8	going to phone calls.
9	MR. KATZ: Yes, I think two are in
10	person and two are phone calls, but even if
11	MR. HINNEFELD: But the October is
12	in person, but yes, I'll be busy that day.
13	MR. KATZ: Yes, so, let's not to
14	the 10^{th} , then.
15	CHAIR MUNN: How about moving it to
16	the last days of January? How about the $30^{\rm th}$
17	or 31 st ?
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: I think the key
19	thing there will be well, there will be two
20	things.

think it's due out on the 29th of December?

One, if the GSI stuff is out, I

21

1	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, the
2	planning that to the day is pretty tough.
3	MEMBER ZIEMER: I understand.
4	MR. HINNEFELD: That is realistic.
5	But being on the day is
6	DR. MAURO: Okay, we'll it's a week
7	late.
8	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay, but then you
9	guys need at least two weeks, and then we need
10	a couple.
11	DR. MAURO: Well, this one, we took
12	a month on.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: We took a month
14	because Bob had some conflicts, but
15	MR. KATZ: Yes, he had some other
16	CDC work.
17	MR. HINNEFELD: I am not available
18	on the 30^{th} and changes are, not on the 31^{st} ,
19	it's the end of my vacation.
20	MR. KATZ: Which one?
21	MR. HINNEFELD: The 23 rd through
22	the 30 th , I'm on vacation.

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: How about the 7^{th} ?
2	MR. HINNEFELD: Of January.
3	MR. KATZ: February?
4	MR. HINNEFELD: January 23 rd to the
5	30 th .
6	MEMBER ZIEMER: How about February?
7	
8	CHAIR MUNN: I hate to set it out
9	that far.
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: Too late?
11	CHAIR MUNN: Well, it just is
12	getting late.
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I am trying
14	to prevent you having to come in here twice,
15	for two meetings, within two weeks.
16	CHAIR MUNN: Well, I don't mind it
17	if it's not the same week, actually, I don't
18	mind even staying. I can always get a lot of
19	work done here, if I'm staying here.
20	DR. ULSH: Not the 12 th .
21	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I mean, it's
22	easy enough for me to get here.

1	MR. HINNEFELD: What about later in
2	the week of the 10^{th} , of January 10^{th} ?
3	CHAIR MUNN: Yes, that would be
4	fine with me. But it means that the GSI stuff
5	we're talking about is not on the table.
6	MEMBER ZIEMER: If we go on the
7	12 th
8	MR. HINNEFELD: He won't have the
9	GIS yet.
10	MR. KATZ: Okay, so the 12 th is not
11	good?
12	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, if we I'd
13	have to leave by three o'clock on the $12^{\rm th}$.
14	I've got a commitment that evening.
15	MR. HINNEFELD: But and GIS would
16	not be available, yet.
17	MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, no.
18	MR. HINNEFELD: No, GSI would not
19	be available.
20	MEMBER ZIEMER: No, I'm thinking we
21	can't go earlier in February 1 st , with GSI.

MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: I mean, that would
2	give them a month, but even now
3	MR. HINNEFELD: I'm not needed for
4	GSI.
5	MEMBER ZIEMER: We only got the GSI
6	stuff like Friday.
7	DR. MAURO: Right, it just came in.
8	MEMBER ZIEMER: From SC&A.
9	MR. HINNEFELD: I am not needed for
10	GSI.
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: No, I know.
12	MR. HINNEFELD: For the 30^{th} and
13	31 st .
14	CHAIR MUNN: But we could do
15	procedures on the $13^{\rm th}$, Friday, that Friday,
16	because that's a long weekend coming up after
17	that. That is Martin Luther King Day.
18	MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, Martin Luther
19	King Day would be that Monday.
20	CHAIR MUNN: So, we could do
21	procedures on the 13 th , and everybody could go
22	home

