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

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

IDAHO NATIONAL LABORATORY WORK GROUP

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2016

+ + + + +

The Work Group convened in the Toronto Room of the Cincinnati Airport Marriott, 2395 Progress Drive, Hebron, Kentucky, at 9:00 a.m., Josie Beach, Acting Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

JOSIE BEACH, Acting Chair JAMES M. MELIUS, Member DAVID B. RICHARDSON, Member* GENEVIEVE S. ROESSLER, Member PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member*

ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official NANCY ADAMS, NIOSH Contractor* BOB BARTON, SC&A RON BUCHANAN, SC&A* PETE DARNELL, DCAS DOUGLAS FARVER, SC&A* MITCH FINDLEY, ORAU Team JOE FITZGERALD, SC&A* ALBERT FROWISS, SR.* LARA HUGHES, DCAS* JOHN MAURO, SC&A* JIM NETON, DCAS STEVE OSTROW, SC&A* JOHN STIVER, SC&A TIM TAULBEE, DCAS GERALD WOLZ* BRIAN ZINK*

*Participating via telephone

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S
Welcome and roll call/introductions Ted Katz4
<pre>Work Group Discussion Discuss and address any further questions regarding the 18 cases. Completeness of the Temporary Badge Reports and review memo on the ERC issue. Discussions or concerns the Work Group has with regards to sufficiency of the data Tim Taulbee</pre>
Discussion on CADRE Tim Taulbee96
Discuss NIOSH's response to SC&A's evaluation of internal monitoring for fissions and Activation 1949-1970 (Including extension of the co-worker model). NIOSH and SC&A
Review draft SEC issues matrix (note that there are no findings at this preliminary stage, just areas of concern, references, and annotations)111
Update on SC&A's prioritized list of 52 Reactors that OTIB-0054 may not cover. SC&A129
Discuss timeline of when the INL bioassay dataset will be available Tim Taulbee134
Update on the ANL West SEC Evaluation 172
Path forward for SEC petition evaluation 174
Petitioner comments174
Work Group recommendation(s)/Plans for March Board Meeting174

(9:02 a.m.)

MR. KATZ: So good morning everybody in the room and on the line. This is the Advisory Board on Radiation Worker Health, the INL Work Group, and we're still waiting a Member or two, but let's, we can get some things done administratively at least.

So for everyone on the line the materials that are being discussed today you can find on the NIOSH website, those that could be cleared and posted, and they are on the NIOSH website under the Board section, Schedule of Meetings, today's date.

There should be an agenda there and other materials that we will be discussing so you can follow along today.

And staff that are on the line, Live Meeting hopefully is working for you better than me. It's not really working for me, but I think most people have been able to get on.

So we'll do -- let's do roll call, and

I'll begin with Board Members but I'll come back to Board Members because not everybody is here yet.

We're talking about a specific site, so please for staff and members speak to conflict of interest as well.

(Roll call)

MR. KATZ: Okay. Let me just note for people who aren't usuals on these calls, please mute your phones. Everybody mute your phone except for whoever is speaking to us at the time and if you don't have a mute button press *66 to mute your phone and then you press *66 again to take your phone of mute, but please mute your phone.

And, also, please don't put the call on hold at any point, but hang up and dial back in if you need to go for a piece.

Josie?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, thank you. So we do have a full agenda. It is posted on Live Meeting if you have it or get on the website as Ted mentioned.

We're going to start with the first

bullet which deals with the Class Definition, so the last two papers that were issued just before our January meeting, we'll look, we'll go through those in more detail.

NIOSH, I'm hoping for some updates. We do have an emergency response issue that we are going to cover in that first bullet and then, of course, questions, answers, surrounding the Class Definition.

So we're hoping to hear from NIOSH, SC&A, and then we'll have Work Group discussion on it.

Okay, so, Tim, if you are ready.

DR. TAULBEE: Okay, sure. Well the, you know, at the end of our last call you all had wanted some more additional time to look at the 18 cases that we had done follow-up on.

And at that time I indicated there was some concern about temporary badges and whether they were complete or not and I indicated that we could try and do some comparison even though we knew we didn't have monthly reports reporting the temporary badges like we did all of the area dosimetry that we presented at the Board Meeting both in November as well as in July.

But I did commit that there was a few years that we could look at and then tally up the temporary badges that we had and compare the two to show you, you know, whether we felt that within these years it would give you some feel that we have the temporary badges.

And so hopefully this shows up on Live Meeting, but this is our comparison of the temporary badge reports and the monthly reports for '63, '64, and '65.

As you will notice here we have temporary badge reports for '64, January '64 through May of '64, but we don't have monthly reports to compare them to, which is why you just see the green bars.

The green is what we actually have. We went through, let's see, about 800 pages of temporary badge reports and tallied up the number of names on each page in order to get these, this breakdown here on a monthly basis, and then compared them to the monthly reports, how many badges did they say that they -- how many temporary badges did they have that month and how many badges did we actually count, how many names.

And you can see the comparison looks pretty good through the whole time period. Interestingly, there are a few months where we have a lot more temporary badges than we have, than were reported on the monthly badges.

If you were to look at November of 1963 as well as, I believe it was May of 1965, there is several hundred more temporary badge reports with names on them than what was reported in the monthly reports.

So we do feel pretty confident that, at least for this sample, that we have the complete set of temporary badge reports, you know, for that particular time period.

So I think that gives you guys the follow-up that I committed to back in January during our Work Group call. Are there any questions?

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes. This isn't in a form of report?

DR. TAULBEE: No.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: No.

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay. I just don't --

DR. TAULBEE: It's really --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MEMBER MELIUS: -- over the weekend when it's not --

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. TAULBEE: No, no, it's just one.

No, it's just one graph. It's just to show you.

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay. And that's just

a temp number count not a physical match?

DR. TAULBEE: That is correct.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: Well, the monthly

reports just give a count.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: And so there is no way to go through and do it otherwise.

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Just like with the area badges they would indicate by area, you know, the number of badges for there.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So does this get us just to '66 or through '66?

DR. TAULBEE: No, just to '66.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Just to, so --

DR. TAULBEE: December of '65. They changed their report format in January of '66.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: They continued to report the area ones but stopped reporting the temporary ones in their monthly reports.

We have temporary badge reports, obviously, beyond '66, but I don't have anything to compare them to.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: So the number that I get -- and you can see there is some variation here. In October of '64 there was 300 temporary badges, whereas back in August of '63 there were 700.

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

So there can be some significant differences and the big difference that you see there in that September of '63 time period was apparently some remodeling job because there was a lot of construction trades, a lot of HS Wright, a lot of Fluor, a lot of Arrington Construction that I noticed in going through those reports.

So when there is a big construction job you do see an increase.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So the highest month was in, like you said, in October '63, you've got close to, what, 700?

DR. TAULBEE: Right. On average --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So is that in total? Is that the -- or is that a sample of it or is that in total all the temporary badges you have in total?

DR. TAULBEE: That is in total, all of them.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes, that is in total for that month. It averages around 450, is where the

(202) 234-4433

average over the whole time period.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So you can see one person more than once within that month? DR. TAULBEE: Oh, absolutely.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So it's --

DR. TAULBEE: Absolutely.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: And, in fact, the longest we saw any temporary badge worn was 12 days. I went through, as I was going through these, and looked for time periods where the same badge was worn multiple days.

Most of these they are issued a day and then the next day they get another one, then the following day they get another one. If they are going to be there three consecutive days and they know that it will be for three consecutive days, but the longest I saw was 12 days that somebody would be issued one of these badges.

Most of them are, like I said, are single days, and I think that comes from pulling people out of the local halls to come and do work

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

(202) 234-4433

and they don't know if the next day they're going to be, you know, offered to come back out to the site or not, and so you see some variation, and then some people you see, you know, a longer, you know, several days in a row.

MR. BARTON: Tim, when you were looking at this did you come across situations where a temporary badge spanned two months?

DR. TAULBEE: No.

MR. BARTON: No, not at all, okay.

DR. TAULBEE: No. I did not see anything longer than 12 days.

MR. BARTON: Okay. I actually meant like six days in one month and six days in another.

DR. TAULBEE: Oh, six days in one month, six days --

MR. BARTON: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MR. BARTON: The temporary badge

spanned --

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. BARTON: -- not two full months but

kind of crossed in between?

DR. TAULBEE: Yes, you are correct, which actually is causing some of this variation here between what the monthly report is. I don't know what their cutoff was when they counted.

MR. BARTON: Right, yes.

DR. TAULBEE: But around the month breaks, yes, there is many of them that will be issued April 30th through, you know, May 2nd, and so we're seeing, bridging that span.

MR. BARTON: Right. So would that badge have counted for both months in these totals or --

DR. TAULBEE: I don't know how the site counted that from that standpoint.

MR. BARTON: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: I do know that we have more temporary badges than what was reported on monthly reports by about 3 percent.

So over the whole span of this three years we have, for the months that we can compare, we do see more names on these reports than what the

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

site was reporting in their monthly reports.

So they were being conservative if they were being graded on how many badges they were doing, they were under-reporting how many badges they were processing.

MR. BARTON: It seems like it would probably be whenever they turned it in, that's probably the month it counted for, but we don't really know.

DR. TAULBEE: That's my guess, but it also could be the read date. What I used here was the read date on the report date up at the, on the upper right-hand corner.

MR. BARTON: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: And around April or -not April, but, you know, like August 1st, for example, all of them that they read were all July, and so, you know, that --

MR. BARTON: So these totals accounted for August for the temporary badge report total? DR. TAULBEE: Actually for two months I did move them because all of them were in July.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

For the time periods when it was mixed I just reported it into that month, because I couldn't -okay, because what you'll see is one month up high, one real low.

But whenever they were all in one month then I did move them, but when they were not then I left them into the --

MR. BARTON: The read date.

DR. TAULBEE: -- the reporting log. I just didn't know how else to deal with it.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: All right, so those are the temporary badges, where do the visitor badges fit in?

DR. TAULBEE: These are.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: These are visitor

_ _

DR. TAULBEE: These are visitor and --ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Oh, they are both,

okay.

DR. TAULBEE: They're together, yes. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Give us

that.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. This is combined.

MEMBER MELIUS: So what's the status of the indexing and scanning of -- scanning and indexing in that order, of the --

(Simultaneous speaking)
DR. TAULBEE: Of the -MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.
DR. TAULBEE: Of the temporary badges?
MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: When we talked to them in June, or in January out there at the site, they were anticipating six to nine months that they would be done.

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: That they would have it all indexed.

MEMBER MELIUS: So you don't have an

update?

DR. TAULBEE: I don't beyond that.

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: We talked to them at the

end of January.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: I have not talked to them this month to see if they were still on schedule.

They seem to be doing pretty well, and you saw them, I think Josie and Gen got to see them, compiling them together into small groups and scanning them and they were beginning the indexing.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, we did see it, but that's still going to be a tough one for the validation of it until it's done and you can actually go from those cards to what the Class is going to look like as far as implementation of it and how that's going to be done.

So, all right, back on the -- we had the two reports, NIOSH's report and SC&A's report, right before the last Work Group meeting and I know people wanted more time to look at that.

Questions on that or do we need another presentation or what is the Work Group members' need?

MEMBER MELIUS: I don't need any more presentations or information, but I'm still

skeptical until we can validate this better than we have, the temporary badges situation.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, I --

MEMBER MELIUS: For those of, you know, the original years in that one. I just find it --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: That first, the first four?

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes. I think there is too many unanswered questions.

MEMBER ROESSLER: So which years are you --

MEMBER MELIUS: The earlier years. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: The '63 to '70? MEMBER MELIUS: The one where we're -the one with the unusual Class Definition.

DR. TAULBEE: The -- okay. '63 through --

MEMBER MELIUS: Requiring badging,

DR. TAULBEE: Okay.

MEMBER ROESSLER: So you're talking about the -- oh, I don't have the dates right in

yes.

front of me. I should have --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: '63 to '70. DR. TAULBEE: '63 to '70.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, '70.

DR. TAULBEE: This is the best I can validate from '63 through '66. '66 through '70 we've got temporary badges. What validation are you looking for?

MEMBER MELIUS: I want the sample drawn and want SC&A to go through it and develop a plan that will answer some of the questions we raised at the last meeting.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So I went through and made a list of all the things that we've made, the list of all the issues. I did that late last night.

So there is still several unanswered questions. I don't know if I should -- because a lot of these are issues that all of us brought up, of course.

Yes, when I was looking at this and thinking that I don't know that we were ready today.

I know we have some petitioners on the line and would it be pertinent to request, see if anybody wants to weigh in on this topic of the Class Definition?

MEMBER MELIUS: Why don't you go through your list first and then we'll see what questions are on that.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Should I? Okay. So and these are just taken out of the transcript, so if anyone wants to add to it please feel free to.

So one of the first ones was completeness and adequacy of the visitor cards and temporary film badge reports, of course, Jim, you just brought that up.

Another one was reliance on subjective judgments based on weight of evidence to determine worker locations. Third one, discrepancies and spellings of workers' names, absence of other identifiers.

And then the fourth bullet I have is NIOSH suggests as people we are going through some of this they are going to have to be flexible and claimant-favorable, that's in looking at these names and determining, you know, does that person, if the spellings are the same or if it's a junior.

So, let's see, that was on Page 37 of the transcript. Next bullet, no way to validate temporary badge reports, and then implementation is questionable.

That I only wrote implementation is questionable, but it went into a lot of different scenarios with DOL and how they would administer that, and that, let's see, that was taken, Page 68 through 74 discussion.

The next bullet I found, visitor insert cards appear on some of the temporary badge reports, it's not consistent.

Next bullet, how much uncertainty is acceptable? This is a new concept that, of course, was something Gen brought up.

So that's something we're going to have to decide and I don't know -- as a Work Group I guess we can decide amongst ourselves and then bring it to the whole Board how much uncertainty is acceptable.

