1

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

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

WORK GROUP ON ROCKY FLATS

+ + + + +

THURSDAY NOVEMBER 3, 2011

+ + + + +

The Work Group convened via teleconference at 2:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time, Mark Griffon, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

MARK GRIFFON, Chairman PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official ISAF AL-NABULSI, DOE TERRIE BARRIE, ANWAG JOE FITZGERALD, SC&A MARY GIRARDO ADAM JONES, Senator Mark Udall's Office JEFF KOTSCH, DOL JENNY LIN, HHS ARJUN MAKHIJANI, SC&A JAMES NETON, NIOSH DCAS CHARLES SAUNDERS MUTTY SHARFI, NIOSH ORAU GREG SMITH JAMES TURNER, Beryllium Support Group BRANT ULSH, NIOSH DCAS

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

Welcome and roll call	3
Discussion of DOL Bulletin 11-08	8
Status of Site Profile issues	29
Former petitioner concern - Site Profile	36
Action items/path forward	38

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

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	2:00 p.m.
3	MR. KATZ: So, this is the
4	Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health,
5	Rocky Flats Work Group and it's convening
6	after quite a long time in passive mode.
7	So we will begin with a roll call.
8	And since we're speaking of a specific site
9	for all the Agency-related personnel please
10	speak to conflict of interest as well. And we
11	will begin with Board Members, with the Chair.
12	(Roll Call.)
13	MR. KATZ: Okay. Well, Mark, I
14	think you should just carry on. We don't have
15	any other Work Group Members on the line but
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. We don't
17	have a Work Group but I think it would be
18	important, you know, for the record, to start
19	this discussion, especially about the
20	bulletin.
21	MR. KATZ: Absolutely, right.

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

1 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: And then 2 outline--3 MR. KATZ: Oh, and let me just --

last mention, the agenda for 4 oh ves, the meeting is on the NIOSH website. 5 You can find б it under the Board Section. And the Board 7 Section with Work Groups meeting today, this Work Group meeting today and it should be 8 there. 9

also 10 And there's а matrix of 11 issues that were Site Profile, in effect, issues that were addressed up till when the 12 13 SEC action was taken. That matrix is updated 14 and that got to us quite late but it may show on the website now. I've sent it in there and 15 they post, you know, periodically during the 16 17 day. So you may be able to find that and follow along with that when we get to that 18 19 portion of the agenda.

20 Okay, Mark, sorry about that.
21 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: That's all

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

right. 1 2 MAKHIJANI: Hi. This is MR. 3 Arjun. I've just joined. Welcome, Arjun. 4 MR. KATZ: And no conflict, right? 5 б MR. MAKHIJANI: No conflict. 7 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. This is Griffon Mark and Ι think for the Court 8 Reporter's sake on these kind of phone calls, 9 10 we should make sure we identify ourselves as 11 we speak. Ted said, the agenda: 12 As it's a 13 fairly brief agenda today. But I just wanted 14 to get back to not only the Site Profile issues but also now that we have this last 15 16 bulletin from Labor on implementing the Class, I think it's important that we at least, you 17 know, get a report and have an understanding 18 19 of what that means. And so that's the first item is that discussion. 20

21 And then looking back at the

1	matrix, I will say that I think that was the
2	last matrix I could find but also one of the
3	actions coming out of this meeting may be for
4	Joe Fitzgerald to recover the first matrix. I
5	think I found a date: 12/15/05.
6	SC&A submitted a report with an
7	initial matrix that was a Site Profile matrix
8	and then we evolved into SEC issues. So this
9	last one I'm not sure, you know, if I don't
10	want to miss some that early on we said were
11	Site Profile issues and therefore not relevant
12	to the SEC discussion. So anyway we that may
13	be one of the action items from this meeting.
14	But if we could start, I think
15	it'd be useful to I don't know if, Jeff, if
16	you're willing to give us an overview of this
17	last bulletin that came out so some of us can
18	digest and understand what it means. Could
19	you do that for us?
20	MR. KOTSCH: Yes. It's been a
21	while so let me just read through this