1	MEMBER ZIEMER: Is the 10 th bad?
2	CHAIR MUNN: The 10^{th} isn't bad for
3	me.
4	MR. KATZ: It's bad for us.
5	MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay, it's bad for
6	you, okay.
7	CHAIR MUNN: The 9^{th} would be okay
8	for me. I don't mind traveling on Sunday.
9	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, the 9 th would
10	work, I think.
11	MEMBER ZIEMER: I am okay on the
12	$9^{\rm th}$. But that's a problem on the $13^{\rm th}$, it's
13	that my evening commitment on the $12^{\rm th}$ is at
14	I either drive here at midnight
15	MR. KATZ: No, no, no.
16	MEMBER ZIEMER: or I drive here
17	at four in the morning.
18	MR. KATZ: Let's do procedures or
19	the 9 th .
20	CHAIR MUNN: That is always nice at
21	in the middle of January. Let's just do it
22	the 9 th .

1	MR. KATZ: Okay, so, we have the
2	9 th ?
3	CHAIR MUNN: The 9 th ?
4	MR. KATZ: For procedures, and so,
5	this Fall, it would be good for however it
6	works, when we get update information from
7	DCAS, SC&A, to sort of scour and see what
8	substantial bits and pieces are left open that
9	either DCAS or SC&A needs, to work on, for
LO	this next meeting?
L1	DR. MAURO: That chart we just had
L2	up there, once we have that chart
L3	MR. KATZ: Right, I'm saying once
L4	this is all updated, you'll sort of know what
L5	is on your plate and if you see that there is
L6	stuff that is on the DCAS plate, too, that has
L7	been sitting there idle, let's identify those
L8	this Fall, that way we can have a meaty
L9	meeting.
20	DR. MAURO: Yes, right.
21	MR. KATZ: So to speak.
22	MR. MARSCHKE: Well, yes, I mean,

1 that is the question, I mean, we're having	1	that	is	the	question,	I	mean,	we're	havin
--	---	------	----	-----	-----------	---	-------	-------	-------

- these meetings, but what are we working on to
- 3 -- what procedures or what group of procedures
- 4 are we working on to work off, because --
- 5 MR. KATZ: That is what I'm talking
- 6 about.
- 7 MR. MARSCHKE: Yes.
- B DR. MAURO: I don't know if you
- 9 recall, there was a time when we were able to
- 10 look at the summary level data, we were
- 11 quickly able to say, oh, look at this, this
- 12 procedure has 20 --
- 13 MR. KATZ: I know, we did that with
- 14 54.
- DR. MAURO: And that was great, I
- 16 mean, the next thing you know --
- 17 MR. MARSCHKE: Theoretically, this
- 18 is what this is.
- DR. MAURO: I don't see it.
- 20 MEMBER ZIEMER: It's not popping
- 21 up.
- DR. MAURO: It's not popping out,

1	yes. Bing, right off the bat, I remember I
2	forget which one it was, OTIB-54, we
3	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, this one
4	basically
5	DR. MAURO: We had 22 procedures in
6	it.
7	MR. MARSCHKE: Open procedures, 26.
8	
9	MR. KATZ: We have problems with
10	this data.
11	DR. MAURO: But once it's working,
12	we'll be okay.
13	MR. KATZ: That is my point, the
14	data aren't good right now, once we have the
15	data straight, then you can do that scouring,
16	identify some important consolidated chunks of
17	unresolved issues
18	MR. MARSCHKE: But we should do
19	that before we go to the next meeting,
20	otherwise, right now, there is nothing on
21	MR. KATZ: What I'm saying is, we
22	would do that this Fall, line it up so, that

1	everybody knows what they're working towards
2	for the meeting in February, yes. That is
3	exactly what I'm saying.
4	MR. MARSCHKE: Right.
5	MR. KATZ: That you can be working
6	on it and DCAS can be working on these and
7	then we can have a full agenda in February,
8	yes, I totally agree. That is the aim.
9	So, the quicker we can get the data
10	cleaned up, the quicker we can identify what
11	those are, those remaining fruit to be picked.
12	CHAIR MUNN: Any other thoughts or
13	comments for the good of the order?
14	If not, then I will see you in
15	Tampa. Everyone have a wonderful Halloween, a
16	very pleasant Thanksgiving, a marvelous
17	Christmas and New Year, and a good evening.
18	We're adjourned.
19	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
20	matter concluded at 2:20 p.m.)
21	