

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

+ + + + +

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL
SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND
WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

75th MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY
FEBRUARY 25, 2011

+ + + + +

The meeting convened at 8:30 a.m.,
Eastern Standard Time, in the Marriott Hotel &
Suites, Two Tenth Street, Augusta, GA, James M.
Melius, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

JAMES M. MELIUS, Chairman
HENRY ANDERSON, Member
JOSIE BEACH, Member
BRADLEY P. CLAWSON, Member
R. WILLIAM FIELD, Member
MICHAEL H. GIBSON, Member
MARK GRIFFON, Member
RICHARD LEMEN, Member
WANDA I. MUNN, Member
JOHN W. POSTON, SR., Member

NEAL R. GROSS

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

PRESENT: (continued)

ROBERT W. PRESLEY, Member

DAVID B. RICHARDSON, Member

GENEVIEVE S. ROESSLER, Member

PAUL L. ZIEMER, Member

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

REGISTERED AND/OR PUBLIC COMMENT PARTICIPANTS

ADAMS, NANCY, NIOSH Contractor
AL-NABULSI, ISAF, DOE
BURGOS, ZAIDA, NIOSH
CRUZ, RUBEN, CDC
EVASKOVICH, ANDREW
FITZGERALD, JOE, SC&A
HAND, DONNA
HINNEFELD, STU, DCAS
HOWELL, EMILY, HHS
KINMAN, JOSH, DCAS
KOTSCH, JEFF, DOL
LIN, JENNY, HHS
MAKHIJANI, ARJUN, SC&A
MAURO, JOHN, SC&A
NETON, JIM, DCAS
REUTMAN, SUSAN, DCAS
RUTHERFORD, LAVON, DCAS
TAULBEE, TIM, DCAS

*Participating via telephone

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESENTATION OF VITRO	6
Stu Hinnefeld	
VOTE ON WHETHER SEC SHOULD BE GRANTED	25
TO ALL AWE EMPLOYEES WORKING AT VITRO 1/1/58 THROUGH 12/31/59 - Passed	
SEC PETITION UPDATE	28
LaVon Rutherford	
PETITION DISCUSSION - CHAIRMAN MELIUS	
LINDE PETITION	52
WAH CHANG	56
NORTON	59
VITRO	61
GRAND JUNCTION OPERATIONS OFFICE	65
BLISS & LAUGHLIN	67
DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY	72
CHAPMAN VALVE MANUFACTURING COMPANY	75

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

8:36 a.m.

CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. If I can get everybody's attention, we'll get started.

We have a relatively brief agenda this morning. We have everybody here but Phil. He should be down shortly and I'll turn it over to Ted to do the usual.

MR. KATZ: Sure. So, actually, we're missing Josie who is just helping out with something.

We're missing a laptop, so we can't proceed with the presentation, but we have Vitro.

So, just to let people who are the line know we're having a little technical difficulty here. We're missing our computer for our presentation. But we'll get started on Vitro as soon as we can. We're just in a holding pattern right now.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I would like to
2 at least look at one letter while they get
3 set up here. There's one in your package of
4 letters. It's a letter to Mr. Yundt and
5 which is the ANWAG letter that we received.

6 Also for the sake of our
7 attorneys, the Wah Chang and the Linde
8 letters are getting slightly revised. Okay.
9 As long as you know.

10 So, this is the letter response
11 to the inquiry about OTIB-0049. If anybody
12 has any changes, questions whatever, Matt
13 will just send it.

14 MR. HINNEFELD: This is - if I
15 might. Dr. Melius, on this letter to Mr.
16 Yundt, we actually didn't call the NIOSH
17 Chair's attention to the issue, the
18 technical issue. It was brought to our
19 attention by, essentially, a technical
20 reviewer of TIB-0049.

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Oh, okay.

22 MR. HINNEFELD: Said, notified,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 as a member of the ICRP, notified ICRP that
2 there is this data available that describes
3 more inside of the Class and so they then
4 contacted us -

5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

6 MR. HINNEFELD: - and asked for
7 our data and we provided them the data that
8 we had obtained in our effort.

9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I'll clarify
10 that then.

11 And why don't we go ahead and get
12 started then? Are you ready on Vitro?

13 MR. HINNEFELD: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. We're
15 going to do the Vitro Manufacturing SEC
16 Petition which information is in your
17 packet.

18 MR. HINNEFELD: Good morning for
19 anyone on the phone. This is Stu Hinnefeld,
20 the Director of the Division of
21 Compensation, Analysis and Support at NIOSH.
22 And I'm here to present a summary of our

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Evaluation Report on a petition for Vitro
2 Manufacturing plant in Canonsburg,
3 Pennsylvania.

4 The petition under consideration
5 today is an 83.13 Petition. We received it
6 in July of 2010 and the petitioner proposed
7 a class, all employees who worked in any
8 area of the Vitro Manufacturing facility,
9 Canonsburg, during the time period from
10 January 1st, 1958, through April 30th, 1960.
11 At the time that we received the petition,
12 this was in what was considered the residual
13 contamination period for Canonsburg, because
14 the designated covered period at that time
15 was from about 1942. It was very early,
16 1942 through 1957.

17 We qualified the petition for
18 evaluation on the basis that the petition
19 claimed - says exposures were not monitored
20 during that period and we had not obtained
21 any records of exposure monitoring during
22 that period. So it did appear that that was

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 a suitable basis.

2 Now, we have previously provided
3 to the Board an Evaluation Report and the
4 Board has concurred with our recommendation
5 adding a Class for Vitro from 1942 through
6 1957. In that situation, that was a .14, an
7 83.14 petition that we determined we don't
8 have enough information.

9 The complicating fact or one of
10 the key complications about the Vitro plant
11 is that they process ores and residues and
12 other recovery-type materials that would
13 have not only uranium but the whole string
14 of uranium progeny in various sort of
15 disequilibrium and so we didn't - you know,
16 you can't really place very much with it and
17 for early years, up until about 1953, there
18 was some uranium and bioassay and there was
19 external monitoring up to then. But the
20 uranium bioassay doesn't allow you to
21 extrapolate to what other radioactive
22 materials in the progeny would have been

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 there as well. And we didn't have a method
2 for doing that.

3 The new petitioner's assertion
4 was that, hey, things didn't change in 1958.
5 We were doing the same thing in '58 and '59,
6 right until the time the plant closed in
7 1960 as we were doing before. So, just a
8 little background. We've been through this
9 on the last petition, so I'll be kind of
10 brief here. Canonsburg isn't far from
11 Pittsburgh, because as I recall it was kind
12 of right off I-70 and I don't recall if
13 that's called the Pennsylvania Turnpike yet
14 or not, there.

15 They had performed for the
16 Manhattan Engineer District and AEC. It was
17 a uranium recovery plant and a recovery
18 plant would take all sort of process, sort
19 of byproducts from various uranium
20 production operations and recover the
21 uranium values from it - scraps. And it
22 also had some contracts to recover uranium

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 from mills, including things that were
2 considered essentially waste by the mills,
3 you know, things - essentially mill tailings
4 that the mills had already processed once
5 but Vitro was good enough at getting uranium
6 out of it that it was still worth it to
7 process them again to get some uranium out.

8 Then they started in the '50s,
9 they started receiving a series of special
10 materials licenses because they were also
11 doing some of this processing for commercial
12 customers, not just the AEC, although they
13 were providing uranium to the AEC as well.

14 The shipment of the 10 tons of
15 residue, you know, in January, was part of
16 the process of the AEC deciding if they were
17 going to keep using Vitro or not. This was
18 a waste product or a product that they had
19 actually, according to our information, they
20 had processed it already a couple of times.
21 Maybe three times in some places for the
22 uranium residue, you know. They went back

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 through the process and they just felt like
2 they couldn't recover anything worthwhile
3 out of the same ore so they had it sitting
4 around. It was AEC-owned material. The AEC
5 said we want you guys to store it until we
6 tell you, but if you need the property it's
7 on, let us know and we'll try to get rid of
8 it.

9 So, along about shortly before
10 this, Vitro was doing a renovation and some
11 construction projects and they wanted the
12 footprint where this material was stored.
13 And they told the AEC, hey, you know, we
14 want our footprint back - our property back,
15 and so the AEC finally found a place to ship
16 this to. This site in Blairsville is a
17 waste disposal site which is, I think this
18 is Blairsville, Pennsylvania probably, which
19 is a little bit east of Canonsburg. It was
20 a waste disposal site owned by the
21 Pennsylvania Railroad Company. So, that's
22 the Blairsville site where this stuff went

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and it went as a waste. But during
2 this time then Canonsburg - or Vitro started
3 importing some residues from Port Hope in
4 order to process. And they didn't just
5 process it for uranium. They had other
6 heavy metals or, you know, rare earth metals
7 that they were to cover for other products
8 for commercial customers.

9 Now, the plant closed in 1960 and
10 various documents give different dates,
11 whether it was April or May or whatever.
12 But sometime in 1960 the plant closed. When
13 the plant closed, there were at least two
14 storage piles of Port Hope residue still on
15 the property. And the ultimate
16 decontamination work through the burial of
17 those still on the property didn't occur
18 until more in the mid-'60s.