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: You weren't
2	expected to be called on? I didn't put your
3	name on the agenda.
4	MR. KOTSCH: Yes. I just was
5	reminded that we had this call today.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.
7	MR. KOTSCH: Basically this
8	Bulletin has to do with, the Bulletin 11-08
9	has to do with the use of the Ruttenber
10	database as far as, you know, evidence to
11	basically implement the Class at Rocky Flats.
12	And just looking through it,
13	obviously if the conditions in the other
14	bulletins are met, you know, concerning the
15	250 days and the building and things, this
16	one basically supplements that by adding if
17	there's information contained in the database,
18	with respect to neutron dose of 100 millirem
19	or more in any particular year. That
20	basically fulfills the criterion of, you know,
21	whether there was neutron exposure, you know,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

1	which is one of the basic criteria of the
2	Class.
3	And I'm trying to see, I'm just
4	trying to remember if there was one other
5	thing in here or not.
б	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I think it's
7	the building listed too, right?
8	MR. KOTSCH: Yes. Yes. Let me
9	see. I'm trying to remember back how this
10	thing played out as far as buildings go.
11	Because we had a number of other bulletins
12	that
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. It shows
14	any buildings that matches one of the
15	locations identified in Bulletin 08-01 and
16	Circular 08-03, they'll use that as
17	confirmation that the person could have been
18	exposed to neutrons, basically.
19	MR. KOTSCH: Right. Okay, so
20	COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, who is
21	this speaking? This is the Court Reporter.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Oh, that was
2	Mark Griffon. I'm sorry, I violated my own
3	rule.
4	COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
5	MR. KOTSCH: Right. Yes. This is
6	Jeff Kotsch here.
7	Yes. So it uses information from
8	the database as to both the building with it
9	matches against the other criteria and a
10	neutron value if it's greater than 100
11	millirem in any particular year. Then those
12	would be used to fulfill those other criteria
13	that's within, you know, implementation of the
14	Class.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. So this
16	is Mark Griffon.
17	I think the first question I have
18	is on the neutron, it says the field in the
19	database is called neu_recpen, neutron
20	something penetrating, I assume. But it says,
21	you know, that you only include them if it

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	goes above 100 millirem in any one year. And
2	I understand the basis of the 100 millirem,
3	the question is what's the basis of this
4	number generated by the Ruttenber research?
5	Because if it's derived from the very same
6	data that we said we could not use for dose
7	reconstruction, I have some problems with this
8	approach.
9	MR. KOTSCH: Yes. And I think
10	it's been a while and I'm not familiar with
11	all the background of those. Obviously, they
12	just liked the Neutron Dose Reconstruction
13	Project, you know, imputed doses from

16 understanding after talking to Margaret 17 Ruttenber, of at least which value would be 18 perhaps representative of a neutron dose for 19 any particular individual.

data.

obviously from Rocky Flats basically raw data

And

this

was

our

20 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. Mark21 Griffon again.

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

dosimetry

14

15

or

1	I mean, do you see the obvious
2	dilemma I have here? How do we trust the 100
3	millirem value if it's derived from the very
4	data that we've said we can't use?
5	In other words if you take the
6	case of a non-listed cancer, someone has a
7	non-listed cancer from '52 through '66, I
8	assume NIOSH is not going to calculate neutron
9	doses. We basically said we can't calculate
10	neutron doses during that time period. But on
11	the other hand, in this case we're using, you
12	know, the neutron doses to make a
13	determination if you know, estimated values
14	to make a determination, rather than saying
15	anyone identified as potential neutron
16	exposure.
17	MR. KOTSCH: Again, we were just
18	applying this This is just you know one of

18 applying this. This is just, you know, one of 19 the tools that we use to place individuals in 20 Classes, or into these two Classes essentially 21 and, you know, -- what do I want to say? It's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

1	just trying to fulfill the, you know, the one
2	criterion which we've established as being,
3	you know, 100 or greater millirem for any
4	particular year. So we were just trying to
5	quantitatively, you know, use a number from
6	this.
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. And I
8	guess I'm questioning the ability to use
9	quantitative data when it's based on the very
10	data that we've challenged in the SEC as not
11 :	being useful or usable.
12	MR. KOTSCH: I mean, I understand
13	what you're saying. You know, this is just
14	the way the Bulletin was written. I
15	understand where you're coming from.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Right. Okay.
17 :	Mark Griffon, again.
18	I just think well, it surprised
19	me a bit after two years that this is where it
20	came down.
21	But do others have thoughts on

