UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

.

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND

WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + + + 74th MEETING

+ + + + + WEDNESDAY JANUARY 12, 2011

+ + + + +

The meeting convened at 11:00 a.m., Eastern Standard Time, via teleconference, James M. Melius, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

JAMES M. MELIUS, Chairman
HENRY ANDERSON, Member
JOSIE BEACH, Member
BRADLEY P. CLAWSON, Member
R. WILLIAM FIELD, Member
MICHAEL H. GIBSON, Member
MARK GRIFFON, Member
RICHARD LEMEN, Member
JAMES E. LOCKEY, Member
WANDA I. MUNN, Member

NEAL R. GROSS

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

JOHN W. POSTON, SR., Member

PRESENT: (continued)

ROBERT W. PRESLEY, Member GENEVIEVE S. ROESSLER, Member PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member PAUL L. ZIEMER, Member TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official

REGISTERED AND/OR PUBLIC COMMENT PARTICIPANTS

ADAMS, NANCY, NIOSH Contractor ANIGSTEIN, BOB, SC&A BARRIE, TERRIE BONSIGNORE, ANTOINETTE BROEHM, JASON, CDC CISCO, JEANNE CRAWFORD, CHRIS, DCAS HOWELL, EMILY, HHS HINNEFELD, STU, DCAS KOTSCH, JEFF, DOL LEWIS, MARK, ATL LUX, LINDA MAKHIJANI, ARJUN, SC&A NETON, JIM, DCAS OSTROW, STEVE, SC&A POLLY, STEVE RABINOWITZ, RANDY, NIOSH Contractor RUTHERFORD, LaVON, DCAS STIVER, JOHN, SC&A WADE, LEW, NIOSH Contractor

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

<u>Item</u>	Page
Roll Call	4
Discussion of the NIOSH Ten-Year Program Review	12
Linde Ceramics Plant SEC Petition and Report and Update	14
Science Issues Update	38

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(11:01 a.m.)
3	MR. KATZ: Okay. Well, welcome,
4	everybody on the line, to the Advisory Board
5	on Radiation and Worker Health. This is our
6	quarterly teleconference meeting, and let us
7	begin with roll call with Board Members
8	beginning with the Chair, and I'll since
9	it's by phone, it's easier if I just call
10	people out.
11	So beginning with you, Dr. Melius?
12	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I am here. Do
13	you want us to do conflicts on Linde while
14	we're on the doing the roll call?
15	MR. KATZ: Yes, well, I can
16	actually, I think there are no conflicts
17	among Board Members.
18	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Great.
19	MR. KATZ: So let me just make
20	that statement at the head here. Okay. Dr.
21	Anderson?

1	MEMBER ANDERSON: I'm here.
2	MR. KATZ: Ms. Beach?
3	MEMBER BEACH: I am here.
4	MR. KATZ: Mr. Clawson?
5	MEMBER CLAWSON: Here.
6	MR. KATZ: Dr. Field?
7	MEMBER FIELD: Here.
8	MR. KATZ: Welcome. Mr. Gibson?
9	MR. GIBSON: Here.
10	MR. KATZ: Mr. Griffon, I believe
11	he may be intermittently available to us.
12	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: He's got a
13	conflict at the CSB. He will try to join us a
14	little bit later.
15	MR. KATZ: Okay. Dr. Lemen?
16	Dr. Lemen, do we have you? Dr. Lockey we
17	heard.
18	MEMBER LOCKEY: I am here.
19	MR. KATZ: Ms. Munn we heard.
20	MEMBER MUNN: I'm present.
21	MR. KATZ: Dr. Poston? I've heard

- from him this morning, so I know he's planning
- to join us. Dr. Poston, are you with us?
- 3 MEMBER LEMEN: Dr. Lemen just
- 4 joined.
- 5 MR. KATZ: Oh, welcome, Dick.
- 6 Okay. Let me move on. Mr. Presley?
- 7 MEMBER PRESLEY: Here.
- 8 MR. KATZ: Okay. Dr. Richardson
- 9 is -- has a conflict today, so let me move on
- 10 from there. Dr. Roessler?
- 11 MEMBER ROESSLER: Here.
- 12 MR. KATZ: Mr. Schofield?
- 13 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Here.
- MR. KATZ: Welcome. Dr. Ziemer?
- 15 MEMBER ZIEMER: Here.
- 16 MR. KATZ: You sound a little
- 17 froggy, Dr. Ziemer.
- 18 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, I'm fine.
- 19 MR. KATZ: Okay. Let me try
- 20 again. Dr. Poston, are you with us? Okay.
- 21 Well, we can check on him again in a little

- 1 bit. I know he's planning to attend. I
- 2 traded emails with him this morning.
- Okay, then let me just --
- 4 otherwise -- hello? Okay. Let me otherwise
- 5 remind everyone I can hear a lot of clattering
- 6 pots and pans and so on. Mute your phones
- 7 except when you're addressing the group. If
- 8 you don't have a mute button, use *6 and then
- 9 *6 again to unmute your phone. Please don't
- 10 put the call on hold.
- 11 Let me go on just with the rest of
- 12 the roll call then now that we can hear
- 13 better. NIOSH-ORAU team.
- DR. NETON: This is Jim Neton in
- 15 Cincinnati.
- 16 MR. RUTHERFORD: LaVon Rutherford
- 17 in Cincinnati.
- 18 MR. CRAWFORD: Chris Crawford in
- 19 Cincinnati.
- 20 MR. LEWIS: This is Mark Lewis
- 21 with ATL.

- 1 MR. KATZ: Did I hear Stu
- 2 Hinnefeld?
- 3 MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, Ted. I'm
- 4 here.
- 5 MR. KATZ: Okay. SC&A team.
- DR. OSTROW: Steve Ostrow.
- 7 DR. ANIGSTEIN: Bob Anigstein
- 8 MR. STIVER: John Stiver.
- 9 DR. OSTROW: Ted, this is Steve.
- 10 John Mauro was traveling to Washington this
- 11 morning, and he's going to call in from
- Washington, but he might be a little bit late
- 13 because of the weather.
- 14 MR. KATZ: Okay. Thanks for that
- 15 notice. That's -- for the record, that's
- 16 Steve Ostrow, SC&A.
- DR. MAKHIJANI: This is Arjun
- 18 Makhijani, SC&A.
- 19 MR. KATZ: Arjun, welcome. Any
- others from SC&A? Okay. How about NIOSH or
- other federal officials or contractors for the

- 1 feds?
- MS. HOWELL: Emily Howell, HHS.
- 3 MS. ADAMS: Nancy Adams, NIOSH
- 4 contractor.
- 5 MS. RABINOWITZ: Randy Rabinowitz,
- 6 NIOSH contractor.
- 7 MR. BROEHM: Jason Broehm, CDC.
- 8 MR. KOTSCH: Jeff Kotsch,
- 9 Department of Labor.
- 10 MR. LEWIS: This is Mark Lewis
- 11 with ATL. I don't know if I should identify
- or not, but I contract with NIOSH.
- 13 MR. KATZ: Right. Right. I got
- 14 you before. Thanks, Mark. Okay, and then
- finally, but not least, members of the public.
- 16 MS. BONSIGNORE: Antoinette
- 17 Bonsignore, Linde SEC petitioner.
- 18 MS. BARRIE: Terrie Barrie with
- 19 ANWAG.
- 20 MS. LUX: Linda Lux, petitioner.
- MS. CISCO: Jeanne Cisco with USW.

1 MR. POLLY: Steve Polly, 2 Machinists Union. 3 Okay. MR. KATZ: Any other members of the public? 4 5 Jeanne Cisco with USW. MS. CISCO: Right. 6 MR. KATZ: I got you. 7 Thank you, Jeanne. 8 JEANNE CISCO: You're welcome. 9 MEMBER BEACH: Ted, did you get I think that's --10 Linda Lux? 11 KATZ: I got Linda Lux, too, but it sounded like there was some other. 12 13 Okay. So I've got all of you. Any other 14 members of the public? Otherwise, welcome to all of you, as well. 15 16 MEMBER POSTON: Ted? Ted? 17 MR. KATZ: Yes? John Poston. 18 MEMBER POSTON: Ι 19 didn't want to interrupt your roll call. MR. KATZ: 20 Thank you, John. No.

NEAL R. GROSS

It's great to have you. Let me remind -- I

21

1 said it just a moment ago, but all of you 2 especially folks on the public who may not 3 have heard this who came on late, please mute your phones except when you're addressing the 4 5 actually and there isn't 6 session, although the Linde comment 7 petitioners will have an opportunity to speak to the Board. 8 9 So mute your phones. If you don't 10 have a mute button, use *6. That'll mute your 11 phone, and *6, pressing it again, will unmute Also please don't put the call on hold at 12 13 any point. Call back in if you need to break 14 away for a while. 15 Thank you, and Jim, the agenda's 16 yours. 17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thank you, Ted, and welcome everybody to the -- to 18 19 our call. I guess it's a good thing we're having a call given all the stormy weather 20

around the country. So that -- our first item

21

- on our agenda today is discussion of the NIOSH
- ten-year program review. Dr. Wade, are you on
- 3 the call?
- 4 DR. WADE: I am indeed.
- 5 Dr. Melius, I have no major update to make
- from our last discussion, just to remind you
- 7 that there are three of the Phase 1 reports
- 8 that are undergoing internal NIOSH review.
- 9 That's the customer service piece authored by
- 10 Ms. Chang, the science issues piece authored
- 11 by Dr. Daniels, and the surrogate data piece
- 12 authored by Dr. Spitz.
- 13 I meet with the ADS of NIOSH
- 14 tomorrow. Hopefully, those reports will be
- through internal review, and I can share them
- 16 with Board Members.
- 17 The SEC piece you've seen an
- 18 earlier draft of is being rewritten by Randy
- 19 Rabinowitz, who's on the call, and I would
- 20 categorize Randy as 95 percent complete with
- 21 that rewrite. Again, once that goes through

1	review, you'll be seeing it.
2	The two pieces on DR and
3	timeliness are on the public website accepting
4	public comment. It's my sincere hope to have
5	substantive materials to share with you before
6	your next meeting, and that's what I'm working
7	towards. Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Lew, one quick
9	question. Could you just clarify who the
10	what ADS stands for?
11	DR. WADE: That's the Associate
12	Director for Science for NIOSH, the element of
13	the NIOSH director's office that would clear
14	the reports.
15	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. All
16	right. Thank you. I knew that. I'm sure
17	everybody did, but any Board Members have
18	questions for Lew?
19	Okay. Hearing none, the next item
20	on our agenda is the Linde Ceramics Plant SEC
21	Petition and report and update from the Work