19 Sources of available information are
20 sort of the typical ones. Well, we don't
21 actually have - we have Technical
22 Information Bulletins and procedures that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 are applicable to some portions. We don't
2 have a Site Profile for Vitro.

3 Interviewed seven former
4 employees specifically for this Petition
5 Evaluation Board, including, one of those
6 was the petitioner. We have information
7 that exists in claimant file that the
8 petitioner also provided documentation and
9 then from our various data captures, the
10 information in our Site Research Database.

11 Our data capture efforts were
12 kind of our typical list. The DOE and
13 predecessors, including their FUSRAP
14 reports, various Internet searches, NARA in
15 Atlanta and so forth.

16 Now, all the people we
17 interviewed gave information that was
18 consistent with what the petition had
19 provided. I mean, they didn't all remember
20 exactly the same things. They couldn't all
21 remember exact dates, things like that. But
22 the information was all consistent. And

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 there was limited information from any of
2 them about the clean-up operations because
3 I'm pretty sure the people we interviewed
4 were all gone either before the plant closed
5 or they left when the plant closed. And
6 that clean-up occurred then in the following
7 years. I think a subcontractor company was
8 brought in to do that. And so there was,
9 you know, as a general rule, the workers
10 didn't really know their customer, if they
11 were making this product for the AEC or for
12 a commercial customer.

13 This is our dose reconstruction
14 history for Vitro. You can see we have
15 about 27, I guess, claims at the time this
16 was filled out, 14 of which are in this
17 period - have at least some employment in
18 this period. Clearly, some of those have
19 sufficient periods of employment before 1958
20 that they were pulled for the SEC - the
21 earlier SEC. For these claims in this
22 period we don't have any internal or

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 external dosimetry. As I said earlier, that
2 stopped about 1953 or '54, what we were able
3 to find in those areas.

4 Now, the contract. There was a
5 contract that ended with the AEC in 1957 and
6 that's what I described earlier. That was
7 that waste material that was sitting there
8 that AEC asked them to store for a while and
9 they eventually shipped to Blairsville was
10 sort of in line with wrapping up that
11 contract. And so like I said, the plant
12 shut down operations in 1960. And from our
13 understanding it closed and they closed, you
14 know, everybody went away. It was closed
15 for a while. The property was ultimately
16 dispositioned to other owners and I think it
17 ended up with the county or the city for a
18 while. And if I'm not mistaken, they built
19 a park on it and a baseball field.

20 Okay. But while this one
21 contract did end in 1957, in our research we
22 did find evidence of additional AEC contract

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 work picking up after 1957. This is the
2 contract and it provided for Vitro to
3 process Canadian Port Hope/Eldorado Mine
4 milling byproducts. This had been through
5 the Port Hope mill and they were going to
6 try to recover some things. And AEC asked
7 them to recover uranium from it as part of
8 this contract. And that contract then was
9 terminated in 1959.

10 But under that contract, Vitro
11 delivered quite a lot of uranium in 1958 and
12 then still continued into '59 and delivered
13 some in 1959 as well.

14 So, we then re-evaluated that and
15 sent a letter to the Department of Labor
16 saying, hey, the evidence that we have found
17 in our research indicates that this AEC
18 contract went on. We sent this letter
19 actually to both Labor and Energy, I think,
20 although I think Labor determines the
21 duration, if I'm not mistaken. And we said
22 we think this evidence, especially the fact

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that the AEC reports they bought, you know,
2 a few thousand pounds of uranium from Vitro
3 during that time would indicate that Vitro
4 was still working for AEC during that
5 period. And we told them that and we asked
6 them a question. Also there were these
7 cobalt residues were still on the site.
8 They were still on the site when the plant
9 closed. They were left there when the plant
10 closed. And so we said those are still on
11 the site and is that sufficient? The
12 presence of those residue piles sufficient
13 to extend the covered period of this site
14 for as long as they were there, at least as
15 long as they were exposed to the
16 environment?

17 And in their response they said,
18 well, you're correct. '58 and '59 should
19 definitely be added and so the designation
20 of the site, the covered period had been
21 changed to add '58 and '59. It ends on
22 December 31, '59. The DOL's determination

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 was the presence of those residue piles was
2 not sufficient, based on the language of the
3 law, to extend the coverage of the covered
4 period during their stay there.

5 I want to go a little farther on
6 this than the slides do because with that
7 decision now we, NIOSH, have to decide
8 whether this material, this residue class
9 which stayed on the property, are they in
10 fact related to ADC work? Because during
11 the AWE covered period, we're obliged to
12 reconstruct all radiation doses at the site.

13 During the residual period, we're
14 obliged to reconstruct doses from materials
15 that are residual to the ADC operations.
16 So, we're still puzzled on this one. We
17 don't know what to say about post-1959 and
18 we are not making a recommendation about
19 whether we think dose reconstruction is
20 feasible post-1959. That will come later.
21 I think we can do it by May.

22 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Just as a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 clarification, post-'59 is - are you
2 referring to the four months in 1960?
3 Because I think the petition at least went
4 up through April.

5 MR. HINNEFELD: The petition went
6 through April 1960 because that's how long
7 he worked there.

8 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Okay.

9 MR. HINNEFELD: And so that was
10 what he considered our evaluated petition.

11 Now, if there a situation that
12 exists in April of 1960 and if people did go
13 back on this property in 1960 because some
14 people went there to essentially bury these
15 wastes. So, there were people on there
16 between '60 and '64, '65, something like
17 that.

18 So, we kind of have to do this in
19 pieces. We're going to have to do - chances
20 are we'll do up through 1960. We'll have to
21 make some sort of judgment about post-
22 closure through the remediation which is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 really not a residual radioactivity kind of
2 situation that we normally encounter. And
3 that runs through years '64, '65 and past
4 that there's a residual radioactivity period
5 up through the DOE remediation which
6 occurred in the '80s and I think ends in
7 '85. So, there was a DOE uranium mill
8 tailings remedial action program remediation
9 for this site in the '80s that ended in
10 1985.

11 So, here are the sources of
12 exposure. Uranium and uranium progeny, of
13 course, progeny provided us quite a lot of
14 difficulty because they were rarely
15 monitored specifically. Externals are
16 photon and beta. We don't see a mechanism
17 for neutron exposure there.

18 We have no bioassay data for the
19 evaluation period. No air sampling data for
20 the evaluation period, this two-year period,
21 '58 and '59 and the first part of '60. And
22 we don't have any external monitoring data

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for this period.

2 So, we divided the petition
3 period into the two pieces for the reasons I
4 described. We know through '59 is the
5 covered period. We know we have to
6 reconstruct all the doses during that
7 period. We can't do it. We are
8 recommending adding the Class through '59.

9 For 1960, you know, it's not like
10 we get better doing at dose reconstruction.
11 But the question becomes, is the exposure
12 even covered period? Is it covered
13 exposure, because we have to determine is it
14 residual to the AEC operations. So, that's
15 the question that starts in 1960 and
16 theoretically that would extend to anyone
17 who happened to be on that site through
18 somewhere around '65. Because theoretically
19 I don't see it working out any other way
20 unless we find another cache of data.

21 So, we concluded that the
22 monitoring records, what we know about

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 process and source-term data are not
2 adequate to do those reconstructions for '58
3 and '59 and we are continuing to conduct the
4 period from January 1st, 1960 to April 30th
5 of 1960, which is what was petitioned, in
6 which we're flat-out obligated to give an
7 answer to the petitioner. I think we are
8 sort of obligated to ourselves to answer the
9 question in general what happens after April
10 of 1960.

11 So, our recommendation then is to
12 add this class, all Atomic Weapons Employer
13 employees who worked at Vitro Manufacturing
14 in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, from January
15 1st, 1958, through December 31st of 1959,
16 for 250 days, so on and so forth. And it
17 was, in fact, still Vitro Manufacturing
18 through '58 and '59 so we're okay with this
19 language. Later on, we'll have to throw in
20 that "or successor companies or successor
21 occupants," whatever the right word is,
22 because Vitro closed in April and at some

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 point they turned the property over to
2 somebody else. Whether they sold it or
3 turned it over to the local government, I
4 don't know for sure today.

5 Our table about our
6 recommendation for '58 and '59, we do not
7 believe dose reconstruction is feasible.
8 Since we do not believe it's feasible, we do
9 believe there's a chance for health
10 endangerment because of an accumulated
11 exposure of 250 days. We didn't identify
12 any incidents that would cause us to
13 recommend that the Class be effected for
14 presence. The potential of harm would be
15 signified by the presence and for the final
16 four months we are still evaluating.

17 Are there questions?

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Questions for
19 Stu? Yes, Paul, then Bob.

20 MEMBER ZIEMER: Stu, in the
21 report itself, Table 4.1, there's a line
22 concerning nine dose reconstructions that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 were completed before this period for which
2 we say we cannot complete dose
3 reconstructions.

4 Now, those were earlier ones done
5 I think even before the petition. But were
6 those done on the basis of earlier exposures
7 or - can you talk a little bit about those
8 nine?

9 MR. HINNEFELD: I've looked at a
10 couple. I haven't looked at all nine
11 because I haven't, you know, I haven't spent
12 the time to look at all nine. But it
13 appears that we- at the time we received
14 them, we considered these the residual
15 contamination period. And so we did like a
16 TIB-70 back of dose reconstruction. That
17 appears to be what we did at least in some
18 of them.