(202) 234-4433

1 this? I know SC&A looked at this a little bit
2 or --

3 MR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. Mark this is4 Arjun.

think initial 5 Actually, Ι the б Bulletin of the Department of Labor did not have a dose threshold with it when the SEC 7 first went into effect in 2007. 8 And then a subsequent Bulletin in 2008 amended that and 9 10 added 100-millirem threshold to all the other criteria: buildings, NDRP and so on. 11

And the thing that surprised me in 12 13 that was in that Bulletin from 2008 was it 14 said that if in any the dose year _ _ said neutron dose 15 reconstruction not I 16 don't have my computer in front of me. I'm 17 But it said that if a not at home. dose reconstruction shows 100 millirem or 18 more 19 neutron dose in any year, then they would be in the Class. 20

21 So I think the 100 millirem got

1	carried over from that amendment, probably.
2	But I couldn't figure out where that amendment
3	came from or what the rationale for using the
4	dose-reconstructed figure was in an SEC for
5	the same thing when we said, you know, you've
6	extended what we said, or the Board has said
7	you don't have the data to do neutron/photon
8	ratios and so on for this period. And then
9	there's a fresh, sort of a bright line
10	threshold of 100 millirem for the same thing.
11	MR. KOTSCH: Well this is Jeff
12	Kotsch.
13	And somebody will have to remind
14	me, I thought the definition of the Class was
15	monitored or should have been monitored?
16	DR. ULSH: Yes. This is Brant
17	Ulsh.
18	I can perhaps answer a couple of
19	the questions that are being discussed.
20	First of all, what the Ruttenber
21	number how it was arrived upon. Basically if

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	I recall correctly, I think there's a field in
2	there called total recorded penetrating, tot-
3	rec-pen, or something like that. And the way
4	it was split up into neutron and photon was by
5	job-category-based rules of thumb.
6	I don't remember what the ratios
7	were but it was some ratio that was applied to
8	split that number into neutron and photon
9	dose. So that's where that number comes from
10	in the Ruttenber database.
11	Now in terms of the genesis of the
12	100-millirem number, that is a result of the
13	
15	interpretation of the phrase, should have been
14	<pre>interpretation of the phrase, should have been monitored. You know, the Class definition</pre>
14 15	monitored. You know, the Class definition
14 15	monitored. You know, the Class definition is, was or should have been monitored for
14 15 16	monitored. You know, the Class definition is, was or should have been monitored for neutron. And the corollary onto that
14 15 16 17	monitored. You know, the Class definition is, was or should have been monitored for neutron. And the corollary onto that definition is kind of, by today's standards.

21 is Mark Griffon again.

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

1	Brant, can you refresh my memory
2	on the that is the correct description of
3	the monitored, should have been monitored, you
4	know, sort of under current standards.
5	DR. ULSH: Okay.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Under current
7	standards the 100-millirem threshold is
8	derived how? I thought it was based on total
9	penetrating actually?
10	DR. NETON: No. No. Well, this
11	is Jim Neton.
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.
13	DR. NETON: I haven't worked with
14	the 10 CFR 835 for a while but originally
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Me neither.
16	DR. NETON: those were
17	independent source terms. Neutron, internal,
18	external, they were all independent source
19	terms.
20	MR. MAKHIJANI: Jim, are we
21	applying this is Arjun.

(202) 234-4433

1	Are we applying the 100 millirem
2	like at Y-12 thorium? You said you can't
3	reconstruct dose for Y-12 thorium. Is there
4	100-millirem threshold per organ for internal
5	dose, and what data are used for that?
6	DR. NETON: Y-12, I think we just
7	removed the should have been monitored. I
8	don't know they had that in there. And
9	really, it was Labor's determination as to
10	what should have been monitored means. I
11	mean, that's in the definition but it was 100
12	millirem for that particular source term. If
13	you take 100 millirem per internal dose, it
14	would have been 100 millirem internal exposure
15	not combined with external.
16	Again, I have not worked with 10
17	CFR 835 for some time, but the way it was
18	interpreted by the contractors at least was
19	that the 100-millirem monitored threshold
20	applied strictly to the internal dose.

