UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

+ + + + +

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

85th MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY, AUGUST 15, 2012

The meeting convened telephonically at 11:00 a.m., Eastern Time, James M. Melius, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

JAMES M. MELIUS, Chairman
HENRY ANDERSON, Member
JOSIE BEACH, Member
BRADLEY P. CLAWSON, Member
R. WILLIAM FIELD, Member
MARK GRIFFON, Member
DAVID KOTELCHUCK, Member
RICHARD LEMEN, Member
WANDA I. MUNN, Member
DAVID B. RICHARDSON, Member
GENEVIEVE S. ROESSLER, Member
PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member
LORETTA R. VALERIO, 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
BARRIE, TERRIE
EVASKOVICH, ANDREW
GLOVER, SAM, DCAS
HINNEFELD, STU, DCAS
KINMAN, JOSH, DCAS
KOTSCH, JEFF, DOL
MAURO, JOHN, SC&A
MCKEEL, DAN
NETON, JIM, DCAS
RAFKY, L. MICHAEL, HHS
ROLFES, BETH, DCAS
RUTHERFORD, LAVON, DCAS
STIVER, JOHN, SC&A

NEAL R. GROSS

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S Roll-call by Mr. Katz, DFO 4 Welcome 5 by Dr. Melius, Chair Recording Absent Member Votes, from February Meeting by Mr. Katz, DFO 6 Ventron Corporation 6 by Dr. Glover, DCAS Dose Reconstruction Review Subcommittee Update by Mr. Mark Griffon. 32 Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition Status Update by Mr. Rutherford, DCAS 36 Updates from Work Groups and Subcommittee by WG/SC Chairs 41 Board Correspondence 49 by Dr. Melius, Chair Plans for the September 2012 Board Meeting

Agenda

by all Members.

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 (11:00 a.m.)3 (Roll call.) MR KATZ: Okay, just a couple other 4 things to cover. The agenda for this meeting 5 6 the web, on the Board Site, under 7 Meetings. Minor correction, one of the agenda items has recorded out the number of votes 8 from February meeting, it should be 9 10 meeting. I'll be covering that shortly. And the FPC petition was covering 11 12 Ventron Corporation, Beverly, Massachusetts. That is also on the web. It should be on the 13 meeting site and it's also under the "SECs 14 15 qualified" section of the Board Site. Just 16 follow along with that material. Otherwise let me just note, please 17 18 mute your phones, everyone except people who 19 are addressing the Board. Members of the 20 Board, in this case, actually. MEMBER ANDERSON: Hi, it's Andy, 21

I'm sorry I'm a little late. If you've taken

1	roll already, I'm here.
2	MR. KATZ: Yes, glad to have you,
3	Andy. Great.
4	MEMBER ANDERSON: Okay.
5	MR. KATZ: So everyone, mute your
6	phones, and please do not put the call on hold
7	at any point, but hang up and dial back in if
8	you need to leave the call.
9	And Jim, it's your agenda.
10	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, welcome,
11	everybody, and we have a pretty
12	straightforward agenda here today. So why
13	don't we just move ahead, and we'll start?
14	Ted, you need to record the votes
15	from the June meeting. I was wondering about
16	that when I saw the agenda. We're moving
17	backwards, but it's okay.
18	MR. KATZ: Right, sorry about that.
19	Thank you. At the June meeting for periods of
20	time during the full meeting, Messrs. Gibson
21	and Griffon and Drs. Lemen, Richardson, and
22	Ziemer were absent.

1	They recorded their absentee votes,
2	all completed by July 26, 2012. And they
3	voted approving along with the Board on all
4	actions that the Board voted on. And that
5	includes Winchester Engineering, Hanford,
6	Medina, Clarksville and Titanium Alloys. So
7	all of those votes were unanimous, and that
8	covers absentee votes.
9	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, thanks,
10	Ted. And now, let's move right on to the
11	Ventron Corporation Site. And I believe Sam
12	Glover's going to make the presentation.
13	DR. GLOVER: Yes, sir.
14	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, go ahead,
15	Sam.
16	DR. GLOVER: We haven't done one,
17	or at least I haven't none one quite like
18	this. So I guess I'll just ask folks to
19	change to the next slide and we'll see how
20	this goes. If you have any questions, feel
21	free to stop me.

So we're going to discuss today the

Special Exposure Cohort Petition Evaluation Report for Ventron Corporation. And let's go to Slide Number 2.

So, I thought it would be good to start out with a brief site description.

Ventron Corporation, originally known as Metal Hydrides. Is listed as an Atomic Weapons Employer for the AEC, from 1942 to 1948.

It was one of the very original sites and actually they were one of the beginning sites to handle uranium in the United States, even before the Atomic Energy Commission.