The next bullet, record systems at DOE sites. Facilities are not supportive of limiting a Class Definition to monitoring or specific work areas, that was on Page 60 of the transcript.

The 250-day context of the visitor badges, that was a small discussion on Page 72 with Jim, so the 250-day issue.

The next bullet, indexing temp and visitor badge could take six months to a year. We just talked about that. And then again the subjective versus objective basis in a Class Definition, which is a new -- new for us.

It's a moving target as far as the first Class Definition that came out. We've had a policy change, we found temporary badges, we found visitor badges, so that's what I meant by a moving target there.

Okay, so that's what I pulled out in reviewing the transcripts of the 15th, and those are all questions and concerns that were brought up by members and staff.

So that leaves us, where do we go from here?

MR. BARTON: Tim, I have a question just for kind of clarification here because it is confusing between the temporary badge reports and the visitor cards.

For these years were all the visitor cards entered on the temporary badge reports? Because I mean I've seen temporary badge reports and I can envision it says temporary badge report and you have your read date and a listing, that's what was used to compile this chart or was it the visitor cards for --

DR. TAULBEE: It was those reports.

MR. BARTON: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Those visitor cards and the keeping of those appears to have started in 1968, as where they kept -- They started keeping them and that became the record and those temporary badge reports is where we see the gaps.

That was how we identified some of those

people that were only on those visitor cards and they were not on the temporary badge reports that we had.

MR. BARTON: So they weren't actually visitor cards like we know them?

DR. TAULBEE: I think they were using the visitor cards, it's just they transferred them all to those temporary badge reports --

MR. BARTON: Okay. And then --

DR. TAULBEE: -- and then in the latter years they didn't, they only transferred certain contractors.

MR. BARTON: I'm just wondering if we tallied the --

DR. TAULBEE: That's how we identified the --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. BARTON: If we tallied the visitor cards here I wonder how it would compare with the monthly reports, if you'd get better agreement?

DR. TAULBEE: I don't know.

MR. BARTON: Yes. Just a question.

DR. TAULBEE: I mean we had not captured those specific cards out there at the site.

MR. BARTON: Oh.

DR. TAULBEE: We captured the temporary badge reports --

MR. BARTON: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: -- then we'd capture the visitor cards from '68 and '68 forward.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So a temporary badge report, is it a TLD or a film badge?

DR. TAULBEE: Early years it's film.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Earlier it's film.

DR. TAULBEE: And then once you get into post-1967 it is TLDs.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Let me clarify that, it could be TLDs.

It depended upon where they were going. If they were going into a high area, at the time they didn't have total confidence in their TLDs yet, they continued to issue film.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Film badges, okay.

DR. TAULBEE: So it's a combination.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Because the TLDs came later on?

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, that's what I thought.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. It's a combination.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So the other thing, we could work on a new Class Definition, right, that doesn't require a TLD or a film badge, I mean that's the other option here.

I mean we all agree that there should be a Class put in place during this time period, how we get that -- just throwing it out there.

MEMBER ROESSLER: Why would we work on a new Definition when --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: That doesn't --MEMBER ROESSLER: -- I actually I think this one is a fine --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: That doesn't require TLD or film badge.

MEMBER MELIUS: Well, not all of us agree.

MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes, I know --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: That doesn't require a TLD or film band that includes all people that worked at --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MEMBER ROESSLER: I think we have to sort through whether this is a good Definition or not I would think before we come up with a new one.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: My only problem is we have met on it three times and we, we're not getting to that, so we're just getting more questions.

MEMBER ROESSLER: Well, it seems like we have two categories of questions, one deals with how much certainty is there and the other one, you brought up a question about implementation in DOL.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 MEMBER ROESSLER: It seems like we need to deal with both things. Maybe it would be good to deal with -- didn't you mention DOL and implementing it?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes. We can't deal with that until we see what we're going to give DOL. When DOL said, because I know Gen brought it up at the last meeting, that DOL looked at this Class Definition and said it was okay, but that was early on before all the changes.

DR. TAULBEE: Well, we sent -- we had talked to DOL about the revised Definition in July, and we did not get any feedback of any problems with that.

We sent a letter to DOL last week just reconfirming that, because you are right, we did not get that in writing, it was verbal, and so we wanted to reaffirm that.

And the indications that we have right now is that is workable from their end. They were doing some checking yesterday on some things, but it appears that they are in agreement that this Class Definition is workable in their sample.

Their concern was does a single badge at CPP and 250 days employment qualify somebody for the Class or did they have to verify somebody was CPP for 250 days, and we indicated it's the first, that a single badge and then 250 days of employment.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And it doesn't matter where they were employed?

DR. TAULBEE: It doesn't matter.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. As long as they were onsite?

DR. TAULBEE: Because you can't necessarily -- as long as they were onsite.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Got you.

DR. TAULBEE: Because we can't necessarily definitively put where they were. I mean we can't definitively say how long they were at CPP with that single badge.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Right, sure.

DR. TAULBEE: That's what we can't say. And so, because if it was an annual TLD they could have been there that entire time period is what it So DOL only indicated that they would have a problem if they had to try and verify 250 days worth of badges inside CPP, that was their only concern.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: A single badge and then 250 days of employment they did not have any concerns with.

MR. STIVER: Tim, I got a question for you. Back at the January teleconference, I believe there had been a discussion about whether DOL was aware of this temporary badge report and visitor cards and this kind of new subjectivity, you know, the idea of having a weight of evidence.

Are they -- did you guys talk about that at all in terms of the Definition?

DR. TAULBEE: No. I mean from their standpoint, DOE is the ones that thought their temporary badges system was complete.

We have shown them that it's not. They now have the records and they are updating it to make sure all of these temporary badges are there.

So from DOL's standpoint they're going to get the form, or that sheet, once DOE gets it coded, that says this person was at CPP, check, that's one qualification, next, 250 days.

MR. STIVER: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: And so that's all DOL really cares about.

MR. STIVER: And they're looking at probably about nine months out before that is complete?

DR. TAULBEE: Before that latter part. MR. STIVER: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: I would like to bring up though again that, you know, we went through a large number of cases, 881 of them, and there were three that we could not, you know, find, that fell into that grouping of those visitor cards that we had to go through and do.

So it is a very small population that affects at this time. There is hundreds of cases right now that can be processed and moved through where we've got, you know, this, the Class Definition fully meets it, they can verify the person was at CPP and there is other people that they can verify weren't at CPP.

You know the weight of the evidence that we talked about is that when you have somebody who has, indicates in their CATI that they worked at say EBOR and then we look at their locator card and it says they worked at EBOR, we look at their dosimetry and their dosimetry says they worked at EBOR, and then we look at their bioassay and their bioassay says they worked at EBOR, and their whole body count questionnaire says they worked at EBOR, then they worked at EBOR.

You know that's the weight of evidence that we are talking about, from that standpoint. The one individual in here that we showed all of the different temporary badges from the different areas, the one case with the multiple misspellings of his name, was out at SPERT and it shows each of the times that he was out at SPERT.

Those same temporary badge reports are

the same ones at CPP that we're looking at. We don't see him on CPP, we see him out at SPERT. And so that's the type of weight of evidence that I'm talking about.

MR. STIVER: I can sure see when all the evidence points to being at TAN, for example --

DR. TAULBEE: Exactly.

MR. STIVER: -- yes, you don't want to put any of that, but how about when you get to the kind of gray zone, like say with a draftsman, or you really don't quite know, there is some conflicting evidence one way or the other, I'm just kind of wondering, you know, how Labor would go about doing that.

That is something that just kind of sticks with me for a bit.

DR. TAULBEE: Well the one that you are talking about was a questionnaire --

MR. STIVER: Right. DR. TAULBEE: The questionnaire said

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

CPP.

MR. STIVER: Right, but I'm thinking

more like in a broader sense, the next guy that comes along, you know, and this is what he looked at, you know, kind of assuming that the sample represents the entire, you know, universe of claimants. Maybe it does, maybe it doesn't.

DR. TAULBEE: Well, but this wasn't a sample.

MR. STIVER: Well it --

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. TAULBEE: This is all --

MR. STIVER: I mean of the claimant

population as opposed to all potential claimants.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes, okay.

MR. STIVER: I guess I should have clarified that.

DR. TAULBEE: Or samples --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. STIVER: And also from '70 to '74 basically taking the guy at TAN or EBOR and putting him in the SEC.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

DR. TAULBEE: Well --

MR. STIVER: So, it was kind of a

precedence for the stuff that already --

DR. TAULBEE: Well but the '70 to '74 time period is he could have been at TAN --

MR. STIVER: So, we really don't know, maybe he was, maybe he wasn't.

DR. TAULBEE: Right.

MR. STIVER: If you apply the weight of evidence --

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. TAULBEE: But even if his dosimetry says he was at TAN he could have gone to CPP because they were allowing them to come in the gate without picking up a temporary badge.

MR. STIVER: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: He could have worn his TAN badge into CPP. That's why we opened it up to everybody, because there was a potential for somebody coming into CPP and we wouldn't see it on one of these visitor badges or a temporary badge report or any other way.

And so that was why we opened it up to include all workers, all badged worked, at that time period, because you still had to have a badge, you know, you had to have a badge to go in there.

MR. BARTON: Well, the case of the draftsman, I think that one got pretty good discussion last time --

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MR. BARTON: -- and in the questionnaire he actually put his work area was CF, which I think is Central Facilities, and he said, you know, the last four years at Central Facilities.

Of course, we don't know -- we know that's not the case because he went to SPERT and MTR based on the dosimetry and it was the case that on his actual in vivo record it said CPP and --

DR. TAULBEE: Well, on the front page of his, of the form it said CPP.

MR. BARTON: Right, right.

DR. TAULBEE: But on the questionnaire part it said Central Facilities.

MR. BARTON: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: And we do know that that

individual worked at Central Facilities. When we were out there verifying him we talked to some of the dosimetry people and they physically, they personally knew him and they knew where he was.

MR. BARTON: Right. Well, I imagine his office was there, but as a draftsman you could be going to these different areas --

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. TAULBEE: But he wouldn't list CPP, we would see him on these temporary badge reports in this same time period where we have done this verification, and we don't see him.

In this time period we see him at SPERT, we see him at NTR, we know these other areas where he went to.

MR. BARTON: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: If he went to CPP he should be showing up on these same badge reports.

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

MR. BARTON: Yes. I think that was --

MR. STIVER: This was the guy who had

a full body count that said CPP?

MR. BARTON: Yes.

38

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MR. STIVER: Yes.

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. TAULBEE: But the questionnaire said Central Facilities.

MR. BARTON: And I think that was in 1966.

DR. TAULBEE: Which was the accurate part, by the way, that we verified.

MR. BARTON: Yes, right. I'm trying to find the guy.

DR. TAULBEE: '66. MR. BARTON: It was '66? DR. TAULBEE: What date? His --MR. BARTON: The whole body count in

question.

DR. TAULBEE: I believe it was '68.

MR. BARTON: Okay.

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. BARTON: -- both sides of the period you were actually able to do a verification on?

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. STIVER: You can see --

MR. BARTON: Yes, I mean some of these monthly reports are reporting more temporary badges than we currently have, but as you said if you average them over this period the temporary badges, what is it, 3 percent over the monthly reports for reporting?

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MR. BARTON: Yes, I mean that's, I think, potentially one of those sort of human error things that you all talked about and agreed that's unavoidable in this big of a dataset when you have hundreds or thousands of records.

But, yes, so that certainly was one that gave us pause. And just to clarify a little bit, we did talk about this at the last meeting, at least from SC&A's side when we say we looked at all 881 claimants, I think we both agreed on this, it was to varying degrees.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes, that was absolutely right.

MR. BARTON: You know, came across a claimant that might have worked during the entire SEC period, as soon as you saw a badge in 1973, a case closed kind of thing.

DR. TAULBEE: But --

MR. BARTON: Or it didn't --

DR. TAULBEE: -- that's exactly what DOL is going to do.

MR. BARTON: Yes, right.

DR. TAULBEE: Is the exact same process

_ _

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. BARTON: I'm just saying we got these 18 claims by first eliminating whole batches of claimants and then what we had left we really kind of dug further.

DR. TAULBEE: Right.

MR. BARTON: But we didn't necessarily dig in with the same granularity to each case.

DR. TAULBEE: Right.

MR. BARTON: I just want to make sure that that's clear.

DR. TAULBEE: No, and NIOSH did the same thing. You know, as soon as we found a badge that put them at CPP they were part of the Class and we moved on to the next one.

MR. BARTON: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: And that's exactly how DOL is planning to administer those. Yes, they have a badge at CPP, now they look for 250 days employment.

They probably will do the 250 days employment first because if they don't have that why --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. BARTON: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: -- badge, you know. But the same principle applies.

MEMBER MELIUS: But if they don't have 250 days they send it to you?

DR. TAULBEE: That's right, yes. MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, yes, yes. DR. TAULBEE: That is correct, yes. MEMBER MELIUS: Knew that. So -- DR. TAULBEE: And I will say that, first, in going through some of these we have found additional employment for some people by going through these temporary badges and we have found them outside the time period that they said outside, Department of Labor verified, you know, employment, we located them.

MEMBER MELIUS: Right, yes. I don't think that's unusual at all at many sites with dose reconstructions and the nature of the records.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MR. BARTON: And the nature of somebody's memory after 30 years.

DR. TAULBEE: Exactly, exactly.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, or their survivor.

MR. BARTON: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: Exactly, yes, very true.

MEMBER MELIUS: I want to focus just, and I probably have asked this before, but Part B of the most recent Class Definition, which is the '70 to '74.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes?

MEMBER MELIUS: How confident are we and what evidence do we have that everyone who was at risk of having worked on CPP would have had an external badge? Are there --

DR. TAULBEE: How confident? Very. You had to have a badge to go into that area, and the badge could have been issued either through the main gate at CPP or through the construction gate at CX, and we have all of those records that we should.

