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

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

URANIUM REFINING AWES WORK GROUP

+ + + + +

TUESDAY
AUGUST 16, 2011

+ + + + +

The Work Group convened telephonically at 9:00 a.m., Henry Anderson, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

HENRY ANDERSON, Chairman R. WILLIAM FIELD, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official DAVE ALLEN, DCAS
TERRIE BARRIE
HANS BEHLING, SC&A
MARY GIRARDO
SAM GLOVER, DCAS
JENNY LIN, HHS
JOHN MAURO, SC&A
JIM NETON, DCAS
LAVON RUTHERFORD, DCAS
BILL THURBER, SC&A

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

<u> Item</u>	Page
Welcome/introductions	3
Hooker Electrochemical SC&A review of DCAS White Paper on Surrogate Data Use DCAS Response Issues resolution WG Recommendation to Board	4
Electro Metallurgical DCAS report on work in progress/ path forward; ore work	20
United Nuclear DCAS report on work in progress/ path forward	41
WG Plans	64
Adjournment	66

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	9:00 a.m.
3	MR. KATZ: Let's begin with roll
4	call. First of all, this is the Advisory
5	Board on Radiation and Worker Health; this is
6	the Uranium Refining Atomic Weapons Employers
7	Work Group, formerly called the TBD-6001 Work
8	Group.
9	(Roll call.)
10	MR. KATZ: All right. So let me
11	just remind everyone on the line, please mute
12	your phone, except when you are addressing
13	the group. If you don't have a mute button,
14	press *6, that will mute your phone. Press
15	*6 again to take your phone off of mute. And
16	please, at no time put the call on hold. If
17	you need to leave for a while, hang up and
18	dial back in.
19	Thank you very much. And Andy,
20	it is your agenda.
21	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. The
22	first on the agenda is Hooker Electrochemical

1	and I believe the main thing is the review by
2	SC&A and the White Paper going through the
3	surrogate data use criteria that the Board
4	established.
5	MR. THURBER: John, do you want me
6	to pick that up?
7	DR. MAURO: Yes, Bill, just by
8	way of orientation it might be helpful. Did
9	everyone receive Bill Thurber's e-mail dated
10	August 15? It was our attempt, or SC&A's
11	attempt to collect everything. As you know,
12	there are a number of sites that fall under
13	the AWE Work Group and various stages of
14	maturization. Some of them have been very
15	mature, such as Hooker and United Nuclear and
16	Electro Met and others are in their infancy,
17	such as Baker-Perkins and DuPont. Bill did a
18	nice job in assembling the matrices for all
19	of these and have a cover that sort of gives
20	a status as we understand it as of today.
21	And so, if you don't have that, let us know.
22	Ted, did you receive a copy?

1	MR. KATZ: It was dated, you
2	said, yesterday?
3	DR. MAURO: Yes, dated
4	yesterday. So, yes, some of us may have been
5	on travel. It was sent out. Quite frankly I
6	asked Bill to do it, thinking that even
7	though it wasn't really explicitly asked of
8	us, I said "listen, there's so much here and
9	it could get kind of confusing. It would be
LO	a good idea to get it all in one place." If
11	you don't have it in front of you, don't
12	worry about it. We will work our way through
13	it. But you should have it and I think it
L4	will be useful in going forward because it
15	puts everything in one place. But with that,
16	and don't worry if you don't have it in front
L7	of you, I will ask Bill to kick it off with
18	Hooker.
L9	MR. KATZ: Let me just say, this
20	is Ted oh, let me remind everyone to
21	identify themselves when they speak, for the
22	court reporter. So I have it and I see that

1	it	was	sent	to	all	of	the	Board	Members'	CDC

- 2 addresses as well as to related staff, I
- 3 believe. So, yes. I think --
- 4 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: It is six
- 5 pages?
- DR. MAURO: That sounds about
- 7 right.
- 8 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, yes I
- 9 got it.
- 10 MR. KATZ: I don't know if Dave
- 11 Allen received it or not.
- MR. ALLEN: Yes, we got it here.
- 13 MR. KATZ: I did, and Sam. So
- 14 everyone seems to have it. And the other
- important document is, the one that John has
- 16 mentioned, is back in July, I think on July
- 17 8, he sent out a review of Hooker and a
- 18 matrix back then too.
- 19 MR. THURBER: This is Bill
- 20 Thurber. Ted, that review is also included
- 21 as the matrix for Hooker that is in this
- 22 packet that you all got yesterday. Anyways,

1	with regard to Hooker, at the last Work Group
2	meeting, SC&A was tasked to review the NIOSH
3	White Paper on the use of surrogate data at
4	Hooker. And prior to SC&A performing its
5	review, NIOSH was asked to update their White
6	Paper to include specific reference to the
7	air samples that they had actually used in
8	their analysis. And David Allen issued a
9	revision of the White Paper shortly after the
10	May 16 Work Group meeting, and we then
11	reviewed that document and provided a White
12	Paper dated July 7. And in that White Paper,
13	we concluded, as you can read in the summary
14	of the status report as follows: "Based on
15	our review we believe that NIOSH has
16	addressed the ABRWH surrogate data criteria
17	in an appropriate manner and that the use of
18	surrogate data at Hooker is consistent with
19	the Board criteria. Use of the selected
20	surrogate data will result in plausible
21	bounding estimates for internal exposures at
22	Hooker "

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	So, we felt that NIOSH had done a
2	fine job in addressing the surrogate data
3	question.
4	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Any
5	questions? Bill, do you have any questions?
6	MEMBER FIELD: No.
7	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
8	DR. MAURO: This is John. I
9	believe that was the only open item.
10	Everything else was closed at previous
11	meetings.
12	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right.
13	Looking through the matrix, that seemed to be
14	
15	DR. MAURO: That's correct.
16	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: The only, as
17	I recall does this relate just to the slag
18	surrogate? Did we deal with the surrogate
19	data that was used for the other exposures?
20	MR. THURBER: The exposures were
21	only from slag.
22	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okav. So do

1	T47	harra	anything	مه [م	on	Hooker	than	a t	2112
1	we	Have	anything	етве	OH	HOOKEL	CHen	aı	all:

- 2 MR. THURBER: That's all we have
- 3 from SC&A's standpoint.
- 4 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. I
- 5 have on the agenda here --
- 6 MR. KATZ: Oh, Andy?
- 7 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.
- 8 MR. KATZ: I'm sorry. This is
- 9 Ted Katz. So, if you have closed all the
- 10 issues, I mean, the next step to do before
- 11 you leave Hooker is to come up with a Work
- 12 Group recommendation and a plan for
- 13 presenting. It is on the agenda for the
- 14 Board meeting next week.
- 15 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: It is?
- 16 Okay. I didn't see that.
- 17 MR. KATZ: It is, and so -- I
- 18 believe it is. I hope I'm not confused about
- 19 that, but it certainly should be. Hold on a
- 20 second. Let me see what day it is on. Yes,
- it's on Wednesday and you were presenting.
- 22 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

