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

+ + + + +

LINDE CERAMICS WORK GROUP

+ + + + +

MONDAY OCTOBER 24, 2011

+ + + + +

The Work Group convened via teleconference at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time, Genevieve Roessler, Chairman, presiding.

### PRESENT:

GENEVIEVE S. ROESSLER, Chairman JOSIE BEACH, Member MICHAEL H. GIBSON, Member JAMES E. LOCKEY, Member

## ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official ANTOINETTE BONSIGNORE, Petitioner NICOLE BRIGGS, SC&A
CHRISTOPHER CRAWFORD, DCAS
JASON DAVIS, ORAU Team
JENNY LIN, HHS
JOHN MAURO, SC&A
JAMES NETON, DCAS
STEVEN OSTROW, SC&A
MUTTY SHARFI, ORAU Team
JOHN STIVER, SC&A

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

Welcome and roll-call/introduction 4
NIOSH Brief Summary of the SEC Petition #154(1947-1953)ER5
Summary of August 15, 2011 WG Meeting: Discussion of new information arising from NIOSH summary
Discussion of Action Item on Utility Tunnels (August 15, 2011 WG meeting)
Petitioner Questions/Comments
Plans for Presentation to Advisory Board at Tampa December 2011 Meeting
Adjournment

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	1:02 p.m.
3	MR. KATZ: This is the Advisory
4	Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Linde
5	Work Group, and please speak to conflict of
6	interest since we are dealing with a site,
7	starting with the Chair.
8	(Roll call.)
9	MR. KATZ: Okay, well, so it's
10	your agenda. The agenda by the way for people
11	on the line is also posted on the NIOSH
12	website under the Board section.
13	And Gen, it's yours. Let me just
14	remind everyone on the line to mute your
15	phones except when you are speaking. If you
16	don't have a mute button, please use *6, *6
17	again, will unmute your phone. Thank you.
18	CHAIR ROESSLER: Okay thank you,
19	Ted. I sent out a rather detailed agenda
20	which may or may not be pertinent after we

hear the first item. The first item on the 1 agenda I had asked for NIOSH DCAS to present a 2 3 brief summary of the ER for this SEC period. 4 Т understand from information I morning that 5 aot this there is some information from NIOSH, so I think what we 6 7 ought to do is start out with Jim Neton and Chris Crawford bringing us up to date on this 8 new information and then we may have to all be 9 flexible and decide where to go from there. 10 Okay. Thanks, Gen, 11 DR. NETON: this is Jim Neton. I guess I'll kick things 12 off here. If you remember our SEC Petition 13 Evaluation Report for petition number 154 was 14 2<sup>nd</sup>, 15 issued November 2010, on and that 16 petition was for all employees who worked in any area of Linde Ceramics from November 1st, 17 1947, through December 31<sup>st</sup>, 1953. 18 19 Our position at the time that the 20 was written until very recently was report

that we could do dose reconstructions for all 1 workers for all exposure pathways at Linde 2 3 during that time period. 4 At the last Working Group meeting that was held at the airport Marriott, SC&A 5 brought up some issues that had heretofore not 6 been -- come to the surface before, and that 7 was -- it was related to the progeny ratios 8 that were applied to workers during the 1947-9 53 period. 10 maintained 11 That is, we that to uranium was primarily to 12 uranium after 1947, and that we would apply 13 14 these ratios that were measured either 15 FUSRAP studies or other studies that were more 16 contemporaneous, more recent, to those values to bound exposures. 17 in taking 18 And very а very, 19 detailed look at all of the information, and there is a lot of information out there on our 20

1 Site Research Database and I personally went 2 through much of this on my own, it's come to 3 light that we don't believe our ability to bound dose reconstructions is as good as we 4 thought, and here's why. 5 In the -- at the end of 1947, and 6 virtually most of 1948, and Chris can correct 7 me if I am a little bit off base here, but 8 time period, 9 during that there two were 10 activities ongoing simultaneously. One was the production of uranium 11 starting with purified material in Building 12 38, and that of course would only expose the 13 14 workers to uranium. in fact decided that we 15 And we 16 have bioassay data during that period, somewhere in the order of six to seven hundred 17 bioassay samples were collected between 1947 18 19 and '50, and that those would indeed bound 20 worker exposures in Building 38.

