

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

+ + + + +

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL
SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND
WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

101st MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY
SEPTEMBER 17, 2014

+ + + + +

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

PRESENT:

JAMES M. MELIUS, Chairman
HENRY ANDERSON, Member
JOSIE BEACH, Member
R. WILLIAM FIELD, Member
DAVID KOTELCHUCK, Member
JAMES LOCKEY, Member
WANDA I. MUNN, Member
DAVID B. RICHARDSON, Member
GENEVIEVE S. ROESSLER, Member
PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member

NEAL R. GROSS

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

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Teleconference Board Meeting, has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and certified by the Chair of the Advisory Board for accuracy at this time. The reader should be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

2

LORETTA R. VALERIO, Member
TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official

REGISTERED AND/OR PUBLIC COMMENT PARTICIPANTS

ADAMS, NANCY, NIOSH Contractor
AL-NABULSI, ISAF, DOE
HARTSFIELD, DEKEELY, HHS
HINNEFELD, STU, DCAS
KINMAN, JOSH, DCAS
KOTSCH, JEFF, DOL
MAKHIJANI, ARJUN, SC&A
MCKEEL, DAN
NETON, JIM, DCAS
RUTHERFORD, LAVON, DCAS
STIVER, JOHN, SC&A

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Roll Call
Ted Katz 4

Recording Absentee Votes (General Atomics and
Simonds Saw and Steel SEC Petitions)
Ted Katz 4

NIOSH Update on Implementing 10-Year Review
Recommendations
Stuart Hinnefeld 6

Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition Status
Update
LaVon Rutherford 56

Updates from Work Groups and Subcommittees
WG/SC Chairs
Wanda Munn, Procedures Subcommittee 60
James Melius, SEC Work Group 63
Dave Kotelchuck, Dose Reconstruction
Subcommittee 65

Plans for the November 2014 Board Meeting 66

Correspondence 80

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

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

11:10 a.m.

MR. KATZ: This is the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health. The agenda for this meeting is posted on the NIOSH website, under the Board section, under meetings, today's date. There are no additional materials posted or to be presented at this meeting, per se. We have some presentations but no written materials. And let's do roll call. In roll call we do not need to address conflict of interest because we're not dealing in any specific sites involving any conflicts. So, we'll do roll call.

(Roll call)

MR. KATZ: All right. Jim, it's your agenda.

CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And, Ted, I'll turn it back over to you for recording absentee votes.

1 MR. KATZ: Right. Thank you. So
2 at the last Board meeting in July in Idaho we
3 had two SEC petition actions, one on General
4 Atomics for the period '60 to '69 to extend the
5 Class, and one for Simonds Saw from '58 to 2011,
6 which is the residual period, with a motion to
7 decline adding additional Class to Simonds Saw.
8 And both of those motions passed unanimously.
9 The last vote was cast by Mr. Griffon on August
10 18th and that recommendation from the Board,
11 those two recommendations were received by the
12 Secretary on September 3rd. So that completes
13 the actions for the July meeting.

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thank
15 you, Ted. At our July meeting actually we had
16 asked Stu Hinnefeld to give us an update on
17 implementing the 10-year review
18 recommendations, and I believe Stu, or actually
19 Ted forwarded an email from Stu, I think,
20 earlier this week just pointing us to where some

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of this information was on the DCAS website.

2 And, Stu, I'll turn it over to you.

3 MEMBER ANDERSON: Hi, Jim. This
4 is Andy. Just want to let you know that I made
5 it on.

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

7 MR. KATZ: Great. Welcome, Andy.

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Welcome Andy.

9 MEMBER ANDERSON: Thank you.

10 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay. I sent the
11 email so that Members of the Board could look
12 at the 10-year review sections. There is also
13 a document that compiles all the
14 recommendations from the various chapters of
15 the 10-year review. And then there's another
16 document that lists sort of -- it's called
17 Priority Actions that lists certain priority
18 actions which are identified as the things to
19 be focused on at the time for each of the five
20 sections.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And so, to provide an update. Now,
2 that particular part of our website hasn't been
3 updated very religiously lately. We do have
4 sort of a remodeling our website that's
5 supposed to roll out I think by the end of the
6 month. The remodeling is driven by CDC
7 guidance on what websites should look like. So
8 it will look a little different but will contain
9 all the pertinent information. And that's
10 been a relatively lengthy process to
11 accomplish. And once we get that out of the
12 way, then we will take a shot at updating
13 information in our 10-year review section and
14 then providing periodic updates after that as
15 well.

16 But speaking now in terms of where
17 we are with some of the recommendations from
18 there, I will follow the pattern in the Priority
19 Actions document. For some reason the
20 priority action items for the various factors

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 are not listed in the same order as they are in
2 the document that lists the entirety of the
3 recommendations. So I'll provide a quick
4 summary -- well, a relatively quick summary on
5 each of the chapters, and then at the end of the
6 chapter I'll ask if other people would like
7 additional information or have questions about
8 some of those things.

9 So the first chapter that is listed
10 there, it's called "Concerning Dose
11 Reconstructions." So these are
12 recommendations that relate to dose
13 reconstruction reports. And with respect to
14 those priority actions, there is one item that
15 is providing an overview of the quality
16 management system, and that was done. That was
17 given to the Dose Reconstruction Subcommittee
18 in 2012.

19 And the work on quality of dose
20 reconstructions essentially continues

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 routinely. It's sort of a routine activity
2 with the DR Subcommittee. And so, that's one
3 of the kind of general actions from the 10-year
4 review that is always subject to continuous
5 improvement. And so, you don't ever say, okay,
6 we're done worrying about the quality of dose
7 reconstruction. It's sort of the thing you
8 could do from then on.

9 There are also recommendations in
10 that section about SEC descriptions. Even
11 though it was in the dose reconstruction
12 section it talked about how you define SECs, and
13 so that making sure what can be reconstructed.
14 We are working on that now. I think we are
15 doing a good job giving partial dose
16 reconstructions as good a shake as we can. And
17 also there's a recommendation about making sure
18 with DOL that Classes can be administered.
19 That's a routine part of our process now, is we
20 provide proposed Classes to DOL and they let us

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 know about any administration issues as the
2 Class is proposed. So that's all routine.

3 When you move to the efficiency
4 measures, issues related to efficiency
5 measures, we did come out of an investigation
6 of what it would take to -- with our contractor
7 to eliminate efficiency measure dose
8 reconstructions, and it would take just an
9 extraordinary effort. Sometimes you might
10 want to call that prohibitively expensive or
11 prohibitively time consuming.

12 If you figure you're time limited or
13 money limited, however you want to figure it,
14 it would -- because a fair percentage, quite a
15 high percentage of our dose reconstruction
16 reports still have some type of overestimating
17 approach in them, and so it would be really sort
18 of cost-prohibitive to do with overestimates
19 completely. We do try to make sure that if
20 we're doing an overestimate it really does

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 provide some efficiency and not just do it
2 because it's available to us.

3 So we've kind of gone down that
4 path. We think we've done some things and
5 we'll continue to worry about that, because
6 that is a communication issue. That was one of
7 the actions we were going to take also with
8 about making it clear, trying to make our
9 communications more clearly about that. And
10 now the dose reconstructions do clearly state
11 when an efficiency overestimate has been done,
12 it also says that if additional information is
13 provided and this has to be redone, the estimate
14 of dose could very well go down. That's put out
15 there right in the dose reconstruction. And
16 then when we revise the dose reconstruction for
17 like a rework when it comes back, we do point
18 out what changed from the previous dose
19 reconstruction to the current one.