21 Now it could be a combination of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	nuclides that would have to add up to 100
2	millirem, but you would not add the external
3	to that.
4	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I agree with
5	the non-external and internal. But I thought
6	the external was the limit. So it could be
7	gamma neutron, you know
8	DR. NETON: My recollection was
9	that neutron was a separate source term.
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Really. I
11	don't remember it that way, but it's been a
12	while for me, as well.
13	DR. NETON: I wouldn't swear that
14	is true but I recall in dealing with neutrons
15	at another facility that I had worked that we
16	were treating it and it was I believe it
17	was correct as a separate source term. But
18	you know things could have changed in the last
19	it's been a while.
20	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Can somebody
21	check that while we're on the call? That

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

(202) 234-4433

1	should be an easy thing to resolve.
2	DR. NETON: I'm not sure
3	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. Okay.
4	DR. NETON: about certain
5	regulations.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Well I don't
7	know. This is Mark Griffon again.
8	I'm not sure, you know, where to
9	move this. My concern is that, again, trying
10	to use that threshold value from which is
11	at least in part derived by the total recorded
12	dose. I believe Brandt is correct. But then
13	how that's fractioned out, I'm not that was
14	by job category but then the job categories
15	well, I think they made some assumptions on
16	the neutron/photon split for different job
17	categories. Is that correct, Brant?
18	DR. ULSH: Yes, that is correct.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: So that split
20	would still be derived from the NDRP research,
21	I believe?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	DR. ULSH: Well, I don't know. I
2	guess we should be explicit when we're talking
3	about that. The job categories sorry, the
4	splits were recommended by Roger Falk to the
5	Ruttenber team. Roger was concurrently
6	working on the NDRP but as you know at the
7	time of the Ruttenber study, the NDRP was not
8	finished. So yes, I mean, the source is the
9	same.
10	MR. MAKHIJANI: This is Arjun.
11	Also in the 1950s, you know, we
12	discussed this is from memory now, most
13	people like in the 700 building were not
14	monitored for neutrons, at least in a part of
15	the 1950s, up to '57, I think. And in all
16	those cases the attributed doses, now this
17	goes beyond the Ruttenber database. The
18	attributed doses would be from neutron to
19	photon ratios in that case, by building, which
20	was done in the NDRP, but it's still the same
21	thing. I mean, the dose wouldn't be

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 attributed for a non-SEC cancer.

2	And also the SEC said that I
3	mean, I'm very confused as to how you can do
4	two different things for the same dose. In
5	one case say we're not going to attribute it
6	because we can't calculate it. The other
7	case, use a 100-millirem threshold because it
8	does go back to 2008.
9	As I read the Circular, the
10	amendment came out of a discussion with NIOSH.
11	At least that's what the Circular says.
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. And I
12 13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. And I don't know who's on the line for NIOSH, but
13	don't know who's on the line for NIOSH, but
13 14	don't know who's on the line for NIOSH, but you might want to look at 835-402, Section A.
13 14 15 16	don't know who's on the line for NIOSH, but you might want to look at 835-402, Section A. You know, I still stand by the way
13 14 15 16	don't know who's on the line for NIOSH, but you might want to look at 835-402, Section A. You know, I still stand by the way I read this is it says, it should be monitored
13 14 15 16 17	<pre>don't know who's on the line for NIOSH, but you might want to look at 835-402, Section A. You know, I still stand by the way I read this is it says, it should be monitored if they have an effective dose equivalent to</pre>
13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>don't know who's on the line for NIOSH, but you might want to look at 835-402, Section A. You know, I still stand by the way I read this is it says, it should be monitored if they have an effective dose equivalent to the whole body of .1 rem. That's just for</pre>

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	is true but I recall there was guidance I
2	recall this is Jim Neton. I recall and
3	again, this was years ago
4	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.
5	DR. NETON: there was guidance
6	that broke that out. But again you could be
7	totally right. I don't know. I guess I
8	shouldn't comment anymore because my
9	information is somewhat dated. But I do agree
10	that it says for external in the regulation,
11	but there may be further guidance in that as
12	to source terms.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Well, obviously
14	we this is Mark Griffon, again. I'm sorry.
15	Obviously, I don't think we can
16	resolve anything today. What I offer is that
17	I want to bring this back to the Board in my
18	Work Group Report at the next full Board
19	meeting. And maybe NIOSH and SC&A can just be
20	prepared to answer some of these questions a
21	little further. You know, especially the one

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1	on the threshold amount but also the way that
2	Ruttenber value I think Brant described it
3	pretty well, but maybe just make sure of how
4	that value is derived and what the different
5	fields. I think it is total recorded versus
б	total recorded penetrating versus neutron
7	recorded penetrating. But I would just ask if
8	you could be prepared for maybe a little, some
9	questions from the full Board.