1	MR. KATZ: You are presenting
2	for the Work Group.
3	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
4	MR. KATZ: Reporting out for the
5	Work Group on Hooker. And we'll need a
6	presentation, whether you do it just orally,
7	but it would be best if you actually come up
8	with either a PowerPoint where there will be
9	some slides or a written presentation. And
10	the DCAS folks and the SC&A folks can assist
11	you with that, to the degree that you want
12	help, summarizing what the Work Group
13	reviewed, found, and its recommendations.
14	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
15	MR. KATZ: I think the first
16	thing formally, I think you have all agreed
17	with the Work Group on the individual
18	findings and closing them but you haven't
19	actually, I don't believe, but I didn't
20	finish reviewing all of the transcripts of
21	the last meeting. I don't believe you
22	actually made, specified a recommendation for

	1	the	Board,	but	it	would	be	appropriate	to	do
--	---	-----	--------	-----	----	-------	----	-------------	----	----

- that as a Work Group first, because then it
- 3 ends up being a motion to the Board.
- 4 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. There
- is only two of us of the three, so I don't
- 6 know if --
- 7 MR. KATZ: There is only two or
- 8 three, that's true but two of three is a
- 9 majority already. And keep in mind that this
- is really, it only ends up being a motion
- 11 before the Board, so it's not that critical
- 12 that you have everyone. It is always good
- to, we prefer to, but Mark hasn't been able
- to make these meetings and we don't want to
- 15 leave this live forever. Mark can certainly
- weigh in at the Board meeting.
- 17 MEMBER FIELD: Ted, this is Bill.
- 18 I think that Mark can easily review maybe
- 19 what Andy puts together in the minutes from
- 20 the last meeting to see if he is in
- 21 agreement.
- MR. KATZ: Absolutely. So Andy,

1	I know we are very short on time, but the
2	thing we normally do is, and I would send
3	around the transcripts of the meetings to all
4	of the Board Members, not just to Mark. But
5	if you have time to get a brief presentation
6	together, you would circulate it to your
7	fellow Work Group Members so that they could
8	say I agree or give you any suggestions if
9	they have suggestions for the presentation.
10	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Sure. So,
11	Bill, I don't know if the Chair can make a
12	motion or not. But it seems to me that after
13	our review and we've closed things out that
14	the motion would be to accept the NIOSH
15	recommendation, which was to wasn't it
16	NIOSH's position that they could do dose
17	reconstruction?
18	MR. ALLEN: Yes, this is Dave
19	Allen. That was our recommendation in the
20	Evaluation Report.
21	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Right.
22	DR. MAURO: And SC&A's

1	findings,	as	а	result	of	this	process,	is
---	-----------	----	---	--------	----	------	----------	----

- 2 that we concur.
- 3 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. So
- 4 that would seem to be the motion from the
- 5 committee would be that we will accept
- 6 NIOSH's proposal that they are able to do
- 7 dose reconstruction that would be claimant-
- 8 favorable and therefore it would be to deny
- 9 the petition? Bill?
- 10 MEMBER FIELD: Yes, I am just
- 11 trying to get off mute here -- yes, I think
- 12 that's correct, Andy.
- 13 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
- DR. MAURO: If I may help, this
- is John. One of the issues always, as you
- 16 know, is surrogate data and we will be more
- than happy to help out in any way we can, if
- 18 you need help. I'm sure David is the same,
- in putting together the slides that summarize
- 20 the large number of issues that were
- 21 entertained, the number of changes that
- 22 occurred in the process. And of course

1	always the matter of surrogate data is always
2	of great concern to the Board and how that
3	was, came to resolution and why. Why we felt
4	that it met the five criteria the Board has
5	developed those are always of great
6	interest to the Board. So any way we can
7	help, we will be glad to help out.
8	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: What I was
9	going to let's first do the I guess if
10	Bill and I are both in agreement on that for
11	the proposal, then we will move forward with
12	the recommendation and then I will need to
13	have the assistance on the presentation. I
14	don't know if I have it. I may, but I'm sure
15	one of you probably has it more handy than I.
16	If you have the first presentation, slides
17	from the first presentation that were made by
18	NIOSH on their recommendation, that set of
19	slides, I could probably pick from that. And
20	then, John, if you folks are willing to do
21	that, if you could put together some slides
22	from the matrix.

1	DR. MAURO: Sure.
2	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And I think
3	we will circulate to the full Board your July
4	7 White Paper review, as well as the NIOSH
5	summary that they did or that you reviewed
6	actually.
7	DR. MAURO: Sure.
8	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: So those
9	seem to be the key documents. So John,
10	maybe, if you could put together a couple of
11	slides from your White Paper review of the
12	surrogate data issue. That seems to me to be
13	the real issue here, and of all of the
14	surrogate data issues that the Board has
15	addressed, this one, to me anyway, seems to
16	be a little more straightforward than usual
17	because it just deals with the slag and the
18	slag handling at the various surrogate
19	facilities and really very similar to what
20	was done here.
21	MEMBER FIELD: And Andy, this is

Bill. I think it would be helpful too if we

1	could just find a few minutes Tuesday to talk
2	about the issues with Mark.
3	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. We
4	will try to do that.
5	MEMBER FIELD: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I don't know
7	if he is going to be out there or not. But
8	we can maybe touch base with him by phone.
9	MR. KATZ: Mark gets out there,
10	I believe, Tuesday night.
11	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
12	MR. KATZ: Wait. The Board
13	meeting starts Tuesday. No, no. So he gets
14	out there, I believe, Monday night, and he
15	will be there Tuesday and Wednesday.

- 16 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Oh, good.
- 17 Then we can get together with him on Tuesday.
- 18 MR. KATZ: Yes. John, is that
- 19 clear for you, to summarize the matrix so
- that people know what issues are where and
- 21 how they were resolved and then address the
- 22 surrogate data in a series of slides that

1 Andy	can	use?
--------	-----	------

- DR. MAURO: Glad to do it. We
- 3 will try to turn it into something giving it
- 4 more of a -- not just itemize the issues but
- 5 sort of tell the story of the issues.
- 6 MR. KATZ: Absolutely.
- 7 DR. MAURO: Yes, and how they
- 8 were resolved. Yes, we'll do the way we've
- 9 done these kind of things before.
- 10 MR. KATZ: Yes. That would be
- 11 very helpful. In terms of timeline here, I
- 12 know it's very late today. We are already
- 13 here on Tuesday. Zaida will need the
- 14 presentation for the Board meeting and so on
- 15 at the very latest by Friday. So that is
- sort of the framework we are dealing with for
- 17 timing.
- DR. MAURO: We'll get on this
- 19 right away and certainly circulate it with
- 20 David and Jim. In effect, what we will be
- 21 trying to do is capture the sense that
- 22 emerged from the whole process in a story

1	that	is	balanced	and	it	is	probably	а	9000

- idea that, if it is okay with everyone else,
- 3 that when I sent a draft out to the Work
- 4 Group, I'll simultaneously send it to Jim and
- 5 David for their consideration and Sam. See
- if there is anything else or rewording. This
- 7 way we're sort of all on the same page. I
- 8 think that's appropriate to make sure that it
- 9 catches the whole story.
- 10 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I will be
- 11 around all week. So if you can get that to
- me by Thursday, we can finalize it and get it
- 13 to Zaida.
- DR. MAURO: I will try to do
- 15 better than that.
- 16 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I was just
- 17 looking at it. If I was going to do it, it
- 18 was going to be this weekend.
- 19 DR. MAURO: No, well, today's
- 20 Tuesday, yes, we should be able to get
- 21 something out by Thursday.
- 22 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, great.