20 There are some other

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 recommendations that don't exactly hit
2 efficient measures. Well, actually many of
3 the recommendations from this section do fall
4 in the category of QA/QC in efficiency
5 measures. And so the actions that we are doing
6 in those areas work with the DR Subcommittee in
7 continuing to try to improve our communications
8 and the continuation of only using efficiency
9 measures when they really provide some benefit.
10 That addresses several of them.

11 There were recommendations about
12 making partial dose reconstructions as
13 complete as possible. I think that's going on
14 quite a bit now, especially -- it's something,
15 like I said, we continue to work on. The Site
16 Profiles, recent Site Profile Reviews of Site
17 Profiles for sites that are SECs is helping to
18 push that along and we're coming to terms now
19 with making sure we get in the best shape
20 possible with partial DRs.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 There's an SEC Class Definition
2 recommendation that goes along those lines.
3 And there's one recommendation in there that I
4 had to kind of look back at the context in the
5 report to figure out what they were talking
6 about. It has to do with something about
7 tension in these processes and management
8 should evaluate that tension. I think it
9 relates to the PER process section of the
10 report, I believe. And if I'm not mistaken,
11 the 10-year report was written after we had gone
12 through a PER process where every potentially
13 affected claim was returned to us for rework
14 regardless of whether the outcome of the claim
15 was going to change or not.

16 And that was a very unpopular
17 approach with claimants because claimants
18 whose case had been decided and they'd been
19 denied and then maybe it took them a year to get
20 over being upset about it and then they get a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 letter saying, oh, hey, look, we're going to
2 look at your report again, your dose
3 reconstruction again. Then they get hope
4 again and then we send them another letter
5 saying, oh, wait, you still don't get paid.
6 And so we don't do that anymore now we only
7 rework claims -- we do the evaluation of claims,
8 find out which ones are going to change and
9 those are the ones we reworked. And those are
10 the claims that get notified. So I believe the
11 process that we do now, we follow now, address
12 that recommendation.

13 Okay. That's what I have for the
14 dose reconstruction section. Are there any
15 questions on that, or comments?

16 MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda.
17 Thank you very much for doing this overview.

18 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay. Thank you.

19 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Right. Yes,
20 Dave Kotelchuck. I have no question.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: This is Jim
2 Melius. I do have a question, and that's on the
3 last item, the PER issue. I think that -- and
4 you may already have incorporated this, but one
5 can imagine at least a situation where there's
6 been a change in the dose reconstruction method
7 that would be dependent to some extent on new
8 information or additional information from the
9 claimant that might not have been a part of the
10 record because it wasn't viewed as being
11 relevant to the dose reconstruction. So is
12 something like that taken into account in terms
13 of the types of information that might be useful
14 rather than just sort of a blanket policy of,
15 well, we're just going to recalculate and --

16 MR. HINNEFELD: I'm not quite sure
17 I completely understand the question. Are you
18 talking about information by the claimant that
19 would affect a particular claim?

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: A particular

1 claim or particular part of the dose
2 reconstruction, the part of the dose
3 reconstruction that's being changed.

4 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay. So I'm
5 trying to understand the sequence here. A
6 claimant would provide us information that
7 would lead us to conclude that our dose
8 reconstruction approach should be changed and
9 therefore we'll do a dose reconstruction?

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: No. No, no.
11 You've already found through some process; a
12 Site Profile Review, SEC, whatever, there's now
13 a problem with the dose reconstruction method.
14 So it's been modified. Okay?

15 MR. HINNEFELD: Right.

16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: But if that
17 modification or the calculation of the dose
18 related to that modification were based on --
19 could be dependent on additional information
20 from the claimant.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay. I think I
2 understand now.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, there would
4 have been no reason to inquire or obtain that
5 information before. Now there's new
6 information.

7 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay. I think the
8 issue would be this: We've decided to do a PER
9 and we evaluate the cases with the information
10 we have on hand. The claimant may have new
11 information, newer information than we have,
12 but because we don't know that information our
13 evaluation would say we don't need to rework it.

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Or the claimant
15 may have had older information but you either
16 didn't inquire or didn't record that
17 information because it wasn't considered to be
18 relevant.

19 MR. HINNEFELD: Oh. Oh, okay.
20 Now I see.

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I'm saying that
2 that information was ignored appropriately
3 before.

4 MR. HINNEFELD: I understand the
5 question now.

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, yes.

7 MR. HINNEFELD: I don't recall an
8 instance when I would think that would be
9 relevant. Certainly any information provided
10 would be in the case file. I think I understand
11 the question now, but I'm having a hard time
12 envisioning when that might come into play.

13 Jim or Bomber, can you envision
14 anything like that?

15 MR. RUTHERFORD: I can't. This is
16 Bomber.

17 DR. NETON: This is Jim. I can't
18 think of one. We evaluate the change in the
19 process in every case. We only recalculated
20 doses for cases that it would increase the dose.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 In that case the complete dose reconstruction
2 is redone. If the change would result in a
3 negative -- decrease the dose, we wouldn't
4 bother to reconsider it. So I can't envision
5 a scenario where that might happen.

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I don't want to
7 belabor this, but what if the information
8 wasn't in the case file because it wasn't
9 considered important to inquire about earlier?

10 MR. RUTHERFORD: So you're --

11 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I mean, it's
12 hypothetical. And again, I just want to sort
13 of avoid --

14 MR. HINNEFELD: I understand. I
15 understand.

16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: The reason to be
17 efficient about doing this process but at the
18 same time it may not be just simply a
19 recalculation. There may need to be some
20 additional information gathering.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. HINNEFELD: I think that would
2 become apparent to us. If we hit that
3 situation --

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

5 MR. HINNEFELD: -- I think it will
6 become apparent to us at the time that we make
7 the dose reconstruction technique change, that
8 leads to the PER.

9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

10 MR. HINNEFELD: I think that's when
11 we would identify that. And then the search
12 for the sufficient information in order to make
13 the appropriate changes with the new technique
14 would occur at that point. I guess it could at
15 times require investigation of claimant
16 information. I think our tendency though is
17 to -- if there's questions about a particular
18 claimant's applicability or not, we tend to say
19 we can't rule them out. We rule them in.

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. HINNEFELD: So I still have
2 trouble envisioning exactly when it would
3 happen, but I think the key actions would be
4 taken when we investigated the dose
5 reconstruction technique that led to the
6 change. I think that's where the
7 investigation for information would occur.

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

9 MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. Stu,
10 I wanted to thank you for that report. It seems
11 to me that this kind of internal review is one
12 of the most difficult things to make happen.
13 And when I was looking over the material that
14 you suggested, I was seized by the item
15 indicating that we were going to do a cost
16 benefit analysis on the overestimating DRs.
17 So I was very pleased to hear you address that
18 and wanted to thank you for the kind of effort
19 that has to go into this kind of follow up.
20 It's helpful for some of us.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay. Thanks,
2 Wanda.

3 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Hi, this is
4 David Richardson. Stu, I had a question. I
5 think you addressed it in part, but I was
6 wondering if you could speak a little bit more
7 about it. One of the action items I remember
8 coming out of the 10-year follow-up was that
9 DCAS would provide an answer to the question if
10 the DR Subcommittee's review found an error,
11 why would that error not be bound by the internal
12 review that happens by DCAS and ORAU for QA/QC?

13 MR. HINNEFELD: Well, Grady is not
14 on the phone and Grady of course is our main rep
15 to the DR Subcommittee now. His report to me
16 as I was preparing this was that that question
17 is routinely asked now on these DR findings.
18 And we in ORAU tried to sort out what happened
19 here and is there something that can be done to
20 prevent this error or an error like this from

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 happening again.

