

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL
NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL
SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND
WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROCEDURES REVIEW

+ + + + +

MONDAY
NOVEMBER 20, 2017

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee convened via teleconference at 11:00 a.m., Wanda I. Munn, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

WANDA I. MUNN, Chair
JOSIE BEACH, Member
PAUL L. ZIEMER, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official
DAVE ALLEN, DCAS
BOB ANIGSTEIN, SC&A
ROBERT BARTON, SC&A
KATHY BEHLING, SC&A
RON BUCHANAN, SC&A
ROSANNA GOGLIOTTI, SC&A
STU HINNEFELD, DCAS
TOM LABONE, ORAU Team
JOYCE LIPSZTEIN, SC&A
LORI MARION-MOSS, DCAS
WADE MORRIS, ORAU Team
JAMES NETON, DCAS
MUTTY SHARFI, ORAU Team
JOHN STIVER, SC&A

NEAL R. GROSS

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

Contents

Welcome and Roll Call.....	4
Administrative Matters.....	6
Review of DCAS Program Evaluation Report 59:.....	26
Norton Company, Worcester, MA.....	26
Review of DCAS Report 5: Alternative dissolution. models for insoluble plutonium-238.....	26
Review of ORAUT Report 78: Technical basis for... sampling plan.....	41
Review of Findings for Procedures: 22.....	58
(Supplemental requests for DOE information), 44..	58
(Special Exposure Cohort), 86 (Case preparation:..	58
Complex internal dosimetry claims - cancelled),..	58
94 (Verification and Validation process for the..	58
Tools Development Group).....	58
Priorities and timeline for completing.....	72
consideration of outstanding findings.....	72
Identification of procedures not yet reviewed....	77
Adjourn.....	126

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

2 11:18 a.m.

3 **Welcome and Roll Call**

4 CHAIR MUNN: My apologies to all of
5 you for holding us up this morning. And my
6 apologies for not being as ready as I should be.
7 But we have, I've received no information from
8 anyone, that is, I haven't seen any information
9 from anyone that would cause me to assume that we
10 need to change our draft agenda, which as Ted's
11 already pointed out, you already have.

12 I am still, like the court reporter,
13 struggling to get my material in front of me. I
14 have relied unfortunately on my newly updated,
15 supposedly now completely healed computer system,
16 and it is not doing well by me at all.

17 That being the case, the program, the
18 PERs for Norton Company, etc., are first on our
19 agenda. And I'm still having a problem trying to
20 get that material in front of me. Working on two
21 different computers, my own and -- I'm not
22 getting --

23 MS. K. BEHLING: Did you try the BRS

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 one? It's all posted there, if you can get to
2 that.

3 MR. KATZ: Well, I can email it to
4 you, Wanda.

5 CHAIR MUNN: That's -- no, it's --
6 well, I'm not sure whether my -- yes, if you would
7 do that.

8 MR. KATZ: I'll email it to you, okay.
9 Hold on.

10 CHAIR MUNN: Alright.

11 MR. KATZ: But I think we can carry
12 on without you --

13 CHAIR MUNN: Yeah, I think we can.
14 Let's just move right into it. And who's going
15 to take the lead on the PER reports?

16 MS. K. BEHLING: This is Kathy
17 Behling, and I'll start with the Norton Company.
18 We have --

19 CHAIR MUNN: Thank you, Kathy, and
20 I'll try my very best to get one of the two of my
21 systems providing the information I expected to
22 have on this morning. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 **Administrative Matters**

2 MS. K. BEHLING: Okay. And Rose, can
3 you pull that up on Skype for people to see?

4 MS. GOGLIOTTI: The BRS or the
5 document?

6 MS. K. BEHLING: The document.

7 MS. GOGLIOTTI: Okay.

8 MS. K. BEHLING: PER-59. But I will
9 start while Rose is in the process of doing that.
10 Just to give you a little bit of history for the
11 Norton Company, Norton was an Atomic Weapons
12 Employer facility starting in September of 1944,
13 because of the working with beryllium. And they
14 worked with that from 1944 through '56. And then
15 also worked with uranium and thorium in 1957.

16 There were non-radioactive materials
17 that they started working with in 1958, so that
18 actually began the residual period. And the
19 residual period went from 1958 through 2009. And
20 initially they broke up that residual period into
21 two discrete periods, because there was D&D work
22 that was done in 1962.

23 So the first residual period, I'll

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 call it, is from January of 1958 through October
2 of '62, when the D&D work was done. And then
3 thereafter, from October '62 through October of
4 2009 is a, I'll say a second phase of the residual
5 period.

6 If we move on to our Subtask 1, which
7 is looking at the circumstances that prompted
8 this PER, and I hope everyone can hear me all
9 right, I'm having some work done in the
10 background here, little bit of background noise.
11 But the PER was initiated because there is no
12 Technical Basis Document for Norton Company, but
13 there is a template that was, initially I guess,
14 embedded into the dose reconstruction reports.

15 And I'm not sure what the first
16 template, the date of the first template. But
17 there was a change to that template, and the
18 change incorporated two SEC classes that were
19 based on NIOSH's inability to estimate internal
20 and external doses for the period of 1945 through
21 1962. So that encompasses the operational period
22 and that first portion of the residual period.

23 So SC&A -- excuse me, SC&A concurs

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 with NIOSH's need to make this change. The other
2 thing that -- oh, I forgot to add, the other thing
3 that was added, not only the SEC but also the
4 revisions to OTIB-70, where the depletion rate
5 was lowered to 0.067% per day for the residual
6 contamination period starting in '62.

7 So SC&A is in agreement with the fact
8 that NIOSH did have to issue this PER, and so our
9 next subtask is looking at the methodology that
10 was used for corrective actions. And in this
11 particular case, because Norton is a template and
12 we had not reviewed this template in the past,
13 our Subtask 2 incorporated a complete review of
14 the Norton Company template.

15 The review of OTIB-70 wasn't necessary
16 since the Subcommittee has already approved that
17 OITB. The revision to OTIB-70 impacted the
18 residual periods, as I said, starting in 1962 and
19 impacted external exposure rates, uranium and
20 thorium intake rates, and thoron exposure rates.

21 So if we go to our Section 4.1, the
22 annual external exposure rate, cited in the
23 template are nine references or nine files from

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the Site Research Database that NIOSH used for
2 the basis for estimating the external exposure
3 rates. And they were listed as, these were nine
4 references that were listed for the operational
5 period.

6 However, when SC&A looked at these
7 references, and we did look thoroughly at all the
8 references, it appeared that only four of them
9 actually were from the operational period, and it
10 seemed like the remaining five were taken during
11 the residual period. We can talk about that a
12 little bit later.

13 And as you see in Section 4.1.1, we
14 summarized each of these references that NIOSH
15 identified.

16 And I'll just point out that the first
17 reference ID that's identified, one of the things
18 we note is that the air sample data, and we do
19 have this illustrated on Figure 1, the air sample
20 data that was listed in this particular reference
21 seemed to be higher concentrations, like greater
22 than 100 dpm per cubic meter, much higher than
23 what we saw in the air sample results from all of

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the other eight references that were identified.

2 And the other thing you'll take notice
3 of in Figure 1 is that a lot of this data, or
4 some of this data, is illegible. And so what we
5 did, though, is we took one of the data, the
6 sample points that was listed there as N493 and
7 calculated the air concentration value from that
8 dpm per cubic centimeter -- or cubic meter, in
9 air, we calculated an air concentration of 7.29e-
10 8 microcuries per cubic meter.

11 And I'll make reference to this later,
12 because like I said, it was obvious to us that
13 this particular sample sheet did have some higher
14 concentrations than we found in the other
15 references. And we go through each of the four
16 references that we associated with the
17 operational period in this section. We won't go
18 into details there.

19 And then a summary, in Section 4.1.2,
20 it's a summary of what we interpreted as the post-
21 operational survey. Just based on the dates in
22 the operations, it did not appear to us that these
23 were surveys or samples that were taken in the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 operational period.

2 If we move on then, what NIOSH did,
3 we'll move on to our comments on page 16, using
4 these nine references, NIOSH derived a surface
5 contamination level of $1.83e-6$ dpm per meter
6 squared for the start of the residual period in
7 1962.

8 However, based on our review of the
9 various references, we took that value and
10 calculated a 95th percentile value of -- by doing
11 just a back of the envelope calculation, of
12 $3.48e-11$ microcuries per cubic meter. And we,
13 based on our review of these references, we
14 really didn't feel we had sufficient information
15 to duplicate or confirm that value, their value
16 of $1.83e-6$ dpm per square meter.

17 So that was our first finding, is that
18 we don't know all the data that they pulled from
19 these references. In some cases, it appears that
20 some of the data wouldn't have been appropriate
21 based on the location. And in other cases there
22 were data that were, you know, several orders of
23 magnitude higher than the remaining data. And so

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 we're not sure if NIOSH eliminated those data
2 points for some reason. And so we really are
3 going to need a little bit more information as to
4 how they derived that value.

5 Finding 2, again, is something that I
6 made mention of, is that their template seemed to
7 indicate that all of these survey data results
8 were taken in the operational period. But as I
9 mentioned, it seemed like five of these were
10 actually during the residual period. So that is
11 where we came up with our second finding.

12 If we move on, then, to Section 4.2,
13 the residual period internal dose, NIOSH stated
14 that they used a Pagnotto memo for coming up with
15 their air concentrations of 2.96 dpm per cubic
16 meter for uranium, and 4.66 dpm per cubic meter
17 for thorium.

18 And if we actually, Figure 3 shows you
19 that memo. And in using that data, we were able
20 to match the thorium values. However, the
21 uranium values, which were based on samples shown
22 in their 3M, 4M, and 6M, we calculated a factor
23 of two lower than NIOSH's assigned intakes in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 concentrations.

2 And I think what had happened here, in
3 fact, I did, Dave Allen and I had talked, but I
4 believe what had happened is NIOSH just
5 inadvertently, for the second sample, where there
6 was zero results for the long-lived alpha
7 emitters, I think they accidentally pulled the
8 short-lived value in calculating their numbers.
9 So that is the Finding 3 that we have listed on
10 page 19. Our value was actually lower.

11 We also went and calculated in Section
12 4.3, the annual thoron exposure rates. And they
13 also used the same memo, and we were able to
14 reproduce their values. And so we don't have any
15 issues with the thoron exposure rates.

16 Going on to our Subtask 3, Subtask 3
17 is the identification of potentially impacted
18 cases and their selection process. And in this
19 case, they looked at all of the previous claims
20 that were less than 50%.

21 There were some that were eliminated
22 because they had already been evaluated under the
23 revised template. And some of them didn't

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 qualify because they were not confined to
2 employment after 1962. So SC&A concurs with
3 NIOSH's selection criteria.

4 And finally, in Subtask 4, we are
5 asked usually to select criteria for a -- during
6 a subset of dose reconstructions, we're reviewing
7 one or two dose reconstructions. And in this
8 particular case, if we can find one claim that
9 has both internal and external dose and with
10 employment at Norton after 1961, we feel that
11 would suffice for completing our Subtask 2 case
12 review.

13 So that's the Norton PER-59. Are
14 there any questions? Everybody there.

15 MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer. Just
16 a comment, I assume we're going to hear some
17 responses from NIOSH on this.

18 MS. K. BEHLING: I don't know if NIOSH
19 is prepared for responses. But we do have the
20 three findings that'll have to be dealt with
21 before we do our Subtask 4.

22 MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.

23 MR. ALLEN: This is Dave Allen, I can

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 respond to those. Okay if --

2 MR. KATZ: Yeah, go ahead, Dave.

3 MR. ALLEN: I guess just taking those
4 in order, there's three findings on the report.
5 The very first one was there was not sufficient
6 information in the template to identify all the
7 critical information to come up with that
8 contamination value of -- and I got the figure
9 here in front of me.

10 I just want to point out that as a
11 template, this was designed somewhat for
12 something we could put in a dose reconstruction,
13 and we generally don't put that hardcore
14 scientific detail in the dose reconstruction
15 report. We get criticized when we put too much
16 in there too.

17 And --- but the 1.83 times 10 to the
18 6th dpm per square meter, that's not something
19 that's new. That was in our Evaluation Report
20 when the SEC was granted. It was in the addendum
21 to the Evaluation Report and it was in the SC&A
22 review of the Evaluation Report. So it's nothing
23 that is brand new to this or anything.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 We do have the calculations in a
2 spreadsheet you know, available. But that's not
3 something we would normally put in the template.

4 As far as Finding 2, you're right, it
5 does say it was operational air samples. The
6 intent there was to say it was prior to the post-
7 cleanup residual period. As Kathy pointed out
8 early on, it was an operational period followed
9 by a -- essentially a D&D period, then followed
10 by what we would normally think of as a residual
11 period.

12 The template was intended to basically
13 say air samples from the -- just like in what we
14 said in the ER, it's the end of the operational
15 period, as well as end of D&D period is what we
16 based --- the air samples we took to come up with
17 that number.

18 You are right that the template said
19 operational and it really should say, operational
20 and D&D, period.

21 And the last one, as Kathy pointed out
22 and we already talked, and there was a mistake in
23 there. We took a .2 value that should have been

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 a zero and essentially came up with an airborne
2 value that was double what it should have been.

3 MS. K. BEHLING: David, thank you. If
4 I could just ask, if I could see -- I understand
5 why you certainly don't put these types of
6 spreadsheets and details into the dose
7 reconstruction report, and these templates are a
8 little bit different than some of the other
9 documents that we use, technical documents that
10 we use here.

11 But if I could see that spreadsheet
12 for the calculations that went behind the 1.83e-
13 6, that would certainly be appreciated.

14 MR. ALLEN: I can do that.

15 MS. K. BEHLING: Okay, thank you. And
16 I do understand the wording issue with regard to
17 Finding 2. And I assume that you'll be making
18 changes to the template for the Finding 3 with
19 regard to the uranium.