They had a residual period from 1949 to '85 and from '87 to '95. There were some residual clean-up time frames.

It is listed as a DOE site for 1986 as well as 1996 to '97. Principal operations included the conversion of uranium oxide to uranium metal powder, and it was the primary facility for scrap recovery for the AEC as well as the Manhattan Engineering District.

1 Next slide. Just a real quick idea 2 how many claims we're talking about. We have 3 19 claims submitted. Nine of which we worked during the SEC time frame. And a total number 4 5 of claims at DOL is nine. 6 We have no internal or external records -- dosimetry records with the claims 7 that have been submitted. 8 Petition SEC 00198 was received 9 10 December 5th, 2011. The petition proposed the following Class: "all metallurgical operators 11 12 and electric furnace operators who worked at 13 Ventron Corporation in Beverley, Massachusetts, from January 1, 1942 14 to December 31, 1948." 15 16 The petition was qualified on January 20, 2012. And basically, the employees 17 were never monitored, was the basis. 18 19 The Class evaluated by NIOSH was all Atomic Weapons Employees who worked at 20

NEAL R. GROSS

Massachusetts from August 13, 1942, through

Site

in

Corporation

Ventron

21

22

Beverly,

December 31	, 1948.
-------------	---------

We'll discuss a little bit about why we stopped at that and what we're doing post-1948 at the end of this.

The Ventron Site is located in Beverly, Massachusetts and occupies 3 acres on Massachusetts Bay, at the confluence of the Bass and Danvers rivers.

It was originally developed to produce metal for the Office of Science, Research and Development that preceded the Manhattan Engineering District.

And they did operation of producing metal from December 31, 1941 to November 1, 1942. And those are not covered.

They produced about 7500 pounds of metal under this original contract. The Manhattan Engineering District took over that contract in November of 1942 and they produced the very first metal used in the CP1, the original Chicago Pile Number 1 reactors.

So they produced from the ores as

NEAL R. GROSS

well as oxides. So they had actual true ore as well as concentrates of ore, so they actually had radium on site.

In fact, it was later used to recast scrap metal. And this equipment remained on site in standby mode. It was the principle scrap recovery facility for the Manhattan Engineering District during this time frame.

Scrap recasting -- I'm sorry. Next slide, please. Scrap recasting contract expired on December 31, 1947. Following this date, all scrap was sent to Hanford for recasting.

In June '47, a contract called for the development of controlled source neutrons. And it looks like they were issued 100 pounds of high-grade pitchblende ore to help with that.

Some more background. Next slide, please. Refinery operations, they had November $1^{\rm st}$ of 1942 through September 1, 1943

NEAL R. GROSS

and an estimated work force of about 107 individuals plant-wide. Production rate of about 350 pounds of metal per day, in a three-shift schedule.

And they also had scrap casting operations which were subsequent to these metal refinery operations from September 1, 1943, to December 31, 1947. Believed to have employed around 16 individuals. Production rates of about 3,000 to 3,200 pounds of material per day. The rate produced about 1,800 pounds per day in April of 1947.

Next slide, please. There were three primary facilities. Building A/A-1; it was a conjoined structure. It contained furnaces, kilns, leaching equipment and machine shop.

It's good to note that uranium activities were not separated from other activities in the building.

They also had a foundry, as well as a machine shop. These were wooden

NEAL R. GROSS

structures, south of Building A.

There is, in the Evaluation Report, there's a map to help give you some feel for this. It was demolished somewhere around 1948 to 1950.

Sources of exposure -- next slide, please -- included processing of black ore, which was a ore with all of its components and progeny. Later it was brown oxide by calcium hydride process. This included the potential for radium contamination.

It also had a production of uranium metal and oxide, and later melting and recasting of scrap and uranium metal.

There was a further, and it didn't for some reason make this slide, but there was a commercial thorium operation on site, and they were using thorium oxide to make some thorium components. And since we have to do all sorts of exposure, thorium would be included in this.

Now we see no discrete incidents

NEAL R. GROSS

involving high levels of radiation. However, we see lots of reports of spontaneous fires. There was a routine occurrence of powders being hand-scooped into tins.

Material was thrown outside and allowed to burn. Spontaneous ignition of metal left in leaching liquid discharged outside settling basin, which was reported to happen once every few weeks.

Next slide, please. External monitoring program and data availability. There's no evidence that a routine monitoring program ever existed. We do have some direct surveys, 1944, we have listed as gamma and beta-gamma measurements, where they took three measurements of outside stockpiled material.

They took three measurements of some work areas, and they took two additional measurements in the June/July of 1945 time frame, also in this gamma, beta-gamma type.

Later, at near the very end of this, after material started to be removed

NEAL R. GROSS

from the site, they had 24 measurements conducted around Ventron, which confirmed widespread contamination.