2 So I don't have a lot of detail on
3 that, but I think we could certainly put
4 something together. Since I'm going to make
5 Grady do it, I don't have to do it. We could
6 probably put something together for say the
7 upcoming DR Subcommittee meeting.

8 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes, and that
9 might be useful. There are some sort of errors
10 where we have -- and I'd put "errors" in quotes
11 here, if I could -- where there's differences
12 of perspective or interpretation of technical
13 issues or interpretation of guidance
14 documents, and we've had really productive
15 discussions about how to clarify those.

16 But there's another class of
17 recurring errors which are the things that fall
18 into the category like of data extraction
19 keypunch issues. And some of them we've talked
20 about improvements in tools or procedures to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 avoid those, and yet I remain kind of struck by
2 two sets of eyes reviewing information. How is
3 it that there's a series of years missing, for
4 example? And like how did that get signed off
5 that that was correct and that wasn't, and
6 particularly when there should be multiple
7 layers of QA/QC? I think that's the category
8 I'm most interested in.

9 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay. I think I'm
10 probably not in a position to say much more than
11 I have at this point, or I'm not prepared to,
12 but I think we could provide something along
13 those lines. And maybe it would be a topic for
14 discussion at a DR Subcommittee meeting.

15 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Well, that
16 would be helpful. Dave Kotelchuck.

17 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay. All right.
18 Are there other things on that chapter then?
19 Okay. I think the next chapter that's
20 addressed in the priority recommendations

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 things is the quality of service. And this has
2 kind of divided into issues related to using
3 customer-supplied information, issues related
4 to the understandability and quality of
5 information, issues related to access of
6 information and issues related to perceived
7 burden on claimants and petitioners.

8 Interestingly enough, when you look
9 at the actions that says related to using
10 customer-supplied information, really the
11 action on the priority action item list doesn't
12 really seem to address that particular topic.
13 It seems to address clarity of our
14 communications.

15 But with respect to using
16 customer-supplied information, we have done a
17 number of things that I think we're trying to
18 improve in that area. And this is certainly an
19 area I would put in the continuous improvement
20 category. No matter how much we improve our

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 use of customer-provided information, I don't
2 know that we're ever done trying to listen
3 carefully and take the information that we
4 receive carefully. Seems that probably the
5 hardest part of communication is listening, and
6 it's particularly hard when people are telling
7 you things that don't necessarily align with
8 what you thought before the conversation
9 started. But we continue to work on
10 that. We have made certain concrete steps
11 about making sure dose reconstructions
12 specifically address information provided in
13 the closeout interviews of people that lists
14 incidents or items that they were involved in
15 that they felt like was important to their dose
16 reconstruction. We want to make sure that we
17 talk to those items, at least in the dose
18 reconstruction and use that information
19 appropriately and make sure that the dose
20 reconstruction is appropriate in light of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 information the customer provided.

2 We also get communications from
3 claimants in other arenas like closeout
4 interviews and we spend a fair amount of effort
5 trying to answer and respond do that. And not
6 just the answer, but use information. It's not
7 that uncommon that we will get information at
8 a closeout interview that we did not have
9 beforehand that is relevant to eh dose
10 reconstruction. And so those dose
11 reconstructions are revised based on
12 information we receive at that time.

13 And so we continue to try to listen
14 carefully to our customers, you know, claimants
15 and advocates, whoever is talking to us. And
16 it's an area that I know we need to continue to
17 work on and I think we'll always need to
18 continue to work on throughout the process. We
19 will never say we are good enough at it.

20 Related to understandability and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 quality of information, we have made a number
2 of concrete steps there. We rewrote a number
3 of the fact sheets that we have on our website
4 that provide information about the various
5 aspects of what we do in order to make those more
6 understandable. Routinely when we write
7 communications for the public we are using the
8 government-wide direction about plain
9 language. We're trying to use plain language
10 to the extent that we can for communications to
11 the public, and we try to do that now in
12 responding to letters and inquiries from
13 customers in whatever arena. We try to make
14 sure our information is written plainly and in
15 language that people can understand.

16 Issues related to access to
17 information, we try to put a lot of information
18 on our website. We hope people can be well
19 informed by the information on our Website.
20 Specifically, we are now posting things like

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 White Papers that are going to be discussed at
2 Work Group meetings. We now try and get those
3 posted. In most cases at least, if not all
4 cases, we get those posted on our website prior
5 to the Work Group meeting so that participants
6 can at least follow along in the document that's
7 being discussed and maybe have a better chance
8 of following the conversation of the Work
9 Groups since they have the document that's
10 being discussed in front of them.

11 And with respect to perceived
12 burdens on claimants and petitioners, we did
13 modify our cover letter on the CATI when we sent
14 the CATI questions to the claimants before the
15 CATI is performed. Computer-assisted
16 telephone interview. That's what CATI stands
17 for. We did change that language to try to
18 reassure the claimant that they were not the
19 ones that were primarily responsible for
20 gathering information for the dose

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 reconstruction. We believe we can do a good
2 dose reconstruction even if they can't remember
3 or if they don't know much about their loved
4 one's work. So we tried to change that
5 language to make that process seem less of a
6 burden on the claimant.

7 Now, also aside from those priority
8 items there were quite a lot of the
9 recommendations related to accepting and using
10 customer-provided information. And like I
11 said, I believe we're improving in that area.
12 I think quite a bit of the recent Rocky Flats
13 SEC investigation involved resolving
14 customer-provided information and I believe
15 much of the LANL SEC work, if you go back a
16 couple of years, was petitioner-provided
17 information.

18 And when we communicate with a
19 claimant or an advocate in a letter we try to
20 make sure we are addressing exactly what

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 they're talking about, speaking to them in
2 plain English and trying to utilize the
3 information they provide us and take it
4 seriously. Again, this is something that we
5 never say we're done with this. We always will
6 try to improve in our acceptance of information
7 provided and use that as much as we can going
8 forward.

9 There were a number of
10 recommendations about customer access to
11 information. Like I said earlier, we try to
12 put a lot of information on our website. Most
13 of our information is available. It's not
14 possible to make all our documents that we hold
15 available to the public because of Privacy Act
16 restrictions. Much of it is Privacy Act
17 information that we have.

18 We also get a lot of information
19 from the Department of Energy that they have not
20 reviewed for public release. And so they

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 provide it to us more expediently if they don't
2 review it for public release. And so there's
3 some information, or quite a lot of our holdings
4 that just because of the manner in which we
5 received them or the information they contain
6 we just can't make everything public.

7 But we do what we can in terms of
8 information that's being discussed and is
9 important for decisions. Most if not all of
10 the documents that are put up for discussion at
11 Work Group meetings are referenced. Those
12 references can be pursued through FOIA,
13 although I know the FOIA process is not a very
14 claimant-favorable process. It's not
15 particularly timely and some information often
16 shows up as redacted through FOIA as well.

17 A number of recommendations were
18 about the burden on claimants, and I think I
19 addressed that earlier.

20 There was a recommendation about

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 making process tutorials available to all or
2 provide independent health physicists for --
3 you know, that have not pursued a staff of
4 independent HPs for this claimant base. I
5 believe the Board's contractor acts pretty
6 effectively as devil's advocate to NIOSH
7 positions as they go through work and I think
8 they work pretty effectively to provide a
9 counterbalancing opinion to the opinion that
10 might come out of our office.

11 We do have some videos on our
12 website that describe what we do and how we do
13 it. There is some information out there like
14 that. We do provide workshops, but I wouldn't
15 say they're available to everybody. We go to
16 our outreach contractor ATL who sets up a dose
17 reconstruction workshop for interested parties
18 that they identify. And we also have done some
19 workshops through our Ombudsman to interested
20 parties. So we try to get information out

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 there to people who are interested in it, but
2 I couldn't really say it's available to all.