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: If they were going through and they were not on the regular dosimetry for CX or for CPP then they had to be on a temporary badge.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So, no way no how they could have got into that area without a badge? DR. TAULBEE: All of the interviews that we have conducted with everybody they all, everybody has indicated they had to wear a badge, you know, and we have interviewed, what, 70 people The procedures say they had to wear a badge. We've interviewed everybody, or 70-some-odd workers, and they've all indicated they had to wear a badge to go into that area.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: That's true. The only conflicting that we heard was whether they picked up a badge or whether they used the one that they had. That was --

DR. TAULBEE: Exactly.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, that's true.

DR. TAULBEE: And in the '70 to '74 they could wear their own badge in, yes. There is a lot of nuance with badging because in many cases before they combined the security badge with the dosimeter badge, people refer to them differently and when we said dosimeter many times they were referring to pencils and not their film badge dosimeter.

So I did notice that in going back through some of the interviews that there is that little bit of -- when we say dosimeter we mean one thing and to many of the early workers dosimeter was a pencil, not --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

MR. BARTON: Well, I think at least a couple of the workers that we interviewed recently said it was sort of like you always wore your badge but if you were definitely going into a hot area then they'd give you a pencil, too, I think.

DR. TAULBEE: Right.

MR. BARTON: Several of the workers said that.

DR. TAULBEE: Right.

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay. Well, again, focusing on the '70 to '74, with what extent is implementation of that dependent on DOE to making a -- I mean are all those records available for lookup now that would cover people for that time period?

DR. TAULBEE: For that time period, no. There are individuals who did not make it into the dosimetry system that there is -- For example, if they never had a positive dose they would not have made into their dosimetry system and that is what is being coded now.

MEMBER MELIUS: For that, for the '70 to '74?

DR. TAULBEE: That's correct.

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay. And that's the six to nine month?

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay.

MR. KATZ: If the Board were to add a Class now, how would DOL -- in March, what would DOL do in the interim, they would process what they can, but how would they know which ones fall in the category of --

DR. TAULBEE: Honestly if I were them I would start with the about 400 to 500 that we've identified as being in CPP and start working those through.

MR. KATZ: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Because we know those folks are clearly in the Class, yes, and that would take a long time period.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: But you don't know

that they --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. KATZ: But they'd have to be conservative about rejecting claims at this point?

DR. TAULBEE: They'd have to be conservative about rejecting until DOE gets that done, sure, but I don't know how long it takes them to process 400 to 500 claims.

MR. KATZ: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: I think it takes quite a while. And then you've also got the time period of the Board voting and then the time for the Secretary and the time for it to become final and the time to be posed in the Federal Register.

So there is significant lead time there.

MR. KATZ: Yes, it's a couple months.

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: But do you have any idea how long that will take?

MR. KATZ: Phil, is that you? MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes.

MR. KATZ: Oh, welcome. I'm glad to

www.nealrgross.com

hear you.

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Thanks.

MR. KATZ: So just for the record, Phil ordinarily chairs this Work Group. He also has no conflict of interest.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: I think we said six to nine, or six to nine months or up to a year, Phil.

DR. TAULBEE: Six to nine months is what the site said.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Six to nine months.

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Okay, thanks.

MR. KATZ: Why don't I just check while we're -- Is Dr. Richardson, are you on the line as well?

(No response)

MR. KATZ: No, okay.

MEMBER MELIUS: And so do we have temporary badges for other parts of the INL that have not been processed?

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

DR. TAULBEE: We just captured them.

(Laughter)

MEMBER MELIUS: A likely story.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Maybe --

DR. TAULBEE: No, we literally did in January when you all were out there, that was what -- Mitch and I went out that first week of January and we pulled, what, 22 boxes of these things and tagged them and did not get the scanning done during that week.

MR. FINDLEY: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: Jennifer and Art were back out the week that we were doing the interviews and they completed the scanning of that, but we have gotten the release for AEC for some of it but not all of it yet, and so -- yes?

MR. STIVER: So, Tim, these represent all other sites at CPP during the SEC period?

DR. TAULBEE: Well it does cover CPP outside of the current time period, but we also were grabbing MTRs for testing --

MR. STIVER: Taking everything you find, right.

DR. TAULBEE: Every temporary badge report we could find.

MR. STIVER: Yes.

MR. BARTON: And that was starting 1968, right? Wasn't there a certain time period in the SEC that we need these visitor badges for? Because I thought when I was asking before about the difference between the temporary badge reports and the visitor cards you had indicated that we haven't captured the visitor cards for this early period at CPP.

So from this, what we are looking at here, do we have those visitor badges now or do we just have the temporary badge report printouts?

DR. TAULBEE: We just have the temporary badge reports. From the -- to answer, I think, your question there, John, the time period that we have it's all other areas, but basically any temporary badge report that we could get as well as any of the visitor cards that we could identify as well that were not within -- we captured all the CPP ones earlier, we got all those. MR. STIVER: Right, already did that.

DR. TAULBEE: These would be the visitor cards for MGR, the visitor cards for other areas. The ones we did not get, which I have a question for the Board on, of if you are wanting 100 percent verification for some people we did not capture the NRF ones.

And some of the construction trades we would be able to place at NRF if we captured those cards, but that's been outside the program. But if you want 100 percent type of verification and have zero tolerance for whether or not they were, or where they were during this time period we would have to capture those cards as well to try and index.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Well, that's a conundrum, isn't it, because it's outside but yet, then you wouldn't say well there is three years we can't figure out where he's out, so where is? Oh, he could be at CPP or oh, wait, he is here, so, yes.

DR. TAULBEE: I mean if you -- That's up to you all.

MR. BARTON: But they also could have been in non-radiological areas, in which case you are still going to see gaps when, you know, for the same kind of issue.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes, which gets back to the weight of evidence there. I mean I feel quite confident that we have now identified all of the temporary badge reports for CPP and all the visitor cards, that this group is complete.

MR. BARTON: Well, I guess to circle back to my question though, how do you know that if we did capture the visitor cards for this earlier period, like you'd expect that they'd match up to the exact number on the temporary badge reports, right, or we don't really know --

> DR. TAULBEE: I would expect, yes. MR. BARTON: Okay. DR. TAULBEE: No, I have not -- I mean

MR. BARTON: Yes. I mean how did you come to the conclusion that, was it '68 that the

_ _

problem was first identified, 1968, that they, if you had a zero dose on your visitor card you weren't entered or --

DR. TAULBEE: When was that? I think it was earlier than that. I think they started doing that in -- Yes, '66 is when we, when they started doing that to where that they --

Let's see, to read from that initial report, this is when a person has a badge and if no number, this would be a positive match, if no number is found a number is assigned to the individual and the above record is prepared, so if they had a positive dose.

Approximately 98 percent of the visitors receive statistically zero exposures and these data appear only on the visitor list prepared at the time of the badge servicing, which would be your temporary badge reports, visitor list there.

These lists are retained indefinitely as well as the film in the case any question should arise at a later date. So they were keeping the temporary badge report and the film are the two -- MR. BARTON: And so this was a policy change that this document is referring to?

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MR. BARTON: Okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Which is why the split in the years?

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. So they considered this temporary badge report as their permanent record of exposure for this person.

MR. BARTON: I mean eventually we're going to get those CPP badges for nothing else than the dose reconstruction angle, right?

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MR. BARTON: Is that what it was?

DR. TAULBEE: Well, which is, like I said on the January report is really the big, is a bigger issue, or it's a big issue for us because we've got some people who were getting daily badges in different areas.

MR. BARTON: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: They're all zero, but from a missed dose perspective it's huge.

(202) 234-4433

MR. BARTON: Right, a missed dose.

MEMBER MELIUS: Back to the '70 to '74 and the NRF issue and so forth, so what are we saying in that Definition, like who were monitored for external radiation at INL?

DR. TAULBEE: Anybody who was badged. Anybody --

MEMBER MELIUS: At INL?

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: So that would not include NRF?

DR. TAULBEE: That's correct.

MEMBER MELIUS: But if we were doing dose reconstruction for those people that's still considered separate?

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. We do not -- We --

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. TAULBEE: Our understanding is we're not allowed to add the NRF dose.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, that's what I wanted to make sure.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. And we don't.

MEMBER MELIUS: And I just want to make sure that the Definition --

DR. TAULBEE: Is the same, yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: -- is excluded of that, okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, and just remind me, Tim, this goes up to '66, the A goes up to '70, and from '66 to '70 you --

DR. TAULBEE: I don't have anything to do a verification on.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: But you have those badges?

DR. TAULBEE: Yes, absolutely.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So that's what the different is, it's the not being able to verify it with monthly reports?

DR. TAULBEE: That's correct.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. And you can't between, for the year of '64 either, I was just wondering why you didn't add that to the list of showing that you had it, but -- DR. TAULBEE: Well I mean -- You mean post-'66 to add the temporary badges?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: We could. I just --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: It's -- Well that's fine, I just --

DR. TAULBEE: Frankly, I was running out of time to get this done.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: -- wanted to make sure I remembered. Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: It's been a busy few months.

MR. KATZ: Just for the record Josie is referencing the chart that Tim provided for today.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Anybody on the phone lines have anything, any questions, comments on what we've been discussing this morning, Class Definition, temporary badges?

MR. ZINK: This is Brian Zink. I just wanted to make double sure, I think most of the questions that I thought about were answered somewhere in the discussions that you guys were having, but the temporary badges you -- What is it that they are basing the decision on that they have all of the temporary badges?

Is it -- was there some indication in records that showed that how many were issued over the entire period of time or what evidence is there that is conclusive that there aren't more temporary badges out there?

DR. TAULBEE: Okay. This is Tim Taulbee, Josie is pointing to me. The one thing that you probably can't see, Brian, or maybe he can, can he see it through Live Meeting?

MR. KATZ: No, no.

DR. TAULBEE: Okay, no. Okay. Is a comparison of the temporary badge reports from January of 1963 through December of 1965 on a month-by-month basis with the monthly reports of how many temporary badges were issued or read during those months.

And there is good agreement going through for this 3-year sampling period. So that

is one of the indicators for us that we feel that the temporary badges are complete.

The other indicator was what we did and reported on in the previous presentations at the full Board meetings of we went through all of the temporary badge reports and looked to see do we have temporary badge reports for each month, and that we did.

We verified of the entire Class period, 1963 through 1974, that we had temporary badge reports for every month.

Now the third piece was when we went through and looked at 881 claims and tried to place the individual workers in different areas and we whittled it down to a grouping of 18 workers that we could not place, and this created a concern for us.

And so we went back to the site and got additional dosimetry from them and from that we were able to place 15 of the 18 and three additional workers.

Three out of the 881 initially, we went

back out to the site and that's when we found that there were some visitor cards that if they did not, if an individual worker did not have a positive dose they were not entered into their system, therefore, they would not appear on these temporary badge reports.

And that was where we found the additional individuals and we have since captured that information for CPP in that time period, as well as for MTR in the other time periods.

This is what we were discussing earlier of how long is it going to take the Department of Energy to index all of these records and that current estimate is six to nine months.

It is a fairly large set of records, I want to say on the order of around 30,000 individual pages, something along those lines.

So that is currently what DOE is working on, which is why we feel that these temporary badge reports are now complete. I hope that answers the question you are asking.

MR. ZINK: Thank you, yes.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Thanks, Tim. Any other comments, questions from anyone on the phone lines?

(No audible answer)

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And in the room? (Simultaneous speaking)

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes. So the 881 was as of when, claims up to what time?

DR. TAULBEE: That would have been --MR. BARTON: August to September for SC&A. That's when we started ours.

DR. TAULBEE: Oh, really?

MR. BARTON: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: I'm pretty sure ours is back May, April, May something like that.

(Simultaneous speaking)

MEMBER MELIUS: So that's when you

stopped?

DR. TAULBEE: That's when -- Yes, that was the set that we started working with.

MEMBER MELIUS: With April or May. So we have additional ones?

DR. TAULBEE: Additional ones since then, yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: And then -- Okay, that's -- So is it, any estimate of how many additional ones there are?

> DR. TAULBEE: I don't. I don't know. MEMBER MELIUS: You don't know.

DR. TAULBEE: Could you text somebody to see if they can get it?

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. BARTON: Give me five minutes.

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And you are looking at additional above and beyond the 881?

MEMBER MELIUS: Well is there something we can be doing with pending this effort, with of getting all this stuff --

> DR. TAULBEE: Indexed. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Indexed and --MEMBER MELIUS: Yes. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes. MEMBER MELIUS: Because there's no

sense in doing, trying to do any verification or validation or whatever you want to call it until it's all indexed, because if you find something missing then, you know, three months later it may appear, or do you have something that completely you don't know.

So I wouldn't give up on that entirely yet. It's got to be somewhere, but -- And then the other piece that we haven't done in terms of -- Well it was mentioned earlier, was that once you, when you went through these cases, once you put them in the SEC then obviously you stopped looking at their information?

DR. TAULBEE: Absolutely.

MEMBER MELIUS: So there is additional information there that might shed some light, for those individuals that might shed some light on the completeness of the records and, you know, how much I'm not sure, but the --

DR. TAULBEE: Right.

MEMBER MELIUS: But given that it's, you know, 18 cases it's probably not a huge -- DR. TAULBEE: Right.

MEMBER MELIUS: -- effort to re-look at that stuff and --

DR. TAULBEE: Actually it would be. Let me clarify as to why I think it would be.

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: The 18 we're down to when we couldn't place where they were, okay.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes. Yes -- No, you're right it's more than 18. It's really --DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: Because if we wanted to go back we'd be looking at a lot more.