And in the January time frame, they made 25 additional measurements, after there was significant removal of equipment.

Next slide, please. So in December 25th we have -- December 19th, 1947, there's 25 measurements and then January 13th, they did 24 measurements. And these had -- you see again the processing equipment had been removed at that point.

Next slide. Internal dose monitoring programs and data availability. There's no evidence of any routine air monitoring program, uranium urinalysis, or radon monitoring program.

We have bioassay results from one individual in June 1945. That basically was a four-day span in August of 1945, which was requested as the result of significant weight loss of that individual.

NEAL R. GROSS

That's the only monitoring for internal dose that we have for bio-bioassay. There are a few air samples, on March 5th, '43 there were 12 samples taken. June 5th of '44, there were also four samples taken June 15th of '44. These again are just very small snapshots.

Next slide, please. Just to let you know how gross the contamination of the facility was in 1943, an assay of the Manhattan Engineering District discovered the soil on site was -- "contaminated" is probably a mild word. The soil contained between 0.1 and 79 percent uranium oxide.

120,000 pounds of soil was removed in '44 and shipped to DuPont for uranium recovery. So we also have, as I said, further information that thoriated tungsten filaments were produced from thorium powder. The complete details are sparse to us at this time.

Next slide, please. Summary of

NEAL R. GROSS

monitoring gaps. External, we have no film badge results. Limited area monitoring for a complex source term.

So this isn't just uranium metal, this has radium and significant contamination as well as lots of hands-on scooping. Just not a controlled environment.

Internal dose, we have virtually no bioassay. Very limited air monitoring for single operation.

refining completely Data for So that puts us in a position where absent. there's no TBD-6000 approach for these operations. Limitations of TBD-6000 for very hands-on scooping and physical very operations.

evidence We have no that monitoring is available for the numerous fires and combustion events. And these fires outside building further broaden the the exposure potential for process and non-process workers. Next slide, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So sort of summarizing Ventron SEC

Petition 198: why the Class workers were

potentially exposed to radium, radon and

uranium who were not monitored, nor does a

suitable dose reconstruction method exist.

Decision was based on a lack of adequate biological monitoring data, sufficient air monitoring information, and/or sufficient process and radiological source term data to reconstruct dose with sufficient accuracy. Next slide, please.

Why everyone? Based on reports by the AEC facility layout, the process areas isolated from were not the non-process facilities. Airborne dust issues from processes were noted to be extending into nonprocess areas. As we noted earlier, the fires also were outside and weren't controlled. Next slide, please.

What about employees not included in the SEC? NIOSH intends to use any internal or external monitoring data that may become

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

available for an individual claim that can be interpreted using existing dose reconstruction processes or procedures.

Dose reconstructions for individuals employed at the Ventron Site during the period from November 1 -- and that should actually be -- yes, November 1, 1942, to December 31, 1948, but who do not qualify for inclusion in the Special Exposure Cohort, may performed using these data appropriate.

Further, NIOSH intends to estimate doses from medical X-rays using information from medical employee files and claimant-favorable medical dose reconstruction assumptions and methods, as we would for other AWE facilities.

So why stop in 1948? That was obviously the end of the contract periods, and at that, we would add a residual period.

NIOSH has obtained additional contract information during its data capture for

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Ventron, which may support additional covered time.

This information has been submitted to the Department of Labor and the Department of Energy. NIOSH reviewed the post-1948 period upon receiving the response to this new information by DOL and DOE.

Health endangerment: evidence reviewed in this evaluation indicates some workers in the Class may have accumulated chronic radiation exposures through intakes of radionuclides and direct exposure radioactive materials. Consequently, NIOSH is specifying that health been may have endangered. Next slide, please.

Proposed Class: "All Atomic Weapons Employees who worked at Ventron Corporation in Beverly, Massachusetts, from November 1, 1942 through December 31, 1948, 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

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 parameters established for one or more Classes 2 of employees included in the Special Exposure 3 Cohort." So our recommendation is that, from 4 5 the period November 1, 1942, through December 31, 1948, NIOSH finds that radiation doses 6 7 cannot be reconstructed for compensation purposes. So we say that the feasibility is 8 no, and health endangerment, yes. 9 10 And that's the end of it. 11 you very much. 12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thank you, 13 Board Members have any questions for Sam? MEMBER BEACH: Yes, Jim, this is 14 15 Josie. I do have a question. Back on Slide 16 21, you talked about why stop in '48, and that was one of the things that I highlighted in 17 the ER on Page 18. It talks about the AEC and 18 19 the ongoing contracts. Can you elaborate a little bit more of the dates? 20 Is it all the way to '54? 21