3 Okay. That's what I had to say on
4 the quality of service. I wonder if there are
5 any questions on that at this point.

6 Okay. Hearing none, I guess I'll
7 proceed.

8 The next section of recommendations
9 was concerning timeliness, and they are grouped
10 into issues related to higher priority to
11 return; that means dose reconstructions that
12 are returned to us for reworks, issues related
13 to aggressive time limits for dose
14 reconstruction, and issues related to
15 aggressive time limits for the completion of
16 the review of SEC petitions.

17 With respect to those
18 recommendations, at least since the time of the
19 10-year review or shortly following that we
20 have given a higher priority to reworks, to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 cases that have been returned, have been done
2 once and then returned to us by DOL for some
3 reason. Usually it's an additional cancer.
4 And we give that higher priority by
5 incentivizing our contractor to complete a high
6 percentage of those within 60 days of the time
7 they have all the information. Often on a
8 rework, when a case is reworked the only new
9 information is that there's an additional
10 cancer and you have all the information needed
11 to do it. So we would do those in 60 days.

12 If the additional information was
13 new verified employment, for instance, we would
14 have to send a request to the Department of
15 Labor for dose information from that new
16 employment. And so we wouldn't have all the
17 information available immediately upon
18 receiving the rework. So the 60 days wouldn't
19 start until we received all that information.
20 So we do have that timeline objective for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 timeliness on reworks which is more aggressive
2 than our objective on dose reconstructions.

3 Since the time of the 10-year review
4 we did impose a six-month -- somewhere between
5 the time of the 10-year review and the review
6 now we incentivized our contractor, told them
7 that they should do a high percentage of claims
8 within six months of having all the available
9 data. We recently changed that to five months,
10 shortened that up to five months, and they're
11 working successfully to that.

12 There are other recommendations of
13 being aggressive on dose reconstruction
14 timeliness. We have not pushed beyond five
15 months at this point partly because the
16 resources that would be needed to make this a
17 shorter period will be taken away from other
18 work that we consider important like Site
19 Profile finding resolution and Evaluation
20 Report Review finding resolution. So at this

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 time we don't really have any intent to push far
2 beyond where we are, but because we feel like
3 there's important work to do elsewhere in the
4 program.

5 And timeliness, I didn't really
6 have many recommendations other than the ones
7 that were addressed by the priority actions.

8 So any questions or comments on
9 that?

10 Yes. Did somebody say something or
11 did somebody say my name?

12 MEMBER MUNN: No, I think it was
13 "nope."

14 MR. HINNEFELD: Oh, okay. SEC
15 petitions had a long, long list of
16 recommendations when you look at the total, but
17 in the priority actions we had items relating
18 to separating policy from science issues,
19 issues related to the definition of "sufficient
20 accuracy," and issues related to a possible

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 health physics bias.

2 With respect to policy and science
3 decisions we have fought with this since the
4 time of 10-year review and have failed to really
5 reach common accord even internally in the
6 office on what the policy or science decisions
7 that are made as we evaluate an SEC. Some
8 people will say they're all science decisions.
9 Other people will say, well, you use science to
10 inform the decisions, but really they're all
11 sort of policy decisions. And so I guess it's
12 our own failing that we just can't really sort
13 these out, policy from science.

14 But we do believe there is value in
15 a particular recommendation to describe why you
16 reached the decision you reached. And so we
17 are pursuing that. I think it might be
18 something of a companion document with an
19 Evaluation Report. We're still kind of
20 thinking about how this might be useful. It

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 might be useful to the Board I think if we
2 provided it with an Evaluation Report that said
3 here's what our thinking was as we arrived at
4 this decision.

5 So we're messing around. We
6 started out -- we've been working on this for
7 years, literally years, writing drafts and
8 rejecting them and commenting and rethinking
9 what we might write in these things. And we
10 didn't work on it every day for years, but
11 there's been effort on it periodically for
12 years.

13 So we're trying to arrive at
14 something that we think helps to explain why
15 decisions were made perhaps in better or more
16 understandable language in an Evaluation
17 Report. At some point maybe when we come to
18 something we think is useful that might help
19 inform us about where in the process it will be
20 useful, in other words, in our discussions with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the Board or whether it's a summary for public
2 consumption on our website, something like
3 that. So we're still struggling with that. I
4 think if anyone has comments or would like to
5 assist us on that, we would be receptive of
6 ideas on that.

7 With respect to a definition of
8 "sufficient accuracy," there were a number of
9 recommendations about that in the SEC section.
10 Part of my reaction to that is if we could do
11 a better job of defining "sufficient accuracy,"
12 we would have done it when we wrote the
13 regulation. We have done a bit of work on this
14 though. We've done sort of some case law
15 studies that we've presented to the SEC Issues
16 Work Group where we've described things that
17 are about decisions that we had made to that
18 time on various Work Groups.

19 And so, we didn't ignore this. We
20 have tried to work on that. I think this

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 question probably comes into the SEC Issues
2 Work Group in the indirect exposure method,
3 part of the quality of science evaluation where
4 we're talking about coworker models and what
5 really is sufficiently accurate when you start
6 down the coworker pathway. So it's something
7 that of course we continue to work on. The
8 Board also continues to refine its thoughts on
9 that.

10 I think we've made a lot of progress
11 since 2011 when the report was written in terms
12 of a common understanding of what might be
13 sufficiently accurate, but it's something that
14 I think probably the better definition of
15 sufficient accuracy will arise from our
16 continuing work with the Board and a decision
17 is reached on various SEC Classes. And like I
18 said, if we could define "sufficient accuracy"
19 better in words, then we would have done it when
20 we wrote the regulation on SECs.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 The final item about health physics
2 bias, the final in the priority
3 recommendations, is kind of near to my heart
4 because I'm confident for a fact that the author
5 of this report got that from me, from a
6 conversation that she had with me. And what I
7 said was that in this program -- this goes back
8 early. I mean, she talked to us probably in
9 2009 or there, so it's a long time ago when these
10 conversations were going on. Maybe it was
11 2010.

12 But the conversation, what I said
13 was when you're a health physicist you're given
14 a problem and told answer the problem. And so,
15 you write down your assumptions because there
16 may be information gaps that you don't have
17 every bit of information needed to solve that
18 problem, but you can make some reasonable
19 assumptions. And you say, well, assuming
20 these things are true, then the answer to the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 problem is this. And so, there's sort of this
2 built-in professional approach or mindset
3 that, yes, I can solve the problem. So you're
4 not really presented with a situation where one
5 of the avenues you can take is there's not
6 enough information to answer this question.
7 So that's where that came from. I'm confident
8 that's where that came from in that report.

9 Now having said that, I think that
10 today in 2014, having worked with the Board and
11 having gone through so much activity on SECs,
12 I think we're far more attuned over here to the
13 ability to say there's not enough information.
14 And I think that's reflected in the number of
15 83.14s that have been brought forward and I
16 think in a sort of a more receptive give and take
17 in the conversations with the Board and their
18 contractor in Work Groups.

19 So I would like to say that we are
20 addressing any issues related to health physics

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 bias. Of course bias is always in the eye of
2 the beholder, and I'm a health physicist. And
3 so others may have other opinions on this, but
4 I believe we're doing certainly better than we
5 were at the time of the 10-year report.

6 There were a lot of recommendations
7 in this section other than what are addressed
8 by the priority actions. I mean, a lot of the
9 recommendations are addressed by priority
10 action because they fall in the same
11 categories. There's a recommendation about
12 submitting -- for complex SEC evaluations to
13 submit a work plan, a comprehensive work --
14 petition-specific evaluation plan. We can do
15 that now. When we aren't going to make the 180
16 days, we do require an evaluation plan and the
17 submittal of that. That's when we get a
18 complex petition.