1	But what we have here also is a
2	cleanup activity going on in Building 30,
3	which you will remember was a Step-1 process
4	that started with uranium ore that contained a
5	lot of the much of the long-lived progeny.
6	During that cleanup activity, in
7	reviewing the records, it became clear that
8	much of the cleanup was done by a
9	subcontractor, H.K. Ferguson, and it
10	specifically called out in their work
11	activities that they were responsible for
12	their own worker monitoring program.
13	Is that right Chris?
14	MR. CRAWFORD: That is correct.
15	DR. NETON: And so it's pretty
16	clear to us at this point that the bioassay
17	samples that we have covering 1947-50 do not
18	cover cleanup activities that occurred in
19	Building 30.
20	So the end of '47 and 1948, we

1 don't believe we can reconstruct. There's 2 also the complication that they were cleaning 3 out Building 30, which had a lot of the longlived progeny in there, and particularly maybe 4 some hold-up materials, at which point we are 5 not convinced that the raffinate ratios that 6 we were applying might necessarily be bounding 7 in all cases. 8 through '48, 9 So can't we 10 reconstruct doses. And now let's examine '49 Well, it turns out that the 11 through '53. bioassay data only goes through 1950. 12 We have bioassay from 1947 to '50. 13 14 And I believe that production of 15 uranium stopped somewhere in the middle of 16 Right. So you have this extended period of time 17 where there large amounts of contamination in Building 38, uncleaned-up, 18 19 however we do know that they were eventually 20 cleaned because the FUSRAP surveys later on

not

but

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

of contamination, contamination consistent with a facility that 2 3 had just been shut down and moth-balled. 4 So during that entire period we really don't have any bioassay data to hang 5 So at this point, we believe we 6 our hat on. 7 going to move forward and revise Evaluation Report to indicate that we can't do 8 dose reconstructions between 1947 and 1953 9 10 because we cannot bound internal exposures to uranium and progeny during that period with 11 sufficient accuracy, right. 12 So that's our position and I know 13 14 it's quite a reversal, but we've combed 15 through this data quite meticulously in the 16 last, you know, six weeks or so and this is where we have ended up. 17 Jim, this is Josie. MEMBER BEACH: 18 19 Do you plan on doing that in an 83.14? 20 DR. NETON: No. I talked to our

1

showed

evidence

- 1 counsel about this and since the Board has not
- 2 taken any action on our original Evaluation
- Report, then we can modify the Evaluation
- 4 Report to indicate our current position and we
- 5 will re-present that to the Board.
- It is our hope to have that ready
- 7 in time for the December meeting in Tampa. I
- 8 hope we can meet that goal.
- 9 CHAIR ROESSLER: Jim, this is Gen.
- 10 This is all pretty new.
- DR. NETON: Yes.
- 12 CHAIR ROESSLER: And I think
- 13 there's a lot that has to be evaluated to
- 14 understand this. For one, on your first item,
- 15 I'm not clear just on your brief discussion,
- 16 why the bioassay samples don't cover Building
- 17 30.
- 18 As I remember in your ER and in
- 19 SC&A's evaluation of it, you felt that those
- 20 bioassay samples which were from Step-3, or

from workers in Building 38, were maximizing, 1 and I can't understand what it is now that is 2 3 different. 4 Well, DR. NETON: they are maximizing for workers in Building 38 5 were working with purified uranium, but these 6 7 were ongoing D&D activities in Building that did not -- it appears to us did not 8 include -- those bioassay samples 9 did 10 include workers from Building 30 the 11 sampling. mean, we have a very detailed 12 listing of all the samples and actually the 13 job titles of all the workers, and we see no 14 15 evidence H.K. that these Ferguson 16 subcontractors were monitored, or were covered by those bioassay samples. 17 They may indeed have been sampled 18 19 but we don't have the data. And also the fact 20 that the type of holdup material that might

1 have been in there, you sort of run into a 2 situation like you had at Mallinckrodt, where 3 there was various steps in the process. 4 Ι don't think it Now was chemically equivalent to Mallinckrodt, but at 5 some point you are going to have separated 6 precipitation of raffinate material that is in 7 disequilibrium with the uranium parent. 8 And if you have taken out -- this 9 10 is exactly what happened at Mallinckrodt -- if you take out the uranium parent by chemical 11 this raffinate 12 separation, have now you material that people could have been D&D, you 13 decontamination 14 know, doing and 15 decommissioning activity on, there's really 16 almost little, very little exposure to 17 uranium. So, we just don't know. 18 19 CHAIR ROESSLER: So if Τ understand what you are saying correctly, what 20

you have now, it seems, is more information on 1 2 activities in Building 30 the that then 3 question your method for bounding. 4 Right, well we have a DR. NETON: lot more information on what was not -- what 5 bioassay samples represent, 6 our and it's 7 pretty clear in our mind they do not represent workers who were in Building 30, and you are 8 the additional thinking now is that 9 riaht, 10 they were removing major pieces equipment during this time period, one cannot 11 12 the ratios that were measured assume that reflect 13 environmentally would what the 14 exposures of the workers were to the long-15 lived progeny. 16 CHAIR ROESSLER: So what I assume you would be changing in your ER is to say you 17 do dose reconstruction based 18 can't not 19 being able to do internal doses for all 20 workers. Does that kind of sum it up?