1	MR. KATZ: That is great. That
2	is much appreciated, John. Thank you.
3	DR. MAURO: That is the only
4	one we have. I am making promises like that
5	guy in that commercial.
6	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.
7	(Laughter.)
8	DR. MAURO: Never mind.
9	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. So I
10	think we've got that. Any other comments on
11	Hooker people have?
12	MR. KATZ: Andy, can I just
13	check on the line? This is Ted Katz again.
14	Do we have the petitioner for Hooker on now?
15	No, okay. Okay, carry on, Andy. I'm sorry.
16	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. I
17	didn't hear them up front. So let's move on
18	to an update on Electro Metallurgical.
19	MR. THURBER: Okay, this is Bill
20	Thurber. We provided in the status report,
21	which you received yesterday, an update on
22	the Electro Metallurgical company matrix,

which you all have and there were a number of

- 2 findings of which -- I'm sorry. I'm looking
- 3 at the wrong matrix.
- 4 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I don't
- 5 think you sent out that.
- 6 MR. THURBER: Yes, everyone should
- 7 have it. It comes after the Hooker matrix in
- 8 the package.
- 9 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay,
- 10 because I only got six pages.
- 11 MR. THURBER: There are actually
- 12 18 pages. Does everyone else have 18 pages?
- 13 DR. NETON: We do here in NIOSH
- 14 for the whole transmittal on yesterday's
- 15 transmittal.
- MR. THURBER: Yes, right.
- 17 MS. GIRARDO: Excuse me, this is
- 18 Mary Girardo in Niagara Falls. Sorry for
- 19 interrupting, but apparently something got
- 20 hooked up on this phone conference.
- DR. MAURO: Mary -- am I the
- only one that can hear Mary? Hello?

1	MS. GIRARDO: Yes, I'm on.
2	DR. MAURO: I hear you, Mary,
3	and this is John Mauro. I'm not sure if
4	everyone else does.
5	MR. KATZ: I do.
6	DR. NETON: This is NIOSH in
7	Cincinnati. We hear her.
8	DR. MAURO: Okay.
9	MS. GIRARDO: Yes. Something got
10	hooked up here because you weren't hearing me
11	so I had to re-call in. So is this the end
12	of Hooker Chemical as far as you people are
13	concerned?
14	MR. KATZ: Mary, this is Ted
15	Katz.
16	MS. GIRARDO: Yes.
17	MR. KATZ: I'm sorry. Are you
18	the petitioner for Hooker?
19	MS. GIRARDO: Yes, I am.
20	MR. KATZ: Thank you. That's why
21	I asked if there was a petitioner for Hooker

on the phone.

1	MS. GIRARDO: Yes, I tried to
2	respond but you weren't hearing me.
3	MR. KATZ: Yes, I'm sorry about
4	that. But you certainly have an opportunity
5	if you want to comment to the group. I
6	assume you heard the discussion. I know you
7	were on the previous teleconference or
8	actually it was a face-to-face.
9	MS. GIRARDO: Yes, but this
10	seems to be like a closed group. The
11	petitioner is kept in the dark. The minutes
12	have not been put on the website. So there's
13	nothing from the last meeting to counteract
14	this thing about surrogate data. There is
15	questions about that. There has been no
16	opportunity to speak. It has just been
17	closed session for SC&A and NIOSH. So, I
18	really don't know what you guys have been
19	doing. Don't know what you are talking
20	about. The White Paper deal, the petitioner

hasn't received anything dealing with White

So we don't really know what in the

Paper.

21

1	world	VO11	are	doing.	So	in	other	words
_	WOLIG	yOu	arc	dollig.	50,	T11	OCHEL	WULUB

- it's like a closed session and we're not to
- 3 know. So that's my complaint.
- 4 MR. KATZ: I'm sorry about that,
- 5 Mary, but the transcript is on the website
- 6 actually, for the last meeting. The White
- 7 Papers -- I really don't keep track of
- whether, for example, the NIOSH White Papers
- 9 have been PA, Privacy Act, cleared or not.
- 10 But certainly you can --
- 11 MS. GIRARDO: But you are making
- these decisions, folks, based on what you
- 13 know and what nobody else knows and that's
- 14 not fair. We have nothing to look at,
- 15 whether we understand it or not, we have
- 16 nothing in front of us to see what in the
- 17 world you are talking about to even make a
- 18 stab at it. This is wrong.
- 19 MR. KATZ: David, do you know if
- 20 the DCAS White Papers are Privacy Act
- 21 cleared?
- MR. ALLEN: No, Ted, I don't

1	langur	\sim ff	+ha	+ on	\sim f	ms z	haad
1	VIIOM	OTT	CITE	LOP	O_{L}	шу	head.

- 2 MR. KATZ: Okay. Well, one
- 3 thing we can do in the meanwhile is check on
- 4 that. Get them cleared. You can have copies
- of those White Papers that have come since
- 6 the NIOSH Evaluation Report. And likewise,
- 7 we will do the same thing with the SC&A White
- 8 Papers on Hooker, if they are not already
- 9 cleared. And I believe I've asked for those
- 10 to be cleared but I couldn't be certain that
- 11 they are out and available already because
- there is a process in reviewing them.
- 13 MS. GIRARDO: Well, if you were
- in my position, wouldn't you think that this
- was a fixed-up job, that it was all planned?
- 16 Because it's very suspicious, this whole way
- 17 that you are doing things. And if a person
- is suppose to speak in front of the Board,
- 19 you've got to know exactly what in the world
- you are talking about to some degree, don't
- 21 you?
- MR. KATZ: I actually agree, and