19 Now, very early on before we had
20 researched this very much we may have done a
21 TIB-04, which is an AWE overestimating for
22 uranium or for, you know, AWE overestimates,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 but we may have done, you know, some of
2 those as well. But I think they would fall
3 into one of those two categories.

4 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, if this
5 becomes a class then those would
6 automatically -

7 MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, if we have a
8 SEC cancel, right. They would go through
9 the Class.

10 MEMBER ZIEMER: Just a related
11 question. You had mentioned in your slides
12 but I think you do say that you can
13 reconstruct medical dose if necessary.

14 MR. HINNEFELD: Yes, we don't
15 have any information with medical exposures
16 that occurred off site and so we are -

17 MEMBER ZIEMER: You would
18 automatically do that.

19 MR. HINNEFELD: We would assume
20 they're on site.

21 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Bob.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER PRESLEY: Did they
2 remediate that area at some point in time or
3 is it still there?

4 MR. HINNEFELD: No, it was
5 remediated in the '80s. Ultimately
6 remediated by the Uranium Mill Tailings
7 Remedial Action Program.

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any other
9 questions?

10 MEMBER PRESLEY: In the '80s.

11 MR. HINNEFELD: Well, the covered
12 period goes to the '80s and I mean, once we
13 start deciding, you know, what's covered in
14 the residual period, you know, we'd have to
15 have some sort of decision up through the
16 '80s. And, of course, the actual
17 remediation work, the exposure situation,
18 would be somewhat different than - and, of
19 course, that always also gets into vicinity
20 properties because there's always neighbors
21 who were contaminated as well, so the
22 remediation includes vicinity properties,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 not just the covered facility. So, it
2 becomes somewhat complicated.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Anybody else
4 with questions? If not, I'd listen to a
5 recommendation. Wanda?

6 MEMBER MUNN: I move that the
7 Board accept the NIOSH recommendation that
8 an SEC be granted to all AWE employees
9 working at Vitro Manufacturing in Canonsburg
10 from January 1, 1958 through December 31,
11 1959, with the understanding that subsequent
12 periods will be reserved for further
13 deliberation.

14 MEMBER CLAWSON: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Second from
16 Brad. Any further discussion?

17 Okay. Ted, go ahead.

18 MR. KATZ: Paul.

19 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.

20 MR. KATZ: Mr. Schofield? Oh,
21 wait. Mr. Schofield, I have to collect his
22 vote.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Dr. Roessler?
2 MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes.
3 MR. KATZ: Dr. Richardson?
4 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.
5 MR. KATZ: Mr. Presley?
6 MEMBER PRESLEY: Yes.
7 MR. KATZ: Dr. Poston?
8 MEMBER POSTON: Yes.
9 MR. KATZ: Ms. Munn?
10 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.
11 MR. KATZ: Dr. Melius?
12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
13 MR. KATZ: I will collect Dr.
14 Lockey's vote.
15 Dr. Lemen?
16 MEMBER LEMEN: Now, hear this.
17 Yes.
18 MR. KATZ: Mr. Griffon?
19 MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.
20 MR. KATZ: Mr. Gibson?
21 MEMBER GIBSON: Yes.
22 MR. KATZ: Dr. Field?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER FIELD: Yes.

2 MR. KATZ: Mr. Clawson?

3 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes.

4 MR. KATZ: Ms. Beach?

5 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

6 MR. KATZ: Dr. Anderson?

7 MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes.

8 MR. KATZ: It's unanimous, the
9 motion passes with 14 in favor and 2 Members
10 absent.

11 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. Jim, do
12 we have the timeframe for the rest of it or
13 - May? Before the May meeting? Is that
14 right?

15 MR. HINNEFELD: I said I hope we
16 can make a determination by May because
17 it's, you know, the fundamental question we
18 have to answer is, is the residual -
19 exposure residual to AEC operations?

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Our next
21 presentation is LaVon Rutherford, SEC
22 petition update.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Dr.
2 Melius.

3 I want to give the status of
4 upcoming SEC petitions. We provide this to
5 the Board at each Board Meeting. It gives
6 the Board ideas. Gives the Board an idea
7 of when -

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I realize
9 there's a shortage of ideas among us.

10 MR. RUTHERFORD: This gives the
11 Board some idea of when Petition Evaluations
12 will be presented and allows them to kind of
13 gauge the amount of work they're going to
14 have to take up at upcoming Board Meetings
15 and Work Group Meetings.

16 A summary on our SEC petitions as
17 of February 7th. We've received 183
18 petitions. We have three petitions that are
19 in the qualification phase and 110 petitions
20 have qualified for evaluation. Three
21 evaluations are in progress and 107
22 evaluations are complete. And we see 18

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 with the Advisory Board. That included the
2 ones that were presented, so that number
3 will drop considerably.

4 And then we had 70 petitions that
5 did not qualify.

6 A little status on petitions that
7 are currently in evaluation. We have a
8 Hanford petition. This is associated with
9 potential bioassay data, issues with
10 bioassay data at Hanford and we anticipate
11 that that evaluation will be complete in
12 April and we will present that evaluation at
13 the May meeting.

14 Sandia National Lab, again, all
15 employees from 1957 through 1962. We're
16 winding down on that evaluation. We
17 anticipate completing that in April and
18 presenting that one at the May meeting as
19 well.

20 Clinton Engineering Works. This
21 is from 1943 to 1947 in the Oak Ridge area.
22 We anticipate completing that evaluation in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 March and presenting that one at the May
2 meeting.

3 Those are the only three
4 evaluations that are actually in progress
5 right now and we have a number of - well, we
6 have three, well, four petitions actually
7 that are under consideration for
8 qualification. Two are associated with the
9 same facility, W.R. Grace in Tennessee. And
10 then there's W.R. Grace in Maryland that is
11 in the qualification process as well. And
12 Mathieson Chemical Company in Texas.

13 You may remember the recent
14 review of SEC class definitions that we'd
15 identified three sites that we anticipate
16 going back in and modifying the Class
17 Definitions to add those Classes. Those
18 will be coming in under 83.14. We are
19 currently scheduling those right now. I
20 should have better dates for each of those
21 at the next meeting. Those are for Ames in
22 Iowa, General Atomics and Y-12. And that's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 short but that's it.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I'll start off
3 with a question. I noticed that at least
4 with the expected completion dates for all
5 three of the Petitions Evaluation Process
6 they're all over the 180 day limit.

7 MR. RUTHERFORD: That is correct.

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Could you
9 explain for us why?

10 MR. RUTHERFORD: Sure. At
11 Hanford we had some difficulty. The
12 documentation that was - the question came
13 up on whether the bioassay data could
14 potentially have been falsified, because
15 there was questions with the company for the
16 - they were convicted of falsifying data for
17 environmental data. So, when we went back
18 to try to get this information, to uncover
19 this information, we had difficulty getting
20 it through their general counsel.

21 We are expected to go look at
22 that information actually early next month

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and once we've looked at that and reviewed
2 that we'll be able to complete our
3 Evaluation Report. So, the difficulty has
4 been getting that information released to
5 us.

6 Sandia National Lab, we've had a
7 number of difficulties here. The site had
8 not catalogued all of their dosimetry data
9 through the years. They gave us a
10 completion date of December that they would
11 have that done. That did not happen. It's
12 not complete yet. However, we do believe we
13 have enough information to complete the 1957
14 through '62 period in time for the May
15 meeting. So, that was the hold-up there.

16 Clinton Engineering Works, we
17 actually had questions that we had sent to
18 the Department of Labor concerning the
19 facility designation. It's hard to
20 understand but the Clinton Engineering Works
21 is pretty much the whole town of Oak Ridge.
22 And so, yes, and so when you look at that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you're evaluating a petition that we have
2 one area, the Elza Gate that we know there
3 was radioactive material. We're trying to
4 understand the implications of having a city
5 designation that includes pretty much the
6 whole town of Oak Ridge at the time. So, we
7 went and we sent a letter to the Department
8 of Labor to actually ask them to clarify
9 their facility designation. They responded.
10 It did not change anything. It's still
11 pretty much the whole area of Oak Ridge.

12 So, we just recently sent them a
13 draft Class Definition for review and we
14 anticipate getting something back from them
15 within the next week or so and then we will
16 move forward with our evaluation -
17 completing our evaluation.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: So, we've moved
19 from entire sites to entire towns?

20 MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: We'll wait
22 until we see it. Thanks.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Anybody else have questions for
2 LaVon? Paul.

3 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, this is
4 just a general comment. At least it kinds
5 of highlights the issue of when the clock
6 starts on the 180 days. There's a lot of
7 criticism, of course, of NIOSH on that
8 timetable for 180. And I often wonder if
9 NIOSH, when it actually defined itself when
10 that started, was perhaps too optimistic.
11 But it seems like there should be some kind
12 of a trigger point related to when NIOSH has
13 available the - at least the basic
14 information to actually start the process.