- 1 Group. Dr. Gen Roessler, I believe you'll
- start off. Gen, are you there? Gen, you may
- 3 have it on mute still if you were on mute.
- 4 MEMBER ROESSLER: Okav. Now I
- 5 think you can hear me.
- 6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes. Okay.
- 7 MEMBER ROESSLER: Okay. Sorry.
- 8 That took me a while.
- 9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: No, that's okay.
- 10 Well, you had me worried. I almost thought
- 11 I'd lost everybody.
- 12 MEMBER ROESSLER: No. I've been
- having so many technological problems lately
- 14 like with my computer that I'm beginning to
- 15 wonder if I can even use the phone, but --
- 16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Sometimes this
- is delayed.
- 18 MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes. Anyway,
- there are a number of things we need to do. I
- 20 would like to comment first that the Board
- 21 should have two documents that I think would

- 1 be helpful as we go through this.
- I sent one last night which was a
- 3 very short summary of our Work Group
- 4 activities and where I think we stand. To
- 5 supplement that, though, I would like to
- 6 mention that there is one report that I sent
- 7 along with a number of other ones after our
- 8 last Board meeting.
- 9 This report is also brief, but it
- 10 has more detail in it with regard to dose
- 11 reconstruction and other things. If you can
- 12 pull that up, I think it would be helpful.
- 13 It's called draft Linde SEC Petition 00107
- 14 Issue Resolution Matrix.
- 15 This was put together by Steve
- 16 Ostrow in November, and I think that would be
- 17 very helpful to look at if you can have that
- 18 there in front of you.
- 19 The -- so the things we have to do
- 20 today as I see them, I think we're going to
- 21 have some updates from NIOSH. We might have

- 1 some comments and updates from SC&A.
- 2 We certainly will have the
- 3 petitioners, and Antoinette's on the line, I
- 4 know, speaking. We'll certainly have
- 5 questions from the Board that we need to
- 6 address. So, Jim, I'll leave it to you to
- 7 decide what order we should go in here.
- 8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Why don't
- 9 we first get an update from NIOSH, just where
- 10 they are with their evaluation because I think
- 11 that's sort of the key thing in terms of
- 12 timing at this point.
- So, I don't know, Stu or Chris,
- 14 who's --
- DR. NETON: This is Jim Neton,
- 16 Dr. Melius.
- 17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Jim Neton.
- 18 Okay, I guessed wrong. Go ahead.
- DR. NETON: I'll start, and maybe
- others will chime in and supplement as I go.
- 21 But really there's one issue on the table that

the

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

on,

and

that

was

2 reconstruction of radon in the tunnels. 3 the Working Group knows, I'm not sure the full Board knows, but there 4 5 previous approaches to radon were reconstruction put forth by NIOSH, and both 6 7 reviewed fairly extensively were the 8 Working Group level. reasons of perceived 9 For various 10 discrepancies and issues, we withdrew those One was a diffusion model, and 11 approaches. one was an empirical model based on measured 12 data in the late -- in the mid-40s. 13 SC&A, 14 Subsequent to that, think they broached this at the Board meeting 15 16 in Santa Fe, put forth an approach that would 17 use the radon levels measured in basements in the area surrounding Linde Ceramics and use 18 19 some adjustment factor based on the radium measure in the soils at the site. 20 We have reviewed that approach and 21

1

we.

are

working

1 believe it to be a reasonable way to move 2 forward, and we have actually developed our 3 version of approach, which will that incorporated into a revision of the Evaluation 4 5 Report. 6 fairly close. That is We do believe -- and it's firm. 7 I think within two weeks we should have the Evaluation Report 8 revised and in the Board and Working Group's 9 10 hands. 11 In addition to revising the radon model or the radon approach, we will also take 12 13 the opportunity to provide make 14 revisions that were discussed and agreed to at 15 the Working Group. 16 Most notably, that would be the 17 reconstruction of dose -- internal exposure during building renovation period 18 the 19 Linde, which we have since modified. So I 20 think that's the extent of where we are. 21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thank

1 you. Do any Work Group or Board Members have 2 questions for Jim? 3 MEMBER ROESSLER: I think -- this I know very early on we had some data 4 from basements in the Linde area, and I think 5 maybe the -- not the quite right step was 6 7 being used at first and I think now you have 8 gotten the set of data that's more appropriate Is that right, Jim? 9 for that area. 10 DR. NETON: That's correct, Gen. We've got the correct county identified now 11 and there was some confusion, as you remember, 12 13 on our last call. We're using that data, or data, 14 which are slightly higher, believe, than the values that were used at the 15 16 SC&A proposed model. Yes, so we're moving 17 forward with that. MEMBER ROESSLER: 18 Just to get it 19 on the record, what is the correct county? 20 DR. NETON: Erie County is the correct county. We've identified that, yes. 21

1	MEMBER ROESSLER: Okay. Thank
2	you.
3	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: The facility is
4	on the close to the border between Niagara
5	County and Erie County. Erie County's where
6	Buffalo city and that and Niagara County's
7	to the north some for those of you not
8	familiar with New York State geography and
9	counties.
10	Any other questions from Board
11	Members? So I guess my question, Gen, then is
12	to the Work Group is would you then say we
13	have an updated report from Evaluation
14	Report from NIOSH available in two weeks.
15	Would you then schedule another Work Group
16	meeting or Work Group call to talk about
17	that? It wasn't clear to me what the Work
18	Group planned.
19	MEMBER ROESSLER: Well, I don't
20	think we really knew until we heard from
21	NIOSH, but

1	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
2	MEMBER ROESSLER: my thought is
3	that we want to keep this moving along and,
4	let's see, our next face-to-face Board meeting
5	is the third week in February. Is that right?
6	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Correct.
7	MEMBER ROESSLER: I'm looking at
8	my calendar, so if we get this from NIOSH
9	within two weeks, that would put it the last
10	week in January. I would think that we should
11	be able to get together by teleconference
12	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
13	MEMBER ROESSLER: and work this
14	out so that we could address this then at the
15	next face-to-face Board meeting. That would
16	be my goal, and I would think we could do
17	that.
18	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. Okay,
19	yes. Then we would in turn plan, again,
20	depending on the Work Group's review and so
21	forth, but to plan to have hopefully try to

1 bring some closure to the issues if we can at 2 the February Board meeting in Augusta. 3 ROESSLER: Ι think that MEMBER would be a good approach. I think though here 4 5 today we need to do as much as we can with regard to hearing from the petitioners, 6 7 then also if there are questions from the 8 Board, wouldn't it be appropriate today to hear those and see if we could address the --9 10 address any questions? 11 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Correct. That's 12 what I wanted to go to next. First, I just 13 wanted to offer any chance for -- any comments 14 from SC&A? From what I hear --15 DR. OSTROW: 16 this is Steve Ostrow. From what I hear from 17 Jim Neton, NIOSH is following the approach had discussed in the Work 18 that we Group 19 meeting, and if all this is incorporated into their revised ER, then SC&A will be happy with 20 it and we can move on. 21

1	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
2	DR. OSTROW: We should be able to
3	review it very quickly.
4	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any questions
5	from other Board Members about issues,
6	unresolved issues, or questions they have? If
7	not, I will raise two issues because as
8	we've been approaching this over the last few
9	weeks, I've been reviewing the transcripts and
10	the various reports and a lot of hard work
11	on the part of the Work Group, NIOSH, and SC&A
12	on this.
13	Very extensive revisions. A lot
14	of back and forth on this, and I think with
15	good participation from the petitioners also
16	in terms of raising issues of both sort of
17	factual, as well as questions about how the
18	methods and what's being proposed in the
19	Evaluation Report, so I think it's been a very
20	good process and it's gone on for a length of
21	time.

1 So I think -- again, I was really 2 very impressed by all the work that had been 3 done. I've raised in the emails I've sent to SC&A and to Gen in the last week or so, I have 4 5 continued -- personally, Ι have continued questions 6 about the planned 7 methodology for -- not the radon, but the during the so-called renovation 8 exposures 9 phase. 10 There's a period of time when, if I understand it correctly, the buildings were 11 -- the site was sort of done, went through an 12 initial decontamination. 13 The buildings were 14 then re-used for other purposes, not DOE or AWE-related. 15 16 of those buildings were 17 renovation, and so one of underwent a things that the -- both NIOSH and the Work 18 19 Group and everybody's been trying to figure 20 out is just how do you then estimate the exposures during the renovation period when 21

1 they were very -- in fact, there was almost no 2 sampling during that was done that 3 period. little different. 4 Tt. was а 5 activity, be at least appears to more 6 might normally extensive than what 7 Normally, residual periods it's just back to sort of normal production and usually not --8 I'm to assume that there's any disturbance of 9 10 the residual contamination and I think this 11 also -- the methods try to take into account the fact that the initial decontamination was 12 13 probably up to standards at the time back in 14 the '50s, but they -- currently -- further 15 decontamination to meet sort of current day 16 standards I think is a fair way of saying it. 17 So Ι quess what I'm trying to understand and I don't think we can go into it 18 19 in great detail on this call, but it is -- so, were the actual activities during the 20 renovation period? How long did that go on 21

1	for, and is that a were all of the people
2	working at Linde involved or was this just a
3	segment of the working population that was in
4	one building or one area of the plant, and,
5	again, does this sort of a single
6	methodology for that covers the entire
7	facility during this time period, is that
8	appropriate or not?
9	I think it comes down to trying to
10	understand some of the sort of factual what
11	do we know about the renovations? Who did
12	them, how long, and so forth.
13	So that's the issue I raised, and
14	going back and forth with NIOSH and SC&A on
15	just trying to understand better. I don't
16	know if, Gen or you or NIOSH or SC&A have
17	any comments on that.
18	MEMBER ROESSLER: Well, this is
19	Gen. NIOSH no, NIOSH didn't respond to you
20	yesterday, but John Mauro explained how he
21	understood the dose reconstruction would be

- 1 done. Then this morning I, too, looked
- 2 through that report that I mentioned to you
- 3 that Steve Ostrow put together that briefly
- 4 but I think very well outlines the approach to
- 5 doing the dose reconstruction during that
- 6 period.
- 7 I don't know if you've looked at
- 8 that, whether that would help out to answer
- 9 these questions.
- 10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I have looked at
- 11 that report and all the reports that formed
- 12 the basis for that from NIOSH and so forth.
- 13 Again, I think it may be for more
- 14 understanding some of the details and so
- forth, so -- we can follow up, but I actually
- 16 did hear back from NIOSH about some of these
- 17 questions also.
- DR. NETON: Yes, Gen, this is Jim.
- 19 I responded to Dr. Melius on your behalf, and
- I sent it to your government email address.
- 21 Maybe that's why you didn't see it.