1	DR. NETON: Well, it could be
2	internal exposures to uranium and progeny from
3	the operations and the D&D. That's correct.
4	There would still be other exposures we would
5	reconstruct for those with nonpresumptive
6	cancers and less than 250 days in the Class.
7	And those we would leave intact as
8	we have outlined in our Site Profile.
9	DR. MAURO: Jim, this is John
10	Mauro. I have got a quick question related to
11	the ratios. It was our understanding that
12	those ratios that were obtained from
13	information collected from sumps and
14	elsewhere, much later on, you felt whereby
15	you had a ratio of uranium to radium and
16	thorium, and the number, if I remember, you
17	recommended was something like 0.26, of that
18	order.
19	I guess notwithstanding the
20	challenge you have of course in front of you

regarding uranium -- I understand the uranium problem now -- but the ratio seems to 2 3 still be valid. The problem now 4 is the reverse. You don't know what the uranium intake is. 5 Would that be a true statement, or do you feel 6 7 that even the ratios -- see we basically felt 8 that that strategy that you have adopted, namely if you know the intake of uranium from 9 '47 to '53 based on bioassay data, and now we 10 understand that you really don't, but if you 11 12 did, and then you were concerned that along with that uranium, there might have been some 13 14 thorium-230 and radium-226 coming in because 15 it was residual from the operations period 16 before '47, that -- and that you could take advantage of the residue analyses that was 17 much later, found that 18 we to be 19 reasonable strategy of a way to prorate. 20 But I am hearing that even that

1

- 1 ratio approach, you are not comfortable with.
- DR. NETON: John, I think I was
- 3 fairly comfortable with the radium-226 and the
- 4 thorium-230. At worst case, you could say
- 5 that they were in equilibrium as they came
- 6 into the plant.
- 7 What really gave me some pause was
- 8 the actinium-227 and protactinium-231 values.
- 9 DR. MAURO: Oh, okay.
- DR. NETON: Because those, as you
- 11 know, those are in the U-235 decay chain.
- DR. MAURO: Yes.
- DR. NETON: And they were much
- more enhanced than you know, you would expect.
- 15 But if you go back and look at some of the
- 16 reports, even the FUSRAP report talks about
- 17 the disequilibrium created in the
- 18 chemical-separation process.
- 19 So imagine now that you are in the
- 20 plant and your job is to remove all of the

equipment including all the holdup material, 1 2 there could have been situations in the plant 3 where these filter presses these or 4 machines that would actually take the 5 precipitate and it, would remove have essentially that purified material with very 6 little uranium that was removed. 7 some workers could have been 8 exposed to that and we just don't know how and 9 how much. 10 11 so really you DR. MAURO: Okay, have a two-pronged problem. One is uranium in 12 bioassay data itself is not representative of 13 14 Building 30, and the ratios that were measured 15 in the sumps and elsewhere during the FUSRAP 16 program, you're not too comfortable with any 17 longer because the of reasons you just described. 18 19 So these are the two things that really put you in a difficult spot. 20

1 Right. At the end of DR. NETON: the day, we couldn't reconcile those pieces of 2 3 information and convince ourselves that this 4 was sufficiently accurate. 5 DR. MAURO: Okay. And this will all be 6 DR. NETON: 7 written up in our revision to the Evaluation Report for everyone to review again and to, 8 you know, give you a chance to look at the 9 10 logic and rationale behind it. But I just thought I would start 11 with that because this is obviously a very 12 significant departure from the past. 13 14 CHAIR ROESSLER: It certainly is 15 and I think it makes the rest of our agenda 16 really not even pertinent at this point. 17 had a lot of tunnel discussion and other things but if what you are saying now holds 18 19 up, and the Board agrees, then nothing else is 20 pertinent. I quess --

1	DR. NETON: Well, Gen, I would say
2	eventually they will become Site Profile
3	issues because again, we will have to, you
4	know, we will have to demonstrate that you
5	know, we can do the nonpresumptive cancers
6	with sufficient accuracy with those other, you
7	know, those other pieces of exposure that we
8	are saying that we can't reconstruct.
9	CHAIR ROESSLER: I had actually
10	seen those as more Site Profile issues anyway.
11	DR. NETON: Right.
12	CHAIR ROESSLER: I'm trying to
13	think now what is the most efficient way to go
14	about this. Perhaps what we should do first of
15	all is I have some suggestions but ask
16	for questions from other Work Group members or
17	comments from Steve Ostrow or anybody else who
18	is involved in this.
19	MEMBER BEACH: Gen, this is Josie.
20	I am going to bring this tunnel issue up only