DR. GLOVER: Yes, right now that is

1	the covered time. That's when it's covered
2	through '48 at this time. And after that it
3	goes to a residual contamination time frame.
4	And so at that point we can only
5	deal with materials that were produced, you
6	know, from the previous operations. The new
7	operations aren't considered. And so right
8	now we're working with the DOE and DOL, to
9	make sure that we have the appropriate cover
10	time.
11	MEMBER BEACH: Okay, so you're
12	talking about the contracts that you found?
13	DR. GLOVER: Yes, ma'am.
14	MEMBER BEACH: Okay, so it could be
15	additional, besides residual period that would
16	be covered potentially?
17	DR. GLOVER: Exactly, we could look
18	at perhaps from '49 through '54. But that
19	would be based on their decision, basically.
20	MEMBER BEACH: Sure, I understand
21	that part. Okay, thanks.
22	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Other Board

Member questions?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER VALERIO: Yes -- go ahead.

MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda.

CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, Wanda.

MEMBER MUNN: LaVon, in your presentation, although you gave us source term data, you never gave us any information with respect to the actual surveys, and what we saw respect to dose monitoring from those surveys. Were the gamma and beta-gamma measurements that we had predictive in any way?

DR. GLOVER: This is Sam, and I could pull those. They are in the Evaluation Report. And didn't emphasize them because they only took like a snapshot of -- they had material in the yard. So they didn't try to actually like measure a wide breadth of the source terms. They were very, very limited.

And so they really didn't let you to put your hands around all the different kinds of things that they were doing.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	You know, since they were handling
2	metal they would have increased dose rate,
3	because of the progeny. You also then had the
4	radium. You had the ore operations. So we
5	really just didn't have a handle. Yes, ma'am.
6	MEMBER MUNN: Yes, I realize that.
7	All right, I'll go to the ER if I want to
8	check it.
9	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Somebody else had
10	a question?
11	MEMBER VALERIO: Yes, this is
12	Loretta.
13	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, Loretta.
14	MEMBER VALERIO: Dr. Glover, I
15	actually have two questions for you. You
16	indicated that in 19 and I'm going back
17	through the slides, bear with me. At one
18	point they believed there was 42, 43, that
19	there 100, approximately 107 employees on
20	site. And I'm wondering, do you know, did
21	that stay consistent through 1948? That

number?

1	That's the first question, and the
2	second question is: the fires that were
3	outside of the buildings, was there a
4	subcontract, say with county firefighters?
5	How did they address the issues with the
6	fires?
7	DR. GLOVER: So on the two
8	questions. I don't know, you know, these
9	things are so far back in antiquity, that we
10	find little bits of information like the 107.
11	But I don't know if we found any additional
12	information to give us how many people as a
13	function of time were at that facility.
14	Certainly, if you'd like it, I could double-
15	check.
16	For fires, because this is an AWE
17	facility, only employees of Ventron are
18	covered. And Bomber or LaVon, if I'm wrong,
19	please correct me.
20	MR. RUTHERFORD: I think you're
21	correct.

CHAIRMAN MELIUS:

22

Yes. Just for

everyone's information, if you turn to Page 15 of the Evaluation Report, there's a little bit more information on the number of employees. At least as estimated by number of people that had chest X-rays and some other medical testing done.

But again, as Sam was saying, in these situations we often find it very hard to estimate how many people, you know, really worked there. Over time, because of turnover, and in fact this is more information than we've found on many other similar sites.

MEMBER BEACH: Yes, Jim, this is Josie again. I was going to point out to NIOSH that it was nice that they did include that information on how many employees. Because that's always a question that we ask.

CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes. I actually emailed Sam about this, but I thought that the -- I believe it's the ORAU group, whoever prepared this report did a very good job and provided a lot of, I thought, helpful detail

NEAL R. GROSS

1	that at least fills in and gives you a little
2	bit more confidence on sort of what steps
3	we're taking and our evaluation of this report
4	and of the facility.
5	Any other Board Member questions?
6	MEMBER VALERIO: This is Loretta
7	again, I'm sorry. It's not a question, it's
8	more that I want to compliment NIOSH. When I
9	was reading through the Evaluation Report and
10	the presentation, one of the first questions
11	that, you know, that came to my mind was of
12	course the contaminated soil, which I thought
13	that they addressed very well. So thank you.
14	DR. GLOVER: Thank you very much.
15	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any other
16	comments or questions?
17	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Dave
18	Kotelchuck.
19	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Oh, yes, go
20	ahead.
21	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: There are typos
22	on Page 13 and 19. You'll correct them before