20 MR. ALLEN: Yes, once we're done with
21 this review and make sure there's nothing else to
22 change, yes.

23 MR. KATZ: So this, I'm sorry, this is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Ted, but could I point out a couple things here.
2 So the labeling thing, that really shouldn't be
3 a finding then, in retrospect, because it's
4 nothing to do with the correctness of the
5 calculations and so on.

6 But the finding, the first finding,
7 Kathy, where you're asking for the spreadsheet,
8 but then don't mention that SC&A had reviewed
9 that material for the ER report. So I'm a little
10 unclear as to whether that isn't already reviewed
11 by SC&A or not.

12 MS. K. BEHLING: Well, I wasn't --

13 MR. KATZ: Because it sounds like it
14 was.

15 MS. K. BEHLING: Yeah, I don't know.
16 When he said that that value was used, I was not
17 involved in the SEC process. I can check on that.

18 MR. KATZ: Yeah.

19 MS. K. BEHLING: And so that's why
20 this became a Finding 4.

21 MR. KATZ: Yeah, I mean --- John
22 Stiver, aren't you on the line? Is John on the
23 line?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. STIVER: Yes, I'm on the line,
2 Ted.

3 MR. KATZ: Okay, I'm just -- John, it
4 occurs to me, I mean Kathy should have been, I
5 guess, apprised of SC&A having reviewed that
6 material before. But anyhow, we need to sort
7 that out.

8 MR. STIVER: Okay, yeah, we can look
9 into that for sure.

10 MR. KATZ: Okay, thanks. So I guess
11 until you do, and since no one seems to know it
12 who's on this call, until you do, I guess, we
13 can't really do much with this Finding 1 until
14 you can confirm that you had already reviewed
15 that and you agreed with that value and so on, or
16 whatever the case might be.

17 MS. K. BEHLING: And both John and I
18 will look into that.

19 MR. KATZ: Okay.

20 MS. K. BEHLING: And my apologies for
21 not digging into the SEC aspect.

22 MR. KATZ: Okay, I got the --

23 MEMBER BEACH: Can we move forward on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the Subpart 4, or do we have to wait for the first
2 three to be, the findings to be settled?

3 MR. KATZ: Well, Josie, I think we
4 need that Finding 1. I mean the other findings
5 are settled, basically, but the Finding 1 --

6 MEMBER BEACH: Right.

7 MR. KATZ: I think we need to know
8 whether SC&A is the one who reviewed and approved
9 the methodology there or not. Because that has
10 to come before you choose your cases.

11 MEMBER BEACH: Got you, okay.

12 MR. KATZ: Yeah. Okay, I'm sorry,
13 Wanda, for interjecting here. I just thought I'd
14 cut to the chase with these items, but --- Wanda,
15 are you on the line? Maybe you're on mute, Wanda?

16 CHAIR MUNN: Was I on mute?

17 MR. KATZ: Oh, there you are. Now
18 you're on.

19 CHAIR MUNN: Oh, alright. Very good,
20 I'm glad. This is just a comedy of errors here
21 at my house today. What I was saying was we may
22 have to rely on you for more of that than usual,
23 Ted, as I am not able to undo, untangle what's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 going on here at my house right now.

2 I have been unable to get my
3 government computer synchronized properly, in the
4 first place. It will not show me mail past the
5 tenth of this month. And I know very well I've
6 seen mail since the tenth of this month on this
7 device. But I've restarted it and it still
8 doesn't do a thing for me.

9 So not only do I not have current
10 information on this computer, I also do not have
11 even basic instructions for getting onto ---
12 starting the screen.

13 And so I'm struggling through that,
14 and an extremely slow, old version of things on
15 my personal computer. So my apologies for that.
16 I did receive your material that you forwarded
17 this morning on my home computer, thank you.

18 MR. KATZ: Okay, yeah.

19 CHAIR MUNN: So we're going to have a
20 carryover here for PER-59 until there has been
21 some additional mutual work on everybody
22 concerned in the background. Am I correct in
23 assuming we will carry PER-59 over until our next

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 meeting?

2 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, a quick question
3 on that to kind of follow up Josie's question on
4 issue -- or Item 4. Really, the recommendation
5 is simply to select one case. Do we need the
6 final resolution on Issue 1 to approve --- going
7 ahead, we don't have to make the selection, do
8 we? We just ---

9 MR. KATZ: Well, I mean, certainly
10 NIOSH can forward a case to them. But until SC&A
11 knows whether the methodology was resolved or
12 not, they can't really review the case for its
13 correctness.

14 MEMBER ZIEMER: No, no, I understand.
15 But the recommendation is that one case is
16 reviewed.

17 MR. KATZ: Oh, yeah, and you guys can
18 discuss that, for sure.

19 MEMBER ZIEMER: And we can simply
20 stipulate that that not be done until they
21 resolve the other. Do you need to resolve that
22 with the Committee? I'm sort of asking that. We
23 have to carry it forward, don't we, Issue 1?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: Yeah, and so if you all --

2 -

3 (Simultaneous speaking.)

4 MEMBER ZIEMER: Unless SC&A says that
5 they've already, previously agreed to it. Then
6 it really isn't an issue at that point.

7 MR. KATZ: Right. So far we can, NIOSH
8 can go ahead and find a case and forward that on
9 to SC&A.

10 And if SC&A, once it looks at what it
11 did with the SEC, sees that they had already
12 reviewed the methodology and approved it, and
13 then if you -- if the Subcommittee then believe
14 that's fine, then the Subcommittee's good with
15 it, then yeah, then they could just carry forward
16 without more marching orders.

17 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah, all we would
18 have to do is, all they would have to do is notify
19 us that the issue goes away. We don't have to
20 take action at that point, right?

21 MR. KATZ: Yeah, correct, correct.

22 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah.

23 MR. KATZ: Yeah, yeah, I think --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER ZIEMER: Otherwise we do.

2 MR. KATZ: Right, right. Unless you
3 hear back from SC&A and you get a green light if
4 you've already approved the methodology.

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: Right, right.

6 MR. KATZ: You go to the case. That
7 makes sense. Thanks, Paul.

8 CHAIR MUNN: Alright, as I said, we
9 are carrying over, and --

10 MR. ALLEN: I'm sorry, Wanda, this is
11 Dave Allen. Before we leave that, could Kathy
12 state what that criteria for the case was one
13 more time, please.

14 MS. K. BEHLING: Okay, yeah, hold on
15 one second.

16 MR. KATZ: It's a claim with internal
17 and external exposure and employment after 1961.

18 MS. K. BEHLING: Right.

19 MR. ALLEN: Okay, that second part is
20 what I didn't get. Alright, thank you.

21 MR. KATZ: Yeah, you're welcome.

22 MS. K. BEHLING: Thank you, Ted.

23 MS. MARION-MOSS: Wanda, this is Lori.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I have a follow-up question as well. Could the
2 other two findings associated with this PER, does
3 the status, once we update the BRS with Dave's
4 responses that he's provided today, does the
5 status remain open?

6 MR. KATZ: I can help you with that,
7 I think, Lori. So the Finding 1, if, I mean, the
8 Subcommittee has said they're fine as long as
9 NIOSH already reviewed and approved the
10 methodology.

11 So that would be closed, then, and it
12 really wouldn't have been a finding then because
13 they had already approved it, if that's the case.
14 Otherwise, we'll be dealing with it at the next
15 meeting.

16 The finding about labeling isn't
17 really a finding, so that can just be taken out.
18 It's not a finding, it's just what we would call
19 an observation in other arenas of the Board.

20 MS. MARION-MOSS: And Ted, you said
21 NIOSH was going to do that, but it's actually
22 SC&A is going to report that they --

23 MR. KATZ: Yeah, SC&A's going to

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 report, right, yes. Right, that's what I meant.

2 CHAIR MUNN: Okay, then can we move on
3 to DCAS Report 5. We're getting to alternative
4 dissolution methods for plutonium. And who's
5 going to lead?

6 **Review of DCAS Program Evaluation Report 59:**

7 **Norton Company, Worcester, MA**

8 MS. K. BEHLING: And that will be
9 Joyce Lipsztein. I believe she's on the call.

10 CHAIR MUNN: Are you there, Joyce?

11 DR. LIPSZTEIN: Yes, I'm here. Yeah.

12 CHAIR MUNN: Alright, sounds as though
13 the meeting is yours.

14 **Review of DCAS Report 5: Alternative dissolution**
15 **models for insoluble plutonium-238**

16 DR. LIPSZTEIN: Oh, okay. So just one
17 second. Okay, the solution models for insoluble
18 uranium, the substitution is RPT-005, which is a
19 substitution for OTIB-0083, which was cancelled.
20 And most of the problems SC&A had with OTIB-0083,
21 were resolved in the new report, RPT-005.

22 It gives guidance on the evaluation of
23 intakes of workers who were exposed to ceramic

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 forms of plutonium-238. These workers were
2 exposed to plutonium-238, they exhibit a
3 different pattern of urinary excretion than we
4 usually deal with. It's a non-monotonic urinary
5 excretion pattern, which is indicative of non-
6 standard lung biokinetics.

7 What we mean by that, explaining for
8 people that didn't --- weren't involved in this
9 discussion, is instead of you're looking at
10 urinary excretion of most of the radionuclides,
11 this time the urinary excretion will go down, the
12 radiation, the plutonium and the amount of
13 plutonium in the urinary excretion will go down.

14 And this is not what happens with this
15 non-monotonic urinary excretion, you have a
16 length of time where you don't see anything, and
17 after some time it goes back to be excreted.

18 So this indicates a different model
19 for this insoluble forms of plutonium-238, which
20 is different from what we use as Type M and Type
21 S plutonium. So there was some cases that I
22 studied in this report. It was cases that were
23 shown at Los Alamos National Laboratory, the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Mound Site, the Savannah River Site, and NUMEC.

2 And on those places, there were
3 incidents involving exposure to plutonium-238
4 sources. And they were studied to see which model
5 should be applied to the lung dissolution. And
6 then if they occur in other sites, they should be
7 evaluated on a case-by-case basis. But mainly
8 they should be used at Los Alamos, Mound, and
9 Savannah River Site, and NUMEC.

10 The report is very well written and
11 the sections are explained in a didactic way,
12 very well explained. It discusses the reasons
13 for the special lung modeling for exposure to
14 those compounds. It describes very well the ICRP
15 Publication 66, lung dissolution parameter
16 models, and how to apply it using IMBA also.

17 It's scientifically well based. Those
18 attachments, attachments A-1, A-2, and A-3, which
19 describe the development of personalized model
20 parameters for five individuals who were exposed
21 at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Mound, and
22 SRS.

23 Each exposure case is described and

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the parameters are derived using individual
2 bioassay data. And then there is a conclusion
3 with a table that divides the lung dissolution
4 parameters estimated for Los Alamos, Mound, and
5 SRS.

6 And there are curves that show the
7 difference between the standard Type M, the
8 standard Type S, and all the dissolution
9 parameters.

10 And then you have on Section A --
11 Attachment A, Section 5, it summarizes the lung
12 dissolution parameters that should be used for
13 each site. And that's the -- we just had two
14 problems.

15 One problem I think is very easy to
16 correct. I think there was a mistake, like a
17 typographical mistake, typographical error.
18 Because one conclusion contradicts the other. In
19 one they conclude the default parameters should
20 be used for the --- each installation, it says
21 that the default parameters for Mound should be
22 used for SRS.

23 And just below it, it says that the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Los Alamos National Laboratory models should be
2 used for SRS cases. And the correct one on my
3 belief and SC&A's belief is that the correct
4 thing is that the Los Alamos National Model
5 should also be used for SRS cases as it says under
6 conclusion two.

7 So I think this was just a
8 typographical error, because all the conclusions
9 are going to that. And then the only other
10 observation that we have is that for Mound, the
11 parameters for Mound 13 should be the
12 representative of those observed for all Mound
13 cases.

14 But there is no explanation why Mound,
15 the case of Mound-13 should be used as a default
16 for Mound. Because all the cases show different
17 lung parameters. Some of them being more
18 conservative than Mound-13, so probably there is
19 an explanation but it's not concluded on the
20 report.

21 So I don't know how you want to go,
22 but there were about 14 findings on the other
23 report, OTIB-0083, and all of them were resolved.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So we only have these two observations.

2 I think I would rest the case here.
3 The only thing I can't complete is that the new
4 ICRP that's going to be published, they have
5 cases for this kind of plutonium intake. And the
6 parameters for lung dissolutions, I've seen and
7 they're not equal, but similar to the ones that
8 were concluded for Los Alamos National
9 Laboratories. These ICRP parameters are based on
10 Los Alamos also and the same cases, and also on
11 two other cases that are not included here. And
12 also on animal experiments.

13 And I think that's all. I don't know
14 how NIOSH wants to respond to this.

15 CHAIR MUNN: Alright, NIOSH, is there
16 a response?

17 DR. NETON: Yeah, this is -- this is
18 Jim Neton. Thank you, we really appreciate
19 SC&A's review and their complimentary treatment
20 of our new report. I was really happy that we
21 could resolve most of the findings in this newly-
22 issued document.

23 The first finding that Joyce

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 mentioned, the use of -- recommendation to use
2 Mound data for the Savannah River Site, she's
3 correct. That was a typographical error, we just
4 left that in there inadvertently.

5 I suggest that we can correct that
6 with a page change notice. Rather than reissue
7 the entire document, we can issue a page change
8 that would essentially say that, it was a
9 typographical error and to ignore that one
10 recommendation.

11 CHAIR MUNN: I would hope that would
12 be acceptable. Seems logical.

13 DR. NETON: Okay. The second issue I
14 think may be a little more, require a little more
15 discussion. But our response is fairly simple.
16 If you look at the -- there was nine cases that
17 were evaluated at Mound, and those were plotted
18 in figure A-5 of Appendix -- of the Report.