1 because I think there's a real disagreement 2 between when those tunnels were built, and I 3 realize with what workers would be covered, it may not be pertinent, but there is a radon 4 5 issue in the tunnels, and Ι think it's to establish the dates of 6 important tunnels. 7 Based on what I have read with the 8 workers' testimonies, I believe those tunnels 9 were in existence. 10 So I am just kind of curious if there is going to be some closure 11 12 there. Josie, this is Steve 13 DR. OSTROW: Ostrow. Our position, SC&A=s position on the 14 15 tunnels is that we reviewed everything that 16 NIOSH supplied, reviewed everything that 17 Antoinette Bonsignore supplied, various things, and we really can't -- we think that 18 19 there is no definitive answer when the tunnels 20 were built. We are not convinced when they

- were built.
- 2 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I did read
- 3 both your reports and understand that.
- 4 DR. OSTROW: And also, Antoinette
- 5 sent more stuff last Friday which didn't
- 6 appear in any of our reports yet because it
- 7 just came out on Friday afternoon.
- 8 MEMBER BEACH: Right.
- 9 DR. OSTROW: And with the
- 10 additional information, Antoinette's argument
- 11 makes a compelling case in that, just by --
- logically whenever you build a building, you
- have to connect it to the utilities, which
- 14 means you have to connect it to electric,
- steam, water, so forth, so logically you would
- 16 think that they would build a tunnel or extend
- 17 a tunnel whenever they built a new building.
- 18 That just makes sense.
- 19 However, we don't have documented
- 20 evidence to say that they actually built a

tunnel so while logically there should been 1 tunnels, we don't have real documentation for 2 3 it, and the documentation we do have, doesn't -- they said when tunnels existed at different 4 they don't really 5 times, but say either exactly when they were built. 6 So our conclusion is that there is 7 really insufficient hard evidence to say when 8 the tunnels were built, and that a, I quess 9 10 claimant-favorable, conservative assumption would just be assuming the tunnels were there 11 12 all the time. 13 MEMBER BEACH: Absolutely. 14 DR. MAURO: Steve, add can Ι 15 something too that might be of interest, and 16 Josie too on this matter? Sort of a light went on while we were working the problem, and 17 I said to myself, you know, if you build a 18 19 building, you are going to have a basement 20 for, even if you don't have tunnels, you are

going to have a basement where you do have 1 your utility equipment. 2 3 Maybe they didn't connect up maybe they did to the other facilities through 4 these utility tunnels, but you are going to 5 have a basement. 6 7 Now, if you have a basement, you still have the radon problem in the basement, 8 notwithstanding 9 whether there are tunnels 10 connecting the basement. 11 So this may be an oversimplification and I would be very interested 12 in hearing any comments others have but it's 13 14 one of these things where the light just went on and we said well wait a minute, maybe the 15 16 tunnels aren't even relevant. 17 It's kind of crazy to say this, but the most important thing is, is there a 18 19 basement, and did people spend a lot of time 20 in the basements maintaining equipment,

1 whether or not there was tunnels connecting the basements of various buildings, if you see 2 3 how I am thinking about this. So I think that's another -- well 4 even if it's a question that says that well, 5 you know, what Steve said, certainly, but in 6 7 addition, there's still the issue that people might very well have been working in basements 8 beneath these buildings where there might have 9 been radon issues. 10 11 DR. NETON: That is interesting, John, but if we are adding the entire site 12 over all times now, you end up with all the 13 14 lung cancers being, well, with 250 --15 DR. MAURO: Anyway --16 DR. NETON: -- being compensated -17 Anyway, that's right. 18 DR. MAURO: 19 DR. NETON: And the amount 20 radon of course would contribute small amounts

- of dose to the other organs, but it's pretty
- 2 small. I mean I don't know that it would ever
- get to the point where it would move somebody
- 4 into the compensable range.
- DR. MAURO: Right. Yes, I
- 6 realized that too when I was thinking about
- 7 it, I said, if you do go with, you know,
- 8 granting SEC status for all compensable
- 9 cancers, and since the radon dose is primarily
- 10 a respiratory-tract dose by far --
- 11 DR. NETON: It would have to mean
- 12 we wouldn't include it, I mean --
- 13 DR. MAURO: Yes, right. It's
- 14 almost a moot point.
- DR. NETON: Yes, for anything --
- 16 for small levels of radon concentration, the
- dose to the other organs is way, way small.
- DR. MAURO: Right.
- 19 DR. NETON: Much less than a
- 20 millirem. But I would suggest that you know,