19 There were several recommendations
20 about surrogate data. That has been I think

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 vetted a lot with the -- I think it's the SEC
2 Issues Work Group. I know the Board has
3 guidance on when it's acceptable to use
4 surrogate data. And we have our IG-004, which
5 is I think very similar to the Board's guidance.
6 So we think surrogate data has been addressed
7 quite a lot in the interim time and it's been
8 given some careful study by the Board and by us.

9 There were several recommendations
10 about using broadly applicable presumptions in
11 the SEC evaluation process. And I guess our
12 reaction to that is that when we look at an SEC
13 petition in each case you probably have a unique
14 combination of exposure environment and
15 available documentation. Those two things
16 aren't likely to be identical at any two sites,
17 or maybe even very similar any two sites. And
18 so, we're not really sure how broadly
19 applicable presumptions can even be applied in
20 the SEC process. So I'm not sure if we can do

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 anything with those or not.

2 There were recommendations that we
3 expand our efforts to cooperate with
4 petitioners. And I believe we've made
5 progress in that area. We have an SEC
6 counselor; have had for some time now, who
7 communicates regularly with petitioners and
8 assists them in preparing petitions or in
9 gathering information. We have phone calls
10 with the petitioner at the qualification stage
11 and try to help get petitions qualified at that
12 stage. So, I believe we're being more
13 cooperative with petitioners than we were a
14 number of years ago. Again, this is something
15 that we always want to make sure we are working
16 to improve and making sure petitioners are
17 getting fair treatment when they deal with us.

18 So I think maybe I'll stop my
19 comments there on this chapter and I wonder if
20 there are other questions or comments from the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Board.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Actually; this
3 is Jim Melius, Stu, I think you're being
4 somewhat pessimistic or whatever about meeting
5 some of these, addressing some of these
6 recommendations, because I actually think
7 you've gone farther than you may realize in
8 terms of sort of developing better criteria
9 that would certainly at least operationalize
10 some of these difficult issues.

11 I mean, one thing, back to I think
12 sort of the policy and science issue
13 recommendation that you're struggling with, I
14 think that may be something it would be worth
15 doing maybe initially within the SEC Issues
16 Work Group since we'll be doing some meetings
17 and maybe we can add that on. At least have
18 some discussion of that and sort of where you
19 are with it and what's been the problem in terms
20 of developing even a document on that.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Because I think
3 that's still worth -- and I have a feeling if
4 we're going to sort of quote/unquote "solve"
5 the sufficient accuracy issue and probably the
6 coworker issue, I think we need to sort of come
7 to grips to some extent at least with the sort
8 of science and policy issues. So whether you
9 need to articulate it in sort of a policy
10 document or some document, I'm not sure, but I
11 think it is something that we ought to at least
12 have some discussion of and then bring that
13 discussion to the Board also. But it may be
14 easier if we start it within the Work Group.

15 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Anybody else
17 have questions or comments?

18 I would just note I guess for the
19 record more than anything, recommendation 28,
20 which basically dealt with sort of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 trade-off between -- in terms of claims that are
2 awarded between SECs. And yet if you do an SEC
3 you in some ways are taking away some dose. It
4 came up at our last Board meeting. I believe
5 it was Dow SEC where we got into the discussion
6 of that where there was sort of spotty data from
7 several different types of exposure monitoring
8 for that group, but trying to define that within
9 an SEC we sort of ended up with a fairly long
10 discussion, although I think we resolved it
11 okay.

12 So these are sort of real issue that
13 come up occasionally and I think it's again
14 worth -- I think we've been addressing them
15 maybe more than you give yourselves credit for.

16 MR. HINNEFELD: Well, good.

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

18 MR. HINNEFELD: Good to hear. I'm
19 always glad to hear that, yes. Well, they
20 always say you should under-promise and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 over-deliver.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Right. Anybody
3 else questions or comments? If not, we'll let
4 Stu go on.

5 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay. Hearing
6 none, then we'll move onto the quality of
7 science chapter. The priority actions here
8 were issues related to documentation, issues
9 related to modification of the procedures
10 database, issues related to indirect exposure
11 assessments, issues related to better
12 characterization of claimant favorability,
13 issues related to review of OTIB-20, and issues
14 related to surrogate data.

15 So with the related to
16 documentation, there has been some work by our
17 contractor to alter their document control
18 procedure to include a process that is intended
19 to ensure that inconsistencies are not being
20 created. And it's kind of outlined in that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 procedure, that it would be served well in that.

2 There were recommendations about --
3 external peer review I guess is also in that
4 same priority item. There is a NIOSH policy on
5 external peer review of intramural projects.
6 We don't fall into that. We comply with that
7 because we don't really fall into it very much.
8 There are certain things that we do that --
9 major changes we get outside peer review on,
10 major change to program activities. Some of
11 the recent examples were our CLL model and risk
12 model and dose model. The paper on DDREF.
13 That's dose and dose rate effective factor.
14 And then back when we were looking at changes
15 to the IREP lung model or when NCI changed their
16 lung model I think we got external peer review
17 on several large changes like that.

18 I guess for our individual
19 documents like TBDs and OTIBs and things like
20 that we're not entirely sure than an external

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 review would be more informative or as
2 informative as the review that those documents
3 currently get in the program from the Board and
4 their contractor.

5 So I guess our reaction to that was
6 that we're kind of comfortable with the level
7 of external peer review that we're getting at
8 this point and we would prefer from our
9 standpoint to kind of continue along those
10 lines. We feeling like we're getting peer
11 review in cases when it's essential and we're
12 getting pretty thorough second-party review
13 with the program just by the nature of the way
14 the program operates.

15 With respect to the procedures
16 database we believe that recommendation had to
17 do with the Procedures Subcommittee Tracking
18 System, which we now call the Board Review
19 System, and we have made a number of
20 improvements on that.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 We've not really gone down a path of
2 putting in that data comments on procedures
3 that we may get from somewhere else. That BRS
4 has really only been utilized for Board-
5 generated comments, and I think that's probably
6 an appropriate use of it. When we get comments
7 from I'll call them customers, whether they be
8 claimants or advocates, or any interested
9 party -- I mean, the word "customer" is kind of
10 a nice word to use for that group of people.
11 When we get comments, we respond to those
12 comments. A lot of those tend to be
13 claim-specific, though, but to be honest, we
14 haven't built a system for when people send
15 comments that might be related to a procedure
16 rather than claim-specific.

17 And I think that might be something
18 that we might look at going forward. I don't
19 know how often that happens just off the top of
20 my head, but it might be worth trying to do a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 little more and not only rely on the Board's
2 review of procedures, but also do a little more
3 to compile comments that are received from
4 others on those. So we might be able to do
5 something along those lines going forward.

6 The indirect exposure assessment
7 methods is mainly the coworker approach, we
8 think. I guess surrogate data would fall into
9 that as well, but it seems to be mainly
10 coworker. Certainly a lot of work is being
11 done right now on coworker and what's an
12 appropriate approach for coworker in the SEC
13 Work Group. I think that work addresses this
14 recommendation to look carefully at how we're
15 doing those indirect exposure assessments. So
16 I think that's being addressed in that manner.

17 The issues related to better
18 characterizing claimant favorability are
19 quantifying really how we favor claimant-
20 favorable, but really how claimant-favorable

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 are we? We haven't done a whole lot down that
2 path. I think there are some opportunities to
3 do that, because there have been NIOSH dose
4 assessments of a sort done for health effect
5 studies and those dose assessments or dose
6 reconstructions would really want to be best
7 estimates of those.