1	that's	why	we	have	these	meetings	in	public,

- on the phone, with a phone line and that's
- 3 why we do put out transcripts for these
- 4 meetings.
- 5 MS. GIRARDO: But, first, the
- 6 petitioner is told that they don't speak
- 7 unless you people give the go-ahead. We
- 8 aren't even allowed to speak. So, I'm
- 9 surprised that you are even listening to me.
- 10 I've been told more than once that this
- 11 meeting, the petitioners are not allowed to
- 12 speak. So now, here I am speaking. So you
- 13 see, I don't understand this whole routine.
- 14 I really don't. And this part about
- 15 surrogate data and slag, you guys just don't
- 16 make sense at all. You have to talk to the
- 17 common people. You have to talk in plain
- 18 English. And you've got to make it clear to
- 19 people what in the world you are dealing
- 20 with. And you can't just say slag surrogate
- 21 data, everything's fine. Well, it may be
- 22 fine with you but it is sure not fine with

1	the	rest	of	us.	So	Ι	thank	you,	and	I'	m
---	-----	------	----	-----	----	---	-------	------	-----	----	---

- going to exit this meeting because I see no
- 3 point in continuing in on it. Thank you very
- 4 much for the opportunity. Goodbye.
- 5 MR. KATZ: Okay, Andy?
- 6 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.
- 7 MR. KATZ: Okay, I think we can
- 8 proceed from there. And we will work on
- 9 getting Mary at least the White Papers.
- 10 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Is the
- 11 matrix an available item or not?
- MR. KATZ: We can -- well, the
- 13 matrix itself -- we can PA clear anything,
- 14 yes. So we will get this latest matrix on
- 15 Hooker PA cleared. We really just need that
- 16 section PA cleared. And like I said, I
- 17 believe I've asked for the Hooker White Paper
- 18 to be PA cleared, so I believe your SC&A part
- is probably done by now, cleared and ready to
- 20 go to her. And I would ask if we could do
- 21 the same for its White Paper.
- 22 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes, those

1	seem	to	be	the	two	kev	documents	that

- apparently she hasn't seen, so if we can get
- 3 those to her.
- 4 MR. KATZ: Right. I think that
- 5 would be good.
- 6 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And we need
- 7 to be able to arrange, I assume she won't be
- 8 -- or maybe she will be out in Pasco but at
- 9 least have her be able to be on --
- 10 MR. KATZ: Yes, that is already
- 11 arranged. I mean, someone from NIOSH
- 12 contacts each of the petitioners and informs
- them about what's on the agenda and finds out
- 14 whether they are interested in speaking to
- the Board, either in person or by phone. So
- that should already be taken care of.
- 17 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
- 18 Because she didn't know that, maybe she
- 19 didn't know that we were this close to just
- 20 having the one issue.
- MR. KATZ: Well, yes. I mean,
- 22 frankly, I thought that the discussion at the

1	last meeting was very clear and sort of
2	systematic in going through the issues and
3	closing the issues. I can understand though,
4	you know, folks in the public, the
5	petitioners, they have a hard time following
6	along on these technical issues.
7	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.
8	MR. KATZ: And you know in some
9	Work Groups, they've asked for things made in
10	a sort of simplified form for them produced
11	and we've been able to do that in some cases.
12	We did some of that for Linde, I think. But
13	it is very tough for them to follow the
14	technical issues, which is not their bag,
15	particularly if they are not someone who
16	worked at DOE or worked in these processes at
17	DOE, trying to understand what is being
18	discussed is hard.
19	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, well
20	let's then, as long as you are going to be
21	taking care of getting what information is
22	cleared to her, that would be helpful.

1	MR. KATZ: Yes. I will follow
2	through on that.
3	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, and I
4	found the 18 pages. I had somehow or other
5	only six printed for me. So go ahead, I got
6	it up.
7	MR. THURBER: Okay, good. This is
8	Bill Thurber again. Do you want to go
9	through these findings item by item or how
10	would you like to proceed on this? In a lot
11	of cases, when these findings were discussed
12	at the May 16 Work Group meeting, NIOSH said
13	that they were still waiting on information
14	from DOE, and without this additional input
15	from DOE, there were many of the findings
16	that were in abeyance because they couldn't
17	come up with a good source term calculation.
18	So, however you would like to proceed. We
19	can go through them item by item or whatever.
20	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Well, if we
21	could just
22	DR. GLOVER: I just want to make a

1	suggestion. This is Sam Glover at NIOSH. We
2	finally received the letter from Department
3	of Labor so I thought maybe so we really
4	hadn't had a chance to proceed on that
5	because we needed our source term
6	information. Maybe we could just go over
7	some of the things that we have been able to
8	cover because we really, until we got that
9	information, couldn't proceed.
LO	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
11	DR. GLOVER: It's up to you.
12	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: That sounds
13	good.
L4	DR. GLOVER: I certainly, if
15	SC&A, Bill, if you still had action items. I
L6	think most of the things were in our court
L7	though.
18	MR. THURBER: They were all in
19	your court, Sam, I believe. Trying to make it
20	easy.
21	DR. GLOVER: There you go. Make

it easy that way. So here's what we've made

1 progress on.

2 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: That's what

3 I thought we were just going to hear about

4 today is if anything has transpired, and it

5 sounds like it has. So if you want to just

6 give a quick update on that.

7 DR. GLOVER: So really the

8 thing, last week we finally received a letter

9 from the Department of Energy regarding ore

10 operations and thorium operations at Electro

11 Met and I'm just going to paraphrase. Ted, I

12 apologize. I was on travel a lot and didn't

get to forward -- I had forgotten to forward

14 that to you guys. So Ted, you should have a

15 copy of that now, if you don't mind

16 forwarding that to the appropriate folks. So

I did include Ted on that letter. Basically,

18 they said that they looked at our

19 information. They can't really put a

timeframe of when ore operations were there

21 nor really what the scope is. Dave Allen and

I went through the operations very thoroughly

1	and back to the letters. And everything we
2	can tell, with the information we have, shows
3	that it was probably a laboratory level 25/50
4	pound kind of operation conducted earlyish in
5	the `44, `45 time frame at Electro Met. So
6	DOE doesn't give any additional information.
7	They didn't find anything additional to what
8	we had. They do concur that there was some
9	ore there. They couldn't put time scopes to
LO	it. They did also say that they were going
11	to remove thorium from the listing that they
12	had included because they had no information
13	thorium had been included. They have no
L4	information that shows thorium was ever at
15	the facility. So, you now have a copy of
L6	that letter. So that we thought there
L7	might have been several tons that were
18	shipped. That may not be the case. It looks
L9	like a more modest amount, as we review the
20	records more carefully in the overall set,
21	but at least what we understand. I think
22	where that leaves us, however, is the back-

