1	DR. MELIUS: (Off microphone) (Inaudible)
2	MR. ELLIOTT: Well, we have 443 claims for
3	Fernald; we've finished 51.
4	UNIDENTIFIED: (Off microphone) (Inaudible)
5	MR. ELLIOTT: (Off microphone) I'd have to go
6	through these. They're not in (Inaudible).
7	DR. DEHART: If we're going to do that, let
8	Jim put the slide up and then we can figure out
9	where it goes on this chart.
10	DR. ZIEMER: Yeah, Jim, can you (Inaudible)
11	that slide?
12	MR. ESPINOSA: Or could we have somebody type
13	it in or
14	Paul, can we get somebody to type that in up
15	on the screen?
16	UNIDENTIFIED: (Off microphone) Can you put
17	your slide
18	DR. ZIEMER: Yeah, can you pull that slide
19	up, Jim, slide number
20	DR. NETON: (Off microphone) (Inaudible)
21	DR. ZIEMER: slide number five, or not?
22	DR. NETON: What I would propose is a slight
23	modification of the slide where I could if you
24	recall, I had green dots for just whether it was
25	finalized or in OCAS review. I would suggest that

I would make it a little more detailed and put in the ones that have actually been approved that are out on our web site.

MR. PRESLEY: Yes.

DR. NETON: That's not a problem.

MR. PRESLEY: Larry, are you going to take these in the order they are?

MR. ELLIOTT: I was planning to.

DR. MELIUS: The thing I think we need to talk about is for tasks one and three, which we'll deal with in closed session. But someone needs to take a look at the task order for those and the schedule for that 'cause depending on our decisions tomorrow there may be deliverables for those that come due within that next two-month time period and -- and, you know -- and for the work that's contingent on that, and I think we need to figure out how that's -- might -- how that might fit into the schedule and if this -- may be as simple as just defer -- deferring that to the conference call, also, but that may be a little bit -- again, the schedule --

DR. ZIEMER: I don't think we'll know till we talk tomorrow, though, because recall that last time we changed some deliverable dates.

DR. MELIUS: Yeah, I just get a little concerned that -- this sort of mix of closed session and open issues, and I agree with you, it's -- till we -- made some decisions, we don't know, but at least we ought to be thinking about it so we can talk that if this is what needs to be done and -- and what's the contingency schedule 'cause presumably if it's something -- a task is awarded, then there'll be some time for NIOSH to process it, so what will that time frame be.

Maybe it's something -- the second conference call becomes something we have to do something at.

DR. ZIEMER: Okay, here's the chart. Fernald is the first one, 443 claims.

MR. ELLIOTT: In-house and 51 completed. And when I say completed, these are the -- over to DOL for decisions.

DR. NETON: I'd just like to point out that there is no site profile completed for Fernald at this time. Those are in house -- many of those chapters are in house for review, but those must have been completed under the DOE complex-wide technical bulletin I talked about this morning, just so the Board's aware of that.

MR. ELLIOTT: Hanford -- Hanford would be

1,631 claims, 64 completed. INEEL, 566 claims, 26 1 completed. The IOP is Iowa Ordnance Plant, 554 claims, zero completed. Mound, 273 claims in 3 house and --4 DR. ZIEMER: Whoa, whoa, whoa, you skipped --5 5 MR. ELLIOTT: On, LANL, I'm sorry --7 DR. ZIEMER: K-25. MR. ELLIOTT: Okay, well, let me give you 8 Mound -- I'm on Ohio, so let me give you Mound, 9 10 273 in house and 18 completed. Let me go back to Tennessee and get K-25. K-11 25, 972 and 30 completed. 12 13 Los Alamos, 551, nine completed. Mound, 273, 18 completed. Nevada Test Site, 868 claims, 21 14 15 completed. And you can make any comment about 16 this while I'm searching. I mean there's several 17 comments you might want to make about some of 18 these -- like you did on the first one, you know -19 20 DR. NETON: I need to -- I need to fill out 21 these circles tonight with some little finer detail. I can do that. 22 23 DR. MELIUS: (Off microphone) Might you also 24 put some of these numbers into a slide and give us

25

(Inaudible)?

24

25

DR. NETON: (Off microphone) Well, I was hoping one of our people were taking these down, but (Inaudible) -- I'll get the numbers and I'll (Inaudible). I'll put them on a slide.

MR. ELLIOTT: Paducah, 732, ten completed. Pantex, 279 -- or excuse me, 297, eight completed. Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant -- is that next? Yeah. Okay, that's 314 and 12 completed. Rocky Flats, 807 and 26 completed. Savannah River Site, 1,965 claims, 515 completed. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, X-10, 997 claims, 2-- I think it's 25 completed. And Y-12, 1,989 claims, 120

You want to go into AWEs?

DR. ZIEMER: Can you give us the ones on that next slide, Bethlehem, Blockson, so on?

