5 6

construction and other tradespeople do move after retirement and --

MR. TURCIC: Yeah, we -- we welcome that.

Sometimes it's hard because of privacy issues to get, you know, the administrators of those funds to allow us -- I mean we don't -- we don't need the names. You know, we'll give them the material that they could stuff the envelope. Yeah, that is in fact one of -- direct mailings have been our most successful method of outreach. And if anybody has any contacts or ideas, you know, we -- we appreciate them all.

DR. ZIEMER: Charles Owens.

MR. OWENS: I'm aware of the efforts that the Department is making at Hanford. Do you have a -- do you have a phased approach that you're going to do in regard to the outreach, and if you do, could you provide that approach to us, too?

MR. TURCIC: Yeah, we -- I sure will. What we -- what we're trying to do is we have a long-range plan and I'll get a copy -- you know, I'll get that to Larry and he can get it to the Board, and then we're -- you know, we have a quarterly plan. We try to stay -- you know, focusing in certain areas. Like I said, we just completed our

plan for the Cleveland office and where we're 2 going to focus in Cleveland is Fernald and Mound 3 because they are sites that are closing. And then the beryllium vendors, so that's where we're focusing in, you know, this -- this upcoming 5 6 quarter. But we'll get that -- we'll get that 7 plan to Larry and he can share it with the Board. 8 MR. OWENS: Yeah, I think that -- you know, 9 we've been very involved -- PACE has --MR. TURCIC: Yeah. 10 11 MR. OWENS: - in ensuring that workers who've been under-represented from a number 12 13 standpoint are contacted. And I know there are 14 some very good folks out at Hanford, and I'm 15 hopeful that your efforts will be successful. 16 week. 17

MR. TURCIC: Yeah. We'll be out there next

DR. ZIEMER: Robert Presley.

MR. PRESLEY: Pete, I know that we get a lot of complaints. I want to pass on a good comment. A person at Oak Ridge came to me last week that had gone through the beryllium program. She was very complimentary about how well she was treated

MR. TURCIC: Good.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PRESLEY: -- the fairness of the people 1 2 that she worked with on your program, and she was very complimentary and she wanted me to pass on 3 thanks. 4 MR. TURCIC: Thank you. 5 6 DR. ZIEMER: Thank you. Larry has a comment, 7 then we'll go to Rich. MR. ELLIOTT: Pete, on your slide on the 8 Special Exposure Cohort, this is the slide that 9 appears right before your outreach set of slides, 10 11 you talk about the total number of cases denied. I just wanted to make sure that everybody's aware 12 13 here that in the total approved cases there's a couple of cases that we have done dose 14 15 reconstructions on and sent back that were 16 approved. 17 MR. TURCIC: Absolutely. MR. ELLIOTT: These are skin cancer cases. 18 19 MR. TURCIC: Exactly. 20 DR. ZIEMER: Thank you. Richard? MR. ESPINOSA: Yeah, as far as outreach, I 21 22 know pretty much all the local unions have 23 newsletters that go out on a monthly basis, and I 24 would imagine that all the internationals have

magazines that go out on a monthly basis to reach

a lot of the people.

MR. TURCIC: We've found that what works the best is the local unions and -- 'cause a lot of times they'll have, you know -- they'll have the contact list that, you know, the internationals don't. So we -- we try whenever we can to also get the -- and we've done a number of direct mailings, you know, with the local unions -- and are willing to do that any time we can.

DR. ZIEMER: Pete, I was impressed by the remarkable reduction in initial claims processing time for this fiscal year. But it also at the same time raised a question. For example, on the AWEs you've gone from 183 days to 99, but since we're only four months or so into the fiscal year, how -- how do you account -- there can be no claims 180 days old this year anyway, so --

MR. TURCIC: Yeah -- yeah, there can.

DR. ZIEMER: How --

MR. TURCIC: Let me explain what the num--

DR. ZIEMER: So I'm really asking how you count them.

MR. TURCIC: Yeah, I'm sorry. That's a good point. It's -- we count it when it is processed,

no matter when it came in. So whatever quarter 1 DR. ZIEMER: So the completed processing --2 MR. TURCIC: It's -- yeah --3 DR. ZIEMER: -- so far this --4 MR. TURCIC: Yeah, so -- so -- and all the 5 claims, you know, on the average, the claims that 6 7 reach that -- that level of processing started, on the average, 99 days prior to that. 8 DR. ZIEMER: Gotcha. So it really is 9 comparing completed claims to completed claims. 10 MR. TURCIC: Yeah, and that has been the 11 trend really for about the last three quarters. 12 It was the beginning -- the beginning of FY 2003 13 we had a effort to work off our backlog, and so we 14 came up with a plan for our district offices to 15 focus on those claims. We worked off that 15 17 backlog, which -- you know, 'cause we started out with something like, you know, 20,000 claims on 18 19 day one. And when those got worked off, then that 20 added to the average time in the beginning of that 21 year. DR. ZIEMER: Thank you, Pete, for the very 22 23 informative presentation. 24 The Chair is going to declare a 10-minute 25 comfort break before our next speaker, and so

let's

let's recess till five after 11:00.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

## SITE PROFILE STATUS

DR. ZIEMER: We will come back to order.