19 And you can see pretty clearly from
20 those plots that there were six cases that
21 exhibited a fairly tight band in central
22 tendencies.

23 In fact, there was so little

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 difference in there, I think what we decided was
2 you just pick one of those six cases as
3 representative of the dissolution properties at
4 Mound.

5 The other cases, being outliers, were
6 outside the range in certain areas. But I think
7 -- and looking at some of those cases, they had
8 a little bit, a lesser degree of a pedigree than
9 the six cases that formed that tight band. At
10 least in one or two of those cases, I think that
11 the incident date was unknown.

12 I mean, so there's certain parameters
13 in there that make them less, I think less, the
14 pedigree is less in those cases.

15 So we felt like using those six
16 tightly banded cases and picking one out of those
17 six that are fairly close together was a
18 reasonable approximation for reconstructing
19 doses for someone at Mound who was exposed to
20 plutonium but did not have their own established
21 clearance curve.

22 And that's a short answer to that
23 question.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. LIPSZTEIN: Yeah, it's not that I
2 don't agree with it, although the Mound 12, for
3 example, has some parameters that are more like
4 the Los Alamos cases. But I don't disagree on
5 using Mound-13, I just think there should be an
6 explanation, explanation that you just gave, for
7 example.

8 DR. NETON: Well, that would be fine.
9 I mean, we would be happy to put that in there,
10 along with the page change note. And maybe if it
11 actually explains a little better, maybe we
12 reissue it rather than a page change. But either
13 one, I think we would be happy to supplement the
14 text and describe how we came about using that
15 value.

16 DR. LIPSZTEIN: Okay, I think that's
17 all that we had of concern, and I repeat it's a
18 very well written, very didactic report. Very
19 good, on an issue that is, you know, still people
20 are debating about because it's a different kind
21 of dissolution. So I think it's very good.

22 CHAIR MUNN: Alright, so NIOSH will
23 bring a --- material to clarify Item 2. And we'll

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 just issue an errata page for the typo, correct?

2 DR. NETON: Well, I think we will
3 modify the procedure in two places now. One to
4 correct that typographical error and one to
5 explain essentially what I just said.

6 CHAIR MUNN: Right.

7 DR. NETON: In the report itself,
8 explain why we chose that value versus something
9 else.

10 CHAIR MUNN: Alright.

11 DR. NETON: Nothing will change in the
12 report. Obviously, we'll use it as is. But it
13 will have a little better documentation.

14 CHAIR MUNN: We'll indicate that on
15 the BRS for those of us who have access to the
16 BRS.

17 DR. NETON: I did put a couple
18 answers, those responses are in the BRS. And you
19 can just update my second response to indicate
20 that we will modify the procedure or report as I
21 stated.

22 CHAIR MUNN: Great, alright. Then we
23 can move on to --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER BEACH: Wanda, this is Josie
2 for a quick second. Do we need to officially
3 close out those other findings that were
4 mentioned in the report from the old report 83?

5 CHAIR MUNN: If they are not
6 officially closed out, yes, we certainly do.

7 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, it's all of them
8 except that one, right?

9 CHAIR MUNN: Correct, as I understood,
10 or what I thought I heard.

11 DR. NETON: Well, it's a little
12 different than that, because this finding, the
13 second finding that Joyce mentioned, I don't know
14 that it would be listed in the previous report as
15 a finding.

16 CHAIR MUNN: Oh, I'm not sure of that
17 --

18 DR. NETON: It's not even, it's an
19 observation really, not a finding, in the first
20 place, isn't it?

21 But the findings from the other
22 report, if that other report is in the BRS, then
23 you can just simply -- you can just indicate that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 all those are closed. Right, as long as the
2 Subcommittee agrees.

3 DR. LIPSZTEIN: In our SC&A report, we
4 recommend finding, closing all of them.

5 MR. ALLEN: Yes, all ten are listed as
6 recommending by closing.

7 DR. LIPSZTEIN: Yeah, they are like
8 Finding 1, SC&A recommends this finding to be
9 closed. It's all in there in our report.

10 MS. K. BEHLING: And this is Kathy.
11 We did enter that into the BRS, but as you're
12 saying, I believe it has to be officially closed
13 by today's meeting, if you're in agreement with
14 that.

15 CHAIR MUNN: And unless I hear to the
16 contrary, we are.

17 MS. K. BEHLING: So that's Finding 2
18 through 14, correct?

19 DR. LIPSZTEIN: One to fourteen.

20 MEMBER ZIEMER: No, one to --

21 CHAIR MUNN: Okay.

22 MEMBER ZIEMER: It's 1 through 14,
23 right?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 DR. LIPSZTEIN: Right.

2 MEMBER ZIEMER: Do you need a motion,
3 or just?

4 MR. KATZ: No, you don't need a
5 motion.

6 MEMBER ZIEMER: No. Just agree, okay.

7 CHAIR MUNN: Yeah, we've just agreed,
8 and they are officially closed.

9 MR. HINNEFELD: Okay, this is Stu.
10 Just to be clear, who will be changing those
11 statuses?

12 MR. KATZ: Lori can do that.

13 MR. HINNEFELD: Lori can do that,
14 okay.

15 MR. KATZ: If that's okay with Lori.

16 MS. MARION-MOSS: Yes, it's okay.

17 CHAIR MUNN: Great, thank you much.
18 Anything else on Report 5 and plutonium-238? If
19 not, thank you very much, Rose.

20 MS. MARION-MOSS: I'm sorry, Wanda,
21 this is Lori. Do the statuses change on Report
22 5?

23 MS. K. BEHLING: This is Kathy. I

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 believe I've identified them all on 83. It's
2 OTIB-83.

3 MS. MARION-MOSS: Yeah, I understand
4 that, Kathy. What I'm asking is relative to DCAS
5 Report 5.

6 MS. K. BEHLING: Oh.

7 MR. KATZ: Yeah, so Lori, those
8 observations are closed.

9 MS. MARION-MOSS: So those were
10 observations and not findings?

11 MR. KATZ: I think so.

12 DR. NETON: No, I think they were
13 findings. But I think that they would be listed
14 in abeyance, awaiting NIOSH to reissue the report
15 ---

16 (Simultaneous speaking.)

17 MS. MARION-MOSS: NIOSH has clearly
18 said, there's two tasks.

19 MR. KATZ: Okay, but they shouldn't be
20 findings, I mean, from the nature of them.
21 They're really not findings, they're
22 observations. One's a typo, and one is we need
23 more explanation to support this. That's all

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 good, but those are observations.

2 DR. NETON: Yeah, I'm not going to
3 argue that. I mean, they are --

4 MR. KATZ: Yeah, I'm arguing that.

5 CHAIR MUNN: And you should. From my
6 perspective, that's entirely correct. They're
7 valid observations but they are not findings.
8 And we now address observations. So we have just
9 done so, I believe. NIOSH understands what
10 they're going to do, and it should be therefore
11 still, it is, however in abeyance, as I see it.

12 MS. MARION-MOSS: Okay, so I'll update
13 the BRS that these are in abeyance.

14 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

15 MS. MARION-MOSS: Are we --

16 CHAIR MUNN: Everybody's agreed on it,
17 it just has not completed its --

18 MEMBER ZIEMER: What's in abeyance?

19 MR. KATZ: The two observations.

20 CHAIR MUNN: The two observations.

21 MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, the two
22 observations. Yeah, the other ones are, the
23 findings are closed.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIR MUNN: Everything else is
2 closed.

3 MR. KATZ: That's correct.

4 CHAIR MUNN: Thank you. Alright, any
5 other questions, uncertainties about Report 5?
6 If not, let's go on to the outstanding findings
7 of prior Subcommittee reviews. And --

8 MR. KATZ: Wait, wait, we have Report
9 78.

10 CHAIR MUNN: Oops, sorry. Report 78
11 indeed. And who's leading?

12 **Review of ORAUT Report 78: Technical basis for**
13 **sampling plan**

14 DR. BUCHANAN: This is Ron Buchanan of
15 SC&A. Report 78 will be pretty simple because we
16 had no findings. But I will review it a little
17 bit and show conclusions.

18 Report 78 was a Revision 0 issued in
19 June of 2016 and entitled Technical Basis for
20 Sampling Plan. And this report describes the
21 statistical sampling technique in which the
22 comparison of data in an electronic database to
23 the original data is performed after

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 transcription is complete to confirm that the
2 specified typo rate has not been exceeded, and to
3 generate final typo rates that will be reported
4 to all stakeholders.

5 In other words, you've got an original
6 or primary database, could be hard copies or some
7 other form. And you hire company XYZ to
8 transcribe that information into electronic
9 database, in electronic form so that you can use
10 it for something that's dose reconstruction. And
11 you have so many fields of information in this
12 original database, and you hopefully have the
13 same number of fields in the electronic database.

14 And what you want to do is to
15 determine how many samples you have to do of the
16 electronic database compared to the original
17 database to determine if your typo rate exceeded
18 what you can live with. Because this was done by
19 humans, and so there will always be, usually some
20 typo rate.

21 And you can say, I can live with a
22 certain typo rate, but you don't want to sample
23 10,000 and compare every one of the entries, say

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 10,000 entries, to see if they match. And so you
2 say what sample size do I need to take, and how
3 many typos can be in that sample size to meet my
4 criteria of a certain overall typo rate.

5 And so the basic distribution function
6 that does this is here on Equation 3-1, on page
7 six of that document. And I won't go into all
8 the mathematical details. SC&A had their
9 statisticians go over these, but I'll give you a
10 little rundown, and then our conclusions.

11 When you're doing this, you have to
12 balance the producer's risk and the consumer's
13 risk. In other words, the person that has charge
14 of the database or does the transfer. What risk
15 they take is that if you reject data that is
16 actually good, and a consumer has a risk in, if
17 they accept data which is actually bad.

18 And so you have to have some sort of
19 limits put on this and set some parameters. And
20 once you use this distribution function and you
21 set your parameters, then you can use the
22 distribution function to determine your sample
23 size you need to look at and how many typos can

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 be in there to satisfy your needs.

2 From that then you create an
3 operational curve and a confidence interval to
4 give you some idea of what interval of the -- how
5 many typos you can observe and still be
6 satisfied.

7 Now, just as a little side point, you
8 might think that as your number of entries
9 increased, you also -- the number you have to
10 sample increases. This is not really true. And
11 Figure 6-1 on page 15 of this document shows that
12 the parameters they choose led to about 4500
13 being your maximum sample you need to take.

14 They give a good example there. It
15 says if you want to see if a bowl of soup is too
16 salty, you take a taste. But if you want to see
17 if a kettle is too salty, you still just take a
18 teaspoon taste. And so you don't need to sample
19 more and more as your population increases after
20 a certain point.

21 Also, they give a good example on page
22 17 to apply this distribution function, if you
23 follow that through, it gives you an illustration

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 how it operates. Now, we went through this and
2 had our statistician look at this, and we agreed
3 on the approach they used, and the statistics
4 were okay. We found no issue with that.

5 Now, what I would like to do is just
6 kind of point out to the Work Group that there's
7 a number of parameters scattered throughout this
8 report. And these parameters kind of get jumbled
9 as you're going through all this.

10 So what I did in our final evaluation,
11 which I put on the BRS, was to look at the --- in
12 the parameters and divide it up into fixed
13 parameters, variable parameters, and the
14 resulting values that fall out of these
15 parameters.

16 And so the fixed parameters are the
17 total population (N), and the number of typos in
18 the electronic database. Those are two
19 parameters you can't adjust, those are set when
20 you go in to solve the problem.

21 And now you do have control over the
22 variable parameters, and the variable parameters
23 in this report are: producer's risk, alpha, how

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 willing they are to take the risk that they reject
2 good data; consumer risk, beta, how willing they
3 are to accept bad data. And then the acceptance
4 error rate and the unacceptable error rate, in
5 other words, what interval will you work in that
6 you'll accept a certain error rate.

7 And then from these parameters, you
8 have the observed values. And the observed value
9 is then what you're going to find out from putting
10 these variable parameters and the fixed
11 parameters in distribution plots, and you'll come
12 out and it'll tell you how many fields in the
13 electronic database you have to sample and what
14 your observed error rate can be to match your
15 criteria of overall error rate in the total
16 population.

17 And from this, then, you create a
18 operational curve, which they give an example on
19 page ten, and a confidential interval --
20 confidence interval on page ten and eleven. And
21 so this then provides the user with how many
22 samples to take and what sample error it can be.

23 And as I say, we went through this,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 did not find any findings or have any
2 observations, just that we condensed some of
3 these parameters so you could see what they
4 meant. And we put this on the BRS on the second
5 of November. And that concludes my presentation.
6 Any questions?

7 MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer. I
8 have one question. First of all, I thought the
9 report was very good. I wonder if -- the
10 selection of the criteria always seemed a little
11 bit arbitrary. I guess it's, and NIOSH has
12 selected the criteria, maybe I would ask NIOSH.

13 Do we have any sort of guidance, you
14 know, sort of standards in terms of how other
15 groups determine what is acceptable on these
16 kinds of things? It's completely, are other
17 groups looking at transformation and coding of
18 data from handwritten on the computer, other
19 groups that do this, what kind of criteria -- are
20 we sort of in the same ballpark on acceptance
21 criteria?

22 DR. NETON: This is Jim. I'm pretty
23 sure we did -- we had this discussion early on,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 but I don't really recall. I'm wondering if
2 anyone from ORAU is on the phone that might be
3 able to weigh in on this.

4 MEMBER ZIEMER: I mean, what you've
5 selected seems reasonable to me.

6 DR. NETON: Yeah.

7 MEMBER ZIEMER: That one would feel
8 more comfortable if it sort of met some
9 acceptance, general acceptance criteria that's
10 used, not just in our own field but other fields
11 as well. Because there's got to be a lot of cases
12 where handwritten data of some sort is
13 transferred onto electronic media.