1	the June meeting? We don't need to go into
2	them, it's just editorial. Just wanted to
3	mention.
4	DR. GLOVER: I'm sorry, sir, you
5	mean on the slides?
6	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: On slides 13
7	and 19.
8	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: "Manhattan." Us
9	New Yorkers are sensitive on that.
LO	(Laughter.)
L1	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Oh, that's
L2	another one. Oh, yes, 13 "conducted."
L3	MR. RUTHERFORD: As long as it
L4	isn't a dangling participle, then we're all
L5	right.
L6	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay, I don't
L7	want to raise, it's not worth a lot of time.
L8	Just to mention it so you'll correct it by the
L9	later presentation.
20	DR. GLOVER: Actually, I believe
21	this will be the only presentation.
22	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Ah, okay, well,

1	then I'm glad I mentioned it.
2	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: It's on the
3	website, so.
4	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay, good.
5	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any other
6	comments or questions? If not, do I hear a
7	recommendation from the Board? Or a motion?
8	MEMBER CLAWSON: This is Brad. I
9	recommend that we accept NIOSH's evaluation.
10	MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda.
11	Second.
12	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, any further
13	discussion? If not, then Ted, you want to do
14	roll?
15	MR. KATZ: Sure, very good. Dr.
16	Anderson?
17	MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes.
18	MR. KATZ: Ms. Beach?
19	MEMBER BEACH: Yes.
20	MR. KATZ: Mr. Clawson?
21	MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes.
22	MR. KATZ: Dr. Field?

1	MEMBER FIELD: Yes.
2	MR. KATZ: Let me just check. I
3	checked earlier, we didn't have Mr. Gibson.
4	Mr. Gibson, have you joined us?
5	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes. And yes.
6	MR. KATZ: Okay. That was Mike.
7	MEMBER GRIFFON: No, that was Mark.
8	MR. KATZ: Okay, I had called for
9	Gibson, but I got yes for Mr. Griffon. So Mike
10	is still absent. Dr. Kotelchuck?
11	MEMBER GRIFFON: Sorry.
12	MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yes.
13	MR. KATZ: Dr. Kotelchuck, yes. Dr.
14	Lemen?
15	MEMBER LEMEN: Yes.
16	MR. KATZ: And Dr. Lockey, I assume
17	is still absent. Dr. Melius?
18	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
19	MR. KATZ: Ms. Munn?
20	MEMBER MUNN: Yes.
21	MR. KATZ: Dr. Poston is absent. Dr.
22	Richardson?

1	MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.
2	MR. KATZ: Dr. Roessler?
3	MEMBER ROESSLER: Yes.
4	MR. KATZ: Mr. Schofield?
5	MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes.
6	MR. KATZ: Ms. Valerio?
7	MEMBER VALERIO: Yes.
8	MR. KATZ: And Dr. Ziemer?
9	MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.
10	MR. KATZ: So the motion passes
11	unanimously with a couple three absent
12	Members. And I'll collect the absentee votes
12 13	Members. And I'll collect the absentee votes between now and the next meeting.
13	between now and the next meeting.
13	between now and the next meeting. CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And then for
13 14 15	between now and the next meeting. CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And then for Board Members, I circulated a letter, our
13 14 15 16	between now and the next meeting. CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And then for Board Members, I circulated a letter, our standard letter for this. If anybody has
13 14 15 16 17	between now and the next meeting. CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And then for Board Members, I circulated a letter, our standard letter for this. If anybody has comments on it, if you want to get back to me.
13 14 15 16 17	between now and the next meeting. CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And then for Board Members, I circulated a letter, our standard letter for this. If anybody has comments on it, if you want to get back to me. I think that should cover us on it.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	between now and the next meeting. CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And then for Board Members, I circulated a letter, our standard letter for this. If anybody has comments on it, if you want to get back to me. I think that should cover us on it. I did two versions, so it's the

MEMBER MUNN: And thank you for those changes. The original raised that question in my mind. Thanks.

Other thing that I just want to put on the record is if NIOSH, if you can be sure to follow up with this and inform us on what the decision is on the Class Definition of the years covered period. Changes and so forth, and this may be something we need to get back to.

And there's also a residual period, and given the amount of contamination in what we've seen about the site from this report, I think it's something that also warrants some further attention also, at some period to follow up on that.

I don't know if you're planning a separate report or what the plan is. That will obviously depends on what happens with the covered period, but if you can just keep us informed on what's going on with this site, it

would be helpful.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ HINNEFELD: We definitely will do that.

CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, thanks. Find my agenda here. The next item we have on our agenda is a Dose Reconstruction Subcommittee Review Update from Mark Griffon. Mark?

Yes, I can give a MEMBER GRIFFON: report. We had a meeting on August 6th, and amongst other things we went through some of the OA/OC things that were brought up in the ten year follow-up report. We also discussed some of NIOSH's current efforts. Internally, with the DCAS blind dose reconstruction quality review, that's their internal so review. And then the last. item that. discussed, other than our normal going through all the cases, the last item that we discussed was possible modifications to our procedures for reviewing the cases.