1	MEMBER ROESSLER: Okay. I didn't
2	see that.
3	DR. NETON: Sorry.
4	MEMBER ROESSLER: Okay. Well, I'm
5	not quite sure where we should go on this.
6	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: What I would
7	suggest is that I will, you know, based on the
8	responses and so forth, I will write out a set
9	of questions that circulate and then maybe
10	it's something the Work Group can take up in
11	more detail at your Work Group meeting later
12	in January or early February.
13	MEMBER ROESSLER: I think that
14	would be helpful. I think we need very
15	specific questions, and, again, I'd ask you to
16	look at the report I mentioned and then there
17	are backup reports, too, that
18	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I've received
19	those. One thing I discovered during reading
20	through transcripts and, again, it's no fault
21	of the Work Group. I don't think it's really

1 anybody's fault, but it turns out that we 2 don't really have a method for capturing sort 3 of technical White Papers and other shorter 4 documents that are written and developed 5 of during the process reviewing SEC evaluation or for that matter a Site Profile, 6 7 those just aren't available and on the 8 website. I'm not -- even on the O: drive 9 10 sometimes, so if you're reading a transcript 11 and -- one of these transcripts and I believe a meeting in April it started off saying that 12 13 there was a report that today we're going to 14 review these three reports. Well, those three reports, 15 16 were, I think, about five pages each, were not 17 So it was very hard to sort of available. understand what was going on in the -- from 18 19 the transcript without the reports. was able to obtain them, I think, from Ted -- had 20 them in his email. 21

1 But, Ι think one thing Ted and 2 I've talked about is we need to try to get a 3 least, for stuff better way, at that's publicly available to make it available --4 5 easier to find and obtain because it's just 6 difficult. 7 And a lot of those reports were available to the petitioners participating. 8 Ι said, everybody, 9 I think I Ι mean, as ___ 10 think, did a good job within the Work Group 11 and the group that were discussing them and back 12 trying to qo and locate 13 information, and I think some will, I believe, will be captured. 14 One of them was this new method 15 16 that NIOSH proposed for the renovation period, 17 and that was one of the documents that wasn't readily available. So I think we can do that 18 19 and just for anybody that needs to review this, I think it makes it a little bit easier. 20 This is Ted. 21 MR. KATZ: Can you

1	hear me?
2	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, Ted.
3	MR. KATZ: Thanks, Jim. I don't
4	want to interrupt the Linde discussion, but
5	just note that at the end of this call I'll
6	talk a little bit about this follow-up bit I'm
7	doing with SC&A and DCAS.
8	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Any other
9	questions or comments on Linde from Board
10	Members.
11	MEMBER ROESSLER: This is Gen. I
12	think in view of the fact that we are going to
13	need another conference call before the next
14	Board meeting, I would like to alert the Work
15	Group Members and any others, and we'll have a
16	number of people to pull together on this that
17	we'll need to get together very soon,
18	hopefully today, and pick a date.
19	I hear silence.
20	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
21	MR. KATZ: Gen, so I'll as soon

as I have -- I can get from DCAS a fairly firm 1 2 date delivery of their as to 3 Evaluation Report, I will work to set that 4 meeting up for as close to that time possible. 5 We do have a good bit of open time 6 7 at the end of January and early February, so 8 I'm confident we can accomplish that. 9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Stu had just 10 sent me an email saying that he was confident that the report would be ready by the end of 11 12 January, so --13 MEMBER ROESSLER: We'll need a 14 little time for SC&A to look at it, but Steve indicated it wouldn't take a lot of time. 15 16 DR. OSTROW: This is Steve Ostrow I heard from Jim Neton 17 again. From what speaking before, that is NIOSH incorporate the 18 19 models that they said they would for radon in the tunnel, then that was the only issue that 20 we had open from all the issues. We should be

21

- able to review it very quickly.
- 2 DR. NETON: This is Jim Neton.
- 3 There won't be that many additional pages, and
- 4 we'll go to some lengths to try to make sure
- 5 we point out the pages that have been modified
- 6 so one doesn't have to review all, whatever
- 7 there are, 40 or 50 pages.
- DR. OSTROW: This is Steve again.
- 9 That would be very helpful.
- DR. NETON: Right, and there will
- 11 be an additional piece on the renovation
- 12 period because we did change that from the
- 13 original Evaluation Report, the approach
- 14 outlined in the original Evaluation Report,
- 15 but that will not -- again, that will not be
- 16 extensive. I don't envision that being any
- more than a couple pages itself, as well.
- 18 MEMBER ROESSLER: This is Gen. So
- 19 it seems like we ought to be ready the first
- 20 week in January to do this, to have a Work
- 21 Group meeting. Now, I will point out there's

- 1 a Health Physics Society mid-year meeting
- 2 starting February 7, but I think I can -- I'll
- 3 be able to work something out around that.
- 4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
- 5 MEMBER ROESSLER: So maybe we
- 6 could aim at the first or second week, very
- 7 early in February if we could.
- DR. OSTROW: This is Steve Ostrow.
- 9 My calendar's clear for the first two weeks
- of February.
- 11 MEMBER ROESSLER: Good.
- 12 DR. OSTROW: I could take any day.
- 13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. Okay. No
- 14 further comments from -- or questions from
- 15 Board Members on Linde. I think we would like
- 16 to give an opportunity for the petitioners.
- 17 Have any comments, Antoinette or Linda?
- 18 MS. BONSIGNORE: Yes, hi. Thank
- 19 you, Dr. Melius. This is Antoinette
- 20 Bonsignore. The only -- it's not really a
- 21 question. The only issue I'd like to raise

1 with the Board and with NIOSH at this point is 2 my continuing problem with where NIOSH derives 3 the authority, the regulatory authority or the statutory authority, to revise an Evaluation 4 5 Report. 6 I simply do not understand where 7 in the regulations you are authorized to do The original Evaluation Report has been 8 that. materially changed. Therefore, you are now 9 10 issuing a revised Evaluation Report. There is 11 no regulatory authority to do that. This is not only an issue for the 12 13 petitioners and the workers; this is an issue for Senator Schumer and Senator Gillibrand as 14 they pointed out in their letter to the Board 15 16 in November. 17 I would like an answer to that. The petitioners and the workers would like an 18 19 answer to that. Senator Schumer and Senator Gillibrand would like an answer to that, and I 20 think we deserve an answer to that because as 21

far as my reading of the regulations, there is 1 2 no authority to do this. 3 had this discussion with the former director, Larry Elliott, about -- in 4 September of 2009, and I asked him whether the 5 6 Evaluation Report was going to be revised at 7 some point. He insisted to me that NIOSH does not revise Evaluation Reports, that we don't 8 do that. 9 10 That's what he said to me, so in that context, I really would like to have some 11 sort of official response from NIOSH or from 12 13 counsel's office sent to Senator Schumer and 14 Senator Gillibrand explaining why this is legal, for lack of a better term. 15 16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okav. Any 17 response, Stu or Emily? This 18 MR. HINNEFELD: is Stu 19 Hinnefeld, and I guess all I can commit to 20 today is we -- I've heard the request, and I will be discussing it with others 21 in

2	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
3	MS. BONSIGNORE: Thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Linda, did you -
5	- Linda Lux, I think believe you're on the
6	phone also, if you have comments.
7	MS. LUX: I do. I don't have any
8	comments today.
9	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
10	MS. LUX: Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thank you.
12	Okay. Anyway, we will then look forward to an
13	updated report and further discussions or
14	Linde at our February Board meeting.

17 MEMBER MUNN: Jim, before we leave

The next item on the agenda is a

Jim Neton?

18 that, this is Wanda.

science issues update.

- 19 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I'm sorry,
- 20 Wanda.

15

16

1

agency.

21 MEMBER MUNN: I didn't want to

NEAL R. GROSS

speak to Linde, but thought I would touch on 1 2 the larger issue that you raise with respect 3 to a home for White Papers and how accessible 4 thev miaht be. We've had considerable 5 discussion both this very about issue procedures. 6 7 Ιt based appears on our past 8 experience that so often the White Papers are truly an internal document even though they 9 10 have considerable bearing on the discussions 11 in the Work Group Subcommittee. or They nevertheless had not been through PA clearance 12 process which holds up the discussion of the 13 14 issue, whatever it might happen to be. I just wanted you to know that you 15 16 are not alone in your concern with respect to 17 the often very important papers that bear on almost each of the major sites that -18 19 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Wanda, I believe Ted's going to talk about that a little bit 20 later on the call. 21

1	MEMBER MUNN: Good.
2	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes. Thanks.
3	MEMBER MUNN: Thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Jim
5	Neton, science update.
6	DR. NETON: Yes, thanks,
7	Dr. Melius. This is in response to a request
8	at the last Santa Fe Board meeting to provide
9	the Board an update on where we are with
10	what's sort of been called over time the
11	overarching science issues.
12	I believe I've reported on this in
13	the past, but there are some new Board Members
14	that might not have been around the last time
15	I discussed these issues. But, for your
16	reference, I hope everyone received, I think
17	Ted sent it out a couple days ago, two slides
18	that I intend to be speaking from.
19	One slide is labeled dose
20	reconstruction issues identified as
21	overarching, and the second slide is risk

1 model issues under evaluation. While that is 2 not technically a -- well, they are science 3 issues, the risk models, I thought I'd include them for completeness because these are the 4 two areas that at least I have been tracking 5 since the inception of the program. 6 7 Ιf refer the we to dose reconstruction issues handout, there are eight 8 issues that are listed here, and this has been 9 10 fairly static for some time now. I thought I'd start on the right-hand column where there 11 are there issues identified, the first being 12 13 interpretation of unworn badges. 14 Ι should point out that these have been collected through various 15 issues They've 16 either been identified avenues. 17 through procedure reviews dose or reconstruction reviews or in some cases added 18 19 at the suggestion of Board Members. The interpretation of unworn badge 20 issues arose in several cases where there were 21

1 site Evaluation Reports under review 2 seemed to indicate that the workers did not 3 always wear their badges. At the time, NIOSH felt that there may be some method that could 4 for 5 be developed to account that, namely, of 6 looking at the shape the log-normal 7 distribution of the data set for external, and 8 if it tended to curve over at the upper end of the distribution, that 9 might give us 10 indication that the badges were not 11 worn. To make a long story short, at the 12 13 end of the day, that method did not prove to 14 be useful for us. It became apparent over 15 time that in this particular case, even though 16 is an overarching issue, it really is something that needs to be identified and 17 addressed on a site-specific basis. 18 19 That became very clear when went through and evaluated the issue at Nevada 20 Site. lot of work went 21 Test. Α into

evaluation, and we ended up putting that issue 1 2 to bed there through essentially a lot of 3 work going through the individual grunt monitoring data. 4 5 So, again, even though this is an issue, Ι don't think 6 overarching there's 7 anything specific NIOSH can do other than to address it on a facility-specific basis. 8 material tracking piece 9 The 10 actually identified by a Board Member, and I 11 believe it was Brad Clawson who brought this issue to the table, and that is what does 12 13 NIOSH do when we identify, for instance, 14 exotic radionuclides at one facility? Do we 15 track them to ground? 16 mean, they must've come 17 someplace shipped and maybe have been somewhere else, so we needed to be cognizant 18 19 of where these materials could be identified 20 exposure potentials exist other and at facilities than where we first located them. 21