DR. TAULBEE: Right. And remember that up until early this last September I believe DOE was only providing annual summaries to us if they had a low dose.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: And so they now are providing the full record, but all of those older cases, when we found a single CPP badge, you know, even if it was just an annual record, we stopped looking and if you wanted to try and get their entire history we'd have to go back to the site and have them work up their whole history.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: And it took from October through the end of December to get those 18. So if you are looking at, you know, ten times that, 180, you're looking at a lot more. And, by the way, the same resources that are indexing all of these visitor cards are the same people that pull that information for DOE.

That's why I say it would be a big effort.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: I think my biggest problem with this is we don't know what's missing until we put this in place and then we have that group of people that say hey, I was there or -- We don't know it's missing until later.

I mean the uncertainty factor comes into play.

DR. TAULBEE: Can I ask what the harm

would be to get the Class going and then, I mean we can process several hundred, you know, 400 to 500 now and then we're down to a smaller group and if we run into some of that then we can address it.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: That takes a long time though, too.

MR. STIVER: The other aspect is that it kind of goes to the back of the line at that point -- SEC because others that are more pressing, you know, that are still under review. I mean would that mean Idaho kind of gets to the end of the line?

DR. TAULBEE: I don't think so.

MEMBER MELIUS: Well --

DR. TAULBEE: I wouldn't think so.

MEMBER MELIUS: Tim, you've repeatedly told us that you couldn't put more effort into this because you had other issues to deal with at INL and Argonne, so --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So, yes, and the other thing is --

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

DR. TAULBEE: Okay, all right.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: -- change the

Class Definition to include everyone and then everyone is included in this discussion is done, right?

DR. TAULBEE: But how do you -- I mean to me you are now -- like I said the EBOR example. You've got a huge weight of evidence of some people that were not exposed at CPP, that were never there, they were 25 miles away.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And we grapple with that at all sites in -- I mean I can remember a couple, the hospital one was one where it was a small section but they couldn't pinpoint that down so the whole -- Anyway --

DR. TAULBEE: But this is what we've done at CPP to be quite honest, okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: The area where the transplutoniums are is the access corridors, the operating corridor, and the labs, okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Or outside.

DR. TAULBEE: Now I can't tell you when somebody goes inside the gate whether they went to those areas.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: But that's where the exposure that I can't reconstruct is. That's where the exposure to the plutonium is that is separated from the fission products.

So they come into the gate, they could have gone there. Many of them went and worked over at the calciner. Many of them went and worked over at the Tank Farm Area where we can reconstruct the doses.

So we started with the Class of who went into that gate then, okay. Everybody wore badges, we heard that through the interviews, so that was our initial Class that we casted. Why? To include everybody who went in, had the potential to go into that area.

Okay, now we found that 1970 to 1974 people could have gone into the gate that were not on the CPP dosimetry roster or the CX dosimetry roster.

And so now we had to cast the net wider

to include others that could have gone in past and not appeared on one of ours lists, okay. And the reason for the single badge again, in the early years there wasn't annual badging.

It was 12, it was 12 film badge dosimeters. We've made it one so that we don't have from '63 through '67 you have to have 12 dosimeters in CPP for a full 250 days, because we felt the Class would become unwieldy then to administer.

So a single badge, one badge, is all that we were requiring to go in. So we cast the net very large to include everybody who had the potential of 250 days exposure in CPP.

Now the issue came up of the temporary badges. Okay, we've got people coming in. The longest wear period we see for any of these badges is 12 days, two weeks, we'll call it two weeks.

So that would be mean for somebody to have 250 days on temporary badges in there we would be missing 26 badge reports for that same individual over this whole time period for them to have 250 days.

All we are requiring is one, one single badge to be in there. I do not believe we are missing any -- I don't think we are missing any, but I certainly do not believe we are missing that volume of temporary badges here for anybody.

And that takes into account if they were always on a 2-week badge interval. Most of these badges are a single day.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: A single day.

DR. TAULBEE: So there would be 250 of these for a year's worth of exposure within CPP. But, again, we are requiring a single badge, one day in CPP, 250 days, closure.

So I think the net has been cast very wide to be claimant-favorable to include everybody that had that potential for plutonium exposure in the access corridors, the operating corridors, as well as the laboratories.

MR. KATZ: For the record Dr. Richardson is on the line. He has no conflict for this site. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MR. BARTON: I think, Dr. Melius, to answer your question, there are by my accounts 912 claimants with at least some employment during the two SEC periods, so about 30 more.

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So about 30 more? MR. BARTON: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MEMBER MELIUS: And I believe your -it keeps sort of glossing over the fact that you don't have the records to verify 250 days CPP for anybody by the nature of their, or at least not that would be implementable in terms of an SEC Class.

DR. TAULBEE: I certainly don't have them beyond 1967 when TLDs were issued, because they could be worn a full year.

MEMBER MELIUS: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: In this earlier time period, yes, and they could not have worn them --They did not issue the film badges for more than

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

MEMBER MELIUS: So why not propose that as the Class?

DR. TAULBEE: It would become more difficult. We could from that standpoint, but it certainly makes the Class Definition even more difficult and that seems to be one of the problems that you seem to be bringing up to me is that the split Definition is complicated and so that just makes it more complicated.

MR. BARTON: And more restrictive, too.

DR. TAULBEE: It would be more restrictive.

DR. NETON: I have a question. I'm kind of sympathetic with Tim's discussion point that, you know, this Class is, you know, could get moved forward and some people could get paid, and I am just wondering is there any agreement at all like in the '70 to '74 time period where it's just one badge only anywhere on site?

I mean is that something that people could agree on, the Working Group? If that were

(202) 234-4433

agreeable I mean I don't know why we couldn't just propose that piece.

We've done this many times before where we're just suggesting, or adding a Class for that period and reserve the other ones and solve the other issue that's still under investigation by NIOSH.

MEMBER MELIUS: I would be amendable to that because -- We keep jumping around here between time periods, but I would be amenable to that.

I would like some clarifications from DOL there is an understanding or communication that people that were rejected, because remember if we stayed in two or three months and you start implementing that part of the Class people that were rejected because the temporary badging would not have yet been completed, for the indexing, so that those people don't get the no, they get put on hold pending, you know, the completion of the information that would be needed for the verification.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: I'm glad you

(202) 234-4433

mentioned that, Jim, because I was wondering and was going to ask if we could separate that out.

DR. NETON: Yes, I'm not sure --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Not sure.

DR. NETON: -- how logistically this would work because you have a Class Definition in the ER already.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

DR. NETON: -- but I guess it could be modified and proposed and say that the other one is reserved pending further review. We've done this.

MR. KATZ: Well the Board can make a recommendation for the Class --

DR. NETON: Oh. Oh, that's true, yes. MR. KATZ: -- however, it's not a --(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. NETON: Yes, we wouldn't have to

revise it.

MR. KATZ: There's no limitation.
DR. NETON: Good point, good point.
MEMBER MELIUS: We'll call it the Neton

(Laugher)

_ _

MR. KATZ: The Neton variance.

DR. NETON: I mean then we could at least move that --

MEMBER MELIUS: The Neton amendment to the Taulbee definition.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So let me see if I get this correct.

(Simultaneous speaking)

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So if we were to decide to separate out A and B based on the years we would go forward with the second portion, the -- get my glasses on -- the '70 to '74 and then the first portion we would wait potentially until we could validate and verify the temporary badge situation, is that what I am hearing?

DR. NETON: Correct.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MEMBER ROESSLER: And it seems like the Work Group would report to the Board at the meeting in Tampa that this is our recommendation and then as Tim says then that could move forward because the Board could decide.

DR. NETON: Yes, this four years could move forward. We've done this at many sites.

Or not many, but several sites, the piecemeal, not piecemeal, but, you know, incrementally add that --

DR. TAULBEE: At many sites, yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So, and I know, Jim, you have been questions about that second period. Any drawbacks that our contractor or anybody on the phone can see from doing something of that nature, separating out the two dates, time periods?

MR. BARTON: Well the drawback was the visitor cards aren't coded yet. I mean --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: They're not coded yet, yes.

MR. BARTON: Yes.
DR. TAULBEE: And that's where -(Simultaneous speaking)
MR. BARTON: And then that still

(202) 234-4433

applies to the '70 to '74 timeframe.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: -- get DOL, what, to read those that are rejected on hold pending this --

(Simultaneous speaking)

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Those later times, those later dates.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. Because, yes --All right.

MR. KATZ: Well we can work on getting that confirmation from DOL about that, right?

And I have seen some email traffic that DOL does not have any concerns with the proposed Class, the latter Class.

MEMBER ROESSLER: I like this approach.

MR. KATZ: Phil and Dr. Richardson, do you have any comments on this approach?

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes, I just had one thought though that I don't know if there is, for records, is it possible the Union has any records that might potentially cover anybody that they don't see a temporary card for?

DR. TAULBEE: Well the difference would be if they went out and did site, or did work in a non-radiological area they are not going to have a temporary card, and I am sure that that occurred, but that did not occur inside of CPP where this exposure was.

MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Okay.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, and the construction Unions would keep records by employer and that contractor could be any place on the site. I mean it wouldn't -- They'd have people in multiple locations on the same, you know, time period, so it usually isn't helpful.

DR. TAULBEE: Right.

MR. BARTON: You know, thinking back to July when the Class Definition was the CPP badge alone, you can use it on your site badge at that time -- Well prior to the meeting in July we had done a verification of the CPP badging records by comparing them with the monthly reports but we never really done the validation of the Area Exposure Reports for all of the other areas of the site against monthly reports.

I mean that would certainly give us some assurance that we have all the records if you can compare them, just like we did with CPP but you'd have to do them for TAN and SPERT and all of the other areas.

DR. TAULBEE: And SPERT, all 52 reactors.

MEMBER MELIUS: Anybody volunteering to go --

(Laughter)

MR. BARTON: I mean based on the interviews I think it's reasonable to conclude that if you went into CPP you probably had that film badge.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

MR. BARTON: Then the only question is do we have all those records, and that was the purpose of doing the CPP one way back when is to assure that we, or had reasonable assurance that we have -- ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes. MR. BARTON: Right. (Simultaneous speaking) MR. KATZ: That's a conflict. MR. BARTON: It sounds like a summer

job.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Joe was having a hard time hearing us on the phone so if you are speaking please try to speak up so that we're clear.

MEMBER MELIUS: And two other things, and well one is can we look at those 30 whatever it is, you know, and just to see what's in there and so forth, if there's more information that's available and --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. KATZ: So who is doing that? DCAS, do you, are you going to do that or were you tasking this to SC&A?

DR. TAULBEE: How about both like we did before.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: At the same time or --

(202) 234-4433

MR. BARTON: We'll just have different sets of claimants, so --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay, that's fine.

DR. TAULBEE: Sure.

MR. FINDLEY: Hey, Bob, the 30 that you mentioned that's from what date, for, was that September?

MR. BARTON: That's -- I just looked at January 1, 1963, all the way through the end of 1974. If they have any employment --

MR. FINDLEY: The 30 additional INL claims though?

MR. BARTON: Yes.

MR. FINDLEY: Okay.

MR. BARTON: So I have 912 total that

had at least some employment in that period for CPP.

MR. FINDLEY: Oh, and you have --

MR. BARTON: We had 881, yes. So

that's where the 32 --

MR. FINDLEY: Okay.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. BARTON: Okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And what were the dates again in '63 through '70, is that what you're saying?

MR. BARTON: Yes, it's just 1963 through '74. So if you are on either side of the Definition.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, so that --So NIOSH and SC&A to review the 30 additional claims, okay.

MR. KATZ: Yes, they're both -- It's going to be the same exercise they did previously.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: And hopefully since these are newer claims we will have the complete record --

MR. KATZ: Which will speed it up.

DR. TAULBEE: -- which shouldn't --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Do we want to see that prior to making a decision or we can go --

MR. KATZ: That's related to --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: That's related

mostly to the --

MR. KATZ: -- the other Definition. MEMBER MELIUS: This other Definition is what we're really interested in now.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MEMBER MELIUS: And then the second thing we need to do is think about how do we want to validate or whatever we want to call it for the, once everything gets indexed.

MR. BARTON: Right.

MEMBER MELIUS: So we can do that efficiently.

MR. BARTON: It might be somewhat problematic to be looking at those 30 claims for the latter period because we're going to run into that visitor card issue again.

Until those get indexed and actually put in the claim files we're not going to see them, right?

DR. TAULBEE: May or may not, yes.

MR. BARTON: Yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: It's a small enough

number that if they have some employment, the employment overlaps if it may be worth information --

(Simultaneous speaking)
MR. BARTON: Yes, sure.
DR. TAULBEE: Yes.
MR. BARTON: Okay.
MEMBER MELIUS: -- of what we have.

DR. TAULBEE: We might end up with some that we can't resolve, but most likely -- If the numbers hold the way they have been, or based upon the previous sampling, there will be one person that we won't be able to resolve and the rest we should be able to resolve.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Well and how big of a sampling would we do?

MR. KATZ: Well that whole V&V process, not just how many you sample, but how and who and --

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.

MR. KATZ: You need a proposal I think for that. No one is going to do that, right, unless

someone already knows how they would do it.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, I would ask SC&A to do a, come up with a protocol for doing that.

MR. KATZ: Okay.

MEMBER MELIUS: And then you can talk about them and then after we implement it we can discuss it and so forth, is that -- Yes.

MR. KATZ: Okay, good. So SC&A will develop a draft proposal, or a protocol.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes. And if we find, and if in the 30 cases we find somebody else that has 12 spellings of their last name we'll --

MR. KATZ: That's for the first period Definition.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: So do you want me to, I could briefly go through the ERC CADRE --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Well let's make sure, let's finish this up before --

DR. TAULBEE: Okay, I'm sorry, I thought we were finished.

MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes, let's --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MEMBER ROESSLER: -- doing here.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, let's go. So, David, any thoughts from you on this idea or suggestions that we're moving forward with here?

MEMBER RICHARDSON: I think it sounds good.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So you're in agreement?

MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So the proposal is to bring to the Board to separate out the two, A and B, and recommend that we go forward with the Class using one TLD at INL from March 1, 1970, through December 31, 1974?