And this was brought up by Paul and

NEAL R. GROSS

Jim and some others over a period of time.

And we thought it was a good time to look back

at the original protocols and reexamine those.

Jim joined us on the phone. We basically have a path forward to look at a few things. One is the blind reviews. We want to consider whether the approach that we use --we've only done two blind reviews --we want to look back at those and consider whether the approach was appropriate and whether we should do more of those. That's certainly on the table as a possibility.

And the other item was to look back at at least some subsection of cases that we've done, prior to, you know, up to this point. I think we have gone through about 200 completed cases.

And we want to look back at those to see sort of the final disposition of those cases and consider our findings as compared to the final disposition.

In other words, if these cases

NEAL R. GROSS

1	ultimately were put in a Special Exposure
2	Cohort Class, you know, and we found that the
3	case was adequate, we might have to discuss
4	that in terms of scientific validity. What
5	are we finding through our reviews?
6	So those are the two aspects that
7	we want to sort of look at going forward and
8	we might use those little samples to modify
9	our protocol for reviews.
10	And if I'm missing anything, other
11	Members of the Subcommittee can chime in.
12	I guess I covered it.
13	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good, Mark, and I
14	think we will have further updates on this.
15	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, I was
16	planning on a more in-depth report at the full
17	meeting, a presentation and we can have an
18	open discussion with the whole Board.
19	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thanks.
20	The next item on the agenda is the SEC
21	Petition status update.
22	MR. KATZ: Before we get to that,

just let me just note for all the Board with Members, respect to the Dose Reconstruction Subcommittee. They completed a preliminary review of set 16 of new dose reconstruction cases to be reviewed by SC&A and then by the Board. So I just wanted to note for all of you, you'll be receiving two sets.

the complete set that they One, reviewed, the Subcommittee reviewed, and the set that they pre-selected for your consideration. You'll be receiving before the June Board meeting. Please give us some attention and take into account whether of any of the cases that were not collected might ought to be collected for the final Board decision at the June meeting. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MELIUS: The June meeting or the September meeting?

MR. KATZ: The September meeting, excuse me.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes.
2	MR. KATZ: I'm going backwards
3	again.
4	MEMBER GRIFFON: Thanks, Ted, I
5	forgot to mention that.
6	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I thought we were
7	having to start over again. We did something
8	wrong with our reviews or something.
9	MR. KATZ: I'm going to start
LO	talking backwards.
L1	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, okay. I
L2	should add that Ted is taking time off from
L3	his vacation this week, so he can be forgiven
L4	for being
L5	MR. KATZ: Thank you.
L6	MEMBER MUNN: Sorry about that,
L7	Ted.
L8	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: out of touch.
L9	LaVon.
20	MR. RUTHERFORD: All right, I'm
21	going to go ahead as Dr. Melius thinks I'm
22	going to provide an update on the Petition

Evaluations we plan to present at the September meeting. Also, try to give you an idea of when we expect those reports to be completed.

We have five evaluations we plan to present at the September meeting. They are:

Oak Ridge National Lab. The Petition

Evaluation covers the periods from January 1,

1943, during July 31, 1955. And the report is

in its final stages of review and approval. I

do expect the report to go to the Board

sometime late next week.

Los Alamos National Lab. This is a revision to our previous report, and covers the time period of January 1, 1976 through December 31, 1995. The report is in final approval and should go to the Board later this week or early next week.

Rocky Flats. Petition Evaluation evaluates the ability to reconstruct tritium exposures for the period of April 1, 1953 through December 31, 2005.

NEAL R. GROSS

Actually expanded the Class during the evaluation because of the recognition of that tritium exposure potential exists in broader periods than what we were looking at originally. So through our review, we actually expanded our evaluation period.

I'm not saying we're recommending a Class, just saying that the evaluation expanded through that period. The report is in review now, the current schedule has the report going to the Board and the petitioner on September 4.

Mound Plant, this is an 83.14 that we started to modify the Class Definition. We're modifying the Class Definition for years where we do not have log books with tritium bioassay results.