8 You wouldn't want to over-estimate
9 or be particularly claimant favorable, quote,
10 "claimant favorable" in those cases because if
11 you inflate the doses in your study, then you
12 would have the result of minimizing or
13 artificially deflating the corresponding risk
14 coefficient. So those are really tried to be
15 measured and really, really best estimate kinds
16 of cases. And so, I think the comparison of
17 some of those to what would our dose
18 reconstruction be with the same set of data
19 might be informative along those lines.

20 Now, once we know that, I don't know

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 who the audience is for it. So we haven't
2 really pushed very hard down that pathway
3 because I don't really know where that
4 argument, where that demonstration of
5 favorability needs to be made. So we haven't
6 pushed very far down that path at all.

7 The OTIB-20 items, we did go back
8 into OTIB-20 and deleted the comparison that
9 had been identified in the quality of science
10 as not being sufficiently rigorous. That is no
11 longer a part of that process. The section
12 that was deleted, I don't know that it was ever
13 utilized even. So anyway, it hasn't been there
14 for quite some time. That was deleted very
15 shortly after the 10-year review was completed.

16 And we did review the EPA document.
17 One of the key action items had to do -- this
18 was related to surrogate data, this EPA
19 document that we were supposed to review. We
20 did obtain a review from that from someone

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 actually outside of DCAS and it didn't really
2 seem that there was much in the EPA document
3 that translated into our program very directly.
4 The report did kind of look at our IG-004 and
5 didn't -- findings that would warrant -- or
6 anyhow, I don't know if the report looked at
7 IG-004, but the report didn't have any findings
8 that warrant any changes to our IG-004, which
9 is our implementation guide for using surrogate
10 data. So our surrogate data tasks that we are
11 doing and have done elsewhere I think are
12 sufficient. The EPA document we didn't find
13 very instructive or applicable.

14 And so, there are other specific
15 recommendations in there. There's a specific
16 one about when using CDER data specify the
17 specific files that's used. We tend to shy
18 away from using CDER data on coworkers. We try
19 and get the data sets from the sites themselves
20 rather than trying to get it out of the CDER

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 database. So that may come up once in a while,
2 but it's not a common item that we would have
3 to deal with.

4 That's sort of the end of my notes.
5 I've already spoken much longer than I normally
6 speak, so I'll see if anyone has any questions
7 on that or any question or comments overall.

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Anybody with
9 questions or comments?

10 MEMBER ANDERSON: Well, that's a
11 good update.

12 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yes, this is
13 Dave Kotelchuck. Agreed. That was very
14 useful, Stu. Appreciate it.

15 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay. Thank you.
16 And like I said, once our website redesign is
17 rolled out, we will take a shot at trying to get
18 some updated discussion on our website and
19 maybe some periodic updates on things that are
20 continuing. Some of these it's hard to report

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 milestones. You know, are you listening to
2 your customers carefully? And, well, I
3 certainly hope so. I hope we continue to try
4 to listen as carefully as we can.

5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thanks
6 again.

7 I don't know if we're ready for this
8 now, but LaVon?

9 MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, this is
10 LaVon. I'm not sure I can be quite as long as
11 Stu.

12 (Laughter)

13 MR. RUTHERFORD: No, I should be
14 pretty sort.

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: But we may have
16 lots of questions, though.

17 MR. RUTHERFORD: Okay. Well,
18 there you go. Yes, we'll make it as long that
19 way.

20 As for the next Board meeting, at

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this time I do not believe any of the open
2 petitions will be ready to be closed for the
3 November Board meeting, nor do I believe any of
4 the new Petition Evaluations will be ready. We
5 are actively working on the new Petition
6 Evaluations and working to make the 180 days;
7 and we're on schedule, but the 180 days for all
8 three of those petitions is beyond the November
9 Board meeting.

10 It really looks like the March Board
11 meeting is going to be extremely busy. We
12 should be presenting new Petition Evaluations
13 for Dow, Walnut Creek, Westinghouse,
14 Bloomfield residual period and INL. I also
15 anticipate a few of the existing open petitions
16 will be ready for closure for the March meeting.
17 We should be presenting a Grand Junction
18 addendum. I believe with the few remaining
19 items we have at Fernald and some of the reports
20 we've done with Rocky and the schedule that we

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 have on Rocky -- I believe Fernald and Rocky may
2 be ready for a Work Group recommendation in
3 March. We're working towards closing a number
4 of the Hanford issues before that March
5 meeting, and so we may be able to close out at
6 least some of Hanford by then. And I think a
7 lot of the SRS issues will be completed by then.
8 So the March meeting is shaping up to be really
9 a full meeting.

10 As we get closer to the November
11 meeting if any of the open items that we have --
12 if it looks like we can expedite them and get
13 them closed in time for the Board's review prior
14 to the November meeting, we'll do that. We'll
15 do everything we can. Otherwise, they're all
16 going to be pushed to March.

17 And that's all I had.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I guess a
19 response and a suggestion. The response is I
20 think you're being pretty optimistic about some

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of this for March, but we'll see.

2 One of the things though, if some of
3 these, or even just one of these petitions is
4 relatively straightforward in terms of the
5 recommendation and findings and so forth,
6 there's no reason we could not do it at our Board
7 conference call.

8 MR. RUTHERFORD: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I think we've
10 done that before, usually on the 83.14-type of
11 petition and some of the older AWE sites which
12 tend to be less complicated and tend to be less
13 questions about. So think about that for -- I
14 can't remember when our call is --

15 Is in January, Ted?

16 MR. KATZ: I think so. I don't
17 recall exactly, but I think it is.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I think I recall
19 it, sometime in early January, but whatever.
20 But it might be something we can do and that will

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 sort of ease some of the congestion for the
2 March meeting.

3 MR. RUTHERFORD: Okay.

4 MEMBER BEACH: Jim, that meeting is
5 January 6th.

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thanks.

7 Anybody with other questions for
8 LaVon?

9 No? I guess you are going to be
10 shorter than Stu. Probably just as well.
11 Keep the boss happy.

12 MR. RUTHERFORD: That's right.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, we can do
14 that.

15 Updates from Work Groups and
16 Subcommittees? No one is obligated, but if you
17 have anything to report?

18 MEMBER MUNN: Well, this is Wanda.
19 Procedures has its usual long-winded agenda, if
20 you want me to go over that very quickly.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, if it could
2 be quickly.

3 MEMBER MUNN: All right. That's
4 fine. We met on August the 28th by what we call
5 a live meeting. We had a full complement of
6 issues to address and we were able to get
7 through them in pretty good time.

8 We closed out OTIB-34. That's
9 internal dosimetry coworker data for X-10. We
10 had three outstanding findings which we were
11 able to close. And the ER-33, which is a pilot
12 plant, had no findings on it. We were able to
13 address that pretty easily. We also finished
14 our discussion which had gone on for a couple
15 meetings with respect to a distribution method
16 that was being used in Version 5.7 of IREP.

17 Continuing we have discussions on
18 our dissolution models for insoluble
19 plutonium-238. That's OTIB-83, I believe.
20 NIOSH is rebuilding the scope and the type and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 exposure conditions at Mound which affects this
2 particular OTIB pretty heavily. So that's
3 ongoing, as is OTIB-54, which is the fission and
4 activation product assessment for internal
5 dose-related gross beta and alpha analyses.
6 There's a reactor modeling report and other
7 findings that are still active there.

8 As I have mentioned in earlier
9 reports, we're spending a great deal of time now
10 with the PERs. We had more than a half-dozen
11 on our plate this time in one dimension or
12 another. We're looking at PER-42, Linde, and
13 43. I think that's internal and external
14 dosimetry organ choices for IREP model 559.
15 There are no findings, but the cases that are
16 going to be reviewed in-depth are currently
17 being selected. That's probably already done
18 and in the hands of SC&A for work now.