15 The Elza Gate situation is a case
16 in point where the definition of what's to
17 be reviewed isn't even in place 180 days
18 later. Just a comment. I don't expect an
19 answer today but it's one of those
20 bothersome things that in a sense is outside
21 of NIOSH's purview to control the clock.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Just to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 elaborate on that. I mean, the other
2 situation which is goes along, kind of
3 supports what you're saying, Dr. Ziemer.
4 It's also disturbing in cases where we have
5 an SEC evaluation and parts of it are
6 reserved because the data isn't available.
7 Well, you know, then there's really - okay,
8 they met the 180-day deadline but, yes,
9 it's, I won't say impossible to review, but
10 it makes it difficult or it leaves large
11 areas with uncertainty. And I don't know if
12 there's an easy answer for this and so forth
13 or whether there's any point to having the
14 Board, you know, sort of look at what
15 information they have at a given point in
16 time and say, well, let's at least get
17 started on the evaluation.

18 But I'm not saying in any of
19 these cases, but there's also merit in when
20 things are reserved or incomplete, maybe the
21 Board should start looking at it because
22 there are sections that we could be working

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 on.

2 Paul.

3 MEMBER ZIEMER: Maybe those who
4 are doing ten-year review issues could
5 comment in their reports. Just an idea that
6 popped into my head.

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Yes,
8 David.

9 MEMBER RICHARDSON: I had two
10 questions. One about a petition that's
11 currently in process and then the question
12 about review, the kind of 83.14s that you
13 were considering.

14 Just for my own clarification,
15 the Hanford is personnel who are internally
16 monitored and it says urine or fecal. My
17 recollection was that there was a lot of in
18 vivo monitoring going on at Hanford. Is
19 that included in that definition and just
20 not -

21 MR. RUTHERFORD: Well, if you
22 look at these Class Definitions are actually

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the Class Definitions proposed by the
2 petitioner so you would include it.

3 MEMBER RICHARDSON: And then
4 about the assessments. During the public
5 comments yesterday and, again, it's just for
6 my clarification. I imagine that there's
7 been a lot of discussion a long time ago
8 about some of these issues.

9 But, somebody had raised the
10 question about the definition of the Mound
11 cohort and dealing with somebody who had
12 come forward in saying that in order to be -
13 the Class Definition for Mound had to do
14 with a list that NIOSH held.

15 MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, I wasn't at
16 the public session but I'm sure it was
17 concerning the tritium logbooks. You know,
18 we had the Class Definition that includes -
19 requires tritium bioassay. We are looking
20 at that right now. We're reviewing that
21 right now and I believe that was already -
22 and I'll let Stu add to that if he'd like

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: David, we
3 actually discussed that during the Mound
4 Work Group report and the Mound Work Group,
5 Josie talked to Stu and there's a follow-up
6 meeting planned to deal with it. It's a
7 complicated situation. I talked to Stu
8 about it also recently. So, it's being
9 followed up.

10 MR. RUTHERFORD: We just have to
11 see how to resolve it. Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any other
13 questions?

14 MR. KATZ: Thank you, Bomber.

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, thanks.
16 Okay.

17 Are the lawyers ready now? Okay.

18 Do we have other Board business?

19 Why don't we take a 15-minute

20 break? Emily, does that give you time?

21 Okay. We've take a 15-minute break and then

22 we'll come back. We have the Board letters

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 to review and then we should be finished.

2 MEMBER MUNN: We have one item
3 and that is approval of the two pages that
4 were handed out.

5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thank you for
6 reminding me.

7 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Does
9 anybody have any comments or questions for
10 Wanda on the two pagers?

11 MEMBER MUNN: We handed them out
12 to you the first day we were here. And it
13 has been called to my attention that one of
14 them - we struggled so with trying to find
15 the correct simple word to replace what is
16 an ordinary word to us, but is either not
17 meaningful or might be misunderstood by
18 others who are not familiar with the
19 language we use all the time.

20 IG-2, the Internal Dose
21 Reconstruction Implementation Guideline,
22 page 2, Finding 5. We had said the document

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 does not provide adequate guidance regarding
2 a selection of limits necessary to
3 extrapolate uncertainty.

4 Well, as Dr. Ziemer pointed out,
5 limits doesn't really and truly do what -
6 the original word was parameters. And we
7 came to the conclusion that parameters was
8 one of those words that was potential for
9 misunderstanding. So, the suggestion that's
10 been made is that we use the word "factors"
11 rather than "limits." Perhaps that's a
12 little more prescriptive and may be a little
13 more meaningful to the people who don't have
14 any idea what uncertainties really and truly
15 are required for a calculation.

16 Unless the body feels otherwise,
17 I would request that we consider changing
18 that single words from "limits" to "factors"
19 on that particular one. Other than that I
20 received no comments from anyone.

21 MEMBER RICHARDSON: I had a
22 couple of little comments I was struggling

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 with.

2 On the first paragraph, the first
3 page.

4 MEMBER MUNN: Of the same -

5 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Of the same
6 document, yes. Entry through injection is
7 kind of left off the list and intentional or
8 unintentional injection of radionuclides.
9 That seemed like that might be one of the
10 pathways that would be considered as opposed
11 to contact with the skin - penetration of
12 the skin.

13 MEMBER MUNN: It would have to be
14 accidental in our context here.

15 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Well, there,
16 I don't know. If the Advisory Committee on
17 Human Radiation and Experimentation has
18 documentation of experiments that went on at
19 Oak Ridge where they were tracing the
20 biokinetics and self-injected and also
21 injected others to study excretion. So,
22 there are examples of - but in general

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 simply having injection as a route of entry
2 would seem -

3 MEMBER PRESLEY: Not at the
4 plants. That was done at Oak Ridge
5 Associated Universities.

6 MEMBER MUNN: Does that fall
7 under our program?

8 MEMBER BEACH: Wanda, that's the
9 same thing I kind of discussed with you
10 offline. The four pathways, there's
11 actually five. You kind of have it in the
12 context but injection was definitely one
13 that was left out.

14 MEMBER MUNN: The question I have
15 is, was that program covered by -

16 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Well, we can
17 think of injection other ways. I mean,
18 somebody can have a sharp -

19 MEMBER GRIFFON: You don't have
20 to say intentional or unintentional, you
21 just say injection.

22 MEMBER MUNN: Can we rectify that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 by simply adding injection?

2 MEMBER RICHARDSON: That was the
3 suggestion.

4 MEMBER MUNN: Injection -
5 injection and skin -

6 MEMBER BEACH: Well, you would
7 have to change that there's four pathways
8 instead of three because you only have three
9 listed.

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any other
11 suggestions?

12 If not, could we have a motion to
13 approve?

14 MEMBER MUNN: This is a
15 recommendation -

16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: You are
17 correct. MEMBER MUNN: - the motion.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. We're
19 ready.

20 All in favor, say aye.

21 (Chorus of ayes.)

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Opposed?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I think if anybody discovers any
2 other minor issues I'm sure Wanda would be
3 willing to discuss it with them.

4 MEMBER MUNN: Happy to discuss it
5 with the Subcommittee. We will move forward
6 with our interactions with the IT folks to
7 get this particular set of reviews up and on
8 our website as soon as we can do so.

9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, Paul?

10 MEMBER ZIEMER: With Wanda's
11 permission, I'd like to raise the issue of
12 how we handle these going forward. There's
13 going to be a lot of them. We have another
14 12 on our plate right now and we have a
15 pretty good feel now for how they should be
16 written. I'm wondering if the Board wants
17 to see all these two-pagers in the future or
18 they would want the Procedures Subcommittee
19 to be responsible for preparing and editing
20 and issuing them in the future just as an
21 efficiency measure.

22 I guess my recommendation would

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 be that we authorize the Subcommittee to do
2 that if the Board were comfortable with it.

3 MEMBER MUNN: With the
4 understanding, of course, that these are
5 considered to be Board documents.

6 MEMBER LEMEN: Is that a motion?

7 MEMBER MUNN: No, it's a
8 suggestion.

9 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, at this - I
10 am certainly willing to make it a motion. I
11 sort of wanted to throw the idea out and,
12 you know, see if anybody salutes as it goes
13 up the flagpole. Anyway -

14 MEMBER LEMEN: Why don't we make
15 it a motion?

16 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay. Well, let
17 me make this in the form of a motion when we
18 can discuss it. I move that the Board
19 authorize the Procedures Review Subcommittee
20 to prepare, edit and issue the two page
21 summary reports in the future on behalf of
22 the Board.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER LEMEN: I will second
2 that.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I think Dr.
4 Lemen wants another opportunity to vote no
5 on something.

6 MEMBER LEMEN: No, actually I
7 learned how to spell yes. I seconded that
8 motion so -

9 MEMBER MUNN: In order to have a
10 better feel for exactly the magnitude of
11 what you're talking about here, I'd
12 appreciate it if, John, would you give us a
13 quick overview of what's coming down the
14 pike so that the folks will know exactly?
15 It isn't just this 12 that we have in front
16 of us. And two coming along after that.

17 DR. MAURO: Yes, we are moving
18 out groups of about 10 or so. They're
19 altogether about 55. We have cleared
20 basically about 55 procedures and we've
21 already written, as you've seen, drafts for,
22 I guess, these 12 and the previous 4 so it's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 16 and so they'll be moving through in
2 groups of on the order of 12. We figured
3 those are a good bite-size. If you're
4 comfortable with that, we're comfortable
5 with that and we'll be moving them to the
6 Subcommittee for your deliberation. Every
7 month or so another group will be coming
8 through.

