Division of Compensation Analysis ar Support Program Evaluation Report	nd Document Number: DCAS-PER-062 Effective Date: 11/02/2017 Revision No. 0				
Dave Allen, HP Team Leader	<u>11/02/2017</u> Supersedes: none				
Approval: <u>Signature on file</u> Date: <u>11/02/2017</u> J. W. Neton, Associate Director for Science RECORD OF ISSUE/REVISIONS					
ISSUE EFFECTIVE REV	NO. DESCRIPTION				

ISSUE AUTHORIZATION DATE	EFFECTIVE DATE	REV. NO.	DESCRIPTION
11/02/2017	11/02/2017	0	New document to determine the effect of revisions 1 and 2 to ORAUT-OTIB-0052 (Construction Trade Workers) on previously completed claims.

1.0 <u>Description</u>

On 8/31/2006, the ORAU Technical Information Bulletin (ORAUT-OTIB-0052) was issued titled "Parameters to Consider When Processing Claims for Construction Trade Workers" (OTIB-52). A PER (OCAS-PER-0014) was issued on 11/27/2007 evaluating the effect of issuing this document on previously completed claims. Also, in 2007 a review of OTIB-52 was issued by the Advisory Board's contractor. Revision 1 to OTIB-52 was issued on 2/17/2011 to close some of the findings from that review. An additional revision (revision 2) was issued on 7/24/2014 and the last finding of the OTIB review was closed on 11/25/2014.

Both revisions to OTIB-52 added language to clarify guidance for the dose reconstruction of Construction trade Workers (CTWs) but no values were changed. This PER is being prepared to consider the effect on previously completed claims of the change to guidance in both revisions of the OTIB.

2.0 <u>Issue Evaluation</u>

OTIB-52 provides for a correction factor if co-worker doses are to be used for CTWs. The correction factor is intended to be a favorable upward correction of the co-worker

Division of Compensation Analysis and		Document Number: DCAS-PER-062	
Support			
Program Evaluation Report			
Effective Date: 11/02/2017	Revision No.: 0		Page 2 of 6

doses to account for the CTWs having a different exposure potential than the population of other site workers. The correction factors do not apply to data from dosimetry actually worn by the CTW. Therefore, the evaluation of claims had to include a case-by-case review to determine if co-worker doses were actually assigned.

3.0 <u>Plan for Resolving Corrective Action</u>

3.1 Establishing a List of Sites

To establish the population of claims to be evaluated, the first step was to identify a list of sites for which coworker data had been developed using monitored site workers. Next, those sites for which a site specific PER is planed were excluded. This issue will become part of those site specific PERs. Table 1 lists the sites for which coworker data has been developed. The second column includes a "Yes" next to those included in this PER. Also, a PER number is included next to those for which a PER was completed and the evaluation of doses considered the revisions to OTIB-52.

Site	Included in this PER
Ames Laboratory	
Albany Research Center	
Area IV – Santa Susana Field Laboratory	
Bridgeport Brass Company	PER-61
Brookhaven National Laboratory	
Canoga Avenue Facility	
Clinton Engineering Works	Yes
De Soto Avenue Facility	
Downey Facility	
Electro Metallurgical Company	PER-68
Energy Technology Engineering Center (ETEC)	
Feed Materials Production Center (Fernald)	
Hanford	
K-25 (Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant)	
Kansas City Plant	Yes
Lake Ontario Ordnance Works	Yes
Los Alamos National Laboratory	
X-10 (Oak Ridge National Laboratory)	

Table 1 – Applicable Sites

Division of Compensation Analysis and		Document Number: DCAS-PER-062	
Support			
Program Evaluation Report			
Effective Date: 11/02/2017	Revision	No.: 0	Page 3 of 6

Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant	PER-49
Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant	
Rocky Flats Plant	
Sandia National Laboratories – Albuquerque, NM	Yes
Savannah River Site	
Y-12 Plant	
Extrusion Plant	Yes
Nevada Test Site (1945-1957)	Yes
Pacific Proving Grounds	Yes
Pantex Plant	
Pinellas Plant	
United Nuclear Corp.	
Weldon Spring Plant	Yes

3.2 Develop Population of Claims

The eight sites identified for evaluation under this PER collectively totaled 2486 claims. For each claim, a keyword search was conducted on both the Dose Reconstruction Report and the NOCTS database to determine if they could be classified as Construction Trade Workers. The keywords for which the search was conducted are provided in Attachment A. This process identified 1438 claims that met the search criteria.