MEMBER ROESSLER: Basically take the A part of the current description.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Class, yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: Right.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And then we would leave up to NIOSH how you would fix the ER --

DR. NETON: Reserve the second part of

the Definition.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Well the Board is effectively reserving --

DR. NETON: Well, yes, until we --

(Simultaneous speaking)

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So that would be part of our discussion?

DR. NETON: It would be part of the record, yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

DR. NETON: Yes, it should.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So is everybody in agreement then, it sounds unanimous here, any reservations or problems anybody can see with that?

MR. BARTON: Well even if you vote it through before we actually do any validation on the other site areas we really wouldn't know if we have all the records for those other site areas that are being used in the '70 to '74 period, which is the requirement. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So is that problematic then?

MR. BARTON: Well if you vote on the Class Definition and then we actually do the verification and find out well we're missing certain records in this year for this area of the site then you certainly have to consider modifying it I guess to --

MR. KATZ: The V&V was for the second Class Definition. I mean the first Class Definition not the second.

(Simultaneous speaking)

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: No, it's for the first Class.

MEMBER MELIUS: Well but there are -- (Simultaneous speaking)

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, it spans both. I guess I'm less concerned about the, it's just putting out a wider net that yes there may be, if we find something missing then maybe we have to modify it again, but -- and then it's everyone who worked. I mean that's the next --

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

89

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

MR. BARTON: Right.

MEMBER MELIUS: -- your next step back. But I am less concerned about it given the wider net than I am about the, when you narrow it down to just one area of the CPP.

MALE PARTICIPANT: Sure.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So then the three actions that came, or actually two, SC&A and NIOSH are going to review the 30 additional claims out of the 181, and then how do we go about validating and indexing the temporary badge reports, SC&A is going to --

MR. KATZ: Draft a proposal.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: -- draft a proposal for the Work Group. And then it looks like for me, need to report what we've decided to the Board in Tampa.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Is that everything?

MR. KATZ: Right. And I have -- We'll

have an expedited transcript of this meeting so that will be ready for the Board meeting as well, so people can actually read what the discussion was today and the prior meeting is already up there and available.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And, of course, January's -- Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: From NIOSH do you need a presentation or anything on our end or do you have it, Josie, about the discussion?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: I think I do.

DR. TAULBEE: Okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: I mean, of course, you'd want to be available for questions because I am sure there is going to be lots of questions.

DR. TAULBEE: I'll be there.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So, you know, I don't think it would be a bad idea to --

MEMBER MELIUS: I think it's straightforward enough I would just --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: You think it'll be okay?

MEMBER MELIUS: Tim's there, so let him -- We got the -- He's already got 620 slides for --

(Laughter)

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: It will be much, much less.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: We've seen them a couple times.

DR. TAULBEE: I learned from the last

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: I guess I can do the presentation and be available for questions if there are questions.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.

MR. KATZ: So do you want from Tim any presentation on any of the other matters that doesn't bear on the action, for example an update on what you've done for the Part A and --

MEMBER MELIUS: I think the Work Group can do that.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. KATZ: Okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

MR. KATZ: Okay. All right, good.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Take you off the hook. I know Gen's -- One more thing before we move on totally. Gen, you were asking for kind of like an overview, is that something we can talk about now or later?

MEMBER ROESSLER: Well I think we just -- I think later maybe.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes, I think we should do that. I think we just focus on this and get this and I think the crux of it will be to explain why.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MR. KATZ: Good.

MEMBER ROESSLER: Why we're recommending the change and then what's going to, what we're going to do to proceed on with the other part of the Definition.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Sure. Yes, okay. I think that makes sense. Okay. So everybody is

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

satisfied with that discussion before we move onto the next part of this? Okay, hearing none I guess, Tim, you had a report that you sent out on the --

DR. TAULBEE: Okay, and which one do you want to discuss?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Let's go with the CADRE.

DR. TAULBEE: Okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Let's do that one.

DR. TAULBEE: So with the CADRE Report, this was an observation that SC&A raised on the Class Definition and it stemmed from a 2011 document where CADRE was listed as believed to be located at CPP.

This is on the Figure 4 on the beginning of that particular page. And so we did some follow-up here, what was CADRE and where, you know, what was this particular group.

And so we went back to the Personal Exposure Reports, which are also known as the Area Exposure Reports, and we found that CADRE was listed as a contractor and the area was listed as And when you read through historic INL documentation they refer to CADRE primarily around the SL-1 area and CADRE referred to the military personnel, and in the reports, you know, they talk about the CADRE in that sense.

And we found the same language in the 1959, prior to the SL-1 accident, but when the SL-1 was operating and being built references to CADRE in that same general context, a view of the CADRE at SL-1, a view of the SL-1 CADRE, a U.S. Army Engineer Reactors Group, and then the CADRE training building, and so it was all following along that particular line.

When we went to the Area Exposure Reports and started looking at the individuals I started to notice some names that were what I would say prominent people at the site that didn't seem to be placed into somebody who would have been working at CPP at that time.

And so then we started to go through the names individually, and that is really the bulk of

what we did here, and you can go through the attachment and you can see that there is a very large number of division directors or division chiefs, the site general manager, the deputy manager, all people that would man an Emergency Response Center.

And that was what the photographs were indicating ERC stood for, was Emergency Response Center, and they were looking at offsite locations up in Rexburg or in Idaho Falls for this particular facility.

So when you look at all of these some of the other jobs that were in there were health physicists who had accident experience, they were involved directly in SL-1.

There is meteorologists in here that you would want for wind plumes, especially from a release of a reactor of this magnitude, and then you would also see other people, communications specialists and security division and so forth.

So these are the people that we found within this CADRE group for ERC. So using a weight

of evidence approach we have come to the conclusion that really CADRE should not be listed as CPP in that initial table.

It really is an offsite Emergency Response Center type of group with these people, because I would not see the site general manager really inside of CPP.

So that's generally our conclusion to the Work Group.

MR. STIVER: Tim? DR. TAULBEE: Yes, sir?

MR. STIVER: When was the Emergency Response Center located in town? I thought that it would totally make sense that it would be onsite so that it would, you know, promptly --

DR. TAULBEE: The last set of photos that we looked at here, I want to say that 1965 is when the photo index indicated that the offsite ERC, or actually they did call it offsite ERC. They had an onsite on and an offsite one.

MR. STIVER: Yes, I think, one of the interviewees back in the end of January.

NEAL R. GROSS

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. It's now called the Warning and Communications Center, the WCC. That's the current one in which that they use.

MR. STIVER: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: And by the way one of the individuals that was listed here that you all had identified as having CADRE, one of the communication specialists in his CATI he indicated that he worked at the Warning Communications Center.

MR. STIVER: Okay.

MR. BARTON: Did you say there was an Emergency Response Center offsite and onsite?

DR. TAULBEE: I mean I don't know that.

DR. NETON: Well it's not unusual.

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. NETON: I mean, you know, if the site, if a situation got so severe then they would always have, a lot of times people have an offsite facility to take over.

MR. BARTON: Right, kind of a backup facility.

DR. NETON: To back up, yes.

DR. TAULBEE: What I also find interesting with these badges is that there are three distinct time periods, this spans '62, '63, and '66, but the dates of those reports, if you go through them, are from three, I don't know if these are events or if these were activations of it, but they all have the same dates.

October 2, 1962, is the first three pages, December 11, 1963, are the next three pages, although there are some for December 5th and 6th within that group, and then the last one is March 21, 1966.

There is one that is 1964 in there, but -- So they are, they seem to be distinct events or what you would call call-ups of the Emergency Response Center. Activation.

MR. BARTON: If they were offsite why would they even be badged?

DR. TAULBEE: In case they had to go onsite.

MR. BARTON: But then they -- I mean

99

this is the '60s so they would get a badge wherever they went to.

DR. TAULBEE: It depends upon where the incident was. If you think it from SL-1 you had to be badged to go into SL-1 but when the accident happened fire trucks responded and so forth, the dose rates were so high they pulled back and they would pull it back down the street, so they didn't have a supply of badges there, and that could have been one of the lessons learned that, you know, a command center, you might not be able to issue those.

MR. BARTON: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Especially those badges, they were already overexposed by the time anybody got there.

MR. BARTON: All right. Yes, because they are all zero it seemed.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. That's it.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: All right, any other discussion on CADRE.

DR. TAULBEE: So can we consider that

one closed?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: That's what I'm looking to SC&A.

MR. BARTON: Now what's sort of a parallel issue, and this goes back to the November meeting and I think it was Phil who brought it up, asking about firemen and, you know, responding to, the actual people that would respond to say a fire at CPP.

DR. TAULBEE: I would like to respond to that one separate from the CADRE because I can't

MR. BARTON: Okay. I didn't know if it was on the agenda.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: I think it was brought up at the same context but it's two separate issues.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. MR. BARTON: Yes. DR. TAULBEE: Exactly. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, so just talking about the CADRE, the firefighter one is still on the table.

DR. TAULBEE: That's right, and we still owe you a response on that.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And we have the report. Anyone on the line, Phil or David, any issues with the CADRE and closing it or any, ask questions?

MEMBER RICHARDSON: None from me.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. I heard from David, no. Phil, how about you?

And I thought I saw this on the matrix, it did make the matrix, right?

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. That's why I was asking whether we consider it closed.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes. And, of course, we'll talk about the matrix and update the matrix as we get through this.

MEMBER MELIUS: So the firefighter issue is still on --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: That is, yes. It's separate though, right?

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. BARTON: It's a separate issue.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes. Okay, so the --

DR. TAULBEE: Actually I'm not sure if it is on the matrix.

(Simultaneous speaking)

MEMBER MELIUS: -- don't remember it, that's why --

DR. TAULBEE: Okay. And if it's not we can add it.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, I was making sure those two are separate and it gets added.

MR. KATZ: So that's closed?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So the CADRE is

closed, yes, the issue of where they were located.

MR. KATZ: Okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So it's just now 10:30 let's go ahead and take a break.

MEMBER ROESSLER: Thank you, Josie.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(Laughter)

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Until a quarter to

11, okay.

MR. KATZ: Yes, sure. So folks on the line I'm going to put the phone on mute but we'll back up at a quarter to 11.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:29 a.m. and resumed at 10:45 a.m.)

MR. KATZ: We are back. This is the INL Work Group. Let me check and see if we have our Board Members on the line back on. David, are you on?

MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.

MR. KATZ: Great. How about you, Phil, are you back on the line?

(No audible response)

MR. KATZ: Okay, I don't hear Phil but I think we lost him towards the end of the other session.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, so we're back looking at the agenda. The first bullet we have completed, unless there's any other lingering thoughts. Okay.

(202) 234-4433

So the second bullet is discussion of NIOSH's response to SC&A's evaluation of internal monitoring for the fission and activation White Paper that was put out October 2015, and NIOSH's came out February 25th.

So do we, do you want to hear from SC&A first, or just go right into NIOSH's summary? Any other --

MR. BARTON: We're pretty good --

(Simultaneous speaking)

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: You're all -- it looked like it was to me. I just wanted to make sure there was no other discussion needed. Then Tim, go for it.

DR. TAULBEE: This is going to be real short.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: The SC&A comment or observation was that they felt that a coworker model should be expanded beyond the 1967 to 1970 time period.

And really, when we were writing the ER,

it was, and we specified that particular time period, it was more to try and explain that we clearly knew we had to have a coworker model in that time period for the dose reconstruction to be feasible.

And that was our main goal there because we knew they changed the monitoring from a routine monitoring to a one quarter of their workforce each year.

So they were no longer monitoring everybody on an annual basis or on a quarterly basis, and they changed it to where they were going to be just monitoring part of the workforce that was exposed.

We didn't mean to imply that we wouldn't look at coworker model over the whole time period because we were certainly going down that path as well.

The interviews that we've conducted, both previously and since that, you know, since we started the INL Work Group discussions again clearly indicate that we do need a coworker model over the whole time period because we do have workers who have indicated that if they got, and rad techs confirmed this, that if they got contamination on their hands but nowhere else on their body, they didn't necessarily send them for a bioassay. It was only when there was facial contamination that they would send them for a bioassay.

So there are certain times where workers could have been exposed to internal radionuclides, fission activation products and have not been monitored.

We do have thousands of bioassay, as you had indicated in your review. That you didn't feel anybody was excluded, but you did feel that we did, we should expand the time period.

And basically, our conclusion is we agree. So we will be doing the coworker model for the entire time period at INL.

MR. BARTON: Now, would this be one that would use the implementation guide, or is that still --

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MR. BARTON: -- kind of in the pilot stage?

DR. TAULBEE: It would use the --

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, so NIOSH and SC&A are in agreement. You'll use the implementation guide and you'll develop a coworker model.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Any discussion from Work Group members?

And that will run from the whole time period --

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: -- 49 to 70, okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. Actually it's

going to go beyond 70.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: We will be going out into

the 80's.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Possibly up to 90. I'm not sure.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And we'll review that when we get to that. Okay. So there's no disagreement, this would be put in abatement. How does that work?

DR. TAULBEE: Abeyance.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Abeyance, yes, thank you.

MR. KATZ: I mean, the question is closed.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: The question is, but --

MR. KATZ: Yes, so it's just a matter of if they're going to develop a coworker model, then they'll review it.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And review it.

MR. KATZ: Exactly.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: I just didn't know the correct terminology of where you put that. Okay, there's no other discussion on that. MEMBER MELIUS: Do you have a timeframe for that?

DR. TAULBEE: We can get to that down here in the one on the timeline.

MEMBER MELIUS: So we may come back to it. But I may have some questions but I'll --DR. TAULBEE: Okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MEMBER MELIUS: I'll hold them.

DR. TAULBEE: I'm sure you're going to have questions, trust me.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So I asked SC&A to put together a matrix so that we could, the issues are many and we started off a couple of years ago back in, what, 2011 with the Site Profile. And now we're at the SEC.