9 They're supposed to be - I don't
10 know how long. Are they coming out about
11 two pages, a little longer than that?

12 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

13 MS. MAURO: They've been about
14 two. So, they're not large documents. It's
15 just a matter of polishing them the way they
16 are. So, yes, a group of 10, I'd say every
17 month or so.

18 MEMBER MUNN: Which means it will
19 not be unusual for the Subcommittee to have
20 20 at a lot because we have not been meeting
21 on a monthly basis, more like every six
22 weeks. And that being the case, it will not

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 be uncommon for us to have two groups to
2 deal with.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any further
4 discussion? Josie.

5 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, while I am
6 not opposed to the motion I would like to
7 know how you intend to let the Board know
8 that you've finished a set of 10 or 20.
9 Would you send them out to us or -

10 MEMBER MUNN: We could either
11 send them out to you or, of course, it will
12 be included in my Subcommittee report at
13 each of our meetings. But we could provide
14 copies for that.

15 MEMBER BEACH: I would like to
16 have the opportunity to have the copies and
17 review them at some point.

18 MEMBER MUNN: This is a good time
19 for us to identify what we want the process
20 to be and if that's a part of the process,
21 that would be fine with us.

22 MR. KATZ: Right, we had actually

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 discussed that in the Subcommittee, sending
2 the copies to the full Board so that the
3 Full Board Members - anybody on the Board
4 could comment back to the Subcommittee
5 issues with any of the two page summaries
6 before the Subcommittee clears them.

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Then I would
8 think that would be a more efficient
9 procedure and would obviate the need to wait
10 until a Board Meeting and so forth. And I
11 think if they were circulated to Board
12 Members with a reasonably, you know, good
13 deadline, more than 24 hours and less than
14 three months, in that range, it would be a
15 workable approach.

16 MEMBER LEMEN: Our Subcommittee
17 will hold you to the 180 days.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I said 90 days.

19 MEMBER MUNN: From the time we
20 send them out to you.

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Paul?

22 MEMBER ZIEMER: I think that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 within the context of the vote, you can
2 always specify that the understanding of the
3 motion includes doing that. It doesn't have
4 to be part of the motion but I certainly
5 think that's a great idea. As Ted
6 indicated, that was discussed in the
7 Subcommittee that Board Members would have
8 the opportunity to do that.

9 And the other thing I would point
10 is the Subcommittee would not be making any
11 new policy on behalf of the Board. All
12 we're trying to do is put things in layman's
13 language. Now, it's possible that that
14 would have the effect of changing what you
15 think the Board said, but usually it's just
16 getting understandable words and you always
17 have these cases such as the one just
18 described, or the two just described, the
19 injection and the terminology, where we can
20 improve those. And, in fact, even after
21 they are on the website, they could always
22 be modified. Because they are not actions,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 they are simply lay language of what we've
2 done.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Any
4 further discussion? If not, all in favor,
5 say aye.

6 (Chorus of ayes.)

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Opposed?
8 Abstained?

9 (No response.)

10 Okay. Any other Board issues
11 that I forgot, other than letters and I seem
12 to have done something wrong, those lawyers
13 left the room.

14 MEMBER ZIEMER, No, I think you
15 did something right.

16 (Laughter.)

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: They may be
18 actually working on the letters. No, they're
19 going for the federal marshals.

20 (Laughter.)

21 If they're not ready, we'll take
22 a short break. Why don't we take a short

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 break? Ten minutes and we'll start. We
2 should be able to finish up, I'm hoping by
3 10:00.

4 (Whereupon, the above-entitled
5 matter went off the record at 9:29 a.m. and
6 resumed at 9:43 a.m.)

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: If everyone can
8 get seated, this will take a little while to
9 do because we have some changes to these.
10 And I would also make one announcement, not
11 to embarrass somebody, but - I actually
12 just learned that Emily will be changing
13 tasks and jobs within the Counsel's office
14 so she'll be still working with NIOSH but
15 less involved in this program. So, I think
16 on behalf of the Board we'd like to thank
17 you for the time working with us. We
18 enjoyed it.

19 And if we'd had a warning we
20 would have had a cake and candles and all
21 sorts of things, but we do appreciate
22 everything. I know I've given you a hard

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 time at times.

2 So, let's get started so we can
3 move on here. And I'm going to read all
4 sort of the boilerplate at the end into the
5 record.

6 I'm going to start with the Linde
7 Petition. So, the Advisory Board on
8 Radiation and Worker Health has evaluated
9 SEC Petition 00107 concerning workers at the
10 Linde Ceramics plant in Tonawanda, New York,
11 under the statutory requirements established
12 by EEOICPA incorporated in 42 CFR 83.13.

13 The Board respectfully recommends
14 a Special Exposure Cohort status be afforded
15 to all employees of the Department of
16 Energy, its predecessor agencies and its
17 contractors and subcontractors who worked at
18 the Linde Ceramics plant from January 1,
19 1954 through December 31st, 1969, for a
20 number of work days aggregating at least 250
21 workdays occurring solely under this
22 employment or in combination with workdays

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 within the parameters established for one or
2 more other classes of employees in the SEC.

3 This recommendation is based on
4 the following factors: People working at the
5 Linde Ceramics plant during the time period
6 in question, worked on the renovation of
7 buildings that previously housed uranium
8 processing activities related to nuclear
9 weapons production.

10 The Board's review of available
11 monitoring data as well as available process
12 and source-term information for various
13 activities at the Linde Ceramics plant
14 during the time period in question concluded
15 that NIOSH lacked adequate data necessary to
16 complete accurate individual dose
17 reconstructions for internal doses during
18 the time period in question. Board
19 determined that health may have been
20 endangered for these Linde Ceramics plant
21 workers during the time period in question.

22 The National Institute for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Occupational Safety and Health, NIOSH, has
2 recommended that dose reconstruction is
3 feasible for workers of the Linde Ceramics
4 plant for the subsequent residual
5 contamination period from January 1st, 1970
6 through July 31st, 2006. NIOSH determined
7 that it has access to adequate exposure
8 monitoring and other information necessary
9 to do individual dose reconstructions with
10 sufficient accuracy for members of the
11 group. And, therefore, a class covering
12 that group should not be added to the SEC.

13 The Board concurs with this
14 determination.

15 And then it's the boilerplate
16 about this meeting and so forth.

17 Yes, Gen.

18 MEMBER ROESSLER: You fixed all
19 my grammatical things but one thing. In the
20 next paragraph, would it be better to put in
21 there the date of the Class, just to make it
22 absolutely clear, since two categories are

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 mentioned?

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: That's a good
3 point. Yes, that's out first double. It's
4 an unusual letter. We have a yes/no in it;
5 we don't usually have yes/nos, we add a
6 class or we don't add a class. So I can
7 clarify that in that letter. That's a good
8 point, Gen.

9 Any other changes? Yes, just
10 grammatical changes. Just get them to me
11 and we'll - okay.

12 [The letter Linde Ceramics SEC
13 107 follows:]

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (The Board) has evaluated Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition 00107 concerning workers at the Linde Ceramics Plant in Tonawanda, New York, under the statutory requirements established by the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act of 2000 (EEOICPA) and incorporated into 42 CFR Sec. 83.13. The Board respectfully recommends that SEC status be accorded to all employees of the Department of Energy (DOE), its predecessor agencies, and its contractors and subcontractors who worked at the Linde Ceramics Plant from January 1, 1954 through December 31, 1969 for a number of work days aggregating at least 250 work days, occurring either solely under this employment or in combination with work days within the parameters established for one or more other classes of employees included in the SEC.

This recommendation is based on the following factors:

- People working at the Linde Ceramics Plant during the time period in question worked the renovation of buildings that previously housed uranium processing activities related to nuclear weapons production.
- The Board reviewed available monitoring data, as well as process and source term information for various production activities at the Linde Ceramics Plant during the time period in question, and concluded that National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) lacked adequate data necessary to complete individual dose reconstructions with sufficient accuracy for internal doses during the time period in question.
- The Board determined that health may have been endangered for these Linde Ceramics Plant workers during the time period in question.

NIOSH has recommended that dose reconstructions are feasible for workers at the Linde Ceramics Plant for the subsequent residual contamination period from January 1, 1970 through July 31, 2006. NIOSH found that it has access to adequate exposure monitoring and other information necessary to do individual dose reconstructions with sufficient accuracy for members of this group, and therefore a class covering this group should not be added to the SEC.

Based on these considerations and the discussion at the February 23-25, 2011 Board meeting held in Augusta, Georgia, the Board recommends that the class covering all employees of DOE, its predecessor agencies, and its contractors and subcontractors who worked at the Linde Ceramics Plant from January 1, 1954 through December 31, 1969 be added to the SEC.

Enclosed is the documentation from the Board meeting(s) where this SEC class was discussed. The documentation includes transcripts of the deliberations, copies of the petition, the NIOSH review thereof, and related materials. If any of these items are unavailable at this time, they will follow shortly.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 [The transcript resumes:]

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And actually
3 that also applies to the Wah Chang letter
4 which is also a yes/no. Yes for the
5 operational, no for the residual, so to
6 speak.