14 DR. NETON: I agree, and I'm certain
15 we had these discussions, but it's been so long
16 ago I can't recall now what we did. But we can
17 get back to you if there's no one from ORAU that
18 can address this on the call with --

19 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I was going to
20 ask SC&A if they even looked at that themselves.
21 I assume you just looked at the statistical
22 methodology around this, but --

23 DR. BUCHANAN: Well, now, Harry --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER ZIEMER: And that part
2 certainly looks good.

3 DR. BUCHANAN: Yes, that was our main
4 purpose. Now, Harry did our statistical
5 analysis, the detail of it, and so we can ask
6 him. I don't think he's on the phone today, but
7 we could see if he evaluated the values we looked
8 at.

9 However, I think mainly we
10 concentrated on were the mechanics correct, and
11 then this is one reason I pointed out that these
12 variables do impact the results and that, you
13 know, they aren't set in stone.

14 MEMBER ZIEMER: No, no, understood.
15 But you understand the gist of my question?

16 DR. BUCHANAN: Yes, I understand.

17 MEMBER ZIEMER: So that somebody
18 doesn't say, well, you guys just selected your
19 parameters so it would come out the way you want
20 it to, something like that.

21 DR. BUCHANAN: Yes, I can ask Harry if
22 he has other references in other fields that, you
23 know, use this sort of thing, whether these are,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 you know, where these might have come from or how
2 reasonable they are. They sound reasonable, but
3 I don't have anything to compare it with.

4 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, my suggestion
5 would be, Wanda, that we go ahead and approve
6 this, or whatever action we need to take on this.
7 But perhaps we could get at some point some
8 assurance back, maybe it's from NIOSH.

9 I had a feeling we may have discussed
10 it before, but I just don't remember it either.
11 Do you -- just wondered if we could just have
12 some assurance for all of us that we're in the
13 right ballpark for how this is done sort of in
14 general.

15 CHAIR MUNN: If --- you're talking
16 this specific case, right?

17 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, number one, I
18 think we should -- I recommend we take whatever
19 approval action on Ron's report. What do we need
20 to do on this, we need to approve?

21 CHAIR MUNN: I think we need to accept
22 and approve the report that we've just been
23 given. But we will, on our agenda, carry a

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 request that we get verification of the
2 assessments taking place with respect to the
3 adequacy of the sampling techniques that were
4 used.

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah, I'm not sure if
6 it's the adequacy of the techniques so much as
7 how the -- Jim, help me out here. The question
8 of the criteria.

9 DR. NETON: They've got some criteria.

10 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah.

11 DR. NETON: It's just a bench ---

12 (Simultaneous speaking.)

13 MEMBER ZIEMER: How do we benchmark
14 against others that do this kind of stuff? That
15 would be what I'm asking.

16 DR. NETON: Right.

17 MEMBER ZIEMER: Is that something that
18 we could do easily, Jim? I don't want to
19 overburden us.

20 DR. NETON: Oh, absolutely. In fact,
21 I'm not certain it's not in the report. But we'll
22 look into it, and we can provide some insight on
23 that, no problem.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah. I don't think
2 it affects what we're doing here today, but I
3 would feel more comfortable if we had some
4 assurance that we were certainly within, you
5 know, the kind acceptance criteria that's used
6 for this type of actions.

7 CHAIR MUNN: And my recommendation
8 would be, as I said earlier, to accept the report,
9 with a caveat that at our next meeting, NIOSH
10 will have reviewed the criteria to assure that
11 they're appropriate for the information that we
12 need. Is there any ---

13 MEMBER ZIEMER: Sounds good to me.

14 CHAIR MUNN: --- acceptable to
15 everyone? Acceptable?

16 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

17 MR. LABONE: This is Tom LaBone. I
18 think I can add a little bit to that discussion.

19 CHAIR MUNN: Okay, please do.

20 MR. LABONE: When we went through and
21 wrote that report, we went back and in particular
22 looked at, looking for any guidance from any
23 independent standard organization and couldn't

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 find it. And tried to focus in on medical record
2 transcription, which I thought would be basically
3 --

4 MEMBER ZIEMER: That would be a good
5 area to look at.

6 MR. LABONE: Well, we did. I couldn't
7 find anything.

8 MEMBER ZIEMER: Really.

9 MR. LABONE: And like I said, if
10 anybody knows of anything that we could document,
11 because we were looking for something that was
12 from an independent group. But since we couldn't
13 find it, we queried Jim about what he was
14 comfortable with and those are numbers that we
15 have in the report.

16 MEMBER ZIEMER: Maybe we're being
17 pioneers here so other people can use our
18 guidance.

19 MR. LABONE: Yeah, you know what --

20 CHAIR MUNN: The eternal optimist.

21 MR. KATZ: This is Ted. I just ---
22 I'll send an email. The one Board Member I can
23 think of who might know about that, if there's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 been benchmarking of this, because I know he's
2 always interested in this very issue, is David
3 Richardson. So let me just send him an email and
4 ask him if he happens to know.

5 MEMBER BEACH: Ted, and this is Josie.
6 Didn't we have some discussions on this during
7 the worker outreach, when we were doing our
8 sampling?

9 MR. KATZ: No, not on this. This is
10 really, but this is something that I'm surprised,
11 too, to hear that there isn't somewhere, there
12 probably is somewhere sort of that leads to some
13 examples. But let me ask David Richardson.

14 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, there's a lot of
15 this going on in the medical field of
16 transcribing handwritten records onto computers,
17 because now I know, for example, Medicare won't
18 accept and won't use the medical doctors who
19 don't have the records on electronic media. So
20 I just had one of my doctors knocked off the
21 system.

22 CHAIR MUNN: Is that right.

23 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIR MUNN: Oh, my word. Well --

2 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, anyway, okay,
3 enough said.

4 CHAIR MUNN: Well, yeah, but we've of
5 course looked at sampling requirements for almost
6 everything in the world at one time or another in
7 our deliberations here. But I don't know that
8 this specific issue has been addressed, if it
9 wasn't already addressed, as NIOSH has said, in
10 the report itself, which I have not read. So.

11 Our action at this point, I believe,
12 is NIOSH has said that they'll double check
13 whether there's something in the report or not,
14 and try and get back to us. And Ted's checking
15 with Dave.

16 MR. KATZ: Yeah, I thought Tom was
17 responding for NIOSH. There is nothing more.

18 CHAIR MUNN: Yeah, okay then, we have
19 an indication like that. Are we recommending
20 that we check further to try to identify where
21 this, where such --

22 MEMBER ZIEMER: If it's already been
23 assessed, that satisfies my question.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: Yeah, I'll let you know,
2 I'll let NIOSH know and you folks know if --

3 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yeah, if --
4 (Simultaneous speaking.)

5 MR. KATZ: --- anything.

6 MEMBER ZIEMER: It must have been
7 longer enough ago if none of us can remember.

8 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, it must have been.
9 Okay, then we'll, what's the recommendation from
10 our DFOs? Shall I carry this on the agenda, or
11 is this going to be --

12 MR. KATZ: I don't think you need to.
13 I think you can just approve it and that would be
14 that. I will send you a message after I hear
15 back from Dave.

16 CHAIR MUNN: Okay, that'll be great.
17 And that should be adequate, and unless I hear to
18 the contrary, then we'll accept your report,
19 approve it as presented. Any negative thoughts
20 or any positive thoughts on that?

21 MEMBER ZIEMER: I'm agreed.

22 MEMBER BEACH: I agree also.

23 CHAIR MUNN: Josie? Okay. That's

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 good. Then we'll move onto our next item on the
2 agenda.

3 MS. MARION-MOSS: Wanda, this is Lori.

4 CHAIR MUNN: Yes?

5 MS. MARION-MOSS: Before we do that
6 can I ask who will close this entry out? Would
7 that be SC&A?

8 CHAIR MUNN: Good question.

9 MR. KATZ: It's whatever you prefer,
10 Lori. You have the authority to do that if you
11 want to.

12 CHAIR MUNN: I don't --

13 MR. KATZ: If you want us to maybe do
14 it --

15 (Simultaneous speaking.)

16 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, based on what we
17 just did, yes. Whichever you chooses to do so
18 based on what we've just said here.

19 MS. MARION-MOSS: I'll work with Kathy
20 on that.

21 MR. KATZ: Okay.

22 CHAIR MUNN: Okay.

23 MS. MARION-MOSS: Okay, Kathy?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. BEHLING: That's fine with me.

2 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Very good. Then
3 I'm struggling again here trying to get back to
4 the next item, and it has disappeared from my
5 screen.

6 **Review of Findings for Procedures: 22**
7 **(Supplemental requests for DOE information), 44**
8 **(Special Exposure Cohort), 86 (Case preparation:**
9 **Complex internal dosimetry claims - cancelled),**
10 **94 (Verification and Validation process for the**
11 **Tools Development Group)**

12 MR. KATZ: Oh, so the next item is
13 review of findings for -- this is for procedures
14 that had been already under review. So we have
15 22, supplemental requests for DOE information. I
16 think that's the first group of these.

17 CHAIR MUNN: Okay.

18 MR. KATZ: I guess Kathy -- I think
19 maybe Kathy can --

20 CHAIR MUNN: Sounds like Kathy.

21 MS. BEHLING: Actually I thought it
22 was NIOSH.

23 MR. KATZ: Oh, okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. BEHLING: I think it is.

2 MS. MARION-MOSS: This is Lori. I can
3 facilitate us through these.

4 What we have is a number of
5 administrative procedures that were reviewed
6 awhile back by SC&A back in 2006. And we have
7 one that was reviewed back in 2010, which is
8 Procedure 44. We -- I'll start out with that
9 one.

10 Procedure 44, the previous revision
11 there were some findings issued against that
12 procedure, and it's the Special Exposure Cohort
13 procedure.

14 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

15 MS. MARION-MOSS: And basically the
16 findings that were issued were associated with
17 that procedure not being aligned with the DCAS
18 procedure for Special Exposure Cohort guidance.

19 So what ORAU has done is revised that
20 procedure to align it with the DCAS PER-4
21 procedure, and that was basically the change that
22 it -- is what the revisions consist of. So we
23 revised that here recently and I sent the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 revision out to the Board.

2 MEMBER MUNN: And I recall no problem
3 with it personally.

4 Does anyone else have any concern?

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: So what you're saying
6 is now they both align with the same
7 instructions?

8 MS. MARION-MOSS: Yes.

9 MEMBER ZIEMER: So what is -- is it --
10 does that allow us to close the -- was an official
11 issue?

12 MS. MARION-MOSS: Yes, it was an
13 official issue.

14 MEMBER ZIEMER: You're recommending
15 closure? Or who recommends closure, NIOSH or
16 SC&A?

17 MS. MARION-MOSS: No. This is Lori.
18 Paul, I'm not recommending closure. I'm just
19 bringing the Committee up on what the revision
20 was based on and why we revised the document.
21 And I guess now SC&A can take a look at that and
22 see what --

23 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay. We don't need

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 any action right now is what you're saying?

2 MR. KATZ: Yes, well, I mean, what I
3 suggested -- so this came up and I suggested --
4 at least I copied -- I don't know if I copied the
5 Full Subcommittee. I certainly copied Wanda. I
6 mean, it's -- the result is something -- it's
7 just an administrative document and I don't think
8 it needs an SC&A review. I mean, I think that
9 would be silly. It just iterates the procedure
10 that's used for processing SECs and there's no
11 technical matter there to speak of except for
12 stuff that's totally completely standard with --

13 MEMBER ZIEMER: That is correct.

14 (Simultaneous speaking.)

15 MR. KATZ: -- the Board.

16 So I don't think this is one that
17 needs another SC&A review, but --

18 MEMBER ZIEMER: Does it even need
19 official action by the Subcommittee?

20 MEMBER BEACH: So the findings,
21 originally were they SC&A findings or just --

22 MR. KATZ: They were.

23 MEMBER BEACH: So you would think that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 SC&A would have to at least look at the changes
2 that were incorporated, but I might be wrong.

3 MR. KATZ: Well, it's -- yes, I mean,
4 the -- again, the nature of the -- before was
5 that they were out of alignment, but it's an
6 administrative document that's -- there's nothing
7 substantive to review, I think, but I mean, you
8 can have SC&A read it if you want, but it's your
9 prerogative.

10 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I thought of it as
11 just a -- essentially an internal administrative
12 matter. Okay.

13 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, I was kind of
14 wondering why we were -- actually why the
15 Subcommittee was reviewing these documents which
16 simply seemed to be explaining the process and
17 how it was done.

18 MR. KATZ: Well, I think the -- Paul,
19 the only reason it comes up at all is because
20 they reviewed that prior ORAU document. I think
21 that's the only reason it's being raised, but you
22 can pass on it and just say that's fine.

23 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I think the review

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 process was not -- I think this was a result of
2 the earlier review process, not our -- now we're
3 getting tangled up in our semantics here, but
4 yes, I think we've -- I think it's done, but --
5 because there's no -- the question that was
6 raised has now been taken care of
7 administratively and -- because it wasn't -- it
8 didn't affect in any way the results of the
9 review, the original reviews.

10 So any problem with that? Can we just
11 accept this and thank NIOSH for doing an
12 excellent job and go on?

13 MEMBER ZIEMER: I'm willing, yes.

14 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Very good.

15 MEMBER BEACH: Wanda, for
16 clarification are you changing all of the
17 findings that were in abeyance to closed then?

18 CHAIR MUNN: The findings that were in
19 abeyance?

20 MR. KATZ: On the old procedure, yes.

21 CHAIR MUNN: On the old procedure.

22 Did this align all of them or was -- we were --
23 was this the only thing we were waiting for is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this --

2 MR. KATZ: Yes.

3 CHAIR MUNN: I -- very frankly, I
4 can't remember reading, and I'm having such a
5 terrible problem pulling up my files.