1 we would like to move the SEC process forward with our Evaluation Report, and that 2 3 other issues would certainly be worth 4 considering at the Working Group level. I mean we are not saying the door is closed on all 5 those, but you can take the Evaluation Report 6 and read it as it comes out, and then we can 7 you know, the Working Group can address the 8 9 other issues of exposure that we are 10 reconstructing and take them up at that time. I don't know that we need to solve 11 all those issues in order to move this SEC 12 forward. 13 CHAIR ROESSLER: This is Gen. 14 Τf 15 -- from what I am hearing, the DCAS argument is pretty persuasive, I think that we 16 and that certainly the 17 Work Group, members and SC&A really need to look at the 18 19 details and evaluate everything. 20 know Ι want to re-look at

- everything. But it seems like our next step
- 2 in order to be efficient on this should be to
- 3 take the new ER and evaluate that first and
- 4 then decide where to go.
- I don't know Josie --
- 6 MEMBER BEACH: No, I agree with
- you Gen, perfectly. Yes.
- 8 CHAIR ROESSLER: I don't know,
- 9 Jim, what you=re thinking, or what anybody
- 10 else would recommend on this. To me it would
- 11 seem like it's not only the Work Group who
- 12 needs to look at this, but the new -- the
- 13 revised ER -- sorry for my voice here but --
- 14 also perhaps SC&A, as this is really a total -
- 15 a total new approach, and I quess I'd like
- 16 to hear what Antoinette thinks about this
- 17 approach also.
- MS. BONSIGNORE: Well, can
- 19 everyone hear me?
- 20 CHAIR ROESSLER: Yes.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 Okay. MS. BONSIGNORE: Ι am 2 always wondering if I am still on mute. 3 a little sort of shocked right now, so I am 4 trying to get my bearings. I was -- on the issue of when to 5 proceed with the presentation of the revised 6 ER to the Board, are we still planning that to 7 be for the December 15<sup>th</sup> meeting? 8 CHAIR ROESSLER: I think what we 9 10 need to know now from NIOSH is when they think they can get us a revision, and whether they 11 12 think we will have sufficient time to take a look at it. 13 14 Yes, this is Jim. DR. NETON: We 15 believe that we can get a draft out far enough in advance of the December -- I think it's 7th 16 17 meeting. BONSIGNORE: Okay, I thought 18 MS. it was the 15<sup>th</sup>. 19 I'm sorry. I think it's the  $7^{th}$ . 20 DR. NETON:

- 1 I might be wrong.
- 2 CHAIR ROESSLER: Yes, I think so.
- DR. NETON: But anyway, I think
- 4 that it's not -- it wouldn't represent that
- 5 big of a change in the body of the report
- 6 because most of the -- most of the dose
- 7 reconstruction methods we outlined stand.
- 8 It's just the pieces for the
- 9 internal exposure for uranium and progeny that
- 10 would need to be changed. So yes, I don't
- 11 have to write it so I can promise a lot.
- No, I've been told it should be
- 13 available in advance of the meeting, no
- 14 problem.
- DR. MAURO: Gen, this is John.
- 16 Just from past experience in working with SEC
- 17 reviews, I can say that in general, when NIOSH
- 18 recommended an SEC, I don't recall any time
- 19 that the Board came to SC&A to question
- whether that SEC should be granted.

1	The Board has come to SC&A with
2	respect to the degree to which the SEC covered
3	the appropriate time periods, and whether or
4	not the portions that NIOSH claims they can
5	reconstruct for a partial dose reconstruction.
6	But I do not recall an occasion
7	where SC&A was brought in to see whether we
8	agree that an SEC should be granted, when
9	NIOSH is recommending an SEC for a particular
10	time period and for particular exposure
11	scenarios.
12	CHAIR ROESSLER: Yes, John, I
13	think you are right on that. So I'd I
14	don't know Jim Lockey, what is your thought
15	on this?
16	MEMBER LOCKEY: Well, I am in
17	agreement. I'd like to look at all the data,
18	but I think before the maybe before the
19	Tampa meeting we can have a brief phone call
20	among the Working Group to finalize our

1 position and then make а presentation in 2 Tampa. 3 CHAIR ROESSLER: Yes, I think -- I think that's what my approach would be. 4 So what we need is sufficient time for the Work 5 Group to look at it, and then I would like for 6 7 us at least to get together for а teleconference and I don't know if that has to 8 be official or how would we do that, Ted? 9 10 MR. KATZ: Yes, I mean that should be official, and in other words it should be a 11 proper Work Group teleconference. 12 But -- and your timing is, I mean, you'd have to do it 13 the week before the Board meeting, which is, 14 15 you know, the very end of November, beginning 16 of December, that week. 17 think So Ι you check your schedules now and of course that means that 18 19 you'd have to have a DCAS revised Evaluation 20 Report ahead of that week so that you guys can