And trying to just get a handle and keep a handle on where we are. Even this matrix is a little more unusual than what I'm used to in the past. But because we don't have any actual findings, we have more observations. But it is together on one spot. DR. TAULBEE: Is it both the work, or the TBD issues and the --

(Simultaneous speaking)

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: No, those are separate. Those are still separate.

DR. TAULBEE: Okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: As they should be. So generally, we don't go back to the Site Profiles until we resolve all the SEC issues. And I suspect this is going to be a living, growing document.

MR. KATZ: And then some of the SEC issues may end up on the Site Profile.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, yes.

MR. KATZ: Matrix later.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So I don't know if everybody had a chance to review it or if, John --

MR. STIVER: I can say a few things about it.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MR. STIVER: Basically, the issues matrix as it stands reflects the observations that we made in our papers that were delivered back in October.

Looking at the, you know, basically the CPP Class Definition and also the review of different areas where NIOSH felt that they could reconstruct doses. That would have been test area north, some of the reactor, the reactor modeling issue.

Excuse me, the use of TBD-5 Tables 522 and 523 and OTIB-54 as index, using an index radionuclide to assign fission activation product and actinide doses, the model for FAP based on bioassay which we've already seen and central facilities. I believe those are the ones that we looked at.

And so what I did is I, actually Steve and I, Ostrow together, went ahead and set those up according to each one of those papers being a major issue with sub-issues as needed.

And basically, the observation, the references to it, annotations based on Work Group discussions and also annotations as to where we believe we need to concentrate effort. Basically, it comes down to doing more and more data capture.

At this point, there really are no findings because we don't have the data we need to have a complete analysis of what's available and to draw conclusions from that.

Having said that, Bob and Joe who were lucky enough to escape the blizzard at the end of January were able to get out to Idaho and did some data capture there. And Joe has also done some follow up work out in Seattle.

And so I don't know, it's basically a tabulated version of the progress update that I gave back in the November Board meeting. So I don't know if it would really be a lot of, much value to go through each one of these line by line.

If you've already seen them and, you know, it's in the transcript. It's basically just trying to keep track of everything that's on the table at this point.

One other thing I would like to ask the Work Group for input on, I basically limited this to actual deliverables, to papers that we have

Having said that, there are also other issues like the burial grounds, CPP pre-63, Ron's paper on the fission activation product, index of radionuclides.

These things are all contingent upon gathering new data. And so I did not, anything that does not have an actual deliverable assigned to it I did not include in the issues matrix.

If the Work Group would like me to do that, we could certainly add those in. I mean, this is kind of an oddball situation. It's not like we have a complete picture to work with. And so, you know, it's not like most of the issues matrices. It's kind of a living document.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes. So I quess for me, we generally have an Evaluation Report, and from that you flesh out issues and that's what we would develop the issues matrix from.

Burial ground definitely is going to So as we go, I think this needs have some issues. to look more like, more issues need to be put on

NEAL R. GROSS

www.nealrgross.com

this. And I believe the burial grounds will be a good example of that.

MR. STIVER: Okay. So we can go ahead and put all the issues that we are working on, whether or not there has actually been a paper delivered.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

MR. STIVER: Okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Because the, I think, the reason I wanted to get this started is so we could track what's out there and what the issues are and where we're going, and prioritize them.

MR. STIVER: Right.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And I know it's kind of a little --

MR. STIVER: The evaluation report's kind of a work in progress too, so it's, you know, we're sort of playing catch up.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes. So maybe we'll step back a little bit. We've got the Class Definition kind of separated out and we'll report

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

on that and maybe take the time that we need to develop the matrix from the Evaluation Report.

Also, I know this needs to go on the BRS system.

MR. STIVER: BRS, yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: I looked for it, it's not there.

MR. STIVER: I haven't put it up there yet. I wanted to get the input on flushing it out completely before we do that. That's just the mechanics of getting it.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Sure.

MEMBER MELIUS: On one of these we should have, for those where a paper hasn't been delivered, we probably should have a schedule for that, when to expect that paper.

MR. STIVER: Yes, I mean, that's all contingent on what we find in the data capture.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: But at least have it there so that then, like Jim said --

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

MR. STIVER: People decide and yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: -- and we can

prioritize.

MR. STIVER: Yes, there will be annotations instead of when we can make some sort of projection, reasonable projections as to when that should happen. Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, and I like the way you separated them out from areas. I think that's an important factor. You know, central facility, CPP, TAN. I that, and burial grounds, I think that's going to be important for us to keep track of the various areas.

MR. STIVER: Yes, and as we dig deeper and, you know, get more of a feel for what the, what we consider the main points might be, of course it's going to sort of get bigger and bigger and more complex.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

MR. STIVER: We might even consider splitting it out of the various components depending on how that goes. But that's kind of down the road at some point. Right now we just need to capture it and prioritize. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, and it may just lend itself to that as you continue to put them in separately with the different facilities. ANL West will --

MR. STIVER: That will be a separate --ACTING CHAIR BEACH: -- be separate. That will be --

MR. STIVER: Separate --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: -- separate as well.

MR. STIVER: -- evaluation all together.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So any other comments or that you saw with this matrix that --

MEMBER ROESSLER: Josie?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes?

MEMBER ROESSLER: This leads me to the thing you asked me about earlier. And something that I guess I would like to see if this were possible. And I think it would help not only the Work Group but the Board when we're talking about this very large, complex site over a number of

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

years, and I've talked to Tim about this before, some sort of a diagram or a matrix where we have a listing.

Well, and this is in the Site Profile, but I guess I'm looking for a more simplified diagram of the --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: One page?

MEMBER ROESSLER: Well yes, maybe. The various areas on the site maybe across the top and the dates, pertinent dates that we're dealing with down one side. And then in the block, the status of that particular place and during those dates.

And under that status I guess, you know, where we are on it. And then maybe a link or a reference. Here's where you can go to get more information.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Sounds like the BRS.

MR. STIVER: Yes, that sounds like the BRS. I mean, that's really --

MEMBER ROESSLER: Like a what?

(202) 234-4433

MR. STIVER: The BRS will have all the capabilities.

MR. KATZ: The Board Review System which is --

MR. STIVER: The Board Review System.

MR. KATZ: -- what the Procedures Work Group uses now. Now another of other Work Groups are using it in their SCC or --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. STIVER: For ease to link different documents to different findings.

MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes, because then you would have a whole picture where you can, you've got it all in your head and --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. KATZ: Gen, someone can show you how to get to that BRS.

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. KATZ: And then they have live links so you can get to documents that are associated with findings.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MEMBER ROESSLER: Okay, so this is

already available?

MR. STIVER: Oh, yes. Absolutely, definitely. --

MR. KATZ: It's not available right now.

MR. STIVER: Not right now, but it will be once we get the --

MEMBER ROESSLER: It will be.

MR. STIVER: Yes.

MEMBER ROESSLER: Okay.

MR. STIVER: BRS is available, we just don't have the matrix in there yet.

DR. TAULBEE: But one thing we could possibly do for each of the different areas where this is, maybe a half page summary or so for all of the issues at CPP, all the issues at test area north.

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. STIVER: Yes, yes. Eventually I think we're --

DR. TAULBEE: So that Gen can see, you know, what are all the issues within this area.

MR. STIVER: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: I think BRS is --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: That would be separate.

MR. STIVER: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Because what you started out with was, like, a one pager. But then you grew it to the BRS which is a huge area.

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. NETON: It won't do the first part of what you talked about.

DR. TAULBEE: Exactly. That's what we're trying to do.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Which I think the overview is one thing.

MEMBER ROESSLER: This is, I'm looking for an overview so each time we have a meeting --

MR. STIVER: Yes, that's different from the BRS.

MEMBER ROESSLER: -- I or a Board Member can say okay, this is a total.

MR. STIVER: Get down to see the one

MEMBER ROESSLER: This is a total site. These are the areas that are in, and if they're not on there then we know they're not. We keep asking questions about is that a part.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So it seems like that's a two part. The first part, Tim, can you develop something like that as a one-pager?

DR. TAULBEE: I think I can.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: That kind of --MEMBER MELIUS: It will be a scroll.

DR. TAULBEE: I have some ideas on how I can try and link those together to help you and other Board members.

MEMBER ROESSLER: I can see us, we got to keep moving along. This will help the Board, Board Members who are not as involved as we are.

MR. STIVER: It's only going to get more complex too.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: What are we going to call that?

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

DR. TAULBEE: Issues overview?

MR. STIVER: Issues overview.

DR. TAULBEE: Issues overview.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So not to be confused with the matrix or the BRS, but just, like, a single page --

DR. TAULBEE: What I plan to try and do

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Quick reference. MEMBER MELIUS: A Roessler.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: A quick reference, how's that.

MEMBER MELIUS: The Idaho Roessler.

DR. TAULBEE: What I will try to do is develop this and tie the different issues by, you know, like, the BRS has a number I believe associated with each one of the issues, to try and tie them graphically into an area so that then they can see it as well as summary one page for each of the areas as to what happens.

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. KATZ: That's organized by findings.

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. TAULBEE: Findings one, three, and seven are associated with this area, two, four, and six are here.

MR. STIVER: Right.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: There was an instructional page that went out, I think, at the last Work Group meeting --

MR. STIVER: Yes, Amy put together --ACTING CHAIR BEACH: -- on how to get

into the BRS.

MR. STIVER: Amy put together an instruction sheet.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: I have a copy of it.

MR. STIVER: I can have her re-send it out.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, have her re-send it out.

MR. STIVER: It's pretty intuitive.

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. STIVER: It is, it is.

MR. KATZ: John, I don't think it's going to the whole Board so I can forward the list to everybody.

MR. STIVER: No, but just navigating through I think is what we're talking about.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, it's super easy.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, and Josie, this is Joe. Keep in mind too that all the data capture and interviews that we're doing at the beginning of the year are really to see whether potential issues become findings as far as the ER.

So the earlier, of course, you know, the pre-70 for burial grounds, pre-63 for CPP for example. We don't have findings, these are issues that are in discovery right now. So in a sense, the listing is going to be a little fluid as we continue and get closer to knowing, you know, what the data tells us.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Right. And we'll talk about that more in a path forward to where, what we need to do as a Work Group and how much time people need to develop and come up with different issues and findings.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, it's to the fact to what Gen was saying though because you really have three things happening at the same time for Idaho which is unusual for most sites.

You know, we have the ongoing review of the recommended SEC class for CPP workers, for which we're involved with the deliberation on a class definition. We are going back and doing a traditional ER review for those years that NIOSH has determined it can dose reconstruct. Those are the earlier years, and evaluate that for the first time.

And then we have the reserved years that go later which NIOSH is still actively researching. And so all that's going on in parallel.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes. And hopefully we'll get an update on that from NIOSH this afternoon.

MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes. We have to keep the dates in mind, and we have to keep the areas

in mind. And it's kind of hard.

MEMBER MELIUS: And two sites.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And two sites, yes. We haven't even got to the second site, but we will in March. Yes. Okay.

MR. KATZ: Are we going to expand this Work Group to cover ANL?

DR. TAULBEE: They are separate. It would make no sense.

Keep in mind that before the SEC petition, because the sites did combine at the end, we were combining documents for one site and rolling the ANL stuff into the INL. So we started out we were only doing one evaluation. But we had to split it because in the time period, they were two physically separate sites.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: I think it makes sense.

DR. TAULBEE: But now they are one currently.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Now they are. Okay. Anything else on the matrix? Thank you for putting that together. I know it's not finished, a work in progress. Comments, questions before we move on past the matrix?

The next one was we were looking for an update from SC&A on the prioritize list of the 52 reactors. I thought you said that that was going to be in but it --

MR. STIVER: Yes, it's done but it has to go through DOE classification review. And it turns out that their reviewers are on vacation, both of them, this week.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MR. STIVER: They won't be back until the 6th. So I'm kind of being held up on a technicality. But Steve can probably give you, like, a thumbnail sketch of kind of what --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Sure.

MR. STIVER: You still on, Steve?

DR. OSTROW: One thing of good news. The 52 reactors all together which is from the list and Stacy's Proving the Principal book from the year 2000, but of those 52 reactors, we can actually

(202) 234-4433

subtract a few right away.

Twelve of those reactors are in ANL West, so we're not considering that now.

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. OSTROW: The whole program to consider, but they're not considered either. And the two of them listed in Stacy's list were never operated all together. So it's not quite as daunting as 52 reactors.

As John said, we finished our Evaluation Report. We were prioritizing them. But it hasn't been DOE cleared yet, so we'll probably get it in a couple of days when it's cleared.

We looked at all the remaining reactors and tried to classify them in three priority Classes, high, medium, and low. And it was based on such things as the fuel type, like, the enrichment of uranium in it, whether it's a plutonium reactor, fuel reactor composition, things like the coolant.

And we also looked at the operating

regime, how they operated. This is all to prioritize it to see if OTIB-54 can pull it up, the cases they have in there. They have nine cases. Whether they envelope the actual reactors that I know.

We had done this already for the reactors in the test reactor area, the three material test reactor and the other two materials reactors, and we did for the reactors in TAN. So it turns out that if you add that all up, we have 28 remaining reactors to categorize as low, medium, and high.

As you know from reading all the INL reactor stuff, you know, the Site Profile and so forth, a lot of the reactors at INL were totally different than operated anywhere else. It was basically an experimental station.

It had reactors, like, in the aircraft nuclear propulsion area. It had reactors that were investigating the failure fuel that might be used in power reactors, the commercial reactor industry. And rather than operate within safe limits, they were deliberately or sometimes accidentally push to failure. So they operated differently.

Also, unlike most reactors, since these were all experimental reactors, most of them operated for only short periods of time. And sometimes when you were operating, they were put in birth mode where they produce a huge amount of power for very short amounts of time.