1	extrapolation timeframe where we are looking
2	at back-extrapolating using that `48 data to
3	go back to `43. So where I am, as I talk to
4	Jim and Dave and Stu, is that we are
5	currently reviewing our data as it supports
6	dose reconstruction and we are focusing on
7	concentrating on that back-extrapolation
8	timeframe. So that's really the focus where
9	we are at, what data we have and whether
10	that's going to support that timeframe for
11	dose reconstruction, mostly regarding the
12	uranium data and not concentrating on this
13	ore component.
14	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We don't
15	know we are not going to find out how much
16	ore was processed, it sounds like. I mean,
17	you have a sense that it might not have been
18	very much, but we really don't know.
19	DR. GLOVER: DOE was hesitant to
20	I can read let's see. I will read a
21	little more carefully here. "This document
22	confirms that Electro Met received varying

1	grades of uranium ore from the Belgian Congo.
2	The facility supported the beneficiation
3	program which involved assessing different
4	ore leaching methods to determine the best
5	approach to larger-scale mill operations to
6	recover uranium. They were unable to find any
7	additional documents relevant to our
8	request."
9	And that's pretty much where they
10	left it. So that is
11	DR. NETON: This is Jim. DOE is
12	not able to tell us how much was there. All
13	records that we have, as Sam said, indicate
14	small quantities. But we, as Sam indicated,
15	are refocusing our efforts on looking at the
16	dose reconstruction process for the earlier

feel that is the place to look right now to
see if we can actually continue to do dose
reconstructions and will come to some

determination in the near future on that.

and our looking at it a lot closer.

NEAL R. GROSS

years, in light of, frankly, SC&A's findings,

17

18

22

And we

1	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: So that's
2	really finding number two is still on hold
3	while you look at things.
4	DR. NETON: Right. We think if
5	something comes up where we feel that maybe
6	dose reconstruction is not possible, I'm not
7	saying we've reached that determination, but
8	saying we did, it would be on a uranium
9	basis, and that would sort of make the ore
10	situation, I don't want to say irrelevant,
11	but
12	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. Okay.
13	DR. MAURO: Jim, this is John.
14	Now my recollection is that when I think
15	back of many of these different sites we work
16	on. Really the only thing I am able to keep
17	in my mind is the 30-second sound bite until
18	I actually go into it. But I remember there
19	were two aspects of this particular site that
20	remained with me. One is, back-extrapolating
21	from `47/'48 data when you did have data on
22	uranium and then back-extrapolating to the

1	earlier `40s, which is what you just
2	mentioned. And the other one had to do with
3	and I remember Bill explaining to me that
4	Electro Met is a very, very large site. And
5	the place where the operations took place
6	that are under discussion was the way I
7	keep it in my head, a postage stamp on this
8	large envelope and there was some questions
9	on whether or not, when the issues are being
10	aired, whether or not we are able to confine
11	our concerns to just this localized area that
12	perhaps was under tight security control,
13	access control where we knew who was going in
14	and going out and therefore the issue is just
15	the smaller area where the work was going on
16	or whether there was, as we ran into, I guess
17	in GE, more of a difficult problem in
18	defining the size of the area that's under
19	consideration. Is that still a matter before
20	us?
21	DR. NETON: Well, we examined
22	that and I think that relates to issue number

7	
1	one.

- DR. MAURO: Okay.
- DR. NETON: No, where was that?
- 4 I'm on the wrong --
- 5 MR. THURBER: Yes, that is finding
- one, that is correct.
- 7 DR. NETON: Finding one, and Sam
- 8 I can speak to that but we did follow up on
- 9 that with, was it Energy?
- DR. GLOVER: With Department of
- 11 Labor.
- DR. NETON: Labor rather. Go
- 13 ahead, Sam. Tell them what we found.
- DR. GLOVER: So we spoke with
- 15 Department of Labor regarding this and based
- on their records, they cannot differentiate
- 17 the people. They just simply do not have the
- 18 ability to do it. Yes it is, there is not
- 19 differentiation between Electro Met and
- 20 Electro Met little in the middle. It is
- 21 Electro Met. So they don't say the little
- building here, they call Electro Met Electro

1	Met. And when they go do employee
2	verification they simply do not have the
3	records. We've got that documented and DOL
4	puts people in places. Whether we try to
5	make that distinguished, you try to
6	distinguish that or not, they can't put them
7	in place. That's how they are going to treat
8	them. That's what they've told me. There's
9	nothing I can do.
10	DR. MAURO: Okay, that helps,
11	because I remember that was important because
12	the number of people changes dramatically in
13	terms of the issue, depending on how you draw
14	those boundaries.
15	DR. GLOVER: So I apologize that
16	I haven't gotten farther for you on this but
17	we had to wait until we got the ore
18	discussion.
19	DR. MAURO: No, I understand.
20	DR. GLOVER: So that's, we will
21	proceed with due haste and get some
22	additional follow-up on these action items.

1	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay,
2	others?
3	MEMBER FIELD: Yes, this is Bill.
4	I just had a question. Does anyone know
5	what the original source was to indicate that
6	there may have been thorium used at the site?
7	DR. GLOVER: We have no idea.
8	That was just put into they used thorium
9	at the facility in the `60s or `50s, late
10	`50s, outside the covered period. So the
11	facility had some specific, some other things
12	that they cleaned up and so I think it got
13	drug in from the clean-up documents, some of
14	the descriptions they had. That, as I
15	started to think about it more, I think it
16	came from some different documentation but
17	not from the DOE process that occurred in the
18	early `40s, to the beginning of the `50s.
19	MEMBER FIELD: Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: What about
21	finding number six on the air?
22	DR. NETON: I think these are

1	all	related	to	the	general	issue	of	our	going

- 2 back and looking at our ability to
- 3 reconstruct uranium.
- 4 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.
- 5 DR. NETON: There is a lot of
- 6 things we need to consider such as: what kind
- 7 of work processes were there? Was this
- 8 mechanical, shuffling, that sort of thing,
- 9 and we are rethinking our position on this
- 10 right now.
- 11 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: So all of
- these things kind of roll into that.
- 13 DR. NETON: All of the internal
- 14 issues that are there kind of roll into that
- one.
- 16 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. So
- then it is kind of what's your timeline, do
- 18 you think, Jim?
- 19 DR. NETON: I would say that we
- 20 will have a position here well in advance of
- 21 the December Board meeting.
- 22 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.