10 But I want to bring the issue to the full Board of, you know, whether -- if 11 there's any concerns from the Board as far as 12 13 this threshold quantity. And in part, I will say this is one of our early SEC rulings and 14 maybe, you know, the monitor should have been 15 We've struggled with this on some 16 monitored. of these issues. So maybe in part, it's our -17 - the way we defined this was a problem. 18 19 DR. NETON: Mark, this is Jim. think the central issue really 20 Ι

21 doesn't seem to be whether -- I mean, there is

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	an issue as to whether it's neutrons or
2	combined or not. But it really seems to me
3	that your central issue is any dose that one
4	would impute might be questioned, and that's a
5	different issue that we don't really have any
6	stake in. I mean
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes, I know.
8	Right. Right. Right.
9	DR. NETON: Whether it's a 100
10	millirem combined or not I think is probably
11	not going to address your central concern, is
12	my point.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. This is
14	Mark again.
15	That is probably true, yes. If
16	there was some middle ground, I would be
17	interested, you know, in that, possibly.
18	And I don't even know, you know,
19	I'm sure that Labor looked at the full
20	Ruttenber database, but I don't know how they
21	laid it out. If they identified people that

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	had potential neutron exposure, you know, is
2	there a 90 percent of them that fall under
3	this 100 millirem thing or is there you
4	know, I don't have a sense of what impact it
5	would have as far as inclusion or exclusion.
6	But, you know, I think when we're trying to
7	use that line to distinguish, I've got
8	concerns on that because of the underlying
9	data. So I guess we'll leave it at that
10	unless SC&A, Joe or Arjun, do you have
11	anything to add?
12	MR. FITZGERALD: On that issue, I
13	don't. Certainly, I think those are the two
14	issues.
15	MR. MAKHIJANI: No. No I don't
16	have any desire to
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. I mean
18	I'll just describe the issue and, you know,
19	Jim Neton and Brant, you know, certainly at
20	the full Board discussion, I want you to
21	you know, if I mischaracterize anything,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

26

1	certainly be there prepared to discuss this.
2	But I think I'd just rather bring it back to
3	the full Board and see, you know, what if
4	anything how we want to weigh in.
5	DR. ULSH: So the issues you want
6	us to be prepared to talk about, Mark, are 10
7	CFR 835 and whether it's total external dose
8	or whether it's neutrons that are supposed to
9	be 100 millirem a year, that kind of an issue,
10	and then also the issue of how the Ruttenber
11	team partitioned the total penetrating dose
12	into neutron and gamma. Is that correct?
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: That's correct.
14	That's the two fundamental ones I can think
15	of, yes.
16	DR. ULSH: All right.
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: I mean I can't
18	anticipate what other questions the Board
19	Members might have, but yes.
20	MR. FITZGERALD: Joe Fitzgerald.
21	Mark, you just mentioned something

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

. . .

-

-

. . . .

1	that I think we had kicked around a little
2	bit. We really don't have a good feel for
3	what the implication of applying any threshold
4	is to the database in terms of what impact
5	that would have in terms of workers included
6	or excluded.
7	I'm not sure how hard that would
8	be just to give the Board some sense of how
9	significant a 100-millirem threshold is. I
10	certainly don't have any feel for what that
11	would do.
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Perhaps, Jeff,
13	you know, I don't know if you can be prepared
14	to answer that question. I don't know who
15	that question could go to.
16	MR. FITZGERALD: I'm just guessing
17	that, you know, that might be a question from
18	the Board. You know, how significant is that,
19	I mean quite apart from the conceptual issue
20	is okay, you know, what impact would that
21	have. I think Jim's quite right. Certainly

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

.