DR. NETON: You want that next slide for

MR. ELLIOTT: Bethlehem Steel, 494 claims, 448 completed. Blockson Chemical, 107 claims, 49 completed. Huntington Pilot Plant, 63 claims, 23 completed. Mallinckrodt Chemical Company and this is on Destrehan Street -- 163 claims, 24 completed, so that does not include the other

Mallinckrodt sites. That's only Destrehan Street. 1 While we're there, though, Weldon Spring plant, 2 3 129 claims, seven completed. Aliquippa Forge, 21 claims, three completed. 4 I can't report on -- my report is not 5 generated so that I can easily provide you numbers 6 on complex-wide uranium facilities. That's a 7 large number of different sites. Nor can you -- I 8 don't think I've got anything here for Tennessee 9 Valley Authority. I don't believe we've done any. 10 11 DR. ZIEMER: Jim, when you provide your slide tomorrow, will that then indicate the status of 12 the -- the reviews on the --13 DR. NETON: I can break it down into whether 14 15 -- whether the green means that it's actually approved and available for review now or --16 17 DR. ZIEMER: Yeah, that's what I'm asking. 18 DR. NETON: (Off microphone) -- under -under (Inaudible). 19 20 DR. MELIUS: Some idea whether it's 21 comprehensive or complete. There aren't large sections that are reserved that would -- that 22 you're working on that --23 24 DR. NETON: Right, I think --

DR. MELIUS: I don't think we want our

contractor to review something that's half done. I mean and -- or where there's large, important things that are going to affect a lot of claims completed. Now if it's something that affects a small number or whatever, it's not an important issue, then I think that's different.

DR. NETON: (Off microphone) My gut feeling, there are very few that have large, gaping holes. An exception may be residual contamination in AWEs we haven't figured out yet (Inaudible). I hope I can fit it all in one slide. I mean this is already kind of crowded and (Inaudible). I might try to break it into two.

DR. ZIEMER: Okay. We will return to this topic then tomorrow as part of our work session.

Now we're going to adjourn here momentarily. I do want to ask Jim if you would provide a straw man wording on your proposed motion for tomorrow concerning a letter to the Secretary, and that'll give us an opportunity then to do some wordsmithing, if necessary. Okay?

Any other comments before we recess? We're going to recess until 7:00 p.m., at which time we'll reconvene for the public comment session of our meeting.

1	DR. MELIUS: Just one more thing just to
2	reiterate for tomorrow morning if Martha or
3	somebody could provide for us what any other
4	scheduled tasks should scheduled products or
5	deliverables, should tasks one and three get
6	awarded in the near future so that we can figure
7	that
8	DR. ZIEMER: Or at least if there's some
9	items that we need to take action on right away,
10	then
11	DR. MELIUS: (Off microphone) (Inaudible).
12	DR. ZIEMER: Right, thank you. Then we'll
13	recess until 7:00 o'clock this evening. Thank
14	you.
15	(Inaudible) this room and you should be able
16	to leave things here if you need to.
17	(Whereupon, a recess was taken to 7:00 p.m.)
18	INTRODUCTION
19	(7:00 p.m.)
20	DR. ZIEMER: Good evening, everyone. This
21	session this evening is the public comment period
22	portion of the 21st meeting of the Advisory Board
23	on Radiation and Worker Health. I'd like to
24	remind you, if you haven't already done so, to
25	please register your attendance with us tonight.

There's a book at the back table. Most of you I think have already registered. If you neglected to do that or missed it, please do so so we have a record of your attendance with us here tonight.

My name is Paul Ziemer and I serve as
Chairman of the Advisory Board on Radiation and
Worker Health. I would like to spend a few
minutes here at the beginning, particularly for
the benefit of a number of visitors who we have -and we do welcome, particularly those from the
Savannah River Site that are with us here this
evening. I'd like to take just a few minutes and
familiarize you with the role of the Advisory
Board with respect to the larger program, the
Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation
Program. And then we will have an opportunity for
-- primarily for public comment, hearing from you.

We do actually ask that if you wish to make public comment, you also sign up to do so. Some of you have already done that. If you do want to make public comment and have not already signed up to do so, Cori in the back has the sign-up sheet for public comment. The reason we ask you to sign up is simply so we have an idea of how many wish to comment and whether or not we need to restrict

or apportion the time accordingly.

But let me begin then and take just a few minutes to talk a little bit about the role of this Advisory Board. I already indicated this is our 21st meeting. This Board has been meeting regularly for the past two years, actually, which means that we meet nearly every month. And one of the questions is what do we do. And I want to familiarize you with that so that when you make your public comment, what you say might be helpful to us in carrying out our role and our function.

Jim, if you'll advance the slide there.

of which we are a part involves a number of groups. There are a number of Federal agencies involved with this, and I'm not going to discuss their roles -- Department of Labor, Health and Human Services -- particularly NIOSH or National Institutes for Occupational Safety and Health, Secretary of Energy or Department of Energy, and the Attorney General. Those individuals and their agencies all have various roles that are defined by the legislation that brought this program into existence.