7 Going to read the letter in.

8 "The Advisory Board on Radiation
9 and Worker Health has evaluated SEC Petition
10 00174 concerning workers at the Wah Chang
11 Facility in Albany, Oregon, under the
12 statutory requirements established by
13 EEOICPA incorporated in 42 CFR Section
14 83.13. The Board respectfully recommends
15 Special Exposure Cohort SEC status be
16 accorded to all AWE employees working in any
17 building at the Wah Chang Facility in
18 Albany, Oregon, for the operational period
19 from January 1st, 1971 through December
20 31st, 1972, for a number of work days
21 aggregating at least 250 work days occurring
22 either solely under this employment or in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 combination with work days within the
2 parameters established for one or more other
3 classes of employees included in the Special
4 Exposure Cohort.

5 This recommendation is based on
6 people working at Wah Chang during the time
7 period in question, worked on the processing
8 of uranium for the production of nuclear
9 weapons. The NIOSH review of available
10 monitoring data as well as process and
11 source-term information for various
12 production activities at Wah Chang found
13 that NIOSH lacked adequate information
14 necessary to complete accurate individual
15 dose reconstruction for internal and
16 external doses from exposures to thorium,
17 thorium byproducts during the time period in
18 question.

19 Board concurs with this
20 determination.

21 Number three. NIOSH determined
22 that health may have been endangered for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 these Wah Chang Facility workers during the
2 time period in question. The Board also
3 concurs with this determination.

4 The National Institute for
5 Occupational Safety and Health has
6 recommended that dose reconstruction is
7 feasible for workers of the Wah Chang
8 facility in Albany, Oregon, for the
9 subsequent residual contamination period
10 from January 1st, 1973 through October 31st,
11 2009.

12 NIOSH has determined it has
13 access to adequate exposure monitoring,
14 other information necessary to do individual
15 dose reconstructions with sufficient
16 accuracy for members of the group. And,
17 therefore, a class covering this group
18 should not be added to the SEC.

19 The Board concurs with this
20 determination.

21 And then I think in the next
22 paragraph we need to make that same

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 clarification that Gen mentioned.

2 Any comments or questions on
3 that?

4 Paul.

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: One quick. I
6 noticed when you read it in the second
7 bullet you read out - you left out the
8 "nuclear" before "production." Was that,
9 are we intending to do that -

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: We are
11 intending to do that.

12 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay. Just
13 wanted to double check that.

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

15 [The letter Wah Chang SEC 174
16 follows:]

17

18

19

20

21

22

The Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (The Board) has evaluated Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition 00174 concerning workers at the Wah Chang facility in Albany, Oregon, under the statutory requirements established by the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act of 2000 (EEOICPA) and incorporated into 42 CFR Sec. 83.13. The Board respectfully recommends that SEC status be accorded to all Atomic Weapons Employer (AWE) employees who worked in any building at the Wah Chang facility in Albany Oregon, for the operational period from January 1, 1971 through December 31, 1972, for a number of work days aggregating at least 250 work days, occurring either solely under this employment or in combination with work days within the parameters established for one or more other classes of employees included in the SEC.

This recommendation is based on the following factors:

- People working at Wah Chang during the time period in question worked on the processing of uranium for the production of nuclear weapons.
- The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) review of available monitoring data, as well as process and source term information for various production activities at Wah Chang, found that it lacked adequate information necessary to complete individual dose reconstruction with sufficient accuracy for internal and external doses from exposures to thorium and thorium by-products during the time period in question. The Board concurs with this determination.
- NIOSH determined that health may have been endangered for these Wah Chang facility workers during the time period in question. The Board also concurs with this determination.

NIOSH has recommended that dose reconstructions are feasible for workers at the Wah Chang facility in Albany, Oregon, for the subsequent residual contamination period from January 1, 1973 through October 31, 2009. NIOSH found that it has access to adequate exposure monitoring and other information necessary to do individual dose reconstructions with sufficient accuracy for members of this group, and therefore a class covering this group should not be added to the SEC.

Based on these considerations and the discussion at the February 23-25, 2011 Board meeting held in Augusta, Georgia, the Board recommends that the class covering all AWE employees who worked at Wah Chang from January 1, 1971 through December 31, 1972 be added to the SEC.

Enclosed is the documentation from the Board meeting(s) where this SEC class was discussed. The documentation includes transcripts of the deliberations, copies of the petition, the NIOSH review thereof, and related materials. If any of these items are unavailable at this time, they will follow shortly.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 [The transcript resumes:]

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Norton. This
3 next one, the Advisory Board of Radiation
4 and Worker Health. The Board's evaluation
5 of Special Evaluation Code 00173 concerning
6 workers at the Norton Company in Worcester,
7 Massachusetts under the statutory
8 requirements established by the Energy
9 Employees Occupational Illness Compensation
10 Program incorporated into 42 CFR 83.13.

11 The Board respectfully recommends
12 SEC status be accorded to all Atomic Weapons
13 Employer employees who worked at the Norton
14 Company or a subsequent owner in Worcester,
15 Massachusetts from January 1st, 1958 through
16 October 10th, 1962, for a number of work
17 days aggregating at least 250 work days
18 occurring either solely under this
19 employment or in combination with work days
20 within the parameters established for one or
21 more other classes of employees included in
22 the SEC.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 This recommendation is based on
2 the following factors: The Norton Company
3 performed research and manufactured several
4 products under contract with the Atomic
5 Energy Commission. NIOSH evaluation found
6 that there were insufficient data to
7 estimate internal and external exposures
8 with sufficient accuracy for the
9 decontamination/ decommissioning activities
10 that took place during the time period in
11 question.

12 The Board concurs with this
13 determination. NIOSH determined that health
14 may have been endangered for the workers
15 exposed to radiation during the time period
16 in question. The Board also concurs with
17 this determination.

18 And that's the boilerplate.
19 Anybody, questions or comments?

20 [The letter Norton Company SEC
21 173 follows:]

22

The Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (The Board) has evaluated Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition 00173 concerning workers at the Norton Company in Worcester, Massachusetts, under the statutory requirements established by the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA) and incorporated into 42 CFR Sec. 83.13. The Board respectfully recommends that SEC status be accorded to all Atomic Weapons Employer employees who worked at the Norton Company (or a subsequent owner) in Worcester Massachusetts, from January 1, 1958 through October 10, 1962, for a number of work days aggregating at least 250 work days, occurring either solely under this employment or in combination with work days within the parameters established for one or more other classes of employees included in the SEC.

This recommendation is based on the following factors:

- The Norton Company performed research and manufactured several products under contract with the Atomic Energy Commission.
- The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) evaluation found that there were insufficient data to complete individual dose reconstructions with sufficient accuracy for internal and external exposures during the decontamination and decommissioning activities that took place during the time period in question. The Board concurs with this determination.
- NIOSH determined that health may have been endangered for the workers exposed to radiation during the time period in question. The Board also concurs with this determination.

Based on these considerations and the discussion at the February 23-25, 2011 Board meeting held in Augusta, Georgia, the Board recommends that this class be added to the SEC.

Enclosed is the documentation from the Board meeting(s) where this SEC class was discussed. The documentation includes transcripts of the deliberations, copies of the petition, the NIOSH review thereof, and related materials. If any of these items are unavailable at this time, they will follow shortly.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 [The transcript resumes:]

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Vitro or
3 Vitro, I'm not sure. I guess LaVon's not
4 here to correct the pronunciations. Vitro?
5 Medically it's Vitro. It would be like in
6 vitro.

7 Okay. The Advisory Board on
8 Radiation and Worker Health, the Board has
9 evaluated Special Exposure Cohort Petition
10 00177 concerning workers at the Vitro
11 Manufacturing Facility, Canonsburg,
12 Pennsylvania, under the statutory
13 requirements established by the Energy
14 Employees Occupational Illness Compensation
15 Program Act of 2000 and incorporated it into
16 42 CFR 83.13.

17 The Board respectfully recommends
18 SEC status be accorded to all Atomic Weapons
19 Employer employees who worked at Vitro
20 Manufacturing in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania,
21 from January 1st, 1958 through December
22 31st, 1959, for a number of work days

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 aggregating at least 250 work days occurring
2 either solely under this employment or in
3 combination with work days within the
4 parameters established for one or more other
5 classes of employees included in the SEC.

6 The recommendation is based on
7 the following factors: The Vitro
8 Manufacturing facility was involved in early
9 uranium processing work for a manufacturer
10 of atomic weapons. The NIOSH evaluation
11 found that there were insufficient data to
12 estimate with sufficient accuracy the
13 potential occupational exposures to uranium
14 products and uranium progeny during the time
15 period in question.

16 The Board concurs with this determination.

17 NIOSH determined that health may
18 have been endangered for the workers exposed
19 to radiation during the time period in
20 question. The Board also concurs with this
21 determination. Any questions/comments?

22 MEMBER RICHARDSON: I have a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 question.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

3 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Who is the
4 person who keeps the boilerplate for these
5 things?

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Well, it's a
7 combination of me and the lawyers.

8 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Because -
9 just as a suggestion. There's the
10 introduction of acronyms which are then
11 never used, there's the introductions of
12 acronyms which are sporadically used and
13 then there's the use of acronyms which are
14 never defined, all within the boilerplate.
15 So, EEOICPA and AWE are introduced and never
16 used. SEC is -

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Well, those are
18 usually cleaned up during the final editing
19 process.