19 The ER-45, which is Aliquippa
20 Forge, is ongoing, as is 38. Thirty-eight is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Hooker, and the case audits for that are
2 underway right now. We took look at potential
3 PERs that are coming up yet and we still have
4 as yet not addressed completely Ames, K-25 and
5 LANL.

6 And our next meeting is set for
7 November 18th. We're having a significant gap
8 between our meetings now based on the work load
9 that key participants have on not just
10 procedures reviews, but other ongoing
11 activities as well. And that wraps it up
12 unless there are any questions.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Thank you,
14 Wanda.

15 Anybody else with Work Group or
16 Subcommittee updates?

17 I can give I guess one SEC Group just
18 to follow up. I know that SC&A has sent in sort
19 of their comments on sort of the coworker
20 discussion follow-up to the meeting of the Work

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Group we had just before the last Board meeting.

2 I don't know, Jim Neton, if you're
3 still on the line, if you have a plan in place
4 for responding to that in terms of timing?

5 DR. NETON: Yes, Dr. Melius, I've
6 been working. I've received the 9-5 memo from
7 SC&A and looked at it and it appears that
8 there's substantial agreement between us. I
9 think the trick is going to be of course
10 deciding where to set the bar in these various
11 criteria that we're establishing. I'm working
12 on that. I would hope to have -- well, first
13 of all, I'd like to respond to the SC&A memo
14 because they asked for a response. And I could
15 have that out in the next week or so. I've
16 reviewed it and it's very straightforward.

17 But I am working on, as we talked
18 about at the Work Group meeting in Idaho,
19 revising Draft Implementation Guide for
20 Coworker Model to incorporate the timeliness

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that was discussed at the meeting, as well as
2 the information SC&A just provided. And I'm
3 hoping to have a draft out of that document
4 sometime around the first full week of October.

5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

6 DR. NETON: That should give us
7 enough time to maybe hold a meeting before the
8 next Board meeting and hash out some of the
9 details.

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Good.
11 Good. No, you answered the question, because
12 I wanted to make sure you had enough time but
13 that we could -- we'll plan on holding a Work
14 Group meeting and do that in terms of follow-up.
15 So thank you on that.

16 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Dave
17 Kotelchuck on Dose Reconstruction Subcommittee
18 just to say to folks on the Committee that the
19 meeting that was originally scheduled for
20 tomorrow has been postponed to Wednesday,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 October 29th. So you'll get further notices
2 about that.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. I think
4 we already got a notice about the 29th, right?

5 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. Any other
7 Work Group reports?

8 Okay. If not, just I think Ted
9 circulated an email that since the last meeting
10 the Santa Susana Work Group added -- Dr. Poston
11 and Dr. Anderson were both added to the Work
12 Group. That Work Group was sort of short of
13 Members.

14 Ted, plans for the November
15 meeting?

16 MR. KATZ: Right. Thank you, Jim.
17 So a couple things I guess just to note. With
18 respect to Santa Susana, I guess we're still
19 expecting -- the Work Group has not met yet.
20 The Work Group is still waiting on the NIOSH

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 product to be delivered. But the intent is to
2 have the Work Group meet of course in October
3 before the Board meeting. And I guess I just
4 wanted a little clarification from LaVon about
5 that, because it was his remark that he didn't
6 expect anything to be completed on any of the
7 current SECs that are on the Board's plate.
8 But Santa Susana, I thought our intent was to
9 get to the end of the issues there. Is that not
10 still correct?

11 MR. RUTHERFORD: Well, the
12 original goal was that -- and Jim's probably got
13 a little more insight than I do, but I don't
14 think based on the current schedule we're going
15 to be able to have everything closed out by
16 then, and we'll probably be providing an
17 update.

18 But, Jim, you might have something
19 to add.

20 DR. NETON: Well, we're trying to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 complete the external dose coworker model for
2 Santa Susana. That's been the holdup for quite
3 some time. And specifically we're trying to
4 evaluate the neutron doses.

5 We had a data capture at Hanford.
6 We're expecting documents from them -- not
7 until the 19th of this month, so that's in a
8 couple days. Once we get that, we'll review
9 the data we receive from them. And I don't
10 think that the -- the coworker model right now
11 is scheduled for completion until near the end
12 of October. I'm not sure if that would allow
13 enough time to have a Working Group meeting.
14 Maybe a brief one before the Board meeting.
15 Although if we're only going to focus this one
16 issue, maybe we could do a telephone call,
17 because it would be fairly short.

18 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: This is Phil.
19 There is one area of concern that's come up from
20 a number of people from the Santa Susana, and

1 that's the fact that there is widespread
2 contamination in the caldera area and it's
3 possible of people having internal exposures
4 without being monitored for it. It's
5 something I think we're really going to have to
6 look into and see if we can come up with an
7 answer there.

8 DR. NETON: Well, Phil, are you
9 speaking specifically of off-site residents
10 being exposed?

11 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: No. No, I'm
12 actually speaking about some of the people --
13 I mean, there has been contamination found in
14 Area II. Actually in all the areas there's
15 been samples taken. Some of them have low-
16 level contamination, but the water was recycled
17 up to NASA, whereas some of that water that they
18 were using from Area I actually was
19 contaminated that they had. So people who
20 might have been badged for Area IV but normally

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 speaking were not monitored for any uptakes,
2 what kind of coworker data there might be or how
3 that issue would be addressed and if they can
4 come up with a bounding estimate or not.

5 DR. NETON: I guess I'm still
6 confused. These people are exposed off site
7 though, not on site?

8 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes, I mean,
9 some of them could have been exposed like in
10 Area II where they had sodium burns. There was
11 some depleted uranium, my understanding is,
12 that had been buried at one time that has since
13 been removed. So some of these people actually
14 had potential for uptakes. I realize we're
15 having to limit it to people who were badged for
16 Area IV, but they could have been actually
17 exposed in other areas and I'm not sure all of
18 them were actually monitored for uptakes. I
19 mean, I haven't found anything yet that says all
20 personnel who were badged into Area IV were

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 monitored for internal dosimetry. I may have
2 missed that. I don't know.

3 DR. NETON: Yes.

4 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: But that's kind
5 of one area of concern.

6 DR. NETON: Well, that's something
7 we need to take up then. I know there are some
8 issues surrounding the badging of people in
9 Area IV and whether workers could have come from
10 other locations and such.

11 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: This is Jim
12 Melius. I mean, I'd obviously like to get this
13 site addressed; it's been a long while, but at
14 the same time part of our reason for holding a
15 meeting near the site is to get additional
16 information. And what's probably as important
17 is to have identified issues that we need
18 further input on, that where the people that
19 worked on the site would be able to help address
20 those in some way.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So if we can at least get to that
2 point and make some effort to get people to come
3 to the public comment period to identify them,
4 I think that would be the reason for holding the
5 meeting more than trying to essentially have
6 everything closed out by November. But I think
7 having at least your Work Group call or
8 something to make sure everybody's up to date
9 and understands what's going I think would be
10 useful just given what's happened, the time
11 frame work on this.

12 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: I think they are
13 going to have a fair number of people who
14 actually show up for the public comment period
15 when we're out there --

16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

17 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: -- they would
18 have liked to have been able for us to have a
19 meeting before the actual Board meeting since
20 we're addressing some of their concerns and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 documents they have found.

2 MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. Jim,
3 thank you for your observations. I'm on that
4 Work Group and it's very clear to me from this
5 current discussion that a great deal of
6 communication and a great deal of information
7 is being exchanged at some level that I have not
8 seen. I don't know whether I've missed the
9 Work Group's internal discussions or whether
10 there hasn't been anything available for me to
11 see.