1	the issue is not so much what the particular
2	threshold is; any threshold's going to have
3	the same issue. But I'm not sure what the
4	impact would be.
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. I agree.
6	Jeff, is that something this is Mark
7	Griffon.
8	Jeff, is that something you could
9	be prepared to address if called on at the
10	meeting?
11	MR. KOTSCH: Yes, we can look into
12	it.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. At least
14	generally numbers, you know. Okay. Is there
15	anything else on that issue?
16	All right. Having heard nothing,
17	I think we'll move on. And two items really
18	remaining and the one is the existing issues
19	on the Site Profile. And I did circulate a
20	matrix, and as I said in the introduction, it
21	was an early or it was the last version of

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	the matrix that I could find. But I also
2	noticed that, even when you look down the
3	numbering, it starts with number two and it
4	goes like two, four, eight, something like
5	that. So I don't know if we combined, I do
6	have sort of a memory that we combined some
7	issues and folded them into one broader issue.
8	But I'm not sure that I'm ready to try to
9	make a distinction of the remaining Site
10	Profile issues on that matrix today.

I would ask at least that SC&A go 11 12 back and try to pull out the original. Joe, I mean, you should probably have this somewhere. 13 The date I find is December 15, 2005 that you 14 submitted your Site Profile Review Report to 15 the 16 Board. So that predated the SEC 17 qualification and the SEC discussion.

18 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. This is Joe19 Fitzgerald.

20 CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: But I think we 21 started from that matrix.

(202) 234-4433

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

30

1	MR. FITZGERALD: Right. I think
2	that would probably be very useful. This is,
3	as I recall, a very dynamic situation with the
4	matrices and I think we went through probably
5	nine or ten. So I think the first order of
6	business is to try to go back and at least go
7	back to the original and sort of make sure
8	that we've captured all the Site Profile
9	issues as well as what may have been left or
10	determined to be a Site Profile from the later
11	SEC list, and just make sure we have a
12	complete treatment of that.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes. That
14	sounds like the best path forward right now is
15	to use the first one and look at the last one.
16	And if I can task SC&A with modifying that
17	matrix to bring back to us with the remaining
18	Site Profile matrix issues, I think that would

19 be the best path forward. And the next 20 meeting --

21 MR. KATZ: Mark?

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.
2	MR. KATZ: It's Ted. I was just
3	thinking, if you just go from the first to the
4	last, though, you may miss issues that got
5	closed. So I think Joe will want to look and
6	see if he can find records on what might have
7	been closed as well.
8	MR. FITZGERALD: This is Joe.
9	Ted, you're right. I think this
10	is going to be a bit of an archeological dig.
11	And I will go through transcripts as well
12	because I think things were moving fairly
13	fast. And I think just ascertaining what got
14	closed, what got pushed from SEC to Site
15	Profile, what may have been left behind as a
16	Site Profile in the beginning. I mean, I
17	think all of the above would be necessary to
18	come up with an updated list.
19	MR. MAKHIJANI: This is Arjun.
20	I think there are also issues that
21	came up during the SEC discussion where we

1	said, that issue is resolved for SEC purposes
2	but it's a Site Profile issue. And I'm not
3	sure that all of the issues that came up
4	during that hectic period in the first half of
5	2007 are in the original. So I think Joe's
6	plan to go through the transcripts is a good
7	plan because we need really to develop a new
8	matrix starting with the old one and saying
9	which issues are closed and which new issues
10	came up and so on.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay.
12	MR. MAKHIJANI: That's what I
13	would suggest.
14	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: This is Mark
15	Griffon again.
16	That's fine. I just thought that
17	the last matrix, at least the last one that we
18	find, you know, I did look through and a lot
19	
19	of them say, this issue closed.

21 terminology this issue closed, but remains a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

33

1	Site Profile issue. So that's a valid point.
2	I don't know, but it may happen, I mean, I
3	was thinking the in-between ones, I tended to
4	carry these matrices through but I may have
5	inadvertently dropped Site Profile issues
6	along the way since we were focused on the
7	SEC, so
8	MR. MAKHIJANI: Yes. It was
9	moving awfully fast, Mark, and I don't know
10	whether Joe was doing that or Ron or me, but I
11	think we were really focused on which issues
12	were open for the SEC or closed for the SEC.
13	But I might be mistaken.
14	MR. FITZGERALD: This is Joe.
15	I think you're right. I think the
16	last four or five months it was SEC-focused in
17	order to deliver something to the Board. And
18	so certainly, we need to go back and just
19	make sure QA the record and just make sure
20	nothing slipped through. But I agree with
21	you, Mark. I mean, a lot of these look like