20 MEMBER RICHARDSON: NIOSH is used
21 but never defined.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: No, they're

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 usually cleaned up during the final editing
2 process. Because some get added and not
3 used and so on, so I wouldn't worry about
4 that part. Of course, if you'd like to take
5 on a secretarial role.

6 MEMBER RICHARDSON: I'm just
7 wondering if there is somebody who keeps the
8 boilerplate if we could just clean the
9 boilerplate.

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Well, I keep
11 boilerplate but the boilerplate tends to
12 evolve over time.

13 MEMBER RICHARDSON: It boils
14 over.

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And the
16 situations of how we approach these, you end
17 up with different sort of matching. When
18 the Board makes recommendations different
19 that NIOSH and so ends up so it's just
20 easier to -

21 MEMBER RICHARDSON: I know. I
22 understand.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: But, of course,
2 if you'd - the offer is on the table. Dr.
3 Ziemer conned me about nine years ago and I
4 never figured how to get out of it. I had
5 Jim Lockey do it for one meeting but he was
6 smart enough to get out of there quick.

7 MEMBER MUNN: He ducked out of
8 there fairly quick.

9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, Wanda.

10 MEMBER MUNN: I was reading
11 somewhere else at the time that you were
12 reading aloud. I'm assuming that 1959 did
13 get inserted?

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: It did, yes.
15 Thanks to the attorneys.

16 Okay. Moving on.

17 [The letter Vitro Manufacturing
18 SEC 177 follows:]

19
20
21
22

The Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (The Board) has evaluated Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition 00177 concerning workers at the Vitro Manufacturing facility in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, under the statutory requirements established by the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA) and incorporated into 42 CFR Sec. 83.13. The Board respectfully recommends that SEC status be accorded to all Atomic Weapons Employers employees who worked at Vitro Manufacturing in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, from January 1, 1958 through December 31, 1959, for a number of work days aggregating at least 250 work days, occurring either solely under this employment or in combination with work days within the parameters established for one or more other classes of employees included in the SEC.

This recommendation is based on the following factors:

- The Vitro Manufacturing facility was involved in early uranium processing work for the manufacture of atomic weapons.
- The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) evaluation found that there were insufficient data to complete individual dose reconstructions with sufficient accuracy for potential occupational exposures to uranium products and uranium progeny during the time period in question. The Board concurs with this determination.
- NIOSH determined that health may have been endangered for the workers exposed to radiation during the time period in question. The Board also concurs with this determination.

Based on these considerations and the discussion at the February 23-25, 2011 Board meeting held in Augusta, Georgia, the Board recommends that this class be added to the SEC.

Enclosed is the documentation from the Board meeting(s) where this SEC class was discussed. The documentation includes transcripts of the deliberations, copies of the petition, the NIOSH review thereof, and related materials. If any of these items are unavailable at this time, they will follow shortly.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 [The transcript resumes:]

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Grand Junction
3 Operations Office. The Advisory Board on
4 Radiation and Worker Health, the Board has
5 evaluated SEC Petition 00175 concerning
6 workers at the Grand Junction Operations
7 Office under the statutory requirements
8 established by EEOICPA and incorporated into
9 42 CFR Section 83.13.

10 The Board respectfully recommends
11 that Special Exposure Cohort status be
12 accorded to all employees of the Department
13 of Energy, its predecessor agencies and its
14 contractors and subcontractors who worked at
15 the Grand Junction Operations Office from
16 March 23rd, 1943 through January 31st, 1975,
17 for a number of work days aggregating at
18 least 250 work days occurring either solely
19 under this employment or in combination with
20 work days within the parameters established
21 for one or more other classes of employees
22 in the SEC.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 This recommendation is based on
2 the following factors: People working at
3 the Grand Junction Operations Office during
4 the time period in question worked on
5 uranium processing activities related to
6 nuclear weapons production.

7 Two, the NIOSH review of
8 available monitoring data as well as
9 available process and source-term
10 information for various production
11 activities, the Grand Junction Operations
12 Office found that NIOSH lacked adequate
13 information necessary to complete accurate
14 individual dose reconstructions for internal
15 doses from exposures to radon during the
16 time period in question and for
17 reconstruction of external doses prior to
18 1960. The Board concurs with this
19 determination.

20 NIOSH determined that health may
21 have been endangered for these Grand
22 Junction Operations Office facility workers

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 during the time period in question. The
2 Board also concurs with this determination.

3 Then, boilerplate.

4 Any comments/questions? Okay.

5 We're on the down side.

6 [The letter Grand Junctions
7 Operations Office SEC 173 follows:]

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (The Board) has evaluated Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition 00175 concerning workers at the Grand Junction Operations Office in Grand Junction, Colorado, under the statutory requirements established by the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA) and incorporated into 42 CFR Sec. 83.13. The Board respectfully recommends that SEC status be accorded to all employees of the Department of Energy, its predecessor agencies, and its contractors and subcontractors who worked at the Grand Junction Operations Office in Grand Junction, Colorado, from March 23, 1943 through January 31, 1975 for a number of work days aggregating at least 250 work days, occurring either solely under this employment or in combination with work days within the parameters established for one or more other classes of employees in the SEC.

This recommendation is based on the following factors:

- People working at the Grand Junction Operations office during the time period in question worked on uranium processing activities related to nuclear weapons production.
- The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) review of available monitoring data as well as available process and source term information for various production activities at the Grand Junction Operations Office found that NIOSH lacked adequate information necessary to complete individual dose reconstructions with sufficient accuracy for internal doses from exposures to radon during the time period in question and for reconstruction of external doses prior to 1960. The Board concurs with this determination.
- NIOSH determines that health may have been endangered for these Grand Junction Operations Office facility workers during the time period in question. The Board also concurs with this determination.

Based on these considerations and the discussion at the February 23-25, 2011 Board meeting held in Augusta, Georgia, the Board recommends that this class be added to the SEC.

Enclosed is the documentation from the Board meeting(s) where this SEC class was discussed. The documentation includes transcripts of the deliberations, copies of the petition, the NIOSH review thereof, and related materials. If any of these items are unavailable at this time, they will follow shortly.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 [The transcript resumes:]

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: We have the
3 three, I think we have three left here. So,
4 I will start with Bliss & Laughlin and, I
5 guess, the rejection letters and we have
6 some new boilerplate here.

7 Okay. The Advisory Board on
8 Radiation and Worker Health, the Board has
9 evaluated Special Exposure Cohort Petition
10 00131 concerning employees who worked at the
11 Bliss & Laughlin Steel Company in Buffalo,
12 New York, under the statutory requirements
13 established by the Energy Employees
14 Occupational Illness Compensation Program
15 Act of 2000, incorporated in 42 CFR Section
16 83.13.

17 The National Institute for
18 Occupational Safety and Health has
19 recommended that workers of the Bliss -
20 excuse me, I'm trying to understand - okay,
21 let me start that sentence again. The
22 National Institute for Occupational Safety

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and Health has recommended that dose
2 reconstructions are feasible for workers at
3 the Bliss & Laughlin Steel Company located
4 at 110 Hopkins Street, Buffalo, New York,
5 for the period from January 1st, 1951
6 through December 31st, 1952, and during the
7 residual period from January 1st, 1953
8 through December 31st, 1998. That was a
9 typo.

10 NIOSH has determined it has
11 access to adequate monitoring and other
12 information necessary to do individual dose
13 reconstructions with sufficient accuracy for
14 members of this group. And, therefore, a
15 class concerning this group will not be
16 added to the SEC. Enclosed is supporting
17 documentary evidence, blah, blah, blah.

18 Any questions on that?

19 MEMBER MUNN: There were several
20 changes made.

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: The boilerplate
22 has changed. I used the boilerplate from an

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 old rejection -

2 MEMBER MUNN: All right.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: - letter and
4 it's been updated.

5 MEMBER MUNN: May I request that
6 you read that second sentence one more time?

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

8 MEMBER MUNN: Because I, when you
9 started -

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: No, no. I
11 hesitated also. I apologize.

12 The National Institute for
13 Occupational Safety and Health has
14 recommended that dose reconstructions are
15 feasible for workers at the Bliss & Laughlin
16 Steel Company located at 110 Hopkins Street,
17 Buffalo, New York, for the period from
18 January 1st, 1951 and through December 31st,
19 1952, and during the residual period from
20 January 1st, 1953 through December 31st,
21 1998.

22 MEMBER MUNN: I thought it was

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 not recommended.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: The dose
3 reconstruction is feasible.

4 MEMBER ZIEMER: Therefore -

5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Therefore, it's
6 not recommended. They just reversed - the
7 old was not recommended. Now we're sort of
8 reversing that.

9 MEMBER MUNN: Very good.

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Yes,
11 Paul?

12 MEMBER ZIEMER: I am wondering
13 about one possibility like the one that has
14 passed counsel. Whether some of the dose
15 reconstructions can be - we're saying that
16 dose reconstructions are feasible. I'm
17 wondering if it wouldn't be wise to use the
18 language that NIOSH can complete dose
19 reconstructions with sufficient accuracy?
20 Which is the wording of -

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: We use that
22 later; we have that in the next sentence.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I'm looking at Dow and it says that we have
2 the information necessary to do individual
3 dose reconstructions with sufficient
4 accuracy.

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: But we don't have
6 that in Bliss & Laughlin or do we?