An additional text search was conducted on the Dose Reconstruction Reports for claims from all sites (excluding those already identified above) to determine if there was any mention of the site names that are the subject of this PER. This search identified 754 additional claims to consider. The keywords listed in Attachment A were searched for in these 754 claims. This eliminated 223 claims from further consideration, resulting in 531 remaining claims.

The total population of claims with CTW employment needing further evaluation was then 1969 claims (1438 + 531).

3.3 Reductions to the Population of Claims Needing Evaluation

The following additional factors that could be used to reduce the population further were considered.

Division of Compensation Analysis and		Document Number: DCAS-PER-062	
Support			
Program Evaluation Report			
Effective Date: 11/02/2017	Revision No.: 0		Page 4 of 6

169 claims were removed that were duplicated between the two lists. This occurred when covered employment was listed at one site but another site on the list was mentioned in the dose reconstruction report.

260 claims were removed because they had a probability of causation (POC) greater than 50%.

59 claims were removed because they were completed after revision 2 of OTIB-52 was issued.

23 claims were removed because they were either in progress (a new dose reconstruction would use the current version of OTIB-52) or they had been pulled from dose reconstruction.

163 claims were removed because they qualified for compensation under an SEC and no longer needed a dose reconstruction for that determination.

267 claims were removed with Nevada Test Site (NTS) employment only after 1957. Coworker assignments at NTS only occurred between 1945 and 1957.

22 claims were removed that did not have Clinton Engineering Works employment in 1948 or 1949. These are the only years that coworker doses are assigned at this site.

These reductions created a total of 970 claims being removed from the population of claims resulting in a total of 1006 claims to be further evaluation.

3.4 Results

The 1006 claims were evaluated to determine if coworker doses were assigned and if so, whether the energy employee should have been considered a construction trade worker. Those meeting both criteria were reviewed further to determine if the OTIB-52 correction factor had already been applied. If not, the dose for each was recalculated using revision 2 of OTIB-0052 as well as the current revision of any other applicable documents.

Of the 1006 claims, 1 claim resulted in a recalculated POC of greater than 52%, while 992 resulted in a POC below 45% or no change. One claim resulted in a POC between 45-50%. For this claim, IREP was run 30 times at 10,000 iterations per NIOSH procedures. The resulting POC was less than 50%.

Division of Compensation Analysis and		Document Number: DCAS-PER-062	
Support			
Program Evaluation Report			
Effective Date: 11/02/2017	Revision No.: 0		Page 5 of 6

An additional 12 claims were returned to NIOSH for a new dose reconstruction prior to evaluation under this PER. Those claims were reworked using current methods including revision 2 of OTIB-0052 so they were removed from further evaluation under this PER.

NIOSH will provide the Department of Labor with the list of all the claims evaluated under this PER. Further, NIOSH will request the return of the 1 claim that would now result in a probability of causation greater than 50%.

Division of Compensation Analysis and		Document Number: DCAS-PER-062	
Support			
Program Evaluation Report			
Effective Date: 11/02/2017	Revision No.: 0		Page 6 of 6

Attachment A

Below is the list of keywords used during the keyword search portion of this PER evaluation.

Craft	iron	teamster	plast	maint	crane
boil	Skill	pipe f	equip	engineer	radiographer
asbestos	rigger	sheet	metal	linem	ship
plumb	construction	n machinist	insulator	weld	mason
tile	black	millw	heavy	electric	operating
cement	truck	paint	brick	laborer	pipef
carp					