6 MR. KATZ: Yes, Wanda --

7 CHAIR MUNN: And this by the way is a
8 very good reason from my point of view why our
9 folks in government are a mistake to work on the
10 assumption that anybody who's not relying on
11 their digital records is not performing up to
12 speed, because if their digital records are as
13 reliable as mine, then that's probably a serious
14 mistake, but we'll find that out. That's for the
15 future, not for here.

16 Yes, it's my understanding that what
17 we've just heard clarifies the only remaining
18 correction to the -- or there weren't other
19 corrections to the document that were necessary.

20 MR. KATZ: It was a replacement, so
21 it's replaced the document's gone that was --

22 (Simultaneous speaking.)

23 CHAIR MUNN: Right. Right, it's not

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 there anymore.

2 MR. KATZ: Right.

3 CHAIR MUNN: And therefore, yes, it
4 should close everything. Yes. Abeyance should
5 change to closed. But that one thread was the
6 only one hanging up to the best of my knowledge.
7 To the best of my memory, which is not anything
8 we should rely on, let me tell you.

9 Alright. Then next on our agenda --

10 MR. KATZ: Well, similarly we
11 have -- -- on the one Lori has there were several
12 other documents.

13 CHAIR MUNN: She just had 44 that we
14 looked at, and there's more.

15 MS. MARION-MOSS: Okay. The next one
16 I'll move onto is another administrative
17 procedure that was reviewed back in 2006, which
18 is PROC-22. And Procedure 22 basically -- the
19 scope of that procedure was in regards to
20 additional requests for DOE information, again
21 another administrative procedure. And basically
22 the concern was that -- SC&A's concern related to
23 correcting the reference throughout the document.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And so we finally got around to revising that
2 document and correcting that reference
3 throughout. So that's the scope of Finding No.
4 1 under Procedure 22.

5 And secondly, the second finding
6 pertained to the lack of process details when it
7 came to handling additional information that was
8 requested from DOE. Again, we've updated that
9 procedure to reflect certain terminology that
10 would be understandable from a reader's
11 standpoint. That procedure was revised back in
12 August of this year and we published it. So
13 that's the gist of Procedure 22 findings.

14 CHAIR MUNN: Can you show us on the
15 screen, which I finally got up -- can you show us
16 on the screen what we said about it?

17 (Pause.)

18 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Alright. Without
19 checking exceptions, it appears to me that that
20 would be listed as completing the requirements
21 for action.

22 Does anyone have any questions for
23 Lori on PROC-22?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 (No audible response.)

2 CHAIR MUNN: If not, then we can close
3 that and move on.

4 MR. KATZ: Were these findings in
5 abeyance or -- I can't -- I don't see where it
6 indicates.

7 MS. MARION-MOSS: Yes, they were in
8 abeyance.

9 MR. KATZ: Okay. Alright. That's
10 what I thought. I just wanted to make sure.

11 And also, everyone who's not speaking,
12 can you mute your phones? Press *6 if you don't
13 have a mute button, because there's some
14 background noise that's interfering with the
15 call. Thanks.

16 Okay. Go ahead, Lori.

17 MS. MARION-MOSS: The next procedure,
18 again another administrative procedure, is
19 Procedure 94. And this particular procedure is
20 associated with the verification and validation
21 activity associated with the tools that are used
22 in dose reconstruction. And this -- there's one
23 finding, in abeyance finding that was issued back

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in 2007, and it was one finding issued by SC&A.

2 And that particular finding had seven sub-parts.

3 And the subsequent reviews that took
4 place regarding the review of this particular
5 procedure the Committee agreed that five of the
6 seven sub-parts -- there was no requirement for
7 response. So therefore that left us two findings
8 that -- where NIOSH needed to respond one of these
9 sub-parts basically was concerning a reference
10 to an attachment in that particular procedure and
11 SC&A thought it was unnecessary. In the revision
12 of this document we actually removed that
13 reference and made some clarifications. Okay?

14 And the second finding associated with
15 this procedure basically dealt with how we --
16 what steps we would take if we modified a tool.
17 And basically what we did was just clarify those
18 steps in the revision of this procedure from a QA
19 standpoint. And that's the gist of the change
20 that was made to this document.

21 Any questions?

22 CHAIR MUNN: I'm reading.

23 MEMBER BEACH: None here, Lori.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Thanks.

2 MS. MARION-MOSS: Yes.

3 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, it sounds adequate
4 to me. Paul, any problem?

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: No, I'm good.

6 CHAIR MUNN: Alright. Very good.

7 Any other comments with respect to Lori's
8 explanation of these two, items 5 and 6 on PROC-
9 94?

10 If not then, we can indicate that
11 that's acceptable, close that concern and move
12 on.

13 Did we have a fourth?

14 MS. MARION-MOSS: Yes, we do have one
15 more, and that's Procedure 86. And I do believe
16 that finding was in progress. I'm not sure. Yes.

17 This particular procedure was
18 canceled. The procedure addressed case
19 preparations for complex internal dosimetry
20 claims, and the scope of the procedure when it
21 was created was basically to instruct claim
22 preparers on how to process DOE information that
23 was received and how it -- how that information

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 would be loaded into our spreadsheets.

2 Well, we no longer follow the process
3 in PROC-86, so therefore that procedure was
4 canceled. And now the process is addressed in
5 Procedure 106, again which is another
6 administrative procedure.

7 CHAIR MUNN: Alright. Very good. I
8 guess we don't need to see -- that's -- yes,
9 that's -- it's fine as long as it's been
10 completely superseded in its complete form. Is
11 there a problem?

12 MEMBER ZIEMER: No, I'm good.

13 MR. KATZ: Excuse me, there's some
14 background talk, but I don't recognize the
15 voices.

16 Hello? There are some folks on the
17 line that probably don't belong on this call.

18 Folks, someone was just talking about
19 smoking. Can you guys hang up, whoever's on the
20 line?

21 Okay. I'll get Zaida to cut that
22 line. We can go ahead.

23 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Thank you, Ted.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I see no problem with closing. Paul,
2 Josie, do either of you have any negative
3 thoughts with respect to PROC-86? Can we close
4 it?

5 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, now that it's 106
6 I have no problem with closing it, Wanda.

7 CHAIR MUNN: Paul?

8 MEMBER ZIEMER: No, I'm good on that.

9 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Thank you, both.
10 We can close it, Lori.

11 MS. MARION-MOSS: Okay. Well, that
12 concludes my presentation --

13 CHAIR MUNN: Very good.

14 (Simultaneous speaking.)

15 MS. MARION-MOSS: -- changes.

16 CHAIR MUNN: I do appreciate your
17 help. Thank you very much. Believe me, I doubly
18 appreciate it today since I've only just got to
19 the BRS in the midst of it. So thank you very
20 much. Much appreciated.

21 My next list on my draft agenda is --
22 does that complete --

23 (Simultaneous speaking.)

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 **Priorities and timeline for completing**
2 **consideration of outstanding findings**

3 MR. KATZ: Wanda, the next item on the
4 agenda is priorities and timelines for completing
5 consideration of outstanding findings, so it was
6 just to check to see what other outstanding
7 findings if any we have and what the turnaround
8 is for getting those things done.

9 CHAIR MUNN: And I have no information
10 that would authorize me to make a comment on that
11 right now given my condition. The only thing I
12 can do is say I'll take a look at this myself
13 personally to see if there's anything in my
14 personal list of things that need to circle back
15 around. But other than that, I --

16 MEMBER BEACH: Wanda?

17 CHAIR MUNN: Yes?

18 MEMBER BEACH: This is Josie. We got
19 an answer from NIOSH on the DCAS Procedure 057
20 that we discussed at the last meeting. I didn't
21 know if SC&A had a chance to look at that or if
22 that fit in that category or not.

23 CHAIR MUNN: Well, it probably fits in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the category, but the question would be
2 whether -- you're correct, the question would be
3 whether SC&A had -- in fact had an opportunity to
4 look at it and if they're prepared to make any
5 comment today.

6 MS. BEHLING: This is Kathy Behling.
7 No, we haven't. I didn't realize that that was
8 out there. Sorry.

9 CHAIR MUNN: Oh, okay.

10 MR. KATZ: Okay. So otherwise, Wanda,
11 it wasn't all on you. I had been seeing or
12 assuming that SC&A and NIOSH would look at what
13 they still have in the works.

14 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

15 MR. KATZ: But I don't know whether
16 that happened on either side.

17 CHAIR MUNN: No, I have not. If it
18 has been reported, I don't believe I have seen
19 it.

20 NIOSH, do you have any running lists
21 that you want to bring to our attention that is
22 coming up that we need to be looking forward to?

23 MR. HINNEFELD: Well, I think Lori

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 might be in the best position to comment on that
2 if we do. Or failing that, we can provide
3 information at the meeting.

4 Lori, do you have anything?

5 MS. MARION-MOSS: Not off the top of
6 my head, Stu, but again --

7 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, if we could request
8 that you would take a look at that and get us an
9 email in that regard.

10 SC&A?

11 MS. BEHLING: I don't have anything
12 else.

13 CHAIR MUNN: You don't have
14 anything --

15 MR. KATZ: Yes, Wanda we used to look
16 at what was left open in BRS --

17 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, yes.

18 MR. KATZ: -- for all of our
19 procedures and so on.

20 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

21 MR. KATZ: We haven't done that in a
22 long time.

23 CHAIR MUNN: No.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: So that's one of the
2 reasons. That's what this is here for, but we
3 should probably do that before we schedule
4 another meeting so that we know what kind of plate
5 we have --

6 (Simultaneous speaking.)

7 CHAIR MUNN: I agree.

8 MR. KATZ: Yes.

9 CHAIR MUNN: I have not done that
10 myself in --

11 MR. KATZ: Okay.

12 CHAIR MUNN: -- quite some time. So
13 let's say that all of us will take a look and see
14 what is actually on the plate. I think it would
15 be premature for us to attempt to plan another
16 meeting at this juncture until we do have an
17 opportunity to do that.

18 MR. KATZ: Yes.

19 CHAIR MUNN: May I request that we --
20 that all Board Members do that as well and that
21 NIOSH and SC&A take a look at what they know is
22 perhaps something that is on the plate that is
23 not yet on the BRS as well? And if -- sometime

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 in the next couple of weeks if both SC&A and NIOSH
2 could give us a brief glimpse if you have anything
3 currently on your schedule and working that you
4 know is going to --

5 (Simultaneous speaking.)

6 MR. KATZ: No, Wanda, I didn't mean
7 just what's -- what people have that they're
8 working on. I meant what's sitting in the active
9 findings or findings in progress that --

10 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

11 MR. KATZ: -- haven't been addressed.
12 Yes.

13 CHAIR MUNN: There's a lot in the
14 hopper still on BRS I'm quite sure.

15 MR. KATZ: Right, that's what I was
16 trying to get at.

17 CHAIR MUNN: And that's -- it's a good
18 opportunity for us to all try to recalibrate just
19 a little bit and see what we have down the road
20 coming at us, if anything, to get a better handle
21 on.

22 MEMBER ZIEMER: So one of the things
23 that Ted distributed to us a couple of days ago.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I think it was from [identifying information
2 redacted] on an item from GSI.

3 CHAIR MUNN: I did see [identifying
4 information redacted] request and I will draft a
5 brief response to it and which I will send to --
6 (Simultaneous speaking.)

7 MEMBER ZIEMER: No, I think Ted is --
8 well, let's see.

9 Ted, you already responded to him,
10 didn't you?

11 MR. KATZ: Yes, I said --

12 MEMBER ZIEMER: I mean --

13 MR. KATZ: -- that I would -- I said
14 that I would -- I already responded to him, so he
15 knows I put this to the Procedure Subcommittee.

16 MEMBER ZIEMER: Right, so it'll just
17 come up for us to look at, at some point.

18 **Identification of procedures not yet reviewed**

19 MR. KATZ: And, yes, moreover Kathy
20 Behling re-sent -- added that and maybe another
21 item, too, or two to the list she gave you of
22 procedures that haven't been reviewed that are up
23 for consideration for --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIR MUNN: Right.

2 MR. KATZ: -- recommending to the
3 Board for review.

4 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, and that's -- I
5 think that's key.

6 MR. KATZ: Yes.

7 CHAIR MUNN: And as I interpreted it,
8 that was the primary concern that [identifying
9 information redacted] had, is that it -- we
10 didn't have it under our wing already. So I'll
11 see if we hear from him after that.

12 And is there anything else for the
13 good of the order?

14 MR. KATZ: Well, so do you -- I have
15 it on -- the last item on the agenda is -- I mean,
16 Kathy's identified them, but do you all -- are
17 you ready to discuss that set of procedures and
18 your thoughts on them or -- it sounds like maybe
19 you're not. I don't know.

20 CHAIR MUNN: Well, it would be a very
21 good idea for us to do so. The condition of my
22 communications equipment here is making me very,
23 very leery of making any comment at this time. I

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 certainly -- would there be any problem in our
2 convening a very brief meeting of the
3 Subcommittee for the specific purpose of going
4 over those items and those items alone? That
5 would in my mind be a wiser thing simply from my
6 own personal position because I hate to do this
7 without --

8 (Simultaneous speaking.)

9 MR. KATZ: Yes, I mean, we can of
10 course do that. We can meet for however brief
11 you would like -- briefly you'd like, but I have
12 to go through the same administrative process, so
13 it's a -- so that's a meeting that's more than
14 two months out, is what --

15 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, so -- since the
16 Subcommittee -- the logistics of it are a little
17 more complex.

18 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, sure.

19 MEMBER ZIEMER: But --

20 MEMBER BEACH: So this -- if we took
21 a lunch break and then reconvened, would that be
22 sufficient time, Wanda?

23 CHAIR MUNN: Oh, that would be very

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 helpful for me if I can get the electrons to fall
2 in their proper slots.