1	DR. NETON: Easy to say now
2	since it is only August, but I think this
3	will go fairly quickly on our side.
4	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, great.
5	Any other questions on Electro Met? Bill?
6	Do we have the petitioners on? Okay. Either
7	people are on mute and they are talking.
8	Should we move on to United Nuclear?
9	DR. MAURO: How would you like
10	to proceed?
11	MR. THURBER: I can pick it up if
12	you want, John.
13	DR. MAURO: Yes. I know Hans
14	also, the both of you worked pretty closely
15	on this. Why don't you get it started?
16	MR. RUTHERFORD: This is LaVon
17	with NIOSH. I do want to point out the fact
18	that we haven't issued any White Papers in
19	resolution to the issues that SC&A has
20	previously identified from the last Work
21	Group meeting. We are working towards
22	resolutions to those issues and actually we

Τ	can provide the Board or the work Group
2	some better dates on completion of those
3	issues within the next week or two. We
4	should be able to finalize some good dates
5	based on the resources that are available.
6	I just wanted to point that out
7	instead of going through each of the issues
8	where we are going to end up coming back to
9	stating that we are working on those issues
10	at this time. And, again, we can give you
11	some better dates here within the next week
12	or two. I can send that out to the Work
13	Group as soon as those are available.
14	DR. NETON: Which site is this
15	we're talking about?
16	MR. RUTHERFORD: United Nuclear.
17	DR. NETON: Oh, we are skipping
18	over DuPont?
19	MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes.
20	DR. NETON: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We had
22	started talking briefly about United Nuclear

1	but you are still working on that?
2	MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, the actual
3	matrix that was provided with the grouping
4	that Bill Thurber provided, I appreciate that
5	because it does actually identify the issues
6	that are closed and the issues that are open
7	and the issues focused around the internal,
8	we are working at, that were previously
9	identified. And all the issues that are
LO	open, we have action items and we are working
11	to resolve those issues. Again, I anticipate
L2	having good dates for the Work Group within
13	the next week or two weeks.
L4	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
15	MR. RUTHERFORD: That we can
L6	identify future Work Group meetings.
L7	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. Do we
L8	want to go talk about the other sites that
L9	are listed here? I don't know, is there
20	anything to
21	MR. THURBER: Neither of, the
22	other two sites this is Bill Thurber

1	Neither Baker-Perkins or DuPont Deepwater
2	have been on the Work Group agenda. We
3	provided just for informational purposes the
4	Baker-Perkins matrix at last Work Group or
5	in some of the material we supplied for the
6	last Work Group meeting. But the matrix was
7	not reviewed. We just recently, I think in
8	the last week or so, got DOE clearance and
9	issued our report on DuPont Deepwater and
LO	have, based on that report, also supplied a
11	findings matrix. Again, this has never been
12	discussed. These are kind of just for the
13	group's information at the moment.
L 4	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And both of
15	these are just Site Profiles, right?
16	MR. THURBER: Yes. They are both
L7	Site Profile reviews, not SEC.
18	DR. MAURO: And I don't believe
L9	there are any SECs active on either Baker or
20	DuPont.
21	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
22	DR. MAURO: So these are pure

1	Site	Profile	1 991169
_	SILE	PLOLITE	ISSUES.

- 2 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
- 3 MR. ALLEN: This is Dave Allen
- 4 from NIOSH. I've got one suggestion. As far
- 5 as DuPont, as Bill said, we just got this
- 6 like last week so we haven't had a chance to
- 7 really digest that one yet. But the Baker-
- 8 Perkins, Bill, you can correct me if I'm
- 9 wrong, but I believe all of these findings
- are associated with the original Appendix P.
- MR. THURBER: Yes, they are, Dave.
- 12 I'm pretty they are, yes.
- 13 MR. ALLEN: Yes. And since that
- 14 time, we revised that appendix into a
- 15 standalone TBD and when that happened, we did
- 16 have these findings alongside of us and we
- 17 tried to address these findings and the TBD
- 18 because the original TBD was based on some of
- 19 the defaults in TBD-6001 and we had to go
- 20 away from that.
- MR. THURBER: Right.
- 22 MR. ALLEN: So, my personal

1	opinion,	I'm	thinking	this	might	warrant,	Ι
---	----------	-----	----------	------	-------	----------	---

- 2 guess, what would you call it? A focused
- 3 review of the TBD compared to these findings.
- I mean, several of these just seem like they
- 5 are moot now.
- 6 MR. THURBER: That could well be.
- 7 And if the Work Group wants us to do it --
- 8 help me, John, here. I think that we could
- 9 certainly undertake a focused review of the
- 10 standalone TBD and come up with a revised
- 11 matrix.
- DR. MAURO: Yes. It may turn
- out a lot of these go away, as they have in
- 14 the past, because you are absolutely right.
- 15 I didn't think of that. Because I think the
- Baker-Perkins has been, you have reissued, as
- 17 your cover memo indicate, I believe the
- 18 original Baker-Perkins was withdrawn. I'm
- 19 not sure. Yes, it was. Let's see, I'm
- 20 looking down at the front. Yes, it was
- 21 canceled on February 17. Now -- and I am
- 22 presuming there is a revised Baker-Perkins

1	active	ทดพ	and	perhaps	 Т	don't	know	Bill
_	active	TIOW	and	PELLIAPS		uon c	WILLY.	$D \perp \perp \perp \perp$

- do you know whether our review was done --
- 3 MR. THURBER: No, our review was
- 4 back in September of last year.
- DR. MAURO: Okay. So, that
- 6 means that our review is dated.
- 7 MR. THURBER: That's right.
- 8 DR. MAURO: And so I think it
- 9 would not serve the Work Group well for us to
- 10 review issues given that the -- we probably
- 11 should take a quick look. I don't think it's
- 12 a big deal. I think these are not big
- 13 matrices and just to see how you step back
- away from TBD-6001 defaults and have adopted
- 15 other strategies for dealing with these
- 16 matters. I will leave it up to, of course,
- 17 you folks, if you like us to go back and
- 18 revisit and update our report, revise the
- 19 matrix to reflect these changes and then
- 20 maybe we will be on better standing.
- 21 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I think that
- 22 would be a good -- rather than try to go

1	through	something	that's	not	dated	and

- 2 support document as changed. I think if you
- 3 could redo the matrix, look at your initial
- 4 points, see if they are still relevant or
- 5 not.
- 6 MR. THURBER: Yes.
- 7 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And where's
- 8 the new TBD? Is that on the website?
- 9 MR. THURBER: Yes, it is. It is
- 10 covered in the front page of the status
- 11 report.
- 12 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
- 13 MR. THURBER: Down there
- 14 somewhere. It was formerly Appendix P.
- 15 There is a link there.
- 16 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
- 17 MR. THURBER: Which we lifted from
- 18 the NIOSH website.
- 19 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. I see
- them now. And 6001 is not there anymore. I
- 21 want to be sure I can get it. Okay.
- DR. MAURO: Now that's not,

1	that's	not	the	case	of	DuPont.	DuPont

- 2 unlike Baker, was in fact released recently
- and does reflect -- I don't even think DuPont
- 4 is part -- is DuPont part of 6001?
- 5 MR. THURBER: Oh, yes.
- DR. MAURO: Oh, it was, okay.
- 7 MR. THURBER: It was Appendix
- 8 whatever, P.
- 9 DR. MAURO: It was one of the
- 10 appendices. Well, anyway, that was done only
- 11 recently and does reflect the latest version
- of DuPont. So it doesn't suffer from the
- 13 same problem as Baker.
- 14 MR. THURBER: No, it was the Site
- 15 Profile that we reviewed.
- DR. MAURO: We reviewed the
- 17 Site Profile. So of course it was only
- issued last week, so certainly NIOSH didn't
- 19 have a chance to look over these. If you
- 20 would like to quickly go -- there are seven
- 21 findings, these are pretty straightforward.
- 22 If you want to go through them quickly, or