1 That, again, Ι think is an 2 We certainly are aware of it awareness issue. 3 now, and we do try to track these as we go on Again, there's no -- I 4 a case-by-case basis. 5 don't believe there's any procedure or such 6 that we could put in place that would aid us in addressing this issue. 7 8 The third issue, which is the from Super S 9 internal dose plutonium, had 10 arose during the Rocky Flats SEC evaluation, 11 and I believe the Board is pretty familiar We have issued a TIB-49 that 12 with that case. 13 provides our methodology for dealing with this, and that is now in place and used at any 14 facility where we have a potential for very 15 16 insoluble plutonium. That's what Super 17 stands for; highly insoluble plutonium. moving the left 18 Okay, over to 19 column, there are five issues over here, and 20 I'11 start on the bottom with thoriated welding rods. That issue was identified in a 21

1	review. I think I forget which review it
2	was. It was a Site Profile, I believe, review
3	where potentially thoriated welding rods were
4	used.
5	NIOSH did evaluate this. There
6	was a fair amount of analysis done,
7	particularly by the Nuclear Regulatory
8	Commission. In fact, they exempt them from
9	licensing. The bottom line is the exposures
10	turn out to be fairly small in these cases;
11	less than 10 millirem for any particular year.
12	For overestimating cases, the
13	increase in dose would be trivial. For best
14	estimates, it would need to be considered even
15	though it's small, and we would address these
16	exposures under specifically defined
17	circumstances.
18	The issue of non-standard external
19	exposures arose from several Site Profile
20	reviews. I think it originally came up at the
21	Mallinckrodt review where one might be exposed

The orientation of the badge 1 to a geometry. 2 that the person is wearing might be different than a sort of an anterior/posterior parallel 3 beam situation. 4 The 5 examples that brought were forth were for someone working on a -- lathing 6 7 a piece of uranium or possibly working in a glove box or cleaning up a material spilled on 8 These are what we would consider 9 a floor. 10 non-standard geometries, and correction factors would need to be applied. 11 addressed a 12 have number these in TIBs already. 13 TIB-13 specifically 14 deals with these issues, so the ones that we're aware of we've addressed and they've 15 16 been dealt with using essentially Monte Carlotype simulation techniques. 17 In fact, one of those, TIB-13, is 18 19 under review currently by the Subcommittee on Review. 20 Procedures So feel we we've identified the major ones, and any additional 21

ones that arise we would certainly deal with on a case-by-case basis.

The hot particle issue dealt with
both inhalation of hot particle and the
present -- or the ingestion of hot particles
and the deposition of hot particles on the
skin.

We have methods in place for using 8 model; standard 9 VARSKIN it's а model а believe, 10 developed by, Ι the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, deal with 11 to calculation of dose on the skin from hot 12 13 particles.

The ingestion issue we evaluated, and it turns out that as long as you know the total magnitude of the intake, the dose to the GI tract is about the same. The ICRP models even thought about this and felt that there was no way to account for the difference of hot particle transversing the gastrointestinal system versus a -- sort of a particle that

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

uniformly distributed throughout the system. 1 2 The issues, top two oronasal 3 breathing and workplace ingestion, were probably the two biggest issues that affect 4 5 largest number of procedures and dose 6 reconstructions. I'11 start with workplace 7 ingestion. There have been comments raised by SC&A early on that our ingestion model, that 8 is how do we predict how much a person ingests 9 10 from this transfer of contamination on 11 surface to their mouth in the workplace, how do we do that? 12 13 We have issued a TIB, TIB-9, that deals with this, and over time there has been 14 a debate on several issues. I believe at this 15 16 point, and SC&A would have to verify this, 17 that we are in essential agreement with the ingestion approach or facilities that have 18 19 been cleaned. That is, I think our approach would be considered acceptable by them as it's 20

written.

21

1 The only outstanding issue on the 2 ingestion method, I believe, has to do with 3 facilities that have a fair amount of loose contamination present, and it boils down to 4 of that contamination 5 what percentage 6 available for ingestion. That issue is being tracked and 7 reviewed by the Subcommittee on Procedures 8 Review under both TIB-9 and a large part of 9 10 TIB-70, which is reconstruction of residual contamination -- is being reviewed. So those 11 two are being tracked. 12 13 The last issue is oronasal 14 breathing, and that essentially has to do with mouth breathers. A certain percentage of the 15 16 population are mouth breathers, and the issue was raised during the Bethlehem Steel Site 17 Profile review is what -- how does that affect 18 19 your models? Well, we did an analysis of this, 20 and it turns out that this mouth breathers --21

1 if you have bioassay data whether you're an 2 -- you're a mouth breather 3 regular nasal augmenter, the biokinetics are such that the models do account for it, and it 4 makes almost, I think, no difference in the 5 6 dose that would be calculated -- intake that would be calculated. 7 8 only place this comes into effect. is in 9 the area where air we use 10 sampling data to establish intakes. Our position is that we use the distribution of 11 in the workplace and pick 12 the air samples 13 either the 50th or 95th percentile 14 establish intake and assiqn the geometric standard deviation. 15 16 we use the 50th, we'd assign 17 geometric standard deviation which the is That uncertainty incorporates -18 fairly large. 19 is much, much, much larger than any 20 uncertainty that's associated with the oronasal breathing portion. 21

1 So that pretty much covers our I'd certainly 2 position on these eight issues. 3 be happy to take any questions before I move on to the risk model issues. 4 5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Why don't break here and see if there are any questions 6 7 on these issues. 8 DR. NETON: All right. 9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Anybody -- any 10 Board Members? My sense going through them, I hope I captured this right, Jim, but -- is 11 that all of these issues are either, I quess, 12 13 ones either settled or they are issues that 14 have -- essentially deemed site-specific. 15 DR. NETON: Correct. 16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Ιt be 17 overarching, but the solution or the resolution may be the better word -- is site-18 19 specific or three, that they're currently 20 under -- they're part of TIBs that are under review or whatever would be covered under the 21

- 1 Procedures Work Group. Is that a fair 2 statement on these?
- 3 DR. NETON: I believe that's
- 4 correct, yes.
- 5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Anybody -
- 6 any other Board Members have comments or
- 7 questions?
- 8 MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer. I
- 9 have one question on that. Jim, on the
- 10 workplace ingestion, I think the issue there
- 11 was for the dirtier places was the
- 12 resuspension factor. Isn't that correct?
- DR. NETON: Yes.
- 14 MEMBER ZIEMER: Are you saying
- 15 that rather than a generic approach to that
- 16 you would have to handle that on a case-by-
- 17 case basis also? Is that where we're going to
- 18 end up?
- DR. NETON: That's probably where
- we're going to end up.
- 21 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes. I think on

NEAL R. GROSS

1 the clean ones you were -- both SC&A and NIOSH 2 were comfortable with a ten to the minus six 3 resuspension factor something in or 4 but the issue was on these dirty workplaces and you would have to look at sort 5 of the particle-size distribution and the work 6 7 activities and so on a site-specific basis. 8 Is that the approach? 9 DR. NETON: That's correct, 10 that would be reflected in the modification of 11 the TIB. Which might give 12 MEMBER ZIEMER: 13 approach to handling it rather 14 specific number. 15 DR. NETON: Exactly. 16 MEMBER ZIEMER: Thank you. Yes. 17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thank you. Any other 18 Board Members have questions or 19 comments? 20 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes, Jim, this is Brad. 21

1	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
2	MEMBER CLAWSON: I know, Jim,
3	we've been around this numerous times about
4	this material and transferring back and forth,
5	and I know that you've said that we're going
6	to have to do this as a site-specific, but
7	part of the things that we're getting into,
8	and I've seen it at numerous facilities, is
9	that the record keeping of these transfers
10	aren't that good.
11	That's why I was you know, this
12	is why it's kind of been come over an
13	overarching issue. We're dealing with this at
14	Mound. We're dealing with this at Fernald.
15	We're dealing with this at a lot of sites. I
16	know we'll have to deal with it as the site-
17	specific, but part of my thing is when we get
18	into these other sites and we see this
19	material being transported someplace else,
20	we've got to be able to track that in a little
21	bit of a way because a lot of this stuff never

- 1 showed up as on the site.
- 2 I'm thinking of Mound. They were
- 3 saying that they were using small amounts of
- 4 this certain material and so forth, but we
- 5 traced back to where it came from, and it's
- 6 much larger.
- 7 I just wanted to make sure we
- 8 don't lose -- part of what my comment was was
- 9 that we need to do -- we need to track this,
- 10 so we -- when we find these, we know where
- 11 they did go and the quantity because you may
- only see it on the shipping end of it.
- DR. NETON: Right. I totally
- 14 understand what you're saying, Brad, and
- 15 totally agree with it.
- 16 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. I just --
- 17 yes, I just wanted to make sure that that
- 18 part of it was --
- DR. NETON: Yes.
- 20 MEMBER CLAWSON: -- and I know
- 21 we've got to do it site-by-site, and I

NEAL R. GROSS

appreciate your input into it.

2 Yes, Ι DR. NETON: and 3 trying minimize the importance the It seems to me, though, a lot of --4 we've learned a lot in the last few years 5 about a lot of these exotics and such and the 6 7 picture's become somewhat clearer, but there 8 surprises still fairly that pop up are I fully understand what you're 9 frequently. 10 saying. Well, and part of 11 MEMBER CLAWSON: my thing was that as we're doing research, 12 13 this data retrieval and so forth, it may be for a totally different site, but we've ended 14 up pulling up other data for different sites, 15 16 and I hope that when we pull this data that we 17 kind of collectively send this to the people

that need to know because as any of us that's

been doing data retrieval, we find all sorts

of stuff in these files. A lot of them don't

have anything to do with the site that we're

18

19

20

21

1

1 looking at, but they pertain to other sites. 2 Yes, I totally DR. NETON: 3 understand what you're saying. Thanks, 4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any other comments or questions? 5 If not, Jim, 6 do you want to do the risk model issues? 7 NETON: Yes, I will. DR. These are -- Risk Model Issues Under Evaluation, and 8 there are six of them on this handout. These 9 10 issues were identified fairly early on in the Ι think aside from chronic 11 program, and lymphocytic leukemia, I think the other five 12 13 were actually brought up either during or 14 shortly after the Probability of Causation rule was being written. 15 16 I'11 iust through these So qo 17 briefly. The evaluation of chronic lymphocytic leukemia, I think the Board is 18 19 pretty well aware of what's going on there. We have prepared our position on this after 20 doing extensive reviews and model development. 21

1 All I can say at this point is that we are 2 it through the government 3 I don't think I can say any more than that at this time. 4 5 The second issue, the incorporation of nuclear worker epi studies in 6 the risk models is something that is certainly 7 8 a goal of ours. It's recognized that the Hiroshima/Nagasaki data is the gold standard, 9 10 but how does that differ when you exposures that are low dose rate exposures in 11 the workplace. 12 13 We've not done a lot on that, but 14 there is a sister agency within NIOSH, 15 Occupational Energy Research Program, that has 16 been doing some work in that area, and in 17 fact, they have just recently published a -- I think it's a preprint -- a pre -- online 18 19 available -- it hasn't been published yet, but Occupational Environmental Medicine 20 the Journal, a meta-analysis of leukemia cases 21