So anyway, conclusion is that the resulting fuel mixture, spent fuel mixtures were a lot different in a lot of the INL reactors than from the reactors that are listed in OTIB-54.

So given that, we tried to prioritize which ones to look at first, the high, second the medium, and third category low. So that's basically what we did. And it should be coming out in a couple days after DOE has a chance to look at it.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Thank you, Steve.

(202) 234-4433

132

MEMBER MELIUS: Steve, how many are in the high category?

DR. OSTROW: Okay, I'll tell you. I have the report in front of me here.

MEMBER MELIUS: That's what I was hoping he would get to.

DR. OSTROW: Let me look. Here we go. We have of 28 reactors we actually categorized, 13 are in the high category, 8 are in medium, and 7 are in the low category.

But of the 13 in the high category, a few of them are very similar, like, where they did a series of three or four similar reactors. So they could be evaluated together probably. So anyway, 13, 8, and 7.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: When you got to the 12 ANL West ones, did you do anything with them or did you reserve them?

DR. OSTROW: The ANL West, I just, I also did using the Site Profile, Stacy's book, and a lot of independent research, I wrote for each reactor including the ANL ones a summary description of some of the main features of the reactor, what they did, what the fuel composition was, what I can find fairly quickly. So we won't be starting off from zero when we do the ANL West.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Perfect. So that's not lost, that's all I was curious.

DR. OSTROW: Yes. As I was doing it, all 52, I just captured as much information as I could about each reactor without actually, you know, going deep into the neutronics of each one.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So that will be a carry over, and much time to digest it, I'm sure. Anything else on the reactors?

DR. OSTROW: Not from me.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Thanks, Steve.

DR. OSTROW: You're welcome.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Anybody on the phone, questions for Steve?

(No audible response)

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, that takes us to the next discussion, the timeline when INL bioassay data set will be available. DR. TAULBEE: Okay.

MEMBER MELIUS: Next.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. This is an issue that there was some miscommunication on our end with when this data set would get started to be coded. To just recap, the data set, we had coded it once, this particular data set.

And in the process of going through analysis to develop a coworker model even before the implementation guide, we found significant errors within the data set. And so we discussed this internally and we decided it needed to be coded again and checked against kind of a double key entry if you would, a new data coding, and then the old data coding to try and come up with a good data set.

The coworker implementation guide that Jim came out with, and if you recall we committed for Savannah River and INL to do two test cases here, and we are still planning that.

INL is falling a little bit, well not a little bit behind, significantly behind right now. There was a misunderstanding in that we thought that the data was being coded or was being worked on at this time, and it had not.

This was discovered earlier this, well earlier last month, February, in that some of the resources working on the ER that were required to get the data set going. And so we have actually lost about three months from that standpoint.

So the current projection dates for the data to be cleaned up to where everybody could then begin to use it for the in vitro would be November right now. We are working with a contractor to try and move that up from a priority standpoint.

So we are working with them on that. And then the current project plan for the in vivo side, the whole body count would be February of 2017, that's about a year from now. So not great news from that standpoint.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: What was the date again, December?

DR. TAULBEE: February.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: February, oh February.

DR. TAULBEE: 2017, yes for in vivo. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, so we're --DR. TAULBEE: We are talking, and this is a very large data set, the vitro, the in vitro alone I believe is around, what, 60,000 data entry points or something along those lines.

We have set, and other people will hear this when we get to full Board meeting in Tampa. But like, on the Savannah River data sets that we ran into some difficulty with them not passing the QA tests, and so they had to be corrected and they have now passed them.

But the implementation guide certainly set the bar pretty high for us and some of the sets that we thought were okay to go were not. And like I said, we have corrected those, applied the QA sampling plan to them, and they passed after they had been basically gone through every line again. So the data corrected --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So then after these two dates, it still takes time to develop the coworker model, or is that -- DR. TAULBEE: It does, but it goes pretty quick.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: -- run hand in hand?

DR. TAULBEE: This is the long part. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: The hard part is getting the dataset set, if you will.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Right.

DR. TAULBEE: That and the documentation of their monitoring methods, the other aspects of the implementation guide. That can take three to four months. But it runs in parallel.

The key was to get the data set going, and this is where I feel like we've lost three months. And this is my fault from not tracking it more closely in that while the data set's being coded, other things can be worked on, and then they marry up at the end.

DR. NETON: I'll take part of the blame for --

DR. TAULBEE: No, it's good. It's good.

DR. NETON: We had a five percent error rate on the general fields, but I cited a one percent error rate on the actual key data field that result itself seemed appropriate. And that's where we had some trouble meeting that criteria.

DR. TAULBEE: I mean, Savannah River's, for example, was 1.38 percent. So it failed but just barely. But doesn't matter.

DR. NETON: Citing a 95th percentile based on the data and you can't code it within five. You know, if you have a five percent error rate on the data, what does that really mean? So I thought one percent on the critical field was appropriate.

And you should be able to code data. Basically transcribing information from one point to the next. But that did cause a little bit more delay than I certainly expected.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, any questions?

MEMBER MELIUS: So is there any way to

speculative, shoot me down if this is wrong, but is there any way of looking, taking a look at the bad data set and looking at some of the parameters of the implementation guideline in terms of reaching certain initial assessment on what's going to be, might be infeasible to do for coworker modeling?

DR. NETON: Potential stratification and using the full data set as it is?

DR. TAULBEE: For INL? I'm not sure because one of the major problems that we ran into was the area indicator and the variations of MTR and TRA, ETR, ATR all being spelled out kind of differently but it's all one area, the test reactor area.

So what was one of the areas, we had, like, 14 variations within the data set for the same area. And so it just trying to marry that all up, and then finding errors within that was what was causing --

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. NETON: I think it's worth taking

a look at, though. I would recognize, it might have some merit there to move things forward. If you know you can't do it with the bad data, well, I'm not sure.

MEMBER MELIUS: Well, you can at least identify the issues and then you decide, well is this issue going to be resolvable when you have a better data set.

DR. NETON: I think we can take a look at it, yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: I mean, you've already identified the issue. To me that's to take an initial look at it and I think you could do, that wouldn't be problematic unless you worried more when people were --

DR. NETON: Okay.

MEMBER MELIUS: -- you know, and you could, you weren't sure how to resolve, they were put into a totally different area or missing or something. Just, again, when I look in the data set, I don't want to over --

DR. TAULBEE: We can look at that and

give you some feedback on it.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, how did you capture that, Tim? I've got an initial look at, you're looking at a bad data set?

DR. TAULBEE: Well, we're looking to see is there anything that pops out as a potential SEC type of an issue.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Like, even though the data set is bad, I can think of one particular thing is looking at all of the years, looking at, you know, do we have, are we missing an entire six month period here or, you know, a year period here.

There are things that we can do even with the bad data set from that standpoint to --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, that makes sense.

DR. TAULBEE: -- see if there's some blaring problem that would cause a problem.

MEMBER MELIUS: Sometimes your data will show that there was a change in monitoring.

DR. TAULBEE: Those are clearly --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MEMBER MELIUS: -- but you weren't aware of.

DR. TAULBEE: Oh, that we weren't aware of, yes, yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: You know, go back in time.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: And it may not have been documented or --

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. TAULBEE: Sure, yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: -- didn't mention or didn't remember it.

DR. TAULBEE: Sure, yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So is that something just in a White Paper, a memo, kind of

DR. TAULBEE: We can do a, probably do a White Paper from that standpoint because it's going to be preliminary. I mean, we're -- ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

DR. TAULBEE: We got it coded for coworker anyway, I mean, we agreed earlier that we need a coworker model for the fission products for the whole time period. That's definite. So it's one of those things we're going to do. It's just

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Sure, okay.

DR. TAULBEE: -- I think Dr. Melius is looking for something that might be indicative or a problem from and SEC standpoint.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes. No, that makes sense.

DR. TAULBEE: That's fine. So we'll try and do a White Paper on that.

MEMBER MELIUS: Or even where you want to separate out years and modify the model.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: In terms of what areas could be covered or, I don't, you know.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, anything else on that?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS MEMBER MELIUS: Just an aside. Is there a, I can't remember the agenda. We still have time, don't we?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Oh yes, we got lots of time.

MEMBER MELIUS: We have until, didn't you give us until the fourth or something, this week to --

MR. KATZ: I did.

MEMBER MELIUS: Oh, okay.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Oh, yes, yes, yes.

MR. KATZ: Well, what do you think of that agenda --

MEMBER MELIUS: Savannah River. I mean, without a coworker model or the addition of the agenda, this --

MR. KATZ: No.

MEMBER MELIUS: Well --

MR. KATZ: Or do you want to just handle it when the Work Group parts having someone talk, update on that SRS?

MEMBER MELIUS: Update.

MEMBER MELIUS: I mean, it is an SEC issue. And I think we can get notice.

DR. NETON: I mean, we can certainly talk about it.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, I don't --

DR. TAULBEE: I can give an update of where we're at and why it's not out yet. So --

MEMBER MELIUS: But tell us about what, you can talk about what could be done. Same thing we're talking about here, makes sense to do there.

DR. TAULBEE: Well actually, there's two of the data sets are now fixed.

MEMBER MELIUS: Done, yes.

DR. TAULBEE: They're fixed.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, Savannah River is moving further along.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

MR. KATZ: Do you want a separate

section?

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, sure.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. KATZ: Sure, sure.

DR. TAULBEE: It'll be literally two to three slides.

(Simultaneous speaking)

MEMBER MELIUS: Okay, on this transcript. It really can't be very small.

MR. KATZ: The INL section won't be that long if we're not getting into much other than the one, right? It won't be as long.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: No, it won't. Well, we might go a little longer than that.

DR. NETON: We can do more than five. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes. Okay, well good.

(Simultaneous speaking)

DR. NETON: Before we get into the ALS, I know Joe Fitzgerald kind of out together a summary about the data capture efforts, to identify those. Maybe it would be a good time to put it in?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, I was going to put that in the next one. But no, that's fine. That's fine.

MR. FITZGERALD: I mean, either way.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Go, go ahead. You're there.

MR. FITZGERALD: All right. Well, I think we covered some of the backdrop on this. You know, Idaho is, the way it's framed up in terms of the ER and SEC is kind of complex.

The piece that I've been focusing on with a couple of my colleagues has been sort of a more traditional ER review which is the not reserve years, not the Class Definition per se, although that's being researched, but the years that I think NIOSH has determined to ER that they can go through the structural which is where the burial ground, that would be pre-1970, for CPP would be pre '63.

And there's some other facilities like the central facility there at the CFA for which we were also looking at the same kind of issues.

We put out a, as soon as I think Tim and his team finished with their onsite data captures for Argonne West, that was sometime late September, last fall, we initiated immediately sort of a Work Group SC&A data capture, begin researching these earlier years and were able to get onsite at Idaho to look at the search results and to interview some workers.

Back in September, this was late September, some of us didn't quite make it. There was a blizzard in DC. But we did manage to get, I think, a number of good days in.

MEMBER MELIUS: Excuses, Joe. Come on.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: You have a sled dog too, don't you?

MR. FITZGERALD: But in any case, you know, again the Site Profile review, unlike maybe some other sites, didn't make much ground on some of the issues that we were of interest to us, including the burial ground.

So we're doing in a sense, some real just fundamental research, looking for documents, reports, interviewing former workers who may have had time either at the burial grounds or the earlier years of CPP, looking for subcontractors.

(202) 234-4433

I think that was a useful exercise, just really talking to a number of subcontractors, crafts workers, and you know, posing the question to them on badging at CPP. I mean, I think it's a very useful validation point to actually talk to workers and how they were badged and how they entered CPP and other facilities on site.

So again, I think it was a useful and timely way to do that. But just briefly, January 25th to 28th was the first onsite review that we've done. That's not to say that Tim and NIOSH haven't been out there.

I think for over a year and a half, they've been looking at documents. So we're only talking about specific reports and documents that might be more narrow and specific to some of our concerns that that would be in addition to what's already on the SRDB are being collected.

So this is a much, in terms of size, much more narrow review. And I think the interviews and hopefully the Work Group and himself likewise, a number of interviews were very helpful. We did talk to some former workers, many of whom were in their 70s and 80s were talking about the 1950s and '60s. So again, we're going back pretty far. But we've had some very helpful discussions.

And I think some of the things that we learned are still being recorded as summaries that will be available to the Board. But things we heard, at least for the burial grounds, were that, you know, work planning was, in my view, better than I had thought it was.

But bioassays and perhaps in terms of symmetry was more scant, wasn't quite very developed at the time. I think we've heard that from a number of people.

And we did talk to some very experienced HPs about CPP contaminations, particularly with the Shift Lab, and I think some of that feedback is helpful to look at the reserved years on CPP if nothing else.

It does help to frame the period during which improvements were being made at CPP. So I

think that, likewise, is very helpful, if not directly to us but certainly to Tim and his team.

Again, we talked to a number of subcontractors. And I think that was reassuring. They were clear that they were afforded the same level of RAD protection controls as were the employees which, you know, if you recall in Hanford that was not the case, and that was the basis for the SEC extension there.

That was very useful to find out how managerial wise and programmatically how subcontractors and the craftsworkers were treated, how they were afforded the level of protection and the monitoring that employees were. And it looked like it was very comparable.

Anyway, we went beyond the onsite review. And there were a number of workers due to age or incapacity that were only available by telephone. And ATL was instrumental in setting up a number of telephone interviews that we did on the 16th of February.

So we were able to catch a number of

workers that just couldn't make it to INL in January. And that too I think proved to be a very useful thing.

Just generally, things learned is burial ground workers in the early years were contaminated fairly often, did have to shower at the end of a work shift. And they would leave urine samples, but it wasn't a routine thing. It did not become routine until the '70s. That's kind of the general feedback.

Air sampling was available, but it didn't seem to function well in the early years, that's what we kind of heard. Some limited alpha smearing. But again, the reliability was such that I think that was the feedback that we heard from a number of sources.