In addition to those Federal agencies then,

this Advisory Board exists. This Board was appointed by the President under authority that is spelled out in the legislation. Could we have the next slide?

The Advisory Board is specified as consisting of no more than 20 members appointed by the President, who also designates the Chair of the committee. Now in reality, the committee does not have 20 members. The White House has appointed just a dozen of us, plus there is a Federal official, and I'm going to introduce those folks in just a moment.

The Executive Memorandum that spells out the operation of this Advisory Board also specifies that the membership should include affected workers and their representatives, and representatives of the science and — or scientific and medical communities, as well.

So with that as a little bit of background, let me introduce the members of the Board. I'm going to put their names here on the screen -- Jim, if you'll give us the next slide -- and I will identify to you the various members of the Board. The slide also contains a phrase or two giving you a little idea of what their background

-- indeed, we have quite a cross-section of people. I've introduced myself as Chair, Paul Ziemer. 3 Our Federal official, who serves as our --4 essentially our Executive on this committee -- is 5 5 the Director of the Office of Compensation 7 Analysis and Support for NIOSH and that's Larry 8 Elliott. Larry, make a motion here -- no applause, please. 9 10 MR. ELLIOTT: (Indicating) 17 DR. ZIEMER: Then absent this evening, and he'll be joining us tomorrow, we believe, is Dr. 12 Henry Anderson, who's a medical officer from the 13 14 State of Wisconsin. 15 Antonio, or Tony, Andrade from Los Alamos 16 over here. 17 DR. ANDRADE: (Indicating) DR. ZIEMER: Roy DeHart, Dr. Dellart is from 18 19 the State of Tennessee, so glad to have Roy on the 20 committee. 21 DR. DEHART: (Indicating) 22 DR. ZIEMER: And then Richard Espinosa. 23 MR. ESPINOSA: (Indicating) DR. ZIEMER: Richard is from the Los Alamos 24 25 National Laboratory. And then continuing, Michael

1	Gibson, with Babcock and Wilcox* in Ohio.
2	MR. GIBSON: (Indicating)
3	DR. ZIEMER: Mark Griffon is an entrepreneur,
4	has his own consulting firm.
5	MR. GRIFFON: (Indicating)
6	DR. ZIEMER: Dr. James Melius, who is from
7	New York and involved with the New York State
8	Labor's Health and Safety Trust Fund.
9	DR. MELIUS: (Indicating)
10	DR. ZIEMER: Wanda Munn, a retired nuclear
11	engineer from the Richland, Washington area near
12	the Hanford site.
13	MS. MUNN: (Indicating)
14	DR. ZIEMER: Charles Owens, who's with U.S.
15	Enrichment Corporation in Paducah.
16	MR. OWENS: (Indicating)
17	DR. ZIEMER: Robert Presley, retired from the
18	Oak Ridge facilities, an engineer.
19	MR. PRESLEY: (Indicating)
20	DR. ZIEMER: And then Dr. Gen Roessler, a
21	retired professor, previously of Florida and now
22	living in the warm state of Minnesota.
23	DR. ROESSLER: (Indicating)
24	DR. ZIEMER: So that is the advisory
25	committee Could we have the last slide?

The role of the Advisory Board is three-fold, and this is also spelled out. One is that the Board is specified as being responsible for commenting and assessing what is being done, specifically by the NIOSH group, in terms of the rule-making that has occurred dealing with how one goes about determining probability of causation. The exact words from the legislation are specified here on the slide, but basically that is a role that the Board is required to carry out.

The Board is also required to advi-- and this advice goes to the Secretary of Health and Human Services -- to advise the Secretary on the validity and quality of the dose reconstruction efforts. And that's an ongoing process. In fact, the Board is in the process of -- of using a contractor to help it in -- help "it", the Board -- in carrying out this responsibility in evaluating the dose reconstructions that are being done by NIOSH and its contractor.

And then finally, at the request of the Secretary, the Board is to advise the Secretary on whether or not there is a class of DOE employees for whom it is not feasible to estimate dose and whether or not there's a likelihood that such

NANCY LEE & ASSOCIATES

individuals may have health endangerment due to their exposures to radiation. That then is related to what's called the Special Exposure Cohort.

The Board does not -- does not -- carry out the dose reconstructions individually. We do not process the cases, the claims that are made. We do not in fact deal with individual claims, but rather the evaluation and the review and the examination of the process by which these things are going on.

So in terms of the public comment, I need to tell you that we are not here at this meeting and our other meetings specifically in the role of a question/answer type of session. We do like to get public comment so that we understand what things look like out there. And even though we -- we do not deal and cannot in the public forum deal with people's individual cases, we're glad to -- if you want to share something about a case you may be involved in, we're glad to hear that insofar as it helps us understand how things are going, how people are -- how cases are being handled; are there things in the system that need to be looked at.

8 E