1 usina, Ι think, 23 separate occupational 2 cohorts that were out there. 3 The bottom line of their study was that they were low-dose rate type facilities, 4 5 the risk coefficients that they derived from 6 their analysis were consistent with what that 7 observed in the Hiroshima/Nagasaki was 8 survivor set, so that was fairly interesting. 9 This is NORA project within а 10 NIOSH, and I'm actually listed as а collaborator on that study, you know, part of 11 my time as author, I have to say that I did 12 13 not put much into it given mУ 14 availability. The third issue is dose and dose 15 16 rate effectiveness factors. That is how do 17 you adjust the dose, the risk to a person fact 18 based on the that you've got hiqh 19 exposures, relatively high exposures in the 20 Hiroshima/Nagasaki survivors and now we're rating people with very low dose rates. 21 Is

1 the radiation less effective at inducina 2 cancer or not? 3 Oak Ridge, our contractor, developed a full scientific 4 review up 5 I believe, last year. through, There's a 200-page draft report that they have issued 6 7 that covers the waterfront on this, and we are going to, once that's finalized, use it to 8 rethink our position -- what our position 9 10 should be on the DDREF. 11 There are a number of agencies --I can say right now looking at this, ICRP is 12 very interested in it, as well as -- I forget 13 14 who -- there's another agency out there. Ι think it's the IAEA is also interested in it. 15 The issue of grouping of rare and 16 17 miscellaneous cancers has to do with the fact that the -- when the models were developed, 18 19 especially for the Hiroshima/Nagasaki survivors, risk models were only deemed to be 20 appropriate 21 if they --Ι think they had

50 cancers available for analysis, so the ones 1 2 they didn't have sufficient were 3 numbers grouped in the various were 4 categories. 5 look how those NIOSH was to at if 6 groupings might be changed or new 7 information comes available how they might be moved around. 8 9 We haven't done a lot with this. 10 SENES Oak Ridge, our contractor, has been paying attention to this. We did look at 11 pulling out the prostate cancers out of the 12 13 all male genitalia. We are in the early 14 stages of that. At the current time, it looks to 15 16 us if you pull the prostate cancers out of the 17 all male genitalia, the risk model actually would go down. But we are looking at that 18 19 issue. 20 The of analysis, age exposure there's nothing actively ongoing at this time 21

- 1 within the NIOSH. It's still on the list.
- 2 This has to do with the fact that people who
- 3 are exposed at older ages may be more
- 4 susceptible to cancer for various reasons.
- 5 There are certainly some studies out in the
- 6 literature that provide some substantiation
- 7 for this argument.
- 8 The final one, interaction with
- 9 other workplace exposures, we even committed
- 10 to this in the regulation that we would be
- looking, at least in the preamble, looking at
- 12 other -- interaction of other agents such as
- 13 asbestos, benzene, or other solvents with
- 14 radiation to see if -- what effect that might
- 15 help potentiate the radiation. There might be
- 16 some synergistic effect going on.
- 17 We are keeping abreast of
- 18 literature on this, but at this time, in our
- 19 opinion, there's nothing out there that's
- 20 risen to the level where we believe a
- 21 quantitative analysis of this is possible.

1	So that's the story on the risk
2	models. I'd be happy to answer any questions
3	if there are any.
4	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thanks,
5	Jim. I actually think that last issue is
6	included in the original legislation also.
7	DR. NETON: I think you're right.
8	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any Board
9	Members have questions for Jim? Comments?
10	If not, I have a suggestion. If
11	you recall or don't recall from at the last
12	Board meeting this issue came up. There was a
13	suggestion that we form a Work Group on
14	science issues, and I believe there was some
15	discussion there.
16	I believe Drs. Richardson and
17	Lemen were involved. I can't remember who
18	else at the time, and we said, well, let's
19	before we do that, let's get an update from
20	Jim on it Neton on it sort of an
21	overview of the issues because not all of the

1 newer Board Members had been -- were aware of 2 our earlier list. 3 I think you're right, Jim. This back to the early days of 4 goes the program when we were first talking about the 5 regulations and so forth. So the other issues 6 7 -- most of them came up quite early. Not all. So I think the question is how do 8 people feel about charging a Work Group to 9 10 look into these issues, and as I recall the conversation, I may be wrong, it was focused 11 more on the risk model side of issues, and I 12 was thinking it might be useful to have a Work 13 Group that would look at the issues currently 14 under consideration on this list. 15 16 I think with the exception of the 17 CLL issue, which is sort of out of our hands, I think, at this point in time, and also 18 19 identify are there any new issues that we need to be -- should be considered as relevant to 20 this program. Any comment on that thought? 21

1	MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. I
2	was unsure at the time that this was under
3	discussion at the Board meeting what real
4	value a Work Group might bring to this that we
5	could not accomplish through simple review
6	from time to time in the Board forum.
7	It's not one of the types of
8	processes that a Work Group can by definition
9	move forward very well. These are all
10	technical issues, which require resolution by
11	our technical contractor and NIOSH.
12	So, I guess at the time we were
13	discussing it, it wasn't really very clear to
14	me how a Work Group could bring any
15	expeditious review or any added emphasis to
16	the process we have. I'd be delighted to hear
17	some thoughts on that.
18	MEMBER LEMEN: This is Dick Lemen.
19	I'd like to support, as I said in the Board
20	meeting in the past, such a Work Group. I
21	think there is a lot of areas that this type

1 of Work Group could address that are not being 2 addressed as a general issue in the 3 Groups that exist already. Therefore, I'd like to see such a 4 Work Group put together. Obviously, if we do 5 6 put together the Work Group and the time that 7 there is not a need for it in some point in time, it can always be disbanded, but I think 8 it's worth setting up initially to at least 9 10 look at the issues we've just been talking 11 about. As Dr. Melius said, I think there 12 13 probably other issues that could are identified that this group could also look at. 14 I think perhaps I 15 MEMBER MUNN: 16 misunderstood earlier then. Your focus, Dick, 17 would be to try to identify whether there are major issues of this nature that have not been 18 19 overlooked and are not included on the list. 20 Is that your -- that's your real --Well, that would be 21 MEMBER LEMEN:

1 part of the issue and also address issues that 2 are not being addressed by Work Groups that 3 are already set up. This Work Group would be more of a general Work Group to address these 4 5 general, more broad-sweeping issues. 6 This is Jim CHAIRMAN MELIUS: 7 I would be a little careful that Work Melius. 8 Groups are supposed to be self-limited to some extent, and so they -- so what I was trying to 9 10 do -- and really, it's somewhat in response to 11 what the concern Wanda raised was that we sort of give it a specific task or specific tasks 12 13 and then ask it to report back on those tasks, 14 which would be, again, on these risk model issues with the exception of the CLL issue to 15 review the current status of those and then 16 also identify any new science risk based --17 risk model issues that would be -- could be 18 19 relevant to this program and should be followed up on. 20 They would come back to the Board 21

NEAL R. GROSS

1 and report to the Board on that and we would 2 have discussion. I'd also say in response to 3 all these precludes the Board from receiving periodic updates from Jim Neton like 4 we've done, but frankly, I don't think we --5 our meeting agendas are tight and limited and 6 I think we -- a Work Group could probably 7 spend a little bit more time and more detail 8 and I think there's a radio of interest in 9 10 expertise from some of our new Board Members, as well as our current Board Members that 11 would be helpful and useful to the Board in 12 13 this kind of endeavor. So, that was what was 14 my thoughts on it. This is Dick Lemen 15 MEMBER LEMEN: 16 I would agree with you, Jim, that the 17 Board should task the Work Group with specific I agree with that wholeheartedly. 18 19 MEMBER LOCKEY: Jim Lockey. Let me ask you a question in relationship to the 20 legislation. instance, 21 For if we start

- 1 looking at epidemiology studies in
- 2 relationship to nuclear production workers,
- okay, I can't see how we would -- our Board
- 4 would use that data in what our assignment is
- 5 and what our tasks are.
- 6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Well, the
- 7 legislation actually calls for NIOSH to do
- 8 that.
- 9 MEMBER LOCKEY: It does -
- 10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, I mean, I
- 11 don't have the language in front of me. It's
- 12 qualified, but it was a specific part of the
- 13 original act, and I think it's fair to say
- 14 that, Jim Neton, you can correct me, that
- 15 NIOSH's response is that they didn't think
- 16 that current scientific literature provided
- 17 enough information to do that in terms of
- 18 incorporating such information into the risk
- 19 models.
- 20 That may very well still be the
- 21 case, but I don't think this is going -- this

1	is a specific charge in the legislation.
2	MEMBER LOCKEY: That's right. I
3	didn't realize that. That's
4	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, no
5	MEMBER LOCKEY: So, if NIOSH comes
6	back and says the epidemiology is adequate now
7	and we do need to modify the risk models, then
8	the legislation allows that? Is that what
9	you're saying?
10	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
11	DR. NETON: Yes, that's true.
12	MEMBER LOCKEY: Yes.
13	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: This is Phil
14	Schofield. I'd be more than I think it's a
15	very good idea given the expertise of the
16	people we have on the Board that I think they
17	have the knowledge and the skills to do these
18	assessments.
19	MEMBER MUNN: The incorporation of
20	existing epidemiological data
21	MEMBER LOCKEY: That's a huge

- 1 task.
- 2 MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer.
- 3 Could I comment?
- 4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
- 5 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, I agree with
- 6 Dr. Lemen on the idea of having a Work Group
- 7 take a look at the issues broadly. I don't
- 8 think any of us are saying that we would, for
- 9 example -- the Board or the Work Groups,
- 10 would, for example, figure out how to
- 11 incorporate worker epidemiological studies
- into the IREP model. That would be a job for
- a group like SENES or even a larger group such
- 14 as the ICRP.
- But, it seems to me in terms of
- the Board, we need to be cognizant of what
- issues are out there, number one, and if they
- 18 are being addressed and how and whether --
- 19 what the timelines are, for example,
- interaction with other workplace exposure.
- We note that nothing significant

NEAL R. GROSS

1 really is showing up in the literature. 2 is doing a little bit on this in other parts 3 of the agency, but for example, are there -can we identify things that could be done to 4 5 implement that in a more active way? 6 The with same age at exposure 7 analysis; nothing actively going on. Should there be and who would do it? 8 I don't So, think we actually solved the problem so much 9 10 see what's out there, what needs to be done, and what we can do to stimulate the work 11 to go forward. 12 13 It may be that such a group would 14 meet only once or twice just to sort of get 15 our hands around it and report back to 16 Board that it -- sort of the status of 17 issue. Obviously, Jim is keeping 18 us 19 abreast of it, but we may want to take sort of an additional in-depth look in terms of how it 20 appears to a number of different people on the 21

- 1 Board that have different backgrounds.
- 2 MEMBER LOCKEY: This is Jim
- 3 Lockey. I would agree with that approach. I
- 4 think that's a reasonable approach. These are
- 5 upcoming issues. Somebody needs to look at
- these issues, but not for us to pull it apart
- 7 because that's just too much of a task.
- 8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: No. Absolutely,
- 9 yes.
- 10 MEMBER CLAWSON: This is Brad, and
- 11 I agree with what Dr. Ziemer just said. One
- of the things that I've been so impressed with
- is many of the people on the Board looking at
- 14 the backgrounds -- Jim, Paul, all the new
- 15 Members that have come in. I think that we
- ought to utilize the talents that we have, and
- 17 we're not saying that we're going to tear it
- 18 apart, but also, too, I think we've got to use
- 19 the best approaches we can out there.
- 20 If they can use their talents to
- 21 help this, I think it's a wonderful thing.