1	would NIOSH care to wait until you have a
2	chance to look it over, read the report and
3	then fill in, I guess, column two in the
4	matrix?
5	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: My
6	preference would be, I think we are going to
7	want to have another meeting before the
8	December meeting. So, unless NIOSH has some
9	thoughts on it, rather than have you go
10	through your comments and NIOSH say, well,
11	we'll
12	DR. MAURO: Right.
13	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We'll look
14	at them, and so I would like to see the
15	matrix filled in.
16	DR. MAURO: And I agree.
17	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Then we can
18	focus on that discussion.
19	DR. MAURO: Yes. And there's
20	nothing that nuanced about these that require
21	development in a conversation like now. I
22	think when NIOSH reads it, it will say, oh,

1	yes, I can see what this is all about. The
2	Putzier effect, things like that. Things
3	that everyone has seen before. So it's not
4	that there will be any ambiguity about the
5	points we are making.
6	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Jim, is that
7	okay with you?
8	DR. NETON: Sounds good with us.
9	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. We
10	don't need a any other issues related to
11	this? So basically DuPont, that matrix is
12	really still current, where the Perkins one
13	is now a standalone TBD.
14	MR. THURBER: And we will revise
15	that and for Baker-Perkins we will revise our
16	report and provide an updated matrix.
17	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
18	DR. MAURO: So SC&A has two
19	action items: help out the Hooker slides and
20	re-review Baker-Perkins.
21	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Right.
22	MR. THURBER: That is what I have

- DR. MAURO: Okay.
- 3 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
- 4 MR. KATZ: Andy, this is Ted
- 5 Katz. I just -- and I was dealing with one
- of these, Mary's issues for a second, so I
- 7 didn't have my ears on for all of the United
- 8 Nuclear discussion but do we have a
- 9 timeframe, folks, Jim, Dave, for when it
- 10 makes sense? I mean, the SECs being a
- 11 priority, Electro Met and United Nuclear as
- to when we should be meeting next?
- 13 MR. RUTHERFORD: Ted, this is
- 14 LaVon. I'm the POC on United Nuclear and
- what I had committed to the Work Group was
- that we would be able to provide some good
- 17 dates for completing the -- or for producing
- 18 some White Papers and stuff on the issues
- 19 that were previously identified. I can give
- 20 good dates on that probably within the next
- 21 week or two weeks. As soon as I get those
- good dates, I will get them immediately to

1	the	Work	Group	and	that	will	help	them

- 2 identify a date that we could have our next
- 3 Work Group meeting.
- 4 MR. KATZ: Thank you, LaVon.
- 5 And Electro Met, what's the date frame for
- 6 that?
- 7 DR. NETON: Electro Met, it's
- 8 going to take a matter of a few weeks or
- 9 more, probably within a month.
- 10 MR. KATZ: Okay. So that one is
- 11 certainly realistic to address in the next
- 12 Work Group meeting before the next Board
- 13 meeting?
- 14 DR. NETON: That is what I said
- 15 earlier. I thought we could provide them the
- 16 information well in advance of the December
- 17 meeting.
- 18 MR. KATZ: Great. I'm sorry. It
- is my fault for having missed those points.
- DR. NETON: I'm just trying to
- 21 be consistent, remember what I said.
- 22 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: That is what

1	you said. You said well before the December
2	meeting.
3	(Laughter.)
4	MR. KATZ: Okay. So we will
5	certainly then wait on you, Lavon, before we
6	try to schedule the next Work Group meeting.
7	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Probably
8	going to have to be some time in November.
9	MR. KATZ: Right, that's my
10	guess.
11	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. Okay.
12	So we pretty well out of assignments here?
13	MR. KATZ: We do. One other
14	thing. This is Ted again. One of the things
15	I was looking to is that the transcript from
16	the last meeting, because I was concerned
17	about Mary's point she was making that she
18	doesn't feel like the petitioners have been
19	given an opportunity to speak for the Work
20	Group. That wasn't the case at the last Work
21	Group meeting because another petitioner I
22	assume she was a petitioner, but she was

1	speaking	for	the	petitioners,	did	ask	about
---	----------	-----	-----	--------------	-----	-----	-------

- this and we did say certainly, petitioners
- 3 can speak to the group, and she did speak to
- 4 the group at the last meeting.
- But I do think, to Mary's point,
- 6 we probably could be more systematic and
- 7 conscientious about asking for petitioners'
- 8 comments to make them welcome to speak up in
- 9 these meetings. I know we try to do that,
- 10 but then we get tangled up in technical
- 11 things and just carry on.
- 12 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.
- MR. THURBER: Ted, this is Bill
- 14 Thurber.
- MR. KATZ: Yes.
- 16 MR. THURBER: I happened to notice
- on the website, the agenda website that it
- 18 said this meeting is open to the public but
- 19 without a public comment period. So I think
- that was probably one of the things she was
- 21 referring to as well.
- MR. KATZ: That is interesting.

1	I mean, I didn't even know they made that
2	notice. We don't have a public comment
3	period, none of the Work Group do, because
4	they're really intended for the Board to do
5	its work. In the rest of the Federal Advisory
6	Committee world, they are not even open to
7	the public. But we've always, in all of
8	these Work Groups, invited the public to
9	comment, particularly dealing with petitions.
10	
11	And most Work Groups, there are
12	many Work Groups that there are petitioners
13	who actually participate heavily with
14	comments during the session even though there
15	is not a public comment session. But they
16	raise their questions and they make their
17	comments as we go along, as most of you know
18	who sit on other Work Groups.
19	So, I know Denise Brock, who's
20	ombudsman, has been consulting with Mary or
21	Mary has been consulting with her to help her
22	along. I think she's maybe not so acquainted

2	petitioners commented at the last meeting,
3	maybe she felt a little intimidated or what
4	have you about speaking up. But we certainly
5	can always try to do better on this front.
6	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: It seems,
7	and certainly on the phone, I would say it is
8	even for us difficult to follow unless you
9	have the matrices in front of you. It would
10	seem to me being able to clear matrices at
11	some point would those are a nice
12	capsulized summary of what the issues and the
13	discussion has been, and then I think that's
14	a little easier for them to respond to than
15	trying to listen as we go forward. And we
16	have documents in front of us that they
17	don't.
18	MR. KATZ: Yes. And the
19	difficulty is, matrices are typically just in
20	time. PA clearing them has been practically
21	impossible in time for the meetings.
22	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes, I know.