And I think Tim pointed this out in one of his White Papers that the Work Group received, we had a pretty experienced health physicist, you know, emphasize that internal dosimetry was not really appreciated in the earlier years, we're talking '60s and late '50s, '60s, what have you. And more bioassay samples could have been taken. This is related to burial grounds and other facilities. But that did not really improve for some years, until the '70s.

At the chem plant, again, the notion was that contamination was progressively pushed back to the cells and CPP during the '80s with more accountability to what DOE was implementing in those days in terms of an ALARA policy.

But that didn't get real teeth until the 835 regulations were promulgated in '90, '91. So it's beginning to get a little better enveloping of the time when contamination control was beginning to be more effectively implemented at CPP.

Again, these are issues in progress. This is sort of a quick profile of some of the more noteworthy feedbacks. But again, this has to be pinned down a lot better, but we're still going at it.

Just last week, I think it was last week, we actually chased down, this is NIOSH and

155

myself, we chased down some remaining documents that were at the National Archives in Seattle.

And it's still not quite certain to me, maybe Tim knows better, but a portion of INL's records, these are relevant records, came to find their way to the National Archives in Seattle.

And so those pieces, whether it's years or facilities, you have to go there. And that review I think was helpful in just being able to, in my case, go through the pretty much all the authorization forms for RAD waste that moved into the site INL or across the site to the burial grounds for probably '59 through '67.

And it was very helpful to see exactly what was being handled and what kind of exposure rates you were looking at and what types of radionuclides were being packaged.

So again, the take away from there is I think it seems Idaho had a pretty good RAD waste planning process, much better than I've seen at other sites, which is encouraging.

Most of this, not surprisingly, was

mixed fission products and Rocky Flats plutonium contaminated waste. Pretty much confirmed that was 99 percent of what was being handled. No surprises in that regard.

What's coming up? In two weeks, we're going back to Idaho to look at I think the final sets of packages. We have some DVDs, we have extensive documentation on waste packages and also contamination control. And we'll spend a couple days and I think Ted's going to attend that as well and pretty much polish off the original data capture request from October.

So this should, I think, complete the first installment. And based on what we learn from all that, we'll have to decide what else we want to look at. But I think in general Idaho has been scrubbed pretty well in terms of documents.

I think the interviews have been pretty extensive, so we've got a pretty good running start. Recognize, you know, for an ER review, this is still the earliest stage where you're basically trying to figure out if there's, you know, real findings that are going to be offered up in the way of White Papers for Work Group attention.

So we should be there, my guess, in the next couple months, deciding on that. So anyway, any questions on that?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: No questions here, but thank you, Joe. That was helpful to have that all lined out of where you're at and what you've been doing.

DR. TAULBEE: I can give a little bit more of an update on Seattle.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, sure.

DR. TAULBEE: As Joe indicated, some of the records have apparently been determined to be National Historic information, and that they have been transferred from what's called the Federal Records Center in Seattle over to the National Archive side of the house.

And so these records are being gone through and indexed and grouped together into folders like the RAD waste management reports from MTR for example, and those from CPP, they're all

being lumped together, or not lumped together but separated out by folders and indexed at the National Archives level.

They're not done in going through all of the boxes that they've gotten from FRC. They took us into the back to the stacks to show us and there were, what, was it 50?

Yes, I'm talking about the ones in the archives. I want to say there was, like, 40 to 50 boxes that they have that are still up there in the shelves that they are moving from full sized record boxes into the small National Archives that are easier to handle, but it takes about three or four of those for each of the other boxes.

So they are in that process. Now what's interesting is that some of those records we had gone through a year ago in December of 2014 as part of the initial INL SEC because some of the boxes that we, the new indexed ones when we went through them were like we've seen this before.

And so there is some overlap from a previous request. There's also some that SC&A had

(202) 234-4433

gone out to in 2010, Kathy DeMers had been out there and we found some of the exact same forms that are in the SRDB that are now in the new records box.

So there's a transition that is happening out there, and some of it we have seen. I don't know that we'll be able to get a full picture of it until we see it, once they got it all in there from that standpoint.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So will you need to go back when they finish their archiving?

DR. TAULBEE: That depends. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Possibly?

DR. TAULBEE: That depends. I mean, quite possibly depending upon findings that Joe and his team comes up with with regards to both of the ERs as to whether we need to follow up and go back to there, from that standpoint.

But I did want to let you know that they are being indexed, but there is a transition that is happening out there.

> ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Great, thank you. DR. TAULBEE: And once, by the way,

once they are pulled by the National Archives, they are National Archives' records. The site cannot hold them back. These are permanent out there and you have to go there. There's no other way to get those records.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Interesting.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes. The ones at the FRC the site can pull back for us, but the ones that have moved over, they cannot even though they're the same building.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: All right. So one more site visit it sounds like for you all. And any other questions or comments on that work?

MR. FITZGERALD: To put this in, I think Gen's framework, we're in the issues to findings phase. And I think as Tim pointed out, once we're able to present these findings to the Work Group for consideration, that will then open it up for whatever further review, you know, both NIOSH and SC&A would need to do.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Sounds

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS MEMBER MELIUS: Sort of like adolescence to young adulthood?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: Chaotic and, you know, now it's --

MR. FITZGERALD: We're almost at the teenage stage.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. So before we get to the ANL West, let's just make sure we have all the actions and kind of maybe some timelines for what we discussed in the first bullet. I don't know if SC&A if you want to, what your actions are or I'm just looking for some --

MR. BARTON: We have 30 extra claims to look at.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes.

MR. BARTON: With respect to the Class Definition.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Do we get a timeline on that?

MR. BARTON: We do. We can get that turned around pretty quickly.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Pretty quick? MR. BARTON: Yes.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. Pretty quick, yes. Pretty quick, that means by tomorrow? MR. BARTON: I'm working on it right

now.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Are you really? MR. BARTON: No.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: No. So fairly soon, in the next month or so?

MR. BARTON: Yes, maybe. MR. STIVER: About another month or so? MR. BARTON: Yes, a month. That's it. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, so that's --MR. BARTON: They're both doing it. DR. TAULBEE: For us it will be two

months.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: For, okay.

DR. TAULBEE: I mean, we're not going to really get to that until after the Board meeting. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: That's fine. So

a couple of months down the road before we get those

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

162

together.

MR. BARTON: Get presentations.

MEMBER MELIUS: Slides, lots of slides.

MR. BARTON: Get the approved.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, and then how about drafting the proposal, is that something you can do now or do you need to wait until after the this 30 or --

MR. BARTON: Well, I guess I'm a little curious because I was a bit confused on what we were validating because I thought we were talking about the latter period which was, you know, the joke about staying at Brad's house.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: No, you're going to validate --

MR. BARTON: Here we're talking about the earlier period.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: The earlier period.

MR. BARTON: I guess I'm not sure. I mean, the SC&A team needs to get together and try

and figure out an approach, but I'm not sure how we would do that beyond what Tim has already looked at.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, so --

MR. BARTON: I have that chart with the comparison of the monthly reports, and badges is really the best way to do it. I don't know how else.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So, I mean, I guess that's why I want to come back to it to make sure we were clear. So that Tim has done in the chart, nothing written of how and what they did other than maybe just counting. Are we waiting for validation after everything's been indexed and is that what we're looking at?

MR. BARTON: As I understand it, we have the temporary badge reports and the area exposure reports for that earlier period. I think, and I'm not sure, is there a question that they're not, I mean, one thing we said that we don't have all the visitor cards per se, but that indicated that although visitor cards were actually entered on those temporary badge reports.

I mean, that might be one thing that would be worth checking out. If we find visitor cards that are on those temporary badge reports --

DR. TAULBEE: You could possibly do that, the visitor cards that we have starting in '68, you could compare those to the temporary badge reports from '68, '69, '70. Those could be, that could be done.

MR. BARTON: So that would be one thing that we can, we might take a look at. For the earlier ones, unless I'm going to go capture those little visitor cards themselves, I'm not sure what we can do beyond what Tim presented.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. I guess that might be one of our answers. So what about waiting until after they're all indexed and is that

MR. BARTON: Well, from what I'm hearing there's no intent to get those visitor cards from the earlier years.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: All right, sounds

MR. BARTON: I mean, we can go get them, but --

DR. TAULBEE: I mean, we can go get them, but they --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Sounds like that's going to be part of the proposal then is brainstorming how to, if there is a way, there might not be a way to validate or verify.

MEMBER MELIUS: You could sample.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Or sample, yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, yes. I'm not saying get them all, but sample from them.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So it might be, yes. Which once you come up with a proposal, I guess we can kind of vet it through the Work Group and see if there's more that needs to be done.

> MR. KATZ: Is that 30 days? MR. BARTON: That's probably not --(Simultaneous speaking) MR. KATZ: Thirty days? DR. NETON: For a proposal.

_ _

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: For the proposal.

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. BARTON: Yes, we can get our team together, brainstorm, and put something together.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, so we're looking for a draft proposal in a White Paper form.

MR. KATZ: Yes. I mean, it can be a very brief memo.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, or a memo. Okay.

MR. BARTON: Commit to sample and do the sample and --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: No, no, no. That will be in the proposal whether we all decided that's viable or not.

MR. BARTON: Yes. Okay, thank you.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Make sense? Any other questions on any of that?

(No audible response)

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: And then NIOSH has got the quick overview of all the sites and the issues and the dates and kind of scroll. The Roessler report? Oh wait, no, it's not a Roessler report. I'm just teasing, Gen.

MEMBER ROESSLER: Good.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay. And then NIOSH has the initial look if there's any problems with those, the data set and the bioassay coworker model, any potential problems. How long do you think that will take?

DR. TAULBEE: I'll get back to you on that.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: You can say six months. You can say, I mean --

DR. TAULBEE: At least three.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

DR. TAULBEE: Three months. Right now the team that would be doing some of that work needs to do the work to get the data coders coding.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Got you. Got you. And that's fine.

DR. TAULBEE: There's a template set up and there's things they need to be involved in.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, okay. Any

other discussion on those issues ahead?

(No audible response)

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: So then we get to ANL West. We know there's a report out. Anything, oh wait, sorry.

MEMBER MELIUS: You skipped over the reactors.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: We talked about the reactors.

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, but the follow up. We're going to get a report.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, we're going to, I just --

MEMBER MELIUS: I assume it's a proposal on, in effect on what should be reviewed.

MR. STIVER: The prioritization, yes.

MEMBER MELIUS: Prioritization. So the Work Group's going to have to look at that report.

MR. STIVER: That's something we could just have distributed because it will be ready in about a week or so. MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, but then the Work Group needs to meet and see if we're going to task, what we want to task on.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Maybe we can do a phone call on that one?

MEMBER MELIUS: Yes, that's what I was thinking.

MR. KATZ: And it might be helpful to have some resource information on how much you can bite off in what kind of time, right? Aren't you going to want to know? I mean --

MR. BARTON: Yes.

(Simultaneous speaking)

MEMBER MELIUS: Your prioritization was, like, basically cutting them in half. It was eight, so I mean, it's I think --

MR. STIVER: Thirteen, basically.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Thirteen high, eight medium, seven low.

MR. STIVER: Those highs though, they kind of can be grouped together.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MEMBER MELIUS: You'll get it, but we

need to look at that and decide.

MR. STIVER: Okay.

MEMBER MELIUS: Can you give us some estimates on, or we can talk about that on the phone, have those ready if we do a Work Group meeting by phone.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes. I --

(Simultaneous speaking)

MR. STIVER: Yes, the only, yes, classification review is holding it up right now. ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Well, I suspect we're going to want to talk about the draft maybe as a Work Group too. So there's a couple of things we can schedule a Work Group call. So that, the first action items we talked about would be part of that, you know, talking about the draft. So maybe we could correlate those together, Jim.

MR. KATZ: Was that protocol, would that be --

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, on the verification.

MR. KATZ: The V&V?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Yes, the V&V. And maybe get a report out on those 30 additional claims. I mean, those are things that we could look to for a call on.

Okay. That makes sense. And yes, and I wasn't, I just put that as a carryover thinking we would get you. But you're right, Jim. Thanks for dropping us back there.

ANL West, I know we have the report out. Anything more to say on that?

DR. TAULBEE: No. We will be giving a full presentation to the Board about the ANL West SEC for those of you who seem to, we are recommending a Class beginning of the time period. So that's kind of where it is.

MR. KATZ: Thick report.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes, it is a very thick report. It will affect your, I think your list of 52 reactors, the ANL ones that were excluded. I think some of them are still going to be excluded because they operated in that early time period where we identified a significant issue.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay.

MR. STIVER: Are we going to look at that at the Tampa meeting?

DR. TAULBEE: Yes.

DR. NETON: Is that report out yet?

DR. TAULBEE: Well, it's out to the Work Group but I don't think it is clear at the final public release yet. So the petitioners have not yet received it. As soon as it clears DOE it will be FedEx'd out to you, to Brian and Mr. Wolz as soon as we get that cleared.

But I think as John mentioned that part of what's holding up the 52 reactor is that the people in D.C. that reviewed this were out.

(Off microphone comments)

DR. TAULBEE: Which we didn't know at the time.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: All right.

DR. TAULBEE: Yes, as you see, it's a pretty lengthy report. But I think it's well done by my team.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Good. So then we

have path forward for SEC Petition Evaluation.

MR. KATZ: We've covered that.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: I think we've covered that. And then petitioner comments. Any other petitioners on the line or any petitioners at all wish to make comments?

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: Okay, hearing none, Work Group recommendation's plans for the March Board meeting, I think we pretty much covered that also. So I'll draft a report out, send it around to the Work Group, and then go from here. Okay?

MR. KATZ: That's good.

ACTING CHAIR BEACH: All right, and then I think we can close. We're adjourned.

MR. KATZ: We're adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting in the above-entitled matter was concluded at 11:50 a.m.)