3 MR. KATZ: Okay. Well, Wanda, I've
4 emailed you that document from Kathy, so you
5 should have it in your emails.

6 CHAIR MUNN: Well, I had it earlier,
7 but --

8 MR. KATZ: I'll send it out again.

9 CHAIR MUNN: -- I just have not been
10 able to --

11 MEMBER ZIEMER: What was the date of
12 the sending on that one? I want to pull my copy
13 up.

14 MR. KATZ: I sent it to -- the updated
15 one. I sent you the original and then I sent you
16 the updated one I'm sure it was just last week.

17 MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, okay. Okay. If
18 it's last week, I'll have it right here.

19 MR. KATZ: Is that right, Josie?

20 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I actually printed
21 the November 10, so it was a couple days after
22 that.

23 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER BEACH: It was probably within
2 the last week, like you said.

3 MR. KATZ: No, because there was an
4 original and then Kathy updated it.

5 MS. BEHLING: Right.

6 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, there was more.

7 MS. BEHLING: I sent out the original
8 and then I had to update the pages that I was
9 missing.

10 MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, yes, yes, yes.
11 Got it.

12 MR. KATZ: So, okay. So anyway --

13 MEMBER BEACH: We have a new one.

14 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

15 MR. KATZ: -- thank you, Kathy.

16 MEMBER ZIEMER: So one hour?

17 CHAIR MUNN: One hour.

18 MR. KATZ: Yes, sure. Sure. We can
19 take an hour lunch break.

20 CHAIR MUNN: And we'll reconvene then
21 at -- well, for those of us on the West Coast,
22 five minutes before the hour. Okay?

23 MR. KATZ: Let's just do it on the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 hour.

2 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Let's do it on the
3 hour. That's fine. That's good. One hour.

4 MR. KATZ: Alright. Thank you.

5 CHAIR MUNN: Thank you.

6 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
7 went off the record at 12:43 p.m. and resumed at
8 2:00 p.m.)

9 CHAIR MUNN: So we're going to work
10 specifically from the latest information that
11 Kathy sent us, completely updated. And let's
12 start with item No. 1 and discuss whether to or
13 not to follow the recommendation. We're talking
14 about Paducah. And the recommendation is that
15 they take a look at Subtask 4 claims. Everything
16 else apparently has been covered pretty well at
17 least to SC&A's and NIOSH's acceptance. It seems
18 to me, my personal reaction is that it wouldn't
19 be a bad idea at all to task Subtask 4.

20 Josie, Paul, your responses?

21 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I agree with that
22 also, Wanda.

23 CHAIR MUNN: Paul?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, agree here.

2 CHAIR MUNN: Alright. Let's task
3 them.

4 MR. KATZ: Okay. Well, just for
5 clarity in general we don't task the reviews, we
6 recommend to the Board, but in this case since
7 we're not really reviewing the PER, we're just
8 reviewing the cases, I think that's fine. And we
9 can actually do that. But you don't have the --
10 I don't see the criteria specified for NIOSH to
11 pull cases --

12 (Simultaneous speaking.)

13 MS. BEHLING: Exactly. This is Kathy.
14 No, I did not specify the criteria yet, but I can
15 do that when we get to the end of this meeting.
16 I haven't done that for any of the recommended
17 Task 4 because I wasn't sure if we were going to
18 be tasked to do that yet, but I will and -- if
19 that's something that the Subcommittee can agree
20 on. But I'll send a memo out with those criteria
21 if that meets everybody's --

22 MR. KATZ: Yes.

23 MS. BEHLING: -- if everybody's in

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 agreement.

2 MR. KATZ: I think it would be fine
3 from my perspective. Where it's just Task 4 and
4 it's not reviewing a whole procedure, I think
5 that's fine. I think the Subcommittee can task
6 those and I think it can just agree now as to
7 whether it wants those cases or not reviewed, but
8 then the rest we can do by email. I think that
9 is no problem.

10 MS. BEHLING: Okay. And if I can just
11 interject one other thing. After the last
12 meeting the first memo that I sent out, which was
13 November 10th, all of the documents that were
14 listed in these tables had been reviewed by NIOSH
15 and by Stu. And I tried to in this write-up
16 include Stu's comments when he had them.

17 The only two as we're going through
18 this that I added in this November 15th memo was
19 PER-80 and PER-81. And so NIOSH did not have an
20 opportunity to make comments on those. So I just
21 wanted you to be aware of that.

22 MR. KATZ: Okay.

23 CHAIR MUNN: Thank you for the update.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 In any case it's always good to get those others
2 in, especially under the circumstances.

3 MEMBER ZIEMER: So a question.

4 CHAIR MUNN: Yes?

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: We're talking both
6 numbers of cases as well as criteria here in this
7 situation, right?

8 MS. BEHLING: That's correct. I'm
9 going to have to look at these and make a decision
10 on the criteria and how many cases then will need
11 to be looked at. Yes.

12 MR. KATZ: Yes, and really, you really
13 only need to specify the criteria, because then
14 it's just a question of how many cases it takes
15 to cover the criteria.

16 CHAIR MUNN: Great. All okay with
17 PER-49? Then we'll move onto 73 --

18 (Simultaneous speaking.)

19 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, well -- yes, so
20 let me just question further. So it seems to me
21 that normally we do -- have some discussion on
22 whether we agree with the criteria. So how --
23 are we going to just be informed of the criteria?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: So I was suggesting what we
2 could do, if you guys want to -- if you don't, of
3 course we can deal with this in a meeting, but if
4 you want to -- we can just do that part by email,
5 if you want, just to speed it up, because
6 otherwise it's going to be quite awhile before we
7 have another procedures meeting.

8 MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.

9 MR. KATZ: So --

10 MEMBER ZIEMER: So if -- you would
11 send out the criteria. Then if -- unless we
12 disagreed with it, we would proceed or something
13 like that?

14 MR. KATZ: Well, I'd want you to
15 affirmatively agree with it --

16 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.

17 MR. KATZ: -- or ask questions,
18 whatever it might be, just as we would in a
19 meeting.

20 MEMBER ZIEMER: Right. Okay.

21 MR. KATZ: But we'll just do that by
22 email just -- again just for efficiency's sake,
23 if that's okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay.

2 CHAIR MUNN: And we have done that in
3 the past, yes. That's good. That was my
4 expectation.

5 Any other concerns?

6 (No audible response.)

7 CHAIR MUNN: PER-73, Birdsboro Steel.
8 SC&A's recommending that it be reviewed. We --
9 and, yes, I will have to admit that was a brand
10 new name to me. So that being the case, I would
11 recommend that we follow SC&A's suggestion.

12 Paul?

13 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.

14 CHAIR MUNN: Josie?

15 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I agree also.

16 MR. KATZ: Okay. But so, Kathy, for
17 clarity this is a review of the whole PER, not
18 just the cases?

19 MS. BEHLING: That's correct.

20 MR. KATZ: Okay. Because this is one
21 we have -- we can recommend to the Board for, but
22 we can't do it.

23 MS. BEHLING: Yes, and I don't know

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 if -- well, you all are recommending that, but I
2 would -- yes, Bob Anigstein had looked at this
3 for -- had looked at this and also at the GSI,
4 and I think there were similar issues there. But
5 if you're going to recommend to the Board that we
6 do go ahead and look at this full PER, I'm not
7 sure he'll need to add any additional comments.

8 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, that's great.

9 DR. ANIGSTEIN: Yes, Kathy, I'm here
10 if you need --

11 CHAIR MUNN: I'm sorry. What?

12 MR. KATZ: That's Bob on the line,
13 but --

14 DR. ANIGSTEIN: Yes, I'm here.

15 CHAIR MUNN: Oh, I was just -- my
16 question was going to be will this be in our
17 recommendations for the upcoming Board meeting?

18 MR. KATZ: Yes.

19 CHAIR MUNN: Good.

20 MR. KATZ: So that's something you'd
21 put together, Wanda, right?

22 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I will. Yes.

23 Next item, PER-74, no recommendation

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for it. And I see no reason for it.

2 If anyone else has other thoughts, now
3 is the time.

4 PER-76, Aliquippa. Focused review
5 only is recommended with a representative number
6 of cases being reviewed as far as Subtask 4? It's
7 my --

8 MEMBER ZIEMER: Ted, does a focused
9 review mean to be reviewed by the -- or approved
10 by the Board?

11 MR. KATZ: I don't know what that
12 means. If we're reviewing the procedure, not
13 just the cases, I think we should -- that's --
14 again, that's an issue for the Board.

15 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, I think they're
16 talking about only -- not doing the full review
17 of the documents, but just -- well, it's just the
18 changes, right?

19 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

20 MS. BEHLING: That's what my intent
21 was when I said a focused review, yes.

22 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, because they've
23 already reviewed the procedure and we've

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 addressed findings.

2 MR. KATZ: I'm confused. I mean, a
3 PER is always just a change of some procedures.
4 I'm confused, Kathy, what we're saying is --

5 (Simultaneous speaking.)

6 MS. BEHLING: Yes, what I was
7 intending is that under our Subtask 2 obviously
8 we've already reviewed the TBD, but just to go
9 not that TBD and ensure that the changes that
10 were recommended during the process, that they
11 were incorporated appropriately.

12 MR. KATZ: Okay. Were they in
13 abeyance?

14 CHAIR MUNN: I believe so. They
15 should have.

16 MEMBER BEACH: Ted, I thought that was
17 part of our regular cycle there.

18 MR. KATZ: I have no idea about this
19 one. That's why I'm asking. I have no idea about
20 this in particular. I have no memory of this.
21 But as long as you're just checking to see that --
22 well, with a PER you're always just checking to
23 see -- again, I mean, you're always reviewing --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 it's always something that's already -- you've
2 already -- you usually have already reviewed the
3 TIB or whatever it is, that original founding
4 document.

5 CHAIR MUNN: Well, the difference in
6 this one however is that a part of the review
7 resulted in an actual technical change. There
8 was a new source term for depletion factors in
9 general, as well as external dose rates. And
10 because of technical changes I thought that was
11 what made this one different than the usual PER.
12 It was more than just incorporating.

13 MR. KATZ: Well, I mean, if it's --
14 again, if we changed our procedures and they're
15 going to review the changes, that's sort of like
16 tasking any other procedure review or not the
17 Board needs to do. I'm not clear about the
18 situation from reading and hearing, so I don't
19 really understand --

20 MS. BEHLING: Well, I guess --

21 MR. KATZ: -- it well enough to --
22 we'll probably end up with -- if there's some
23 elements of this procedure that haven't been

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 reviewed and we're reviewing them, then that's a
2 procedure review and we have to go to the Board
3 for it.

4 MS. BEHLING: Okay. I mean, if --

5 MR. KATZ: If this --

6 MS. BEHLING: I'm sorry, Ted. I
7 didn't mean to interrupt.

8 MR. KATZ: Yes.

9 MS. BEHLING: On this one and the next
10 one I did propose the same thing. I can go and
11 look a little bit deeper into -- I'm not always
12 involved in all of the Work Group activity on
13 some of these. And if those changes -- as we are
14 referring to, sometimes these things go into an
15 abeyance and then once the procedure comes out,
16 if we've had an opportunity already to look at
17 that and verify that everything has been updated
18 as we expected, then I guess we can just do the
19 Subtask 4 portion.

20 MR. KATZ: Yes.

21 MS. BEHLING: I wasn't sure that that
22 was the case for some of these that I've
23 identified, I quote, "focused review," but I can

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 provide you with more details on that. I
2 apologize.

3 MR. KATZ: Okay. No, no, that would
4 be helpful. That's just all I'm --

5 MS. BEHLING: Okay.

6 MR. KATZ: -- asking for.

7 CHAIR MUNN: So how are we going to
8 this, Kathy? You're going to take a look to see
9 precisely what we're talking about here --

10 MS. BEHLING: Yes.

11 CHAIR MUNN: -- as to Subtask 4?

12 MS. BEHLING: Correct.

13 CHAIR MUNN: And you'll get back to
14 all of us? So --

15 (Simultaneous speaking.)

16 MS. BEHLING: I will put this -- all
17 of these in one memo, if that's acceptable to
18 everyone.

19 CHAIR MUNN: That certainly is to me.

20 MS. BEHLING: Okay.

21 CHAIR MUNN: Is that Alright with Paul
22 and Josie?

23 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, it is for me.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.

2 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Very good. So
3 more later.

4 MS. BEHLING: And the next one, PER-
5 77, Simonds Saw, also falls into that category,
6 so I'll look in more details on that also.

7 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. My personal
8 reaction to that was negative. We've really
9 looked at Simonds Saw a lot. And I just -- we'll
10 wait for your memo to see.

11 That will take us to --

12 MEMBER BEACH: So, Wanda, before you
13 move on, back -- I'm sorry, back on 76 there --
14 it was recommended Subtask 4. Are we going to
15 wait on deciding on that, to know about the
16 focused review or can we talk about the Subtask
17 4?

18 CHAIR MUNN: Oh, I think Subtask 4 is
19 reasonable for us to go ahead with, but I --

20 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. I just -- I
21 didn't want to lose that since we hadn't
22 mentioned it.

23 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: Okay. So, Josie, what I
2 was assuming with that is if it turns up being
3 that it's really just a Subtask 4 review, then
4 that's fine. If you guys say yes, then we go
5 ahead and task this.

6 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. I just --
7 (Simultaneous speaking.)

8 MR. KATZ: You guys -- but if it's
9 more than that, then we recommend it to the Board
10 and set it back to you.

11 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. I just didn't
12 want to lose that.

13 MR. KATZ: Yes. No, the clarity is
14 good, Josie. I agree.

15 MEMBER BEACH: Okay.

16 CHAIR MUNN: And as I said earlier, I
17 personally was thinking we were done and done
18 with Simonds Steel.

19 But, Paul, what's your thought about
20 Subtask 4?

21 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, do we still have
22 to assign a case or cases on this one?