with how things go, although the other

1

1 Okay.

2 MR. KATZ: I have asked for this one to be PA cleared for Mary, to be sent to 3 4 Mary, dealing with the Hooker part of it and 5 it shouldn't take too long to clear that 6 piece of it. So, yes, when we can, we PA 7 clear matrices when we know someone wants 8 them and when we know, when we get them early enough, but typically get them just ahead of 9 10 a meeting and then it's literally impossible to do that. 11 12 DR. MAURO: Ted, I have a suggestion 13 that might be helpful, because it benefits me very often when I prepare for these. 14 The matrices serve their purpose well. 15 They keep 16 it organized and keep the work moving and the team, everyone is involved, is tracking it, 17 18 and all the history of it is here. 19 could almost envision a person listening in 20 who may not have been tracking it. And usually there is a story. As you go back to 21 22 the history, a very complex one,

1	Nuclear, for example, which has, I don't even
2	know how many meetings. But it turns out, the
3	way I always look at this is: it always
4	really boils down to a simple story. The way
5	we talked about Hooker. Well, when we're all
6	said and done, it's really, you've got some
7	data in the later years but you don't really
8	have too much data in the early years. And
9	now there is some question regarding whether
10	there was how much and whether or not there
11	was any ore. And all of a sudden it becomes a
12	very simple story. Rather than 25 different
13	issues that are cryptically identified in a
14	matrix which would make a person's head spin.
15	If we could start off, especially
16	a Work Group like this that really has its
17	work cut out, we're dealing with five or six
18	different sites. A little bit of, a few
19	minutes in the front end, to sort of regroup,
20	might be helpful as much to us as it is
21	certainly to any of the interested parties
22	that might be listening in.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. KATZ: John, I couldn't
2	agree with you more. And I actually, this is
3	something you have a good talent for too, for
4	sort of just reminding everybody of the story
5	before we delve into it. And I think that is
6	something that might help at the head of
7	these meetings where when we begin to speak
8	about a site, to just have a brief recap
9	orienting the public. In some Work Group
LO	meetings we do that. We think of that and
11	actually
12	DR. MAURO: Right, right.
13	MR. KATZ: When we start to
L 4	we did that, I think, yesterday, when we
15	starting marching into a detail and then we
L6	step back and say, wait, let's just, for the
L7	sake people listening, start at the beginning
18	of it. So I think that is a good suggestion.
L9	DR. BEHLING: Ted and John, this
20	is Hans Behling. I do want to make a comment
21	exactly to this issue here because I've been
22	involved in so many instances with reviewing

1	an AWE or a Site Profile or a PER and
2	initially we go to great lengths to explain
3	what our concerns may be. And then, of
4	course, a document that may be 10, 15, 20
5	pages get condensed to a handful of comments
6	that enter a matrix and oftentimes there will
7	be subsequent meetings that will occur months
8	or even years later, and no one remembers
9	exactly what the detailed information was
10	that was initial trigger for these comments
11	that ended up being reduced to a single
12	sentence or two in the matrix.
13	I think it would be very helpful
14	if in the matrix we identify the date and the
15	title of the document that preceded these
16	matrix comments so that somebody might could
17	go back and again refresh themselves as to
18	what the initial discussions were that gave
19	rise to the matrix. Because sometimes, after
20	months or years we somehow lose sight of the
21	complexity of some of the issues that are
22	overly simplified in the matrix and somehow

1	lose their meaning.
2	MR. KATZ: Yes, Hans, I think
3	your case is particularly true in a site
4	that's gone through a lot of review and a lot
5	of White Papers and so on. Sometimes the
6	matrices all represent one review, in which
7	case it is not such a problem. But I agree
8	with what you are saying, Hans, with some of
9	these more complex, long reviews, it gets to
10	be labyrinthine and it's all, like you say,
11	condensed into a very brief sound bite in a
12	matrix.
13	Anyway, this is something worth
14	discussing offline. I don't know that we
15	need to do it all for this Work Group because
16	it's really a general issue, but a good one
17	for trying to make these Work Group meetings
18	as understandable as possible for people
19	listening.
20	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Now that we
21	have a much larger number of Work Groups, I
22	think to have some kind of systematic format

1 would also hali	
	_
1 would also help	ノ.

2	MR.	KATZ:	Yes.
_	1.11 C •	11111 -	T C D •

3 Well, one of the DR. MAURO: 4 things -- not to prolong this. But one of the things we often try to do, at one time we 5 6 had to, for example, when we were in the amidst of a number of really big ones, Nevada 7 Test Site, Rocky, Fernald, at least one of 8 the things we try to do to help the Board, is 9 10 -- so much work has gone in over years. to try to capture the essence of it for the 11 12 Board now in a two- or three-pager, which 13 says okay, listen, this is what transpired. So that does, I can't tell you 14 15 how much it helps me, when I'm the one who, 16 for example, on Fernald on a couple of occasions I found myself trying to write all 17 18 of this down, pull it all together and get it 19 into my head. That kind of thing every so often is probably a really good idea to do 20 Because they can easily get away from 21 you and you lose sight of it. I'm thinking 22

1	out loud now. I'm doing a little musing,
2	Ted. But I think a little bit more of that
3	goes into it, because the richness of this
4	program is off the charts, in terms of some
5	of these sites. And regrouping every so
6	often for everyone's purposes. I can almost
7	envision the Board Members listening in on a
8	vote where something that has a history that
9	goes back for five years. In any event, just
10	another thought.
11	MR. KATZ: Okay. Back to where
12	we are with this. Andy, I will be sending
13	then to the full Board the White Papers and
14	background so that they have more context for
15	your presentation as well. So you don't need
16	to worry about that. I will take care of
17	that just as I have earlier this week for
18	other sites that are going to be discussed at
19	the Board meeting.
20	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I've seen
21	those coming through.

MR. KATZ: They won't have your

22

1	presentation. They will get your presentation
2	when it's done, but they will have these
3	background papers that will help them orient
4	themselves and have a deeper understanding.
5	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Send them
6	the matrix as well?
7	MR. KATZ: Yes. I will give
8	them the matrix but I will give them the
9	White Papers as well.
10	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: White
11	Papers, I think are probably the most
12	MR. KATZ: I will give them the
13	transcripts where we've discussed this.
14	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
15	MR. KATZ: So anyone who wants
16	to delve deeper can delve deeper.
17	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. Any
18	other issues we have? Bill, do you have any
19	parting thoughts?
20	MEMBER FIELD: No, Andy, I think
21	everything is pretty much covered.
22	CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay, with

1	that I'll accept a motion to adjourn, if
2	there's no other comment. Or do we have
3	others on the phone that want to make a
4	comment? Okay, hearing none, if someone was
5	talking, we didn't hear you, so think about
6	mute. So with that, I'll adjourn the Work
7	Group meeting.
8	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
9	matter was concluded at 10:13 a.m.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701