1	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any other
2	comments? Does it's just difficult because
3	it's a conference call, but does anyone do
4	we want to make a motion? Why don't we do it
5	that way. Does anyone want to make a motion
6	that we establish such a Work Group?
7	MEMBER LOCKEY: I'll make that
8	motion. Jim Lockey, I move that we establish
9	a what do you want to call it, a Scientific
10	Work Group?
11	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Right.
12	MEMBER LEMEN: I'm Dick Lemen.
13	I'll second that.
14	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Any
15	further discussion?
16	MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda again.
17	I'd be much happier if we identified clearly
18	in our motion what the expectation was going
19	to be for the Work Group. We've talked about
20	it, but if it is clear in the motion it would
21	be helpful for some of us.

1 MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer. 2 I'm wondering if it would be of value to 3 actually spell the of out scope the responsibilities and maybe present that at the 4 full meeting, which is not really far off --5 6 MEMBER LOCKEY: I think Yes, yes. 7 that's a good idea. 8 MEMBER ZIEMER: I'm sure such a group is not going to be able to meet before 9 10 the next -- the full Board meeting in any event because of other pressing things on the 11 schedule such as Linde. 12 13 Would it be of value to postpone final action on the motion until we get sort 14 of a specific charter and not a -- I mean, all 15 16 the Work Groups supposed have are to 17 responsibilities and it's pretty easy standard Site Profile because we do those all 18 19 kind of the same. Maybe we need sort of a more detailed outline of what should happen 20 here. 21

1	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes. I'll take
2	that as a motion to postpone. Do I have a
3	second for that?
4	MEMBER LOCKEY: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Any
6	further discussion? If not, can we just by
7	voice vote all in favor say aye?
8	(Chorus of ayes.)
9	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Anybody opposed?
10	(No response.)
11	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. Okay.
12	What I will do is I will put together a draft
13	charge to that Work Group, circulate that
14	before the Augusta meeting, and we can discuss
15	it at the Augusta meeting. Is that fair?
16	Meanwhile, it just may help to
17	I'm not if people that are interested in
18	serving on such a Work Group could just email
19	me their interest and maybe we can then get it
20	appointed at the after we've discussed the
21	charge at the Augusta meeting. Thank you, Jim

- 1 Neton, for the update.
- DR. NETON: My pleasure.
- 3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Next is -- we
- 4 hear from LaVon on SEC petition status update.
- 5 MR. RUTHERFORD: All right. Thank
- 6 you, Dr. Ziemer -- or Dr. Melius.
- 7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: You can thank
- 8 all of us.
- 9 MR. RUTHERFORD: From the past
- 10 there, you know? First, I want to bring to
- 11 the Board's attention that Josh Kinman
- 12 recently took the SEC petitioner counselor
- position that was held by Laurie Breyer.
- Josh has been working within the
- 15 SEC group for quite a while so there will be
- 16 little time needed getting him up-to-speed,
- and we hope he will be able to attend the
- 18 February Board meeting so we can introduce him
- 19 to some of the -- to the Board Members.
- 20 As for the February meeting, we
- 21 anticipate presenting three SEC petition

1 evaluations. They are for Wah Chang, Grand 2 Junction Operations Office, and the residual 3 period at Norton. Wah Chang petition evaluation was 4 sent to the Advisory Board late last month, 5 6 and we anticipate having Grand Junction to the Advisory Board this week and Norton late next 7 8 week. also anticipate that we will 9 10 provide an update to the Board concerning GE Evandale at the February meeting and possibly 11 That's just depending on whether 12 Hangar 481. 13 we get some information back on the specific individual film badge readings from Landauer 14 15 or not. 16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: LaVon, just to interrupt briefly, the first three -- I know -17 - I believe Norton is a -- was an 83.14, but 18 19 the other two --20 Actually, Norton MR. RUTHERFORD: I'm sorry, all three of 21 these are was --

- 1 83.13s.
- 2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
- 3 MR. RUTHERFORD: Norton
- 4 originally, if you remember --
- 5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
- 6 MR. RUTHERFORD: We added a Class
- 7 for Norton with an 83.14 for the operations
- 8 period. This is specifically for the residual
- 9 period.
- 10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
- 11 MR. RUTHERFORD: Again, Wah Chang
- 12 and Grand Junction are also 83 -- that's
- 13 pretty much it.
- 14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Any other
- 15 questions for LaVon?
- 16 MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer. I
- 17 have one issue or one comment on this topic
- and that is that Bliss & Laughlin, I believe,
- 19 the TBD-6000 Work Group basically is in a
- 20 position to recommend action on that one.
- We were basically waiting for one

- final vote of one Member who was not able to
- 2 be at our Work Group meeting, but I believe
- 3 the other vote -- other four votes were in
- 4 favor of bringing this forward for action at
- 5 the next meeting.
- So, I -- I'm expecting that we
- 7 would have Bliss & Laughlin on the schedule,
- 8 as well.
- 9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
- 10 MEMBER ZIEMER: Ted, does that
- 11 concur with your understanding? We're still
- waiting for one member's vote, I think.
- 13 MR. KATZ: Yes, that's correct,
- 14 Dr. Ziemer.
- 15 MEMBER CLAWSON: Jim, this is
- 16 Brad.
- 17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, go ahead,
- 18 Brad.
- 19 MEMBER CLAWSON: I just wanted to
- let LaVon know that the individual that was
- 21 doing the Grand Junction did contact me, and

- we had a conversation and discussed my issues,
- 2 that he was going to look into them.
- 3 LaVon just made the comment that
- 4 he would have them get in touch with me, and I
- just wanted him to know that he had.
- 6 MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, and he
- 7 actually -- thank you, Brad. He actually told
- 8 me he had had the conversation with you and
- 9 discussed the issues with me, and I think we
- 10 had them addressed.
- 11 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. Sounds
- 12 good.
- 13 MR. RUTHERFORD: All right.
- MR. KATZ: If the Board Members
- 15 don't have any other questions, I have a
- 16 couple questions to add.
- 17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Go ahead.
- 18 MR. KATZ: This is along the lines
- 19 of what petitions might be presented or
- 20 discussed at the next Board meeting. At the
- 21 last Board meeting face-to-face, there was

1 discussion about some DCAS follow-up on 2 Chapman Valve and so I just wanted to check to 3 see where that stands. This is Stu. 4 MR. HINNEFELD: We -- I believe I can provide a sort of summary 5 for what we've tried to learn and I said well, 6 to tell you -- tried to learn and didn't learn 7 8 anything, we -- the item we were pursuing were a set of records that were still classified in 9 10 0ak Ridge at an organization called Records Holding Task Group -- or I think that 11 the organization that gathered them at 12 13 That's how they are referred to now. 14 We made a data review down there, and one of the specific things we were looking 15 16 for was information from Chapman that would 17 help us understand the sample, the enriched sample that was found at D&D. 18 19 а verbal report that got 20 didn't really learn anything. I'm getting a summary now of what exactly did we find down 21

1 there. There was some Chapman information 2 there, and how that doesn't help us out for 3 the period where -- for the question we're interested in. 4 I also at some time committed to 5 contacting the Navy about information. 6 This 7 has been some time ago I contacted them. They -- our contact there assured me that 8 they could not -- they would -- they did not have 9 10 information that would relate to question we're asking at Chapman. 11 There is also -- we received some 12 13 information about a procurement database from the armed services, I'm not sure if it's the 14 15 consolidated armed services Navy 16 procurement database, that's available for certain years. 17 I believe it might be the '70s or 18 19 '80s when that starts. I intend to provide 20 sort of a screen snapshot. I called it a database; it really is a data file. 21 It's a

1	listing of suppliers to the military that
2	and they're listed by company name, so you can
3	search, in this case, by the time this was
4	generated. You would search for Crane
5	Company, which was the successor to Chapman.
6	You can find Crane Company in
7	where was that, Orchard something,
8	Massachusetts. You can find the company on
9	there and there's a very brief description of
10	what the procurement was for and the ones we
11	have been able to see were valves. The
12	military bought valves from the Crane Company.
13	So, that's the extent of what
14	we've been able to learn. I will prepare a
15	summary for that, and I expect I should be
16	able to get that out well in advance of the
17	Board meeting if the Board chooses to consider
18	that.
19	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Just Jim
20	Melius a follow-up on that then and I may -
21	- I'm sure where we stand with this, but would

1	that then go out to the Work Group to
2	MR. HINNEFELD: We can provide it
3	to the Work Group
4	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Are we beyond
5	the Work Group stage? I think
6	MR. HINNEFELD: Well, there is a
7	Chapman Work Group. I have to let the Chapman
8	chairman
9	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: That is why I'm
10	asking Dr. Poston, I believe you're the
11	chair? Is that John, are you still on the
12	call? Apparently not. Ted or I Ted, you
13	and I one of us will follow up and we'll
14	MEMBER POSTON: Jim?
15	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Oh, yes, there
16	you are.
17	MEMBER POSTON: I'm here.
18	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
19	MEMBER POSTON: I'm sorry. What -
20	_
21	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: My question was

1 I didn't know where we stood with the Chapman 2 I guess Stu's going to prepare an Work Group. 3 updated report their attempts find on to further information, and I didn't know whether 4 we'd be appropriated to have that come back 5 6 through the Work Group with perhaps a quick 7 conference call or just have it come directly back to the Board. 8 Well, I don't know 9 MEMBER POSTON: 10 the proper approach, but certainly if you came 11 back to the Work Group, we could have a telecon and bring a recommendation. 12 13 the -- I don't remember exactly, but I think the motion's been tabled. 14 We voted on it a couple times. 15 16 tried to take it off the table, and we've 17 never been able to do that. CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Why don't we, if 18 19 you can -- let's see if we can set up a Work 20 Group call just in case there are questions information rather 21 about. the than if

