

Centers for Disease Control
National Institute for Occupational Safety and
Health
Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health
138th Meeting
Wednesday, February 24, 2021

The meeting convened at 10:30 a.m., Eastern Daylight Time, via Video Teleconference, Rashaun Roberts, Designated Federal Official, presiding.

Present:

Rashaun Roberts, Designated Federal Official
Henry Anderson, Member
Josie Beach, Member
Bradley P. Clawson, Member
R. William Field, Member
David Kotelchuck, Member
James E. Lockey, Member
David B. Richardson, Member
Genevieve S