Therefore, it will go from the tritium results to an "all employees" during all those years. We're working on the report now and should have the report out in early September.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	And the last one is Nuclear Metals
2	Inc. This Petition Evaluation covers the
3	period from January 1, 1958 through December
4	31 st of 1983. The report is being reviewed
5	internally now and we anticipate the report
6	being available to the Board by the end of
7	this month, August.
8	And those are the five that we will
9	be presenting. Do we have any questions?
10	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any Board Member
11	questions? Okay. I think, as you can see, we
12	have a busy meeting coming up in the Denver
13	area.
14	Okay, the next item on our agenda
15	is updates from Work Group or Subcommittees. I
16	won't go through the list, but do any Work
17	Group or Subcommittee Chairs wish to give a
18	report? I know we have a lot of Work Group
19	meetings coming up now
20	MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Paul Ziemer
21	here.
22	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, Paul, go

1	ahead.
2	MEMBER ZIEMER: I'm going to have
3	to get out of here in a minute, so I would
4	appreciate going sort of first if possible.
5	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: You deserve it.
6	MEMBER ZIEMER: I would just like
7	to remind the Board that as a follow-up to the
8	discussion on General Steel Industries, the
9	TBD-6000 Work Group will be meeting on August
10	28 th , focusing particularly on the residual
11	period
12	(Telephone interference.)
13	MEMBER ZIEMER: recommendation
14	for the September
15	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Paul, you were
16	breaking up there. I had trouble I think we
17	picked up that you have your meeting August
18	28th and then you will be ready, expect to be
19	ready for a recommendation at the September
20	Board Meeting.
21	Good, any other Work Group Chairs
22	with

MEMBER MUNN: Yes, this is Wanda,
I'll be glad to report on Procedures, if you'd
like.

CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Go ahead.

We met July 31st in MEMBER MUNN: Cincinnati with an extremely heavy agenda. We knew that it was going to be a full day. it was indeed, it was after 5:00 when we finally adjourned, and had a number of items to carry over. But it was an extremely productive day. The Board Review which we are now calling the BRS, is in very good condition and is working very nicely for the entire Subcommittee when we do meet.

We have added our expectations of tracking for the overarching issues which to this point have not been tracked specifically as such by the Subcommittee. We'll be doing that in the future, getting those established and making sure that we are covering them correctly.

We also are doing multiple revision

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

questions that we are facing for the first time. We have situations where our contractor has reviewed more than one revision of a procedure.

And at this time, one of the shortcomings of our database is that it pulls up only the current version of the procedure that is under review. This of course is not going to be sufficient for us, when we have early revisions and/or more than one revision that have findings.

So we had a technical call, I spoke with the NIOSH lead and with the SC&A lead last week, and we came to an agreement on what we were going to request of the IT folks in order to get all available revisions of any procedure up on the hot link list.

So that any of us who are reviewing that internally can review the correct version that was the generator for the findings that we're looking at.

That will take a little while,

NEAL R. GROSS

because it's a significant effort for us to be asking our digital folks to do that. And a great deal of searching needs to be done to ensure that we've covered the water front. But that is under process.

Didn't mention the fact that we have a new Member on the Subcommittee. Mrs. Beach has joined us. We are delighted to have her, she's a great addition and we're looking forward to working with her.

We did significant work on the Program Evaluation Reports this time. And because we are covering those PERs so thoroughly, as we have not actually in the past, we have added some additional findings to our status report.

Actually, 21 new findings have gone onto the report, so that we now are dealing with a total of 561 as opposed to the 540 we had going into that meeting.

We have no new report on the two pagers. Those summary reports are in the

NEAL R. GROSS

1 hands of NIOSH and they are working on getting 2 those up an onto our public available web 3 So that folks can see what was done page. with the wide variety of these things that we 4 5 have reviewed in the past. 6 We had a difficult time identifying 7 when our next meeting was going to be. Subcommittee Members have very heavy schedules 8 and we've had to push that out to November the 9 10 1st, which will be our next meeting. longer than we would prefer, but we really 11 12 don't have any options given the schedules of 13 the primary folks that we need to work with. And that's the report. 14 15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thank you Wanda. 16 Any other Board Members want to make Work Group --17 Jim, this is Brad. 18 MEMBER CLAWSON: 19 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes. 20 I just wanted to MEMBER CLAWSON: talk and make sure the Board is aware if they 21

the agenda, we're going to have a

1 report on Pantex for the later years. Some of 2 the early years. 3 Just, if they have any questions or anything, it's been over a year since the Work 4 5 Group last met and we left the later years for 6 NIOSH to be able to do a little bit more 7 evaluation. And they're going to be giving a report to us in the earlier years. 8 I just wanted people to be aware of that. Ιf 9 10 any information that they need or 11 questions that they have, if they 12 contact me or NIOSH so we could take care of 13 that. CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, any other 14 Board Members with updates? 15 16 I have two actually. Hanford Work Group will 17 The be meeting the week before the Board meeting. 18 19 have a new or a more recent SEC to review an 20 83.13 concerning some data monitoring issues. We have our Evaluation Report and we have a 21

review of that Evaluation Report now from SC&A

1	which has been sent to the Work Group Members.					
2	And we'll be meeting, I believe it's September					
3	12th to discuss that. And tentatively, put					
4	that on the agenda for the September Board					
5	Meeting.					
6	And the other Work Group, trying to					
7	wrap up Weldon Spring, so I joined the Work					
8	Group for what we think is one meeting, which					
9	is scheduled for September 10 th .					
10	We've had a fair amount of turnover					
11	on that Work Group.					
12	So Dr. Lemen, Dr. Fields and I will					
13	be meeting just to try to wrap up those couple					
14	of issues outstanding, and plan to come back					
15	to the Board at our Denver meeting, be able to					
16	wrap up that SEC Evaluation. So we'll be					
17	reporting on that also.					
18	MEMBER GRIFFON: Jim, this is Mark					
19	Griffon.					
20	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.					
21	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes, I can just					
22	give a quick, you know, September 11th, we're					