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: We do. In the
8 next sentence, the second sentence. The
9 sentence I read back. NIOSH has determined
10 that it has adequate -

11 MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, okay. Yes,
12 yes, yes. Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

14 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay. Thank you.
15 Yes, that would just be
16 repetitive.

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

18 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay. Withdraw
19 that.

20 [The letter Bliss and Laughlin
21 Steel SEC 131 follows:]

22

NEAL R. GROSS

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

The Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (The Board) has evaluated Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition 00131 concerning employees who worked at the Bliss and Laughlin Steel Company in Buffalo, New York, under the statutory requirements established by the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA) and incorporated into 42 CFR Sec. 83.13. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has recommended that individual dose reconstructions are feasible for workers at the Bliss and Laughlin Steel Company located at 110 Hopkins Street, Buffalo, New York during the period from January 1, 1951 through December 31, 1952, and during the residual period from January 1, 1953 through December 31, 1998. NIOSH found that it has access to adequate exposure monitoring and other information necessary to do individual dose reconstructions with sufficient accuracy for members of this group, and therefore a class covering this group should not be added to the SEC. The Board concurs with this determination.

Enclosed is supporting documentation from the February 23-25 Board meeting held in Augusta, Georgia, and earlier meetings where this potential class for the SEC was discussed. If any of these items are unavailable at this time, they will follow shortly.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 [The transcript resumes:]

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Dow.

3 The Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker
4 Health has evaluated Special Exposure Cohort
5 Petition 00079 concerning employees who
6 worked at the Dow Chemical Company site in
7 Madison, Illinois, under the statutory
8 requirements established by the Energy
9 Employees Occupational Illness Compensation
10 Program Act of 2000, incorporating into 42
11 CFR Section 83.13.

12 NIOSH, the National Institute for
13 Occupational Safety and Health, has
14 recommended that workers at the Dow Chemical
15 Company in Madison, Illinois, from January
16 1st, 1961 through January 31st, 2007 - now
17 it's got me confused here. Oh, okay, I see.
18 Has recommended that these workers at the
19 Dow Chemical Company in Madison, Illinois,
20 from January 1st, 1961 through November
21 30th, 2007, not be added to the SEC - I
22 think there's something - something is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 missing in my -Let's start it all over.

2 The Advisory Board on Radiation
3 and Worker Health, the Board has evaluated
4 Special Exposure Cohort Petition 00079
5 concerning employees who worked at the Dow
6 Chemical Company site in Madison, Illinois,
7 under the statutory requirements established
8 by the Energy Employees Occupational Illness
9 Compensation Program Act of 2000 and
10 incorporated into 42 CFR Section 83.13.

11 The National Institute for
12 Occupational Safety and Health has
13 recommended that dose reconstructions are
14 feasible for workers at the Dow Chemical
15 Company in Madison, Illinois, from January
16 1st, 1961 through November 30th, 2007.

17 NIOSH has determined that it has
18 access to adequate exposure monitoring and
19 other information necessary to do individual
20 dose reconstructions with sufficient
21 accuracy for members of this group and,
22 therefore, a class covering the group should

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 not be added to the SEC. The Board concurs
2 with this determination.

3 MEMBER MUNN: You started the
4 first part of the correction there.

5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And that was
6 the correction.

7 MEMBER MUNN: Yes, but when you
8 started the first part of it.

9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

10 MEMBER MUNN: The second
11 sentence.

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

13 MEMBER MUNN: You said that NIOSH
14 has recommended - we left the recommended in
15 there and they didn't really recommend that
16 it was feasible. They -

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: That NIOSH has
18 found that -

19 MEMBER MUNN: They found that it's
20 feasible.

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

22 MEMBER MUNN: Then the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 recommendation that was further down makes
2 sense.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes. I was
4 making editorial corrections on the fly.
5 Okay.

6 MEMBER MUNN: And so this is
7 essentially the boilerplate that's going to
8 be used -

9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: This is the
10 boilerplate that will be used going forward,
11 at least until the next meeting, then we'll
12 start over again.

13 [The letter Dow Chemical SEC 79
14 follows:]

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (The Board) has evaluated Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition 00079 concerning employees who worked at the Dow Chemical Company site in Madison, Illinois, under the statutory requirements established by the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA) and incorporated into 42 CFR Sec. 83.13. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has recommended that individual dose reconstructions are feasible for workers at the Dow Chemical Company in Madison, Illinois, from January 1, 1961 through November 30, 2007. NIOSH found that it has access to adequate exposure monitoring and other information necessary to do individual dose reconstructions with sufficient accuracy for members of this group, and therefore a class covering this group should not be added to the SEC. The Board concurs with this determination.

Enclosed is supporting documentation from the February 23-25 Board meeting held in Augusta, Georgia, and earlier meetings where this potential class for the SEC was discussed. If any of these items are unavailable at this time, they will follow shortly.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 [The transcript resumes:]

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: We have one
3 final one to do. We're going back in time
4 here. This is, believe it or not, SEC
5 Petition 0043. This is Chapman.

6 The Advisory Board on Radiation
7 and Worker Health, the Board has evaluated
8 Special Exposure Cohort Petition 0043
9 concerning employees who worked at the
10 Chapman Valve Manufacturing Company in
11 Indian Orchard, Massachusetts, under the
12 statutory requirements established by the
13 Energy Employees Occupational Illness
14 Compensation Act incorporated into 42 CFR
15 Section 83.13.

16 The National Institute for
17 Occupational Safety and Health has
18 recommended that workers of the Chapman
19 Valve Manufacturing Company in Building 23
20 in Dean Street facility, Indian Orchard from
21 January 1st, 1958 - it's missing boilerplate
22 here too.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER MUNN: The same as -

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, it's the
3 same as for the Dow site.

4 So, it would be National
5 Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
6 has found that dose reconstructions are
7 feasible for workers at the Chapman Valve
8 Manufacturing Company, i.e., Building 23,
9 Dean Street facility in Indian Orchard,
10 Massachusetts, January 1st, 1948 through
11 December 31st, 1949, from January 1st, 1991
12 through December 31st, 1993. NIOSH has
13 determined that it has access to adequate
14 exposure monitoring and other information
15 necessary to do individual dose
16 reconstructions with sufficient accuracy for
17 members of this group. The Board concurs
18 with this determination. And then
19 boilerplate.

20 MEMBER MUNN: Did I not hear the
21 phrase "not be added to the SEC"?

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Oh.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER MUNN: That needs to be
2 going in there.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, you're
4 correct. It just needs to be added at the
5 end of that sentence.

6 Okay. Any other changes,
7 comments?

8 We will have new boilerplate by
9 next time so - to confuse us all. The
10 Boilerplate Working Group. And we'll have
11 the Sub-Working Group on acronyms and then
12 we'll have the Sub-Working Group on puns.
13 Puns and dangling participles. Okay.

14 (Laughter.)

15 [The letter Chapman Valve SEC 43
16 follows:]

17

18

19

20

21

22

The Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health (The Board) has evaluated Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition 00043 concerning employees who worked at the Chapman Valve Manufacturing Company in Indian Orchard, Massachusetts, under the statutory requirements established by the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA) and incorporated into 42 CFR Sec. 83.13. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has recommended that individual dose reconstructions are feasible for workers at the Chapman Valve Manufacturing Company (i.e., Building 23 and the Dean Street facility) in Indian Orchard, Massachusetts, from January 1, 1948 through December 31, 1949, and from January 1, 1991 through December 31, 1993. NIOSH found that it has access to adequate exposure monitoring and other information necessary to do individual dose reconstructions with sufficient accuracy for members of this group, and therefore a class covering this group should not be added to the SEC. The Board concurs with this determination.

Enclosed is supporting documentations from the February 23-25 Board meeting held in Augusta, Georgia, and earlier meetings where this potential class for the SEC was discussed. If any of these items are unavailable at this time, they will follow shortly.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 [The transcript resumes:]

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Ted, anything
3 further we need to address?

4 MR. KATZ: No, thank you all.

5 MEMBER LEMEN: One thing. Did
6 you figure out December yet?

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: No, I have not.

8 MR. KATZ: No, we'll sort that
9 out by email.

10 MEMBER LEMEN: I hope I can
11 understand it. I'll try.

12 MR. KATZ: We'll do our best.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: No further
14 business? Do I hear a motion to -

15 MEMBER LEMEN: I'll so make.

16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

17 MEMBER CLAWSON: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Just one further
19 comment. There was one issue that we did
20 not put on the agenda for the Working Group.
21 I just wanted to remind people and do that
22 because Dr. Lockey couldn't be here. But we

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 have sort of an outstanding issue about
2 talking about modifying these letters. Not
3 the boilerplate but the issue related to
4 voting and so forth. And I sort of felt it
5 was appropriate to skip over it because Dr.
6 Lockey is the one that originally raised it
7 and he couldn't be here at this meeting.
8 So, that will be on the agenda for the next
9 meeting.

10 So, I didn't want anybody to
11 think we were forgetting about it or not
12 addressing it.

13 So, with that if there is no
14 further discussion, all in favor of
15 adjournment?

16 (Chorus of ayes.)

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Opposed?

18 (No response.)

19 (Whereupon, the above matter was
20 adjourned at 10:12 a.m.)
21
22

NEAL R. GROSS

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