We're going to have a session now dealing with

site profile status. Jim Neton will be the

presenter from NIOSH. Jim, you have the floor.

DR. NETON: Thank you, Dr. Ziemer. Good morning. It's my pleasure to present to you an update on the status of our site profiles. It's an area I think we've made some fairly significant progress in a number of efforts, and I've just outlined here the three subtopics that I'd like to discuss during my presentation. That is, one, where are we with the site profiles, progresswise. What have we done since the last Board meeting.

Also to talk a little bit about the status of the worker input effort. At the October meeting in St. Louis the Board requested that NIOSH draft a plan related to developing worker input or obtaining worker input on the site profiles.

And thirdly, I'd like to go off in a little bit of a different direction, talk about examples of dose reconstructions using what's -- what we

call complex-wide technical basis documents. I think this came up at the Board meeting in Las Vegas, and I thought -- I think the Board was interested in hearing a presentation -- an example of one of those dose reconstructions, so I'm prepared to discuss that in some detail this morning, as well.

Just as a reminder -- you've seen this slide I think a couple of times, but I just want to reiterate that -- what a site profile is. They're a limited-scope document specific for a site. They are essentially a road map to be used by dose reconstructors that contain site-specific information -- TLD measurement detection limits, exchange frequencies, that sort of stuff. And what it does is help standardize interpretation of data. As Dr. Toohey mentioned earlier this morning, we have a number of dose reconstructors working on this project in various parts of the country, so they need some sort of standardized documentation to refer to when they are doing these dose reconstructions so that we have some consistency in our approach. Again, basically used as a handbook. And as important, they are dynamic documents. We do our best effort to

1

2

3

obtain and retrieve all possible sources of information that we can. However, we cannot predict that something won't come out of the woodwork in one of these data capture efforts or a claimant might provide something, so we are committed to reviewing these things on an asneeded basis and updating them as new information becomes available that may change the dose reconstruction effort for a particular site.

2.5

As you recall, there were 15 DOE facilities being worked on in parallel by ORAU. This is a fairly huge effort, a large number of people working on this, a number of good HPs out there. The 15 were -- represent a combination of the biggest sites -- you know, the ones where we have a lot of claims, also, but also some of the sites where we have information that was readily available and we could move forward with them. If we complete these 15 DOE facilities, we'll have documents that address about 77 percent of the claimants. So you know, with 15 DOE site profiles done, that will allow us -- at least theoretically -- to move forward on processing claims for almost 80 percent of the claims.

Where we're at right now is over -- if you'll

recall, a site profile for the major DOB sites is a six-section document. They're called Technical Basis Documents, so six Technical Basis Documents make up a site profile. ORAU has completed 85 percent of the individual sections, or they're under review. So essentially what I'm saying is they're either in draft form or approved and completed. So the major work has been done on 85 percent of these chapters. I think that's a pretty good start. T've got a slide after this that'll show it a little more graphically.

On the complex-wide documents we've actually developed a few documents to help us move some claims through the process, even if we don't have a site profile. I believe the Department of Energy complex-wide profile or -- profile was discussed at the Las Vegas meeting, and I'll get into that a little later. It's a little bit of a different flavor document. It's not specific to the site, but they use certain maximizing assumptions that we can use for specific blocks of claimants. There are two complex-wide documents out there now. One is the complex-wide document that addresses Department of Energy facilities, and we also have a complex-wide document that

addresses Atomic Weapons Employers.

1

2

3

4

5

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay, this little graph just displays where we are. If you notice, there's sections 2 through 6 labeled here. I didn't include section one. Those are typically executive summary type sections. They're not really subject to delays based on availability of data and that sort of thing. They kind of naturally come along for the ride after these five major sections are completed. But the important thing to point out on this slide are the green dots. The green dots indicate that the -- that chapter is either approved and out there on our web site or currently in the hands of OCAS undergoing comment resolution -- review and comment resolution. So you can see three, four, five -- six of them -all but six -- nine of those sections are in our hands or out there and approved. And of the ones that are -- the ones that are green, 24 of those sections actually are already out there on our web site, so about a third of them are actually already out there and published -- or soon to be published. They may have just been released in the last couple of days.