23 CHAIR MUNN: We would have to if we

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 task it. The question is shall we task Subtask
2 4? Shall we ask SC&A to do a Subtask 4 or not?

3 Josie would like that to have -- I
4 have reservations.

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: So SC&A didn't make a
6 recommendation relating to Subtask 4?

7 MS. BEHLING: Yes, we did. They asked
8 to be tasked.

9 MR. KATZ: So this is both a focused
10 review possibly on Subtask 4. So this -- and
11 that's just --

12 MEMBER ZIEMER: Pretty much. I --

13 MR. KATZ: -- not just from our
14 focused review. It would just be a
15 recommendation to the Board, but --

16 MEMBER ZIEMER: Now are we talking
17 about 74 or -- or 76 or 74?

18 MR. KATZ: Seventy-seven.

19 CHAIR MUNN: We're talking about 77,
20 Simonds Saw and Steel.

21 MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, oh, oh. Seventy-
22 seven. I'm looking at the wrong one. Okay. Yes.

23 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. And, Wanda, when

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I was speaking earlier, I was back on 76 for the
2 Subtask 4. I hadn't even started talking about
3 Simonds Saw.

4 CHAIR MUNN: Oh.

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, that's what I
6 thought, too.

7 CHAIR MUNN: Okay.

8 MEMBER ZIEMER: But, Josie, were
9 you -- you were asking about seventy --

10 MR. KATZ: Yes, Josie was addressing
11 76.

12 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I just wanted to
13 make sure we -- if we were going to task that or
14 not, because we didn't mention that.

15 MR. KATZ: Correct.

16 CHAIR MUNN: He was talking about
17 Aliquippa Forge.

18 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

19 CHAIR MUNN: And I had already moved
20 on to Simonds Saw.

21 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

22 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, okay. Where did
23 we leave 74?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: So --

2 CHAIR MUNN: Kathy's going to give us
3 more information on 76.

4 MEMBER ZIEMER: No, no, 74.

5 MR. KATZ: Seventy-four is the one,
6 Paul, that we're going to get an email and we're
7 going to get information from Kathy with the
8 recommended criteria and you guys are going to
9 discuss that by email.

10 CHAIR MUNN: No. No.

11 MR. KATZ: Oh.

12 CHAIR MUNN: Seventy-four we're not
13 doing anything with.

14 MR. KATZ: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
15 I was skipping back. Right.

16 CHAIR MUNN: So Aliquippa Forge,
17 Kathy's going to give us more information about
18 what she means by focused review. And we have
19 said that regardless of what happens when she
20 sends that memo our thinking is that it makes
21 sense to go ahead and do -- and task them with
22 Subtask 4. That was my understanding of where we
23 were with Aliquippa Forge. Someone correct me if

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I'm incorrect.

2 MR. KATZ: So 76, if it's only Subtask
3 4, then we're going to task it. If it's not,
4 then we're just going to recommend it to the
5 Board. That's where that stands.

6 CHAIR MUNN: Correct. Correct.

7 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, that's what I
8 thought we agreed, was going to recommend to the
9 Board because it involves a focused review,
10 right?

11 MR. KATZ: Right.

12 CHAIR MUNN: Correct.

13 MR. KATZ: If it actually does, then
14 yes. It's just a recommendation to the Board.

15 MEMBER ZIEMER: Right.

16 MS. BEHLING: But I will look into
17 that a little further, Paul.

18 MR. KATZ: Right, right, right.
19 Kathy, that will be part of your memo.

20 MS. BEHLING: Correct.

21 MR. KATZ: So now we're onto 77.

22 MS. BEHLING: Yes.

23 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER BEACH: Sorry for confusing
2 things, guys.

3 MR. KATZ: No, no, no. Everybody's
4 confused.

5 (Laughter.)

6 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I know. Welcome to
7 the large group. We're just expanding our
8 horizons is all.

9 MEMBER BEACH: So Simonds Saw is
10 recommended as a focused review and a Subtask 4?
11 And we're going to -- and you're saying you don't
12 think that we need to do that, Wanda. Is that
13 what I'm hearing?

14 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, that's essentially
15 what I'm saying. I think we've --

16 MEMBER BEACH: Can we wait and see
17 what Kathy's memo is on the focused review,
18 because that's the recommendation for that as
19 well?

20 CHAIR MUNN: Sure.

21 MEMBER BEACH: And then go ahead with
22 the Subtask 4?

23 CHAIR MUNN: That was my original

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 thought.

2 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. I'm in agreement
3 with that then, too.

4 CHAIR MUNN: Paul?

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: Well, how does this
6 differ? You mean it's not clear that they're
7 going to do a focused review, is that correct?

8 MR. KATZ: Correct.

9 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay.

10 CHAIR MUNN: We're waiting for Kathy's
11 memo, yes.

12 MEMBER ZIEMER: Then if not, then we
13 task them to go ahead with the --

14 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

15 MEMBER ZIEMER: -- cases? Okay. Yes,
16 sure.

17 MR. KATZ: Well, and the only other
18 complication here is in this one Wanda's
19 recommending we don't even do a focused review.

20 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

21 MR. KATZ: Yes. So you can discuss
22 that more when you get the memo with more
23 information, but --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, but I'm just
2 asking for more information on the memo.

3 MR. KATZ: Right. Right.

4 MEMBER BEACH: So perfect.

5 MR. KATZ: Yes.

6 CHAIR MUNN: And now the nasty one,
7 PER-62, which is OTIB-52, on which we've spent an
8 astonishing amount of time. SC&A is recommending
9 a full review of the PER because it is so
10 difficult to deal with. It involves practically
11 every site that we have under our wing here. And
12 so as Kathy has said in her report, the processes
13 used to develop the population of the claims that
14 we have is daunting.

15 I can -- although I would -- I'd
16 really like to be finished with OTIB-52, but I
17 can certainly see the value in doing this.

18 Josie, Paul, how do you feel?

19 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, I feel the same
20 way. I think we should go ahead and do it. I do
21 have a question though. If it says full review,
22 does that include Subtask 4 or not?

23 MR. KATZ: Subtask 4 is always the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 final stage --

2 MEMBER BEACH: The final? Okay.

3 MR. KATZ: -- when you're doing a PER
4 review, yes.

5 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. Got you.
6 Thanks.

7 So, yes, I would agree with going
8 forward with that one, Wanda.

9 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Paul?

10 MEMBER ZIEMER: It says full review.
11 We're recommending the tasking of the Board then,
12 right?

13 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

14 MR. KATZ: Yes, correct.

15 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

16 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, I agree.

17 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. PER-80, General
18 Steel.

19 MS. BEHLING: And I will point out
20 this is where [identifying information redacted]
21 comments were directed towards this PER.

22 CHAIR MUNN: Yes. And thank you for
23 undertaking this look at it again.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 What SC&A is recommending is that only
2 a number of claims under Subtask 4 be undertaken,
3 and I agree.

4 MEMBER BEACH: Well, Wanda, if he's
5 asking for a review, not Subtask 4, he's asking
6 for a review of PER-80.

7 CHAIR MUNN: I know, but we have --

8 MEMBER ZIEMER: So, I thought we had
9 closed that out. Was not -- Bob Anigstein
10 reminded us. Didn't we do a focused review of
11 that last version when we closed out the major
12 selection of the PER case?

13 CHAIR MUNN: SC&A has reviewed all
14 three of those.

15 MS. BEHLING: Yes, I'm not sure if Bob
16 is still on the line with us. The only thing I
17 will point out is --

18 DR. ANIGSTEIN: No, I'm here.

19 MS. BEHLING: Oh, okay. I'm sorry,
20 Bob. Go ahead.

21 DR. ANIGSTEIN: So my -- let's see,
22 I'm not sure if I heard everything correctly, but
23 there were two PERs for GSI. One was based on

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Version 1, on Revision 1. And that was completed.
2 We did a Subtask 4 some time back and that was
3 completed and reported on. And then there was a
4 Rev 2 and a Rev 3. And my understanding was that
5 they would -- that NIOSH was going to do a PER on
6 the combined effect of Rev 2 and Rev 3 separately.
7 They were going to do it on the combined effect
8 of Rev 2 and Rev 3. So is that right, that there
9 is a PER now on -- a later PER on GSI?

10 MS. BEHLING: Yes, and it is on Rev 2
11 and Rev 3.

12 DR. ANIGSTEIN: Yes. Then I would
13 guess I have not looked at it -- but I would
14 assume that we would need to do another Subtask
15 4.

16 MR. KATZ: Well, so the question, Bob,
17 is whether Subtask 4, which is simply to look at
18 a case or two cases, or however many cases covers
19 the criteria, whatever the criteria are. That's
20 Subtask 4. If that's what you're saying.

21 DR. ANIGSTEIN: Now, I have already --
22 on behalf of SC&A we have reviewed -- let's see,
23 we have reviewed Version 2. We did a very -- Rev

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 3 with a very minor update to Rev 2. And I
2 believe there was some communication with Paul,
3 and basically it was wording, or some technical
4 language which wasn't quite clear. And they have
5 clarified it. And I sent Paul an email saying
6 that we do agree that the language has been
7 clarified.

8 And therefore, as far as reviewing the
9 revision, that does not need to be done. But
10 reviewing the cases under it, under Task 4,
11 Subtask 4, certainly needs to be done because we
12 don't know how NIOSH has implemented those
13 changes.

14 MS. BEHLING: And this is Kathy. I
15 believe, if I understood [identifying information
16 redacted] memo correctly, or email, is his
17 concern was the fact that there were six new GSI
18 DRs done, new cases done. So he also seems to be
19 focusing on just case reviews.

20 DR. ANIGSTEIN: Yes. Yes, he was
21 questioning whether the email was sufficient to
22 constitute an SC&A review, and I believe that he
23 was --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: That's a separate issue,
2 Bob. That's a --

3 (Simultaneous speaking.)

4 DR. ANIGSTEIN: Yes.

5 MR. KATZ: -- separate issue that --

6 (Simultaneous speaking.)

7 DR. ANIGSTEIN: Okay.

8 CHAIR MUNN: Only one thing about this
9 confused me, and that is I wasn't certain because
10 of the use of the word "rework." Am I
11 understanding correctly that the six new cases of
12 concern have been returned from DOL for rework?

13 MR. KATZ: Well, [identifying
14 information redacted] wouldn't know that I don't
15 think, so who knows?

16 CHAIR MUNN: Oh, Alright.

17 MR. KATZ: Who knows? Because
18 [identifying information redacted] wouldn't have
19 that information.

20 CHAIR MUNN: Alright. Okay. So
21 Subtask 4, I agree that we should complete
22 Subtask 4 for that, for 80.

23 Paul?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER ZIEMER: Oh, yes, by all means.

2 CHAIR MUNN: Alright. And Subtask 4,
3 we will recommend.

4 MR. KATZ: If it's just Subtask 4, you
5 don't need to recommend. You can just get the
6 criteria and so and do it like the other ones.

7 CHAIR MUNN: Wrong word. We will
8 task.

9 MR. KATZ: Yes.

10 CHAIR MUNN: And we'll accept
11 recommendations otherwise. That is all we need
12 to do with that.

13 Okay. And PER-81, Hooker.

14 DR. ANIGSTEIN: Excuse me, this Bob.
15 Will there be -- will NIOSH be selecting the cases
16 or do we need to send a memo on the case selection
17 criteria?

18 MR. KATZ: Yes, Bob, what we discussed
19 you'd missed, there are several of these, and
20 Kathy will collate them all. But you'll give the
21 information to Kathy on your recommended
22 criteria.

23 DR. ANIGSTEIN: Good.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: You don't specify the
2 number of cases, just want criteria should be
3 met.

4 DR. ANIGSTEIN: Very good.

5 MR. KATZ: Yes, so you could do that,
6 right.

7 CHAIR MUNN: That's good. Any other
8 concerns over 80?

9 (No audible response.)

10 CHAIR MUNN: If not, then we'll move
11 onto Hooker Electrochemical, request for review
12 of Subtask 4, and only Subtask 4. I am tending
13 toward agreeing with that recommendation. Any
14 thoughts to the contrary?

15 MEMBER BEACH: No, I agree, Wanda.

16 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Paul?

17 MEMBER ZIEMER: Agreed.

18 CHAIR MUNN: Very good. Our next one
19 is one that in my view requires no action on our
20 part, Site Profile for Nuclear Materials and
21 Equipment Corporation, ORAU-41.

22 MEMBER BEACH: Agreed.

23 CHAIR MUNN: Okay as is. No action.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER ZIEMER: What one are we one?

2 I had trouble hearing that.

3 CHAIR MUNN: We are on ORAU-TKBS-0041.

4 (Simultaneous speaking.)

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: Got it.

6 CHAIR MUNN: -- 3.

7 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay. Can you repeat
8 what you said on that one?

9 CHAIR MUNN: No action necessary.

10 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.

11 CHAIR MUNN: Josie and I agree.

12 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.

13 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Next item is DCAS-
14 2008, the TBD for -- I'm sorry, TBD for United
15 Nuclear in Missouri. The SC&A is talking about
16 the fact that we've discussed the changes that
17 the Work Group recommended, but that we've not
18 looked at it to assure that the recommended
19 changes are incorporated. The suggestion is that
20 we task them to do so. It sounds reasonable to
21 me.

22 MEMBER BEACH: Is that a simple
23 tasking or does it have to go under the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 recommendations to the Board list?

2 CHAIR MUNN: I suspect it goes to the
3 Board.

4 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. Agreed.

5 CHAIR MUNN: Paul?

6 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, I'll agree.

7 CHAIR MUNN: Okay.

8 DR. NETON: Wanda, this is Jim. Are
9 we talking about the United Nuclear Corporation?

10 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, we are, the TBD --
11 (Simultaneous speaking.)