12 And due to the fact that we are going
13 to be meeting in that site and I was looking
14 forward to a fairly extensive information
15 gathering and observation opportunity, it
16 would certainly be helpful for me -- I don't
17 know about the other Work Group Members, but it
18 would be very helpful for me if someone were to
19 put together a more current identification of
20 documents and materials with which we should be

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 familiar by now. Because as has been pointed
2 out, it's been a long time since we've had a
3 meeting of any sort and Phil has had to take this
4 up as not having been the original chair. So
5 it would be very helpful from my perspective
6 unless I'm the only person in the Work Group who
7 isn't aware of where we are. I'd really like
8 to have an update of some sort to give me an
9 opportunity to review whatever documentation
10 is available that I should be looking at and
11 clearly haven't recently.

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, and that's a
13 very good idea. I mean, because again with two
14 new Members to the Work Group it would be
15 helpful for them and probably to the entire
16 Board, but certainly for the Work Group. And
17 again, having that done and then having a
18 conference call or meeting of the Work Group
19 beforehand in order to make sure everybody sort
20 of understands the issues would be helpful.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And if I recall right, we're
2 planning to do a tour of the work site or the
3 area?

4 MEMBER MUNN: I hope so.

5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

6 MR. KATZ: So we're planning to do
7 a tour the day before the Board meeting,
8 November 5th, and we're making logistical
9 arrangements for that. And there are some
10 complications just because the current
11 operator/owner Boeing is actually -- it's poor
12 timing. They're relinquishing their role in
13 October. But anyway, it will come off and
14 we'll have that tour.

15 As I understand from Lara who's the
16 lead for NIOSH on that site a lot of facilities
17 are no longer there, but we'll certainly get a
18 tour of the site and sort of meet a lot of Phil's
19 intent in terms of understanding layout and so
20 on. And we're trying to get a hold of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 company that's actually sort have actually sort
2 of handled the bus tours in the past so that the
3 driver will have experience with that, too. So
4 that will happen and that will be helpful for
5 sure.

6 I just want to check on Phil's --
7 what I think I understood Phil, you, to say that
8 you're already aware that there will be
9 considerable public participation at the Board
10 meeting in terms of attendance. Is that
11 correct what you were --

12 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Correct.
13 There are a number of large concerns. And
14 something I wasn't -- I don't know how I missed
15 them; I assume they're there on the O: drive,
16 SC&A in the past did a number of interviews with
17 workers and their experiences there and what
18 they did and et cetera, et cetera, which I have
19 not read those. I'll be honest with you. I
20 honestly was not aware of them until yesterday.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So it's something I've got to look at and
2 hopefully those are on the O: drive. I assume
3 they are somewhere. I just had missed them
4 evidently.

5 MR. KATZ: Right. Well, where I
6 was just headed with this is -- I mean, so that's
7 great that there is already some, but I think
8 we need to -- as we made an effort at INL that
9 I think was very fruitful, if we could just --
10 between NIOSH's and SC&A's contacts out there
11 let's reach out to the individuals we know of
12 just to let them know of the meeting and the date
13 and try to get them there.

14 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: We have some
15 meetings coming up for them to -- people to talk
16 to and would like to address us.

17 MR. KATZ: Right.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Not to
19 complicate this further, but if there are
20 people who need to be able to have more

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 information that's not really either
2 appropriate or would fit the time frame of a
3 public meeting or public comment period, maybe
4 we want to have time for them to be interviewed,
5 or a Work Group to talk to them along with NIOSH
6 and S&CA or whatever. Whatever would be most
7 helpful in terms of giving them input as well
8 as gathering information I think we should try
9 to do out there.

10 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Sounds good to
11 me.

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

13 MEMBER MUNN: In the meantime, for
14 the Work Group, if someone, I don't know who,
15 would be good enough to put together some
16 indication of documentation we should be
17 looking at.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Do I hear LaVon
19 volunteer? I thought I heard --

20 MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, I was

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 thinking that would come from my group, so we'll
2 put something together with myself and Lara.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Oh, okay.

4 MEMBER MUNN: Oh, thank you, LaVon.

5 I really appreciate --

6 (Simultaneous speaking)

7 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: And, LaVon, one
8 quick question: This is Phil. One quick
9 question there: If I could give you some
10 contacts to get in touch with some of these
11 people before the Board meeting, I don't know,
12 maybe they could at least point you to some area
13 or have some information that you guys could
14 look at? Like I said, the SC&A interviews, I
15 was not even aware of those until yesterday.

16 MR. KATZ: Right. So, Phil, I
17 mean, certainly SC&A can send LaVon their list
18 of contacts and then LaVon has their own,
19 NIOSH's. And certainly they can do that
20 outreach as part of setting up for the Board

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 meeting.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes, it may be
3 good to do a conference call with Phil and SC&A.
4 Lara, or whoever is handling it from DCAS might
5 get everyone coordinated.

6 MR. KATZ: Right. Well, I mean, I
7 think we need a Work Group meeting even though
8 the group --

9 (Simultaneous speaking)

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Well,
11 absolutely. I think that's --

12 MR. KATZ: Right. So I will work
13 to schedule that for -- I guess later in October
14 will be more useful for NIOSH because they'll
15 have gotten more work done at least related --

16 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

17 MR. KATZ: -- to the coworker model
18 and be fresh about all the other issues, or
19 whatever they might be. And I guess the focus
20 of that meeting can be sort of a dry run of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 bringing everybody up to date because we want
2 to do some sort of presentation about that at
3 the Board meeting as well.

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Anything
5 else on the Board meeting?

6 MR. KATZ: No, that's what I have.
7 We don't have a hotel yet, but we're working on
8 that.

9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

10 MR. KATZ: And it's pretty clear
11 that we only need a day for the Board meeting
12 itself.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Yes.

14 MR. KATZ: Yes. So that will be
15 on -- I believe it's the 6th.

16 MEMBER ANDERSON: And did I hear a
17 January meeting?

18 MR. KATZ: On, no, no.

19 MEMBER ANDERSON: A January
20 conference call?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: January is the
2 teleconference meeting.

3 MEMBER ANDERSON: And that's on the
4 6th?

5 MR. KATZ: Yes.

6 MEMBER ANDERSON: Okay. Because I
7 didn't have that on my --

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: But we're
9 planning on surprising you.

10 MEMBER ANDERSON: That's okay.

11 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. And then
12 Board correspondence. The only
13 correspondence I'm aware of since our last
14 meeting has been a -- I think it's a
15 continuation -- maybe it was before the last
16 meeting, I can't remember. But Dr. McKeel was
17 concerned about the minutes no longer being
18 produced for the Board meetings. I believe Ted
19 has responded to him. And then I believe Dr.
20 Ziemer also responded recently, and I think

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this morning Dr. McKeel re-responded again.

2 So I guess that just will continue.

3 So, any other correspondence I'm
4 not aware of, Ted?

5 MR. KATZ: No, that covers it.

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Thank
7 you, everybody. Unless there's other
8 business, we will close this meeting. And
9 thank you, everybody, and we'll see you in
10 November.

11 MR. KATZ: Okay. Thanks,
12 everyone.

13 (Whereupon, the above-entitled
14 matter went off the record at 12:40 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

This transcript of the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, Teleconference Board Meeting, has been reviewed for concerns under the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and personally identifiable information has been redacted as necessary. The transcript, however, has not been reviewed and certified by the Chair of the Advisory Board for accuracy at this time. The reader should be cautioned that this transcript is for information only and is subject to change.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7