The blue squares represent the ones that are

NANCY LEE & ASSOCIATES

actually drafted and in ORAU review. So we've got a number of them that are just about ready to come over to OCAS for review. But the important thing is the data capture efforts, the collection, the writing has been done. They are in the process of being refined.

And the red triangles represent that the draft is not complete yet, not in ORAU internal review. However, since I developed this slide a couple of days ago, two of the red dots have now become blue. This one is now internal ORAU review, that one is the Los Alamos environmental dose chapter, and the X-10 internal dose chapter is in ORAU review. So the only ones remaining with a red triangle right now is the X-10 external dosimetry chapter.

So a lot of progress has been made. I think you recall -- you know, we were hoping to get these all completed by the end of the calendar year this last year. We're pretty close. We're a little bit off and there's been some reasons for delays, but we're not too far off the mark.

Okay, what's the site profile status for the AWEs. There are of course a lot more of those. There are several hundred plus AWEs out there. We

have completed at least some of them -- Bethlehem Steel, Blockson Chemical, Huntington Pilot Plant, Mallinckrodt. We have out on our web site, although I will say that some of these have sections that are marked "reserved", and by reserved, that means that there is some issue that is preventing us from completing that particular section. It could -- that could come from a num-for a number of different reasons, but we still publish them with the idea that claims that can be done, even though those sections are still reserved, we'll move them out. And in fact we have done that for a number of these facilities.

The AWE -- I mentioned that we have this complex-wide TBD for uranium facilities, and I'll discuss that after I'm done with this part of this presentation. We have two new ones that just came in, Aliquippa Forge and the Tennessee Valley Authority, and they are in our hands right now and currently being reviewed.

There's a large number of AWE profiles that are currently being worked on by ORAU. I believe there's somewhere in the vicinity of 24 different ones that are being looked at right now. There's about 24 that are being looked at and have actual

scheduled completion dates.

There is a point of diminishing returns, though, when you work on these AWE site profiles. Many of these sites have small numbers of people, so we are currently undergoing deliberation as to how best to handle a lot of the remainder of small sites. It may well be that we end up having addenda placed on the back of some of the ones that are already completed because the processes were very similar. Just with some minor modifications we could accommodate the other facilities.

I just briefly want to talk about the status of the site profile rollouts with the worker input effort that we've put in place since the October Board meeting. We have a worker input plan drafted. It's currently undergoing review, but it does establish a worker outreach group. We've tasked ORAU with heading up the effort for us. Some of you know Bill Murray that works for ORAU now is heading up that effort in their shop, along with Vern McDougal, who's a subcontractor to ORAU. So we have the plan drafted, and it provides a framework for obtaining worker input. We are encouraging workers to provide input to the e-mail

sites -- addresses that we've established for each of these documents. There are individual e-mail addresses that a person could mail into and provide written comments. We're also encouraging input prior to the release, when possible. Of course we're moving these things fast and furious because we're trying to get claims processed in a timely manner. But where possible, we're encouraging input before the release. And of course after the release we -- in cases now we're going around the sites and having meetings with union representatives.

Public briefings are planned when necessary.

There are some sites that may not have organized labor representatives, some of these AWEs for example, or stakeholders, survivors may require some briefing, so we are open to having public briefings as necessary.

DR. ZIEMER: Jim, could I interrupt here?

DR. NETON: Sure.

DR. ZIEMER: It's safe to assume that the SRS meeting was last November rather than scheduled?

DR. NETON: Sorry, yes.

DR. ZIEMER: Okay. Thank you.

DR. NETON: Yeah, my mistake. Appreciate the

input.

And we have adopted a format of taking minutes at these meetings and -- with the sign-in sheets at the meetings, making them available to participants so that they can review what the salient points were discussed at these meetings and have a record for them. And also we hope to develop a list from these sign-in sheets of contacts for future -- future discussions, as necessary.

As Dr. Ziemer pointed out, the meetings are ongoing. We met at SRS in late November -- or early November. And Hanford, we were at the -- there on January 13th and 14th with -- had two meetings, one with the metal trades and one with the construction trades. Both of those meetings I will say I think were very productive for us. At the SRS briefing we had a -- some very good verbal input from the workers. We heard some interesting things, and as a result of that, we are committed to looking at the site profile for Savannah River to address the unique needs and exposure conditions of the construction workers.

At Hanford we also had some verbal feedback that was useful to us, and we are looking at