12 DR. NETON: That might go under the
13 purview of the Uranium AWE Work Group.

14 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

15 DR. NETON: So I don't know --
16 (Simultaneous speaking.)

17 CHAIR MUNN: And they --

18 DR. NETON: Does the Procedures
19 Subcommittee provide recommendations to the Board
20 for Work Groups to evaluate things? I mean --
21 (Simultaneous speaking.)

22 DR. NETON: -- clear on the process
23 here.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, this does say the
2 Work Group, Wanda. I missed that, too.

3 MS. BEHLING: Yes, that was -- what I
4 did with -- on adding these, during -- between
5 meetings Ted usually sends John Stiver and I a
6 list of those that we may want to look at, and I
7 just keep a record of all those so that the
8 Procedures Subcommittee knows what is going on,
9 and in this particular case I did recommend that
10 this would be something that would be looked at
11 under the Work Group.

12 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I saw that it was --

13 DR. NETON: Well, yes --

14 CHAIR MUNN: -- that the Work Group.

15 (Simultaneous speaking.)

16 DR. NETON: -- Work Group. It's not
17 us. Not us.

18 CHAIR MUNN: Correct. Yes. But the
19 Board will be -- Alright. We'll not -- no action
20 for us then.

21 MR. KATZ: Right, right.

22 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Then TBD-6000
23 Appendix for Seymour Specialty. SC&A is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 requesting a focused review of that Appendix, an
2 Appendix of which I am not familiar, but --

3 DR. NETON: And this is the same
4 issue. I mean, this would be taken up by the
5 TBD-6000 Work Group, not the Subcommittee on
6 Procedures Review.

7 CHAIR MUNN: It would seem so to me.
8 Am I missing something?

9 MS. BEHLING: Okay. Yes, so I
10 apologize. I should have --

11 CHAIR MUNN: Oh, no, that's okay.

12 MR. KATZ: In this case you have --
13 three of you are on the Subcommittee.

14 MEMBER BEACH: Yes. Or on the Work
15 Group, yes.

16 MR. KATZ: On the Work Group. I mean
17 in the Subcommittee or on the Work Group. So if
18 you want something done here, that's okay.

19 CHAIR MUNN: Yes. Alright. No, I
20 don't think there's anything. I think it
21 properly should go the Work Group process, if
22 we're going to do that.

23 MR. KATZ: Well, what I'm saying is

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that I think it's fine if you guys want -- if you
2 guys can based on this information want to task
3 this. I know the Work Group isn't meeting right
4 now, but I don't think that's a problem.

5 MEMBER BEACH: I don't think it hurts
6 to get a memo on what needs to be reviewed
7 either --

8 (Simultaneous speaking.)

9 MS. BEHLING: Okay.

10 MEMBER BEACH: -- focus for new
11 recommendations.

12 MS. BEHLING: Okay. I'll add that to
13 the memo.

14 MR. KATZ: Okay. And I think that's
15 fine to handle that one since you guys are the
16 bulk of the Work Group.

17 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

18 MR. KATZ: I mean, it just leaves out
19 Dr. Poston, but --

20 CHAIR MUNN: And, yes, that's easy
21 enough to remedy.

22 DCAS-TKBS -- TBD for Nuclear Metals.
23 NIOSH said that a recommendation for a focused

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 review is not particularly necessary. I have a
2 tendency to agree. The methodologies are -- were
3 incorporated appropriately so far as -- at least
4 they were -- the methodologies themselves have
5 been reviewed and expected.

6 Other thoughts?

7 MEMBER BEACH: Well, NIOSH said they
8 don't think an in-depth review is necessary, and
9 SC&A is recommending a focused review. So we get
10 back to what's been considered in the focused
11 review that they're suggesting or recommending.

12 DR. NETON: This is Jim again. I don't
13 know why this wouldn't be considered under the
14 Work Group. I don't know which one that would
15 be, whether it's the Uranium AWE or the --

16 MR. KATZ: Right, that is the
17 question.

18 DR. NETON: I don't think it's the
19 Uranium AWE. I think it's the other one that
20 used to be called -- I forget what it was called,
21 but --

22 MR. KATZ: Well, if you mean TBD-6001,
23 that is Uranium. Or do you mean a different one,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Jim?

2 DR. NETON: Well, one is metals
3 handling and one is fabrication of material. I
4 think --

5 MR. KATZ: Right.

6 DR. NETON: -- either one. If TBD --
7 no, the Henry Anderson Work Group.

8 MR. KATZ: Yes, that's Uranium.

9 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, that's 6000.

10 DR. NETON: Uranium Refining, I think.

11 MR. KATZ: Okay. So this is
12 another --

13 DR. NETON: It would be under one of
14 those Work Groups, not necessarily the
15 Subcommittee here.

16 MR. KATZ: Yes, I know. No, I
17 understand. But then that's the Uranium. So
18 that falls in the same bucket as that earlier
19 one.

20 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, no action for that.

21 MR. KATZ: No action here.

22 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. At least the
23 buckets lined up properly.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. KATZ: And, Kathy, while we're on
2 it, these two items that belong with that Work
3 Group -- so the next time that Work Group meets --
4 because at some point we -- we're getting -- we're
5 moving towards that Work Group being ready to
6 meet. There's something -- work that still needs
7 to be done. But would you just make sure between
8 you and John Stiver that these items end up on
9 the agenda, too?

10 MS. BEHLING: Yes, I will.

11 MR. KATZ: Thanks.

12 CHAIR MUNN: Alright. Next item is
13 another TKBS, 25, exposure matrix for Linde.

14 MEMBER BEACH: That goes to the Work
15 Group, doesn't it?

16 CHAIR MUNN: That does -- well --

17 DR. NETON: Yes, I would think so. I
18 mean, these are -- I don't know if the Linde Work
19 Group is still together, but --

20 CHAIR MUNN: Well, I think they worked
21 really hard at not being together anymore.

22 (Laughter.)

23 CHAIR MUNN: Yes. So --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MEMBER BEACH: If it's TBD issues,
2 then the Work Group should be dealing with it.

3 CHAIR MUNN: Probably so. Yes, I
4 think you're probably correct.

5 MR. KATZ: Yes, I think for that one,
6 Wanda, you could just raise that when you make
7 your recommendations. You can also just raise
8 that issue with the full Board, because that Work
9 Group I think has been recessed, but it can be
10 resurrected.

11 DR. NETON: This is Jim. I vaguely
12 recall addressing these issues at the Work
13 Group's group level. I don't know why this would
14 still be open. This was -- these are some, I
15 wouldn't say minor issues, but there are some
16 verbiage issues in here. I'm reading this again.
17 I -- part of me thinks that this has already been
18 disposed of, but --

19 CHAIR MUNN: Well, could we --

20 (Simultaneous speaking.)

21 DR. NETON: -- we'd have to go back
22 and look at this to make sure.

23 MR. KATZ: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I can look at it in
2 more detail.

3 DR. NETON: Yes, these are Hans'
4 findings based on a review and --

5 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I think those we --

6 DR. NETON: -- I have a very vivid
7 memory of having discussion on --

8 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

9 MR. KATZ: Yes. So why don't we
10 separate this one not go in that other memo, but
11 sort it out between you and Jim so -- because
12 it's not clear that this should be something we
13 are asking for a tasking for.

14 MS. BEHLING: Okay. No problem.

15 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. I'll do nothing.

16 (Laughter.)

17 CHAIR MUNN: I like that part.

18 Okay. Next one is the TBD for Texas
19 City Chemicals. And is this not another then
20 Work Group issue?

21 MS. BEHLING: This is Kathy. I looked
22 for whether there was a Work Group, but --

23 MR. KATZ: There is no Work Group.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. BEHLING: -- then --

2 MR. KATZ: There is not a Work Group.

3 MS. BEHLING: No. The only thing,
4 this was discussed under the Surrogate Data Work
5 Group. And SC&A I believe only did initially
6 some very focused review, and that was back in
7 like 2008. So that's why I thought --

8 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, Surrogate Data
9 hasn't met in a long time.

10 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes, Jim Melius' Work
11 Group was handling Texas City Chemicals for
12 the --

13 MS. BEHLING: Right, but --

14 MEMBER ZIEMER: -- Surrogate Work
15 Group criteria as a sample.

16 MS. BEHLING: Correct, but I'm not
17 sure that we ever did a real thorough review then
18 of the final documents.

19 MEMBER BEACH: I don't remember doing
20 it. I'm on that Work Group.

21 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I don't remember it
22 either.

23 DR. ANIGSTEIN: This is Bob Anigstein.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 We did do a review of the initial Site Profile
2 for Texas City Chemicals. I know Bill Thurber I
3 think was heading it and I worked with him on it.

4 MS. BEHLING: Okay.

5 DR. ANIGSTEIN: But that was several
6 years ago.

7 MS. BEHLING: Yes, well, all I could
8 find was, like I said, a focused review back in
9 2008 and then some discussions at the Surrogate
10 Work Group. And in fact I think during those
11 discussions when I looked at the transcripts I
12 think Paul and Josie had some questions as to
13 sort of the methodologies that were used. So
14 that sort of prompted me to suggest that we look
15 at this.

16 DR. NETON: This is Jim. This -- I
17 was just looking now. This was effective 11/2.
18 What this is is we had a -- an SEC Evaluation
19 Report that we prepared for Texas City, and there
20 was no Site Profile. And they found in that
21 Evaluation Report that Texas City was added as an
22 SEC site I think for radon only. They found
23 radon. And this was our attempt to actually

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 formalize that SEC Evaluation Report into a TBD,
2 because we had none. So it is effectively a
3 restating of what was in the Evaluation Report
4 that was reviewed by SC&A during the SEC process.

5 MEMBER ZIEMER: Okay. I -- yes, it
6 wasn't a revised TBD or anything like that.

7 DR. NETON: It was just -- it was
8 formalizing the Evaluation Report into a Site
9 Profile. So I would think it could be reviewed
10 again, but --

11 MR. ALLEN: This is Dave Allen. One
12 more little piece of information. I think the
13 Texas City and possibly the Linde -- those
14 revisions or edits were made as I recall as a
15 result of a DR Subcommittee review. You might
16 want to look at that Subcommittee. That might
17 answer -- Kathy, that might answer some of the
18 questions about the reviews.

19 MS. BEHLING: Okay. I can provide
20 more details on this also.

21 MR. ALLEN: Yes, I might be
22 remembering wrong, too.

23 MR. KATZ: Yes, it sounds like anyway

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 those would be -- need more research before we go
2 either to the Board or however to deal with them.

3 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, not adequate for our
4 purposes.

5 MR. KATZ: So not ready yet for
6 discussion here with the Board, because the Board
7 will have -- will not know what they're getting.

8 CHAIR MUNN: Yes.

9 MEMBER BEACH: And --

10 CHAIR MUNN: Okay.

11 MS. BEHLING: I'm sorry, Wanda.

12 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, go ahead, Kathy.

13 MS. BEHLING: No, the only thing I was
14 going to say -- and for the remaining three
15 documents that are on this Table 2, the primary
16 reason that I included them, they have already
17 been reviewed. They -- we -- they were tasked
18 after the last Subcommittee meeting and we've
19 reviewed them. But I -- just for continuity so
20 that you knew -- so that you know what happened
21 to them. Because I didn't want you to think that
22 they were forgotten about from my memo that I
23 sent out before the last meeting. So that's why

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I included them on here.

2 CHAIR MUNN: Right.

3 MEMBER ZIEMER: Right. So no action
4 needed on those. It's --

5 MS. BEHLING: That's correct.

6 MEMBER ZIEMER: -- more of a status
7 report, yes.

8 MS. BEHLING: Correct. Yes.

9 CHAIR MUNN: And my only question was
10 since I didn't have access to the -- our database,
11 is what our database shows as the status of 64,
12 OTIB-64, now that your review was submitted
13 several months ago. And I didn't know what our
14 status was.

15 MR. KATZ: Yes, and I think NIOSH is
16 working on these --

17 CHAIR MUNN: Okay.

18 MR. KATZ: -- on that. I think NIOSH
19 is reviewing these reviews.

20 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I just have that was
21 the case. Am I correct in that?

22 MS. MARION-MOSS: This is Lori. Yes,
23 you are, Wanda.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 CHAIR MUNN: Okay. Very good. Then
2 no action for any of those three for us today.

3 And that is, unless there's a surprise
4 somewhere that I don't know about, the end of our
5 list. Is that correct?

6 MR. KATZ: Yes, that's correct.

7 MEMBER BEACH: So, Wanda, just to
8 recap, we -- I have five that we tasked under
9 Subpart 4 and then four that we're recommending
10 to the Board. Is that correct? Is that what you
11 have?

12 CHAIR MUNN: Sounds about correct. I
13 haven't been counting them. Just been making
14 notes for myself here, but I believe that's
15 correct. And primarily we're awaiting more
16 information --

17 MS. BEHLING: Memos, yes.

18 CHAIR MUNN: -- from Kathy before we
19 make further -- yes, I think you're correct. I
20 believe we're in sync.

21 MS. BEHLING: Okay. Perfect.

22 CHAIR MUNN: We'll try our best here
23 and I'll get a memo out to you sometime before

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the turkey shuttle.

2 And that's all I have in my heretofore
3 incomplete list. Is there any other action or
4 items for consideration that we have not touched
5 upon today?

6 If not, then since it's obviously far
7 too early for us to consider --

8 MEMBER ZIEMER: Move for adjournment.

9 CHAIR MUNN: Yes, I think that's
10 probably the best thing we can do right now.

11 MEMBER BEACH: I'll second it.

12 **Adjourn**

13 CHAIR MUNN: All of you have a
14 wonderful Thanksgiving. I hope the weather is
15 whatever you want it to be and that you have
16 family and friends and great food in great
17 abundance. Enjoy your holiday.

18 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
19 went off the record at 2:46 p.m.)

20

21

22

23

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1

2

3

4

5