- there's not, then we can put it on the agenda
- 2 for the February Board meeting.
- MEMBER POSTON: Sure, as soon as
- 4 we get something from Stu, we can --
- 5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Right. Okay.
- 6 MEMBER POSTON: Should be able to
- 7 talk about it.
- 8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Great.
- 9 Thanks.
- 10 MR. KATZ: Okay. This is -- so
- 11 that was one of my items. Thank you,
- 12 Dr. Poston, and I'll help you with setting up
- that meeting as soon as I get a sense from Stu
- as to when you'll have final documentation.
- 15 The last item I just want to check
- 16 with is with Brad. Brad has scheduled a
- 17 Fernald Work Group, and I think his hope or
- 18 intention was to try to bring Work Group
- 19 activities on the SEC to a close, but I want
- 20 to confirm that.
- 21 I'm not certain about that. Brad

- 1 may have done more work since then and know
- 2 more.
- MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes, Ted, this is
- 4 Brad. I plan on -- we're finishing up the
- 5 last few items here, and I plan on bringing it
- to the Board at the next full Board meeting.
- 7 MR. KATZ: Very good then, Brad.
- 8 So then Fernald will have a place on the
- 9 agenda, as well. Is that good with
- 10 Dr. Melius?
- 11 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
- 12 MR. KATZ: That's it for me.
- 13 Thank you.
- 14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thanks.
- 15 Any other Work Group -- it's time for Work
- 16 Group/Subcommittee updates. I'm -- this is
- 17 sort of a -- we do this on a volunteer basis.
- 18 Anybody that has anybody that has anything --
- 19 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes, this is Brad
- 20 again. What I'm talking about is Pantex, and
- 21 I just wanted to make sure that -- I've had

- 1 somewhat of a problem with my CDC account to
- 2 be able to send stuff out.
- 3 It sends out half of the
- 4 addresses, not the other half, but I wanted to
- 5 make sure that all the Work Group Members,
- 6 especially Stu and Jim, that they got this
- 7 update that I sent out about a week ago on the
- 8 status of where we were at with Pantex.
- 9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Which Jim? Jim
- 10 -- me or Jim Neton?
- 11 MEMBER CLAWSON: Well, actually,
- 12 you were on the list, too. You sent me back
- and said yes, you had received it, so I wanted
- 14 to make sure that Jim Neton got it.
- DR. NETON: Yes, I got it, Brad.
- 16 This is Jim Neton.
- 17 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. I just
- 18 wanted to make sure of that. We're working on
- 19 several issues and we're processing through
- these things right now. I think we're making
- 21 some head ways with the tour that we had and

1 everything at Pantex. Ι think it really helped out, but we're just proceeding forward 2 3 at this time. 4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. Anybody 5 else? Yes, this is Wanda. 6 MEMBER MUNN: 7 The Subcommittee on Procedures is staying We met on January 5 for a long full 8 busy. Covered a great deal of material, got a 9 day. 10 great deal done. 11 able close We were to а significant number of entries that existed on 12 13 the database and look forward to being able at 14 our next meeting to close quite a few more. One of the things that we're very 15 16 pleased to know is that the lead personnel for 17 our contractor is going to be meeting with the IT designers for the database that we use to 18 19 try to tweak what we have just a little more. 20 We've had numerous improvements over the last few months to how that database 21

1	operates, but in adding some new functions, we
2	have lost one or two key items that we need to
3	obtain our overall availability of information
4	when we work with the database.
5	So, it's my understanding that
6	that meeting is going to take place with the
7	programmers and designers for the database
8	probably next week, and so we're looking
9	forward eagerly to the new, again, improved
10	look and availability of information for next
11	time.
12	At this precise moment, we've been
13	focusing on the two-page summaries of the
14	final program reviews that SC&A has been doing
15	for us. We had four on our plate this last
16	time, and up to this point we've undertaken a
17	very tedious process in order to try to get
18	these right.
19	We went through this with the
20	first pilot attempt and we've diminished the
21	amount of attention by some degree but still

1	are spending far too much time how we do this.
2	We had a little discussion about that, and I
3	think it's generally agreed that we will
4	attempt to streamline that process markedly.
5	Necessary that we do that actually
6	in view of the fact that our contractor has
7	just presented us with another 12 two-pagers
8	to be working on. I've been in communication
9	with the lead personnel who are putting
LO	together those summaries for us based on the
L1	actions that we took at our last meeting of
L2	January 5.
L3	They've requested an opportunity
L4	to rework those 12 that have been forwarded to
L5	us, and we look forward to seeing those
L6	reworks in the expectation that they'll be
L7	simplified and come closer to following some
L8	of the rules we have established and what we
L9	expect to do there.
20	We are planning our next meeting
21	to be in early March rather, late March,

and at that time given the information that we 1 2 have now, we probably will have every bit as 3 heavy a load as we have had up to this point. We feel like we're making progress 4 and are going to need to make some decisions 5 6 about how we approach an upcoming report to

the Secretary, which should be coming up on

our agenda in another two or three meetings.

I think that's it.

7

8

9

- 10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thank Anybody else have anything to --11 you, Wanda. Work Group chairs have anything to report? 12 13 Mark Griffon had to leave the call. 14 send me an email updating. Ι just basically that his Work Groups there are --15 16 meetings scheduled or being scheduled 17 them, so -- and I know from the schedule that a number of the other Work Groups are meeting 18 19 or have meetings scheduled coming up.
- 20 MEMBER CLAWSON: Hey, Jim, this is question 21 Brad. This is more of for а

- 1 Genevieve, especially where we were dealing
- 2 with Linde. She spoke of some earlier
- 3 documents that she sent to us.
- 4 I've gone through all of my email
- 5 accounts, and I can't find those. I was
- 6 wondering if, Genevieve, if you could send me
- 7 those earlier two reports that you were
- 8 speaking of.
- 9 MEMBER ANDERSON: Those were back,
- 10 I think, in November, weren't they?
- 11 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes. They were -
- 12 -
- 13 MEMBER ANDERSON: It was a long
- 14 time ago, yes.
- 15 MEMBER CLAWSON: Right. I went
- 16 through all my files and stuff, and I couldn't
- 17 find those. After that last Board meeting, I
- 18 was trying to figure out quite a few things,
- 19 but I was just wondering if I could have Jim
- send those to me. I would appreciate it.
- MR. KATZ: Brad, this is Ted. I

- 1 have them, too. I'm happy to send that to
- 2 you.
- MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. Yes, if
- 4 any -- just so I could be onboard and
- 5 understand what they're talking about. I'd
- 6 appreciate it. Thank you.
- 7 MR. KATZ: Absolutely.
- 8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Ted, do you want
- 9 to give the update on -- you had some other
- 10 updates you wanted to give.
- 11 MR. KATZ: Yes. Yes, thank you,
- 12 Jim. Do you want to address Board
- correspondence first, or do you want me to do
- 14 this?
- 15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I was going to
- have you go first, but it doesn't matter. Why
- 17 don't you go ahead.
- 18 MR. KATZ: No, that's fine. Let
- 19 me -- so, I have a number of things to talk
- 20 about about the upcoming February Board
- 21 meeting. One, I left -- we were talking about

1 petitions and Ι probably should've 2 mentioned we discussed in the November Board 3 meeting Dow Madison, very extensively, Board Members wanted some additional time so 4 5 postponed action that until we any on 6 but that would be on our agenda, February, 7 too. have an action item for that, 8 which was to send the last two transcripts --9 10 both the transcript of the Board meeting --11 the November Board meeting itself, as well as the last meeting of the Work Group -- the SEC 12 13 Work Group, which discussed Dow Madison to 14 Board Members in preparation for the February So, I'll take care of that 15 Board meeting. 16 closer to time so that you have it when you 17 need it. of number 18 Then Ι have a those 19 other things. We'd also discussed for the upcoming Board meeting strategies for maybe 20 coming back on the NIOSH program update, and I 21

1 talked to Stu about some of this, and so one 2 the NIOSH thought is to shorten 3 head of the meeting, update, at the 15 minutes where really I think what DCAS --4 what Stu would do is send you the usual full 5 information sort of presentation in advance of 6 7 the Board meeting, but rather than present 8 that, spend the time at the front end of the 9 meeting presenting that, would take you 10 questions at that point. 11 Then I had another thought, which I haven't had a chance to discuss with Stu, 12 13 but we can discuss it right here on the line, 14 which is perhaps -- we had a conversation during the Board meeting about what would be 15 16 most useful to the public and, for example, David Richardson 17 suggested maybe а poster presentation in the hallways or what have you. 18 19 What I thought might be perhaps a little easier for the public -- because poster 20 presentations are very sort of familiar to 21

1	people in public health and research in
2	general, but maybe less the public, maybe Stu
3	could take that just that portion of the
4	update that covers local sites and just do a
5	very brief oral presentation at the head of
6	the public comment session so that and
7	that's when we have most of the public there
8	to sort of bring them up-to-date with issues
9	that are of direct concern to them locally.
10	But, so that's a suggestion for
11	the Board and for Stu. We haven't discussed
12	it.
13	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Ted, you were
14	also going to update us on the White Paper
15	issue?
16	MR. KATZ: Yes. So I have others,
17	I just wanted to raise that because I'm going
18	to have to start planning for this. So, Stu,
19	I mean, does that seem agreeable to you? The
20	Board, does that seem agreeable to you?
21	MR. HINNEFELD: Ted, this is Stu.

- 1 The local information presentation you're
- 2 proposing, I do at the start of public
- 3 comments.
- 4 MR. KATZ: Yes, that's what I was
- 5 suggesting.
- 6 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay. So, it's
- 7 essentially -- the status for the local site.
- 8 MR. KATZ: Yes.
- 9 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay. I can do
- 10 what the Board requests. That sounds fine to
- 11 me. I think there's some merit in removing
- 12 the overall statistics presentation part.
- 13 We'll still provide that. We'll still provide
- 14 the same information probably in much the same
- 15 format in advance to all the Advisory Board
- 16 Members, and then if they have questions about
- the package, they can ask.
- 18 Then I'd maybe make a comment or
- 19 two about any particular news items or newly
- 20 breaking items that -- to talk about.
- 21 MR. KATZ: Right, Stu. So that's

- what I was suggesting, the questions about the
- full presentation. We still have 15 minutes
- at the front of the meeting to take those.
- 4 MR. HINNEFELD: Right. Right.
- 5 That part I think we had discussed, and that
- 6 part I thought we --
- 7 MR. KATZ: Right.
- 8 MR. HINNEFELD: I'm certainly
- 9 agreeable with, and as for the rest, for the
- 10 local information presenting that at public
- 11 comment, I'll do whatever the Board wishes.
- 12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, I mean --
- this is Jim Melius. Why don't we try that and
- 14 see. I think in Augusta where it's basically
- one-sided, it works. I think it's -- some of
- these locations where you have several sites,
- it gets -- I'm not -- it just may take a while
- 18 or something. But, let's try it in Augusta,
- 19 see how it works, and --
- MR. KATZ: Okay.
- 21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I think we can

always modify it as we try to fit the location and circumstances where we are.