1 read it and be prepared, you know, because 2 it's probably going to be earlier in the week. 3 The very end of the week, like Thursday and 4 Friday, it's hard. I mean you could do it little more difficult 5 then. It's iust а it leaves you very little time to 6 because 7 prepare to present at the Board meeting. But if I'm hearing from Jim that 8 you -- they think they can get this report out 9 10 not immediately before the Board meeting but before that week before the Board meeting, 11 12 then I think a teleconference would work. We can schedule one. We could schedule one right 13 14 here while we are on this call. CHAIR ROESSLER: 15 My last week in November, November 28<sup>th</sup> through December 2<sup>nd</sup> is 16 17 open, and I think that would be a good time for a teleconference. 18

Work Group

don't think

we

to

And

the

Т

time

for

19

20

this

need

look at

- 1 because we are pretty much up to speed on it.
- 2 If we could get something from DCAS the week
- 3 before, and at least have maybe -- I am
- 4 speaking for myself -- but three or four days
- 5 to look at it, it seems like we should be able
- 6 to get this taken care of.
- 7 MEMBER LOCKEY: How does the  $2^{nd}$  of
- 8 December look?
- 9 MR. KATZ: That's a Friday maybe?
- 10 Is that a Friday? It just leaves very little
- 11 time for anyone to prepare.
- 12 MEMBER BEACH: Yes. Ted, this is
- 13 Josie. I am moving that whole week so I will
- 14 try really hard to be on the call. It just
- depends on when you hit it.
- 16 CHAIR ROESSLER: Okay, what date
- did you say Jim, the 2<sup>nd</sup> of December?
- 18 MEMBER LOCKEY: But Ted said that
- 19 doesn't give us enough time. How about the
- 20 1<sup>st</sup>? Is that one day extra?

- 1 MR. KATZ: Well, that's one day
- better, I mean that's one day better for sure,
- 3 but --
- 4 MEMBER BEACH: I prefer the 30<sup>th</sup> if
- 5 we can do the November 30<sup>th</sup>.
- 6 MEMBER LOCKEY: I am down at
- 7 Research Triangle on the 30<sup>th</sup> Josie. I can't
- 8 do that --
- 9 MEMBER BEACH: Oh, okay, okay.
- 10 Well I'll just try to get on.
- 11 MR. KATZ: Let me just suggest
- 12 something, I mean if this Work Group meeting -
- 13 if what you really want to do is see the
- 14 writing now that you have heard a brief
- 15 presentation of the general kind of status,
- 16 where things stand, if all you really want to
- 17 do is confirm that in writing, it is, you
- 18 know, what you are hearing, then I don't think
- 19 you need a Work Group meeting.
- 20 I think then you could read the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

report and all would be good. You could go to 1 the meeting you know, planning to say, you 2 3 know, the Work Group thinks this makes sense. But if you really, if you need the 4 details because it will -- you think they 5 might raise questions, then let's schedule the 6 7 Work Group meeting and we can cancel it if once you see the report you say oh, it's all 8 9 just as we thought. 10 But it would be good to schedule something at least in case you find yourself 11 reading it 12 the report and raising more 13 questions than answering them, as you were 14 expecting. 15 MEMBER LOCKEY: Ted, I agree, Jim 16 Lockey, I agree with that. 17 Yes, I do too. CHAIR ROESSLER: So then let's go and, 18 MR. KATZ: 19 even -- if December 1 is the only date that just book for 20 works for Jim, why don't we

- 1 December 1<sup>st</sup>, and it's possible we won't need
- 2 it, if you read the report and it puts
- everything to bed, then you won't need it, and
- 4 we'll cancel it.
- 5 CHAIR ROESSLER: Okay. I think
- 6 that sounds good.
- 7 MEMBER LOCKEY: What time?
- 8 CHAIR ROESSLER: How about 1 p.m.
- 9 like today?
- 10 MEMBER LOCKEY: One p.m. eastern
- 11 standard time, good.
- 12 CHAIR ROESSLER: Eastern standard.
- 13 And then let's go back to Jim and Chris.
- 14 When do you think we could expect the revised
- 15 ER?
- 16 DR. NETON: I'll let Chris answer
- 17 that since he is involved more than I am in
- 18 that portion.
- 19 MR. CRAWFORD: A lot of it depends
- on administrative details unfortunately, that