1	have a Los Alamos Work Group Call.
2	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.
3	MEMBER GRIFFON: And I think that
4	is in preparation also for the full Board
5	Meeting, so we'll have a full report at the
6	full Board Meeting.
7	And then also for Rocky Flats, we
8	are not going to have a Work Group Meeting.
9	But I believe we're expecting to have a
10	presentation of the Evaluation Report on the
11	latest SEC. Is that correct, Jim, at the full
12	Board Meeting?
13	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.
14	MEMBER GRIFFON: Yes. So no Work
15	Group meeting, but we're expecting to have a
16	transition to NIOSH.
17	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, the report
18	is, LaVon said, I think, it isn't scheduled to
19	come out till the -
20	MEMBER GRIFFON: The week before,
21	right, yes.
22	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Anyone else?

1	MEMBER ANDERSON: This is Andy.
2	Our AWE Work Group is going to be meeting on
3	the 7th to go over finalizing our position and
4	our recommendations on United Nuclear. And
5	that will be reported out at Denver.
6	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good.
7	MEMBER BEACH: Hi, Jim, this is
8	Josie Beach.
9	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, go ahead,
10	Josie.
11	MEMBER BEACH: Mound is also
12	meeting on the 31st. And we expect to finish
13	up tritides and then maybe just get a brief
14	overview from NIOSH on the radon, which is
15	going to be presented at the September Board
16	Meeting as well.
17	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, I wondered
18	about that, because that report sounded like
19	it wasn't coming out till September sometime.
20	MEMBER BEACH: Right. So, we'll
21	get something from NIOSH, hopefully just an
22	update, and then an update on our Site Profile

1	issues.
2	We've also got a Worker Outreach
3	Work Group scheduled. And I'll probably just
4	give a brief report on where we are at the
5	meeting as well.
6	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, great.
7	Anybody else? I think we've covered about
8	every Work Group, so, good.
9	Board Correspondence. I don't think
10	I have anything new to report. We had a letter
11	that came in, we talked about it at our last
12	meeting, from representative Lujan. And then
13	there was some sort of a addendum or some
14	follow-up questions from them that were sort
15	of best answered by NIOSH. So NIOSH has
16	essentially responded to that correspondence.
17	September Board Meeting, Ted, do
18	you have anything to tell us. Ted?
19	MEMBER CLAWSON: He's on vacation.
20	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I guess so.
21	MR. KATZ: I'm sorry, I was muted.
22	Tive circulated to the Members the draft

1	agenda. If you see, it's incredibly full, in
2	fact, I think it's probably our fullest agenda
3	ever. But I have nothing to add to what I
4	have circulated. So far everything on there is
5	still a go.
6	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, and just so
7	everyone knows, my understanding is, unless
8	I've missed an email, was that we still
9	haven't finalized the location yet?
10	MR. KATZ: That's correct, that's
11	correct. We still don't have an approval on a
12	contract with a hotel yet.
13	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And any idea when
14	you're expecting that?
15	MR. KATZ: Well, I've just been
16	dealing with that today again. But I would
17	hope that they get it done this week.
18	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. I think
19	everyone has the agenda, so you know the times
20	for that and should be able to make flight
21	arrangements. It will just be the hotel
22	arrangements.

1	Any other business Board Members					
2	wish to bring up? If not, I guess we I					
3	don't know, do we need a motion to adjourn on					
4	the phone? Or to hang up? I don't know what					
5						
6	MEMBER MUNN: I think you are the					
7	key to that.					
8	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.					
9	MEMBER MUNN: It's your call.					
10	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I think we're					
11	ready to adjourn.					
12	MEMBER MUNN: Thank you all.					
13	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, thank you,					
14	everybody, and we'll see you in September in					
15	the Denver area, if we don't see you at a Work					
16	Group.					
17	MEMBER GRIFFON: In the Brown Palace					
18	or someplace downtown, if I can find it.					
19	MR. KATZ: Thanks, everyone.					
20	CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, thanks,					
21	everybody. Thank you, Ted.					
22	(Whereupon, the meeting in the					

above-entitled	matter	was	concluded	at	TT:23
a.m.)					