3 Okay. Thank you. Then MR. KATZ: some other items for the meeting. 4 5 annual -- I know you've done it online, but we'll get it out of the way for the next year, 6 7 too -- our annual ethics training and we're planning to handle that in the later afternoon 8 of the first day for the Board. 9

Then, another item, public public is dealing comments. The with responding to public comments. The Privacy Act clearance process is backed up in part because of the holidays, and I'm sure it's not helped by this snow event in Atlanta, but for the comments that were provided by the public at the November Board meeting, so I'm a little uncertain as to whether we will have them. need them Privacy Act cleared before DCAS can do its piece in addressing responses to them and then get that to the Board.

NEAL R. GROSS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	So, I'm quite uncertain as to
2	whether that will be ready for the February
3	Board meeting. If it's not, I will plan on we
4	having that session during the next
5	teleconference, which is in April, if that
6	seems acceptable to the Board.
7	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, I think
8	that's fine, Ted. You have to do the best you
9	can given the I think going through those
10	on a call is well, we tried it once; it was
11	difficult. Now we've changed the approach, so
12	it might be easier next time. So
13	MR. KATZ: Well, I'll give that
14	some thought. If it looks like it would be
15	difficult to get in the way, we have things
16	and we can always we have a meeting then in
17	May, as well, a face-to-face. So however that
18	works out.
19	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
20	MR. KATZ: All right. Then, let's
21	see. An administrative matter about the

1 upcoming Board meeting in Augusta I just want 2 to speak with you about. We're going to --3 Zaida is try to coordinate your going to travel. 4 A lot of you -- some of you may be 5 flying directly into Augusta, and that's easy, 6 7 but for many of you who may be flying into 8 Atlanta, we're going to try to coordinate so that we have some of you sharing rental cars 9 10 and you don't have to have a fleet of them to 11 get you all to that. I'd 12 also, iust on an 13 administrative note, encourage you to keep in 14 mind when you're doing your 450s and mandatory annual trainings, clearances, and so on, these 15 16 requests that you get from CDC, I know these 17 are noisome in a sense -- I mean, it's -- you guys are all very busy, and I fully appreciate 18 19 that. I find them noisome myself, having to comply with all these things, 20 as well, but they're very important, and so I just want to 21

1 encourage you to keep that in mind and try to,

on a timely basis, respond to these requests

3 you get from CDC.

4 The CDC folks, I think, work very

5 hard to try to minimize the burden on you to

6 the extent they can in what they ask from you

7 -- being responsive to your questions and so

8 on.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Okay, then the last matter is what we discussed about earlier is the difficulty -- well, two issues really. Two You as Board Members need sides to this. access to all of the SC&A reviews and memos, cetera, particularly for the full because the Work Group gets these things and they all file these things away in their own personal computers or they know where to find them, but then when these -- particularly with SEC petitions when they come to the full Board, of course, everyone else doesn't have the same advantage, and Jim spoke to this in

Linde

the

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

in preparing on

2 matter. 3 So, I am -- I've had conversations with folks at DCAS and with folks at SC&A and 4 we are working to do a number of things. 5 6 the quickest and sort of easiest thing to do 7 is we're getting a complete inventory of all these materials and we'll have those available 8 on the K: drive, including memos, including 9 10 White Papers. 11 Some of these items would never show up on the web anyway, but -- so that's a 12 13

first order of business, to get an easily
searchable place on your O: drive, what you
refer to as your O: drive, so that for any
given site you can find everything that SC&A
has said, everything the DCAS has said in
response to support you in reviewing one of
these petitions or TBD, whatever it might be
that comes before the full Board.

Then we have the issue of trying

21

1

doing his work

1 to get more material up on the public website. 2 Right now the public website is very good in 3 terms of the TBD review, Site Profiles, the SEC Petition Evaluation, the major reports for 4 SC&A responding to those Petition Evaluations, 5 so much of that site-specific material is up 6 7 there and available for the public, but we have a lot of SC&A procedure reviews that 8 9 aren't specific to a site and some procedure 10 reviews that are more or less specific to a specific site. 11 all 12 Those have not been 13 automatically PA cleared, and they're sort of SC&A has them themselves and then 14 dispersed. the Work Groups that have been involved with 15 16 those procedure reviews have them, but they're Then they're certainly not 17 not in one place. in one place on the web for the public. 18 19 So, we're working through that. What I'm having done is PA clearing the site-20 specific material that hasn't been cleared and 21

there's very little of it that hasn't been

2 cleared. 3 First, that we can get that up on 4 t.he website, and Ι think those would be logically put onto the site as other material 5 after 6 is already. Then that will we 7 through and make sure we PA cleared all the major procedure reviews and get those also up 8 on the website so that the public can see all 9 10 of this major work that SC&A has done in doing 11 DCAS' work. 12 Anv questions about mУ path 13 forward or suggestions? 14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Ι think that would be, I think, useful. 15 As I said in the 16 Linde case, when -again, I believe petitioners were given access to this because 17 they were active participants, but there were 18 19 a number of items and it also included one of the general procedure OTIBs that I went to --20 you sort of try to pull the string if you're 21

1

1 looking at something referred to in а 2 transcript, and it wasn't there to find, so I 3 think this will be helpful, and I think it's useful. 4 5 Any other comments or questions on that or for Ted or I guess -- so we're talking 6 7 about the Board meeting. Any other comments 8 questions regarding the Augusta Board or 9 meeting? 10 As Ι think you already know, if you counted the SEC petitions, we have a busy 11 Board meeting coming up with lots of petitions 12 13 to go through. 14 The last item ___ sort of we 15 skipped over for Ted -- correspondence. The 16 only correspondence we've received, 17 interim, at least I'm aware of to the Board is the letter from 18 Senators Schumer and 19 Gillibrand regarding the Linde Site. circulated the letter 20 Ted and a 21 draft response yesterday. I've to you

1	received comments from editor-in-chief Wanda
2	Munn already, which or editorial comments.
3	As Ted indicated, the email we are going to
4	add just sort of a brief update that the Linde
5	petition will be discussed at the next Board
6	meeting and we're expecting closure at that
7	Board meeting.
8	But anybody have questions or
9	comments on the letter?
10	MEMBER ZIEMER: This is
11	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Go ahead, Paul.
12	MEMBER ZIEMER: Ziemer. I was
13	just going to ask, were the editorials that
14	Wanda made change anything substantive?
15	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: No. They
16	clarify. Particularly in the third paragraph,
17	she clarified some issues
18	MEMBER ZIEMER: Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: In that. I'm
20	just going to briefly summary. There are two
21	issues that were raised in the letter. First,

1 was this whole timeliness of t.he initial 2 evaluation process, and the response to that 3 basically that NIOSH and the Board are working together to address this and NIOSH is 4 5 doing this program review and we hope to be able to reduce the amount of time 6 that's involved in the overall process. 7

The second issue is -- I think is a more difficult issue to address. It's the issue of when a Site Profile, or I guess it would come up under an SEC evaluation also, when there's an agreement that there's problem with one of the individual reconstruction methods for a particular site, sort of the timeliness of that then getting -of the review and sort of the working with NIOSH's process for working with a DOL to reopen those cases where necessary and I think that's a knottier issue just because it's complicated by the review process and NIOSH to some extent waiting for closure particularly

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 on an SEC petition as to what's going to 2 happen to the site overall. 3 I think it's difficult and I think it's something that we can work with NIOSH on 4 to be more cognizant of. If not the next 5 6 Board meeting, the following Board meeting, I 7 thought it might be useful to have -- get a little presentation from Stu about what the 8 NIOSH process is with DOL. 9 10 think at the last meeting Stu addressed it -- we asked him some questions, 11 but I think it may be helpful to get a little 12 13 bit more organized -- for Stu to have time to 14 get a little more organized response to that 15 and see if there are things that we can do to 16 address that. 17 We don't want to delay claimants getting a review where it would assist them in 18 19 their claims because the method is changed. 20 the same time, there needs to be certainty that that is going to be sort of the 21

1 final word on that, at least for some 2 significant period of time doing that. 3 So, is basically her response saying, "Yes, it's something we're -- that the 4 5 Board is working with NIOSH on." 6 Anybody -- any other comments or 7 questions? I'll say it, people did not have much time to review this and if people have 8 additional wording changes, whatever, please 9 10 get them to me. 11 If you can try to do it by the end of the week, we'll wait till then till we 12 finalize. 13 14 MEMBER ZIEMER: Jim, this is 15 and I know we have a policy that 16 requires that the Board authorized letters to 17 the congressional people, and I think the nature of your response is fine. 18 19 There may be minor editorials, but think -- I certainly the Board ought to 20 authorize this to be sent and not wait for the 21

Τ	next meeting or something
2	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Right.
3	MEMBER ZIEMER: There's a
4	timeliness issue even on the responses and I
5	think in terms of the general thrust of what
6	you've said, I certainly agree that we should
7	authorize you to send it.
8	I don't know if you need a motion
9	on that, but
10	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I guess maybe
11	try to go through that. Anybody have any
12	objections to the letter?
13	(No response.)
14	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Hearing none, I
15	guess
16	MEMBER MUNN: I'll be glad to send
17	the edits out to the whole Board if you'd like
18	that.
19	MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I assume,
20	Jim, you'll send us the final copy and
21	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I'll send

- 1 everybody a final.
- Nancy Adams also. They're -- they
- 3 needed to go into a federal government
- 4 congressional correspondence formatting also.
- 5 MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.
- 6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. Any other
- 7 business that people would like to bring up
- 8 for this meeting?
- 9 MEMBER PRESLEY: Hey, Jim, this is
- 10 Bob Presley.
- 11 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, Bob.
- 12 MEMBER PRESLEY: Would it be too
- much trouble to have NIOSH, Ted Katz put out a
- 14 revised list of when our Working Group
- 15 meetings are going to be? We've had so many
- 16 cancellations and additions to Working Groups,
- it's hard to keep up with that anymore.
- 18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, I believe
- 19 Ted did one about two or three weeks ago, I
- 20 think, Ted?
- 21 MR. KATZ: Actually, I think I did

1 one less than a week ago, Bob, so you should 2 have it in one of your email accounts. 3 MEMBER PRESLEY: Okay. Ιf you 4 would, send that to my home account, would you 5 please? I'd be happy 6 MR. KATZ: to do 7 that. 8 MEMBER PRESLEY: Thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Any other 10 changes? Comments? Questions? Okay. Ιf not, I guess we have a motion to adjourn. 11 12 MEMBER ZIEMER: So moved. 13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Second? 14 MEMBER BEACH: Second. Seconded. 15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. All in 16 favor -- click your phone. Hang up, and we'll see you all in Augusta if not sooner. 17 Thanks 18 very much. 19 (Whereupon, the above-entitled 20 matter went off the record at 12:51 p.m.)

2.1

1