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

(202) 234-4433

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

they were closed out without an issue being --1 2 Profile issue. think а Site So Т the 3 transcripts might help us make sure that nothing got parked as a Site Profile issue in 4 the discussion. 5

б CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. And what 7 I'll do, I think tasking SC&A to do that and, you know, I'll just keep track of that with 8 And when it makes sense to schedule 9 you, Joe. 10 a face-to-face Work Group, I think that should 11 be our next goal is a face-to-face Work Group to go through that matrix. 12 But I think that 13 might take a little time for you to sort 14 through that.

addition, 15 In I've had some additional information from the petitioner and 16 17 there's -- I summarized them down to -- I guess I get them down to about nine issues in 18 19 addition to what hadn't been put on the table should add to 20 before that Ι think we the 21 matrix. And some of them are more significant

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1	than others but I think and I have a
2	document that Terrie Barrie actually provided
3	us, and I have it in a Word document so I can
4	forward that to everyone but also forward it
5	to Joe for inclusion in the modified matrix,
б	if that makes sense.
7	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. And what we
8	would do is just pretty standard practice.
9	We'll do a first draft and make sure that we
10	circulate this to the Work Group and NIOSH
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.
12	MR. FITZGERALD: and elicit
13	any input, validation so that everybody's on
14	the same page by the time we go to issue it.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.
16	Absolutely, I certainly want, you know, Brant
17	will probably have to look back at some of the
18	old matrices too and try to remember what we
19	closed and didn't close and things like that
20	so that makes sense to circulate a draft
21	first. And I will forward these issues. You

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1	know, several of them are building-specific
2	issues but there are some broader issues such
3	as thorium on the list that Terrie Barrie
4	provided. So I will circulate the document to
5	everyone and ask Joe to add it onto the
6	matrix. And you can identify them as
7	petitioner issues.
8	MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. As
9	petitioner-originated. We actually do have
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Yes.
11	MR. FITZGERALD: a category for
12	that in the matrix.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Okay. Right.
14	All right. I think that's as far as we can go
15	with this today. I just wanted mainly to have
16	this call to get a path forward on this and
17	make sure we keep moving. So just for Terrie
18	Barrie and others in the public that are on
19	the phone, others from the site, you know,
20	we'll have this on the agenda at the next
21	Board meeting.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	As far as the Bulletin goes, I
2	will raise this question and ask for input
3	from the Board on it. So we certainly will
4	have some dialogue about that. And then we
5	will keep you informed on the next scheduled
6	meeting where we'll get more into the meat of
7	the matrix and these additional Site Profile
8	issues.
9	We don't normally do formal public
10	comments at the Work Group meetings, but I
11	would offer any comments from the petitioners
12	on what we went over today.
13	Anyone have any comments or we'll
14	certainly have time at the main Board meeting
15	if you want to make
16	MS. BARRIE: Mark, this is Terrie
17	Barrie.
18	And first, I just want to thank
19	everyone for holding this meeting and
20	progressing with the issues with the Rocky
21	Flats facility.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	I would just like to emphasize
2	that it's been four or five years now since
3	these issues have been kind of put by the side
4	and I realize everyone is busy. But there's
5	people whose claims are affected by this and I
6	would encourage a swift but thorough
7	investigation to all of these issues. And
8	again, I thank everyone.
9	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Thank you,
10	Terrie. And we appreciate your continued
11	involvement with this and appreciate your
12	raising issues that we hadn't thought of. And
13	thanks for your effort.
14	MS. BARRIE: It's for the Rocky
15	Flats workers. Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Anyone else?
17	MR. SAUNDERS: This is Charles
18	Saunders.
19	You made a mistake, I think. I'm
20	not Jerry Saunders. I am Charles Saunders and
21	I'd appreciate if that's corrected, please.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFON: Oh, sure.
2	Thank you. Thank you.
3	And if that's it I think we can
4	close for today.
5	We have those actions, and I'll
б	work closely with Ted Katz to keep this Work
7	Group moving and schedule our one face-to-face
8	where we can get into the specifics of the
9	remaining issues.
10	So anything else before I close?
11	Board Members? NIOSH, Ted, anything?
12	Okay. Meeting is adjourned.
13	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
14	matter went off the record at 2:39 p.m.)