- is I believe that we can come up with a draft
- version possibly by the end of this week.
- But it has to be vetted by ORAU,
- 4 by Jim, it has to be sent to probably the NGC.
- 5 It has to have DOE clearance.
- 6 DR. NETON: I think -- I would say
- 7 that we could have something at least a week
- 8 before your December 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, if not well
- 9 in advance of that, but that's -- that to me
- 10 would be sort of a worst case scenario.
- 11 CHAIR ROESSLER: Let's see. We
- 12 have Thanksgiving, I think -- is Thanksgiving
- 13 the  $24^{th}$ ?
- 14 DR. NETON: You know, you're
- 15 right.
- 16 CHAIR ROESSLER: Yes. You know,
- 17 I'd say, could we aim at something --
- MEMBER BEACH: Before.
- 19 CHAIR ROESSLER: If you thought
- 20 you could get us something the 21<sup>st</sup> to the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

- 1  $22^{nd}$ , then I think we would be in really good
- 2 shape.
- DR. NETON: Okay, I think we
- 4 should be able to do that, because that's a
- 5 little less than a month from now, and --
- 6 MR. KATZ: This is Ted.
- 7 DR. NETON: I am not clear that
- 8 this needs to have DOE review. If it does,
- 9 that always adds a few days, but if you know,
- 10 we should be able to get it through the
- 11 process.
- DR. MAURO: Jim, just a quick
- 13 technical question. Is there any troubling
- 14 problems with the external? As I recall, what
- 15 I'm hearing is that -- that the position that
- 16 you will be taking is you can't reconstruct
- 17 internal for lack of bioassay data for the
- 18 Building 30.
- 19 But all along, I believe, our
- 20 position was that when we reviewed the

original work, that you were in pretty good 1 How does this affect 2 shape with external. 3 external? 4 Well, it shouldn't. Ι DR. NETON: think we 5 going to leave that portion are and you know, 6 intact, say that we can do external dose reconstructions with sufficient 7 8 accuracy. And you have external 9 DR. MAURO: 10 data that you can make a distinction between the workers in Building 38 and Building 30? 11 12 No, but I think the DR. NETON: 13 areas where you have higher external dose 14 rates are where the borers were used. 15 DR. MAURO: Okay. 16 DR. NETON: And you can assume that the person was in Building 30. 17 That would be our default position. 18 19 DR. MAURO: Okay.

CHAIR ROESSLER:

20

But that would be

- 1 a bounding --
- DR. NETON: Yes, right, because
- otherwise, as you know, when you have purified
- 4 uranium, the dose rates go way down.
- DR. MAURO: Got you, and that
- 6 would be 38, where there's the purified --
- 7 DR. NETON: Right.
- 8 DR. MAURO: Those two years or so.
- 9 Okay. Good.
- 10 MS. BONSIGNORE: This is
- 11 Antoinette. I just have a quick question for
- 12 Steve and John. I had sent Ted some memos
- from -- some Linde memos from 1945 and 1946,
- 14 actually last December.
- 15 And I resent them to Ted a few
- 16 days -- I think it was a few days ago -- for
- 17 everyone to take a look at because I was
- 18 wondering -- and I was wondering if the SC&A
- 19 team had had an opportunity to look at those
- 20 memos that talk about the diversion of

- 1 effluents from injection wells at one end of
- the Linde facility to another end of the Linde
- 3 facility?
- 4 DR. OSTROW: Antoinette, this is
- 5 Steve. We did look at it, and I was sort of
- 6 alluding to it at the beginning, when I was
- 7 talking before.
- 8 MS. BONSIGNORE: Right.
- 9 DR. OSTROW: We know that they
- 10 were -- the memos show that the effluent was
- diverted, but it doesn't say specifically that
- 12 the effluent was diverted and they went
- 13 through tunnels, you know, certain --
- 14 MS. BONSIGNORE: Well, actually,
- if you look -- if you look a little bit, there
- 16 are a couple of memos afterwards that talk
- 17 about the pipe tunnels.
- DR. OSTROW: Yes.
- 19 MS. BONSIGNORE: And how the pipe
- tunnels, how there was some water seepage into

- 1 the ground and into the pipe tunnels and how 2 some of that water seepage was affecting the 3 conduit boxes. 4 DR. read all OSTROW: Yes, we that, but it's still -- it raises questions. 5 It doesn't nail down exactly which tunnels 6 7 they are talking about, you know. MS. BONSIGNORE: 8 Right. I guess my question was, and maybe this is just, you 9 10 know, this is just sort of -- just kind of logically speaking, if you are talking about 11 12 an injection well located at Building 8, and effluents being diverted to injection wells 13 at Building 30, which are at opposite 14 15 the facility, how would that have ends of 16 occurred? 17 agree with you DR. OSTROW: Ι
- logically. But as I said at the beginning, we have a lot of circumstantial evidence that the tunnels were around, but we don't really have

a document that says for sure they were there. 1 That's why I sort of recommended 2 3 that well Ι did recommend that SC&A's 4 position is that we -- the most conservative 5 thing to do was just to assume the tunnels were there. There's too much doubt about when 6 7 they were actually built. 8 MS. BONSIGNORE: Okay. Thank you. just wanted to clarify that 9 because I 10 wasn't sure if you were referring to those 11 specific memos or not. Thank you. 12 DR. OSTROW: Yes, and we thank you, we know you just sent them originally in 13 14 December, we had looked at them then, but we didn't recall them when we were doing our 15 16 report right now. We sort of --17 Right, MS. BONSIGNORE: yes that's what I noticed so that's why I wanted -18 19

DR. OSTROW:

20

I personally had them

- filed under the SEC-107, the last one we
- 2 looked at.
- 3 MS. BONSIGNORE: Yes, I thought
- 4 that maybe because the memo was titled SEC-107
- 5 and --
- DR. OSTROW: Right, anyway, so we
- 7 appreciate your resending them.
- 8 MS. BONSIGNORE: Sure, okay.
- 9 Thank you Steve.
- 10 CHAIR ROESSLER: This is Gen
- 11 again. I have a question I quess of Ted. I
- 12 know Mike has not been -- Mike Gibson has not
- 13 been on the last couple of teleconferences
- 14 with us. Is he being kept aware of the
- 15 communications and the information and do we
- 16 expect that he might be able to join us either
- 17 for the Board meeting or for a Work Group
- 18 teleconference if --
- 19 MEMBER GIBSON: Gen, are you
- 20 talking about me?

1	CHAIR ROESSLER: Hi, are you on
2	Mike?
3	MEMBER GIBSON: Yes, I got on
4	about five after. I just didn't get a chance
5	to cut in and
6	CHAIR ROESSLER: Great. Okay,
7	well I just wanted to make sure that you had
8	all the information. Do you have any comments
9	or input at this point?
10	MEMBER GIBSON: No, I am satisfied
11	with the approach we are taking.
12	CHAIR ROESSLER: Okay then, it
13	seems to me unless somebody else has some
14	information or comments that we have a plan.
15	We are going to look for the revised ER by
16	November $21^{\rm st}$ or $22^{\rm nd}$ , that this will give the
17	Work Group a chance to take a look at it, and
18	then we will decide whether we need a
19	teleconference December $1^{\rm st}$ , 1 p.m. eastern
20	time.

- But we will plan, hopefully, to
- 2 make a presentation at the Board meeting in
- 3 December.
- DR. MAURO: Gen, this is John. By
- 5 way of action items, should I assume that SC&A
- 6 will not be asked to review it or would you
- 7 like us to look at it?
- 8 CHAIR ROESSLER: Well, I think you
- 9 clarified that. I think, yes, I was -- I had
- 10 kind of forgotten that in a case like this
- it's really not usually necessary.
- DR. MAURO: Okay.
- 13 MR. KATZ: Gen, this is Ted. I
- 14 mean I think SC&A should look at it. I mean
- they have been along for the ride and tasked
- 16 for reviewing all these reports on the Linde
- 17 all along, so I think they should review it.
- 18 I mean I don't think you need to produce a
- 19 report, John --
- DR. MAURO: Okay, I understand.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. KATZ: But I think I just
2	think I think you do need to be clear about
3	the basis being given and so that if the Board
4	at Tampa asks you, you know, what do you think
5	of this, this is, you know, a 180-degree turn
6	but does this make sense to you, I think you
7	need to be able to answer that question.
8	DR. MAURO: Fine. We'll read it
9	without a report and be prepared to discuss it
10	as needed.
11	MR. KATZ: Exactly, no report's
12	needed but just be prepared.
13	DR. MAURO: Very good. Fair
14	enough. Good.
15	CHAIR ROESSLER: Okay, any other
16	comments or are we ready to adjourn?
17	(No response.)
18	MR. KATZ: Okay, so I think we are
19	ready to adjourn. Thank you everyone. I will
20	send out we will send out a meeting notice

1	for the first and just write in your calendars
2	that it's provisional.
3	And then we will make a decision
4	after you have all had a chance to read the
5	report. We can do that by email. You can
6	just email me and let me know if you think
7	it's a moot issue, don't need the meeting, or
8	that you want the meeting, whichever.
9	CHAIR ROESSLER: Okay. Thanks.
10	(Whereupon the above-entitled
11	matter adjourned at 1:42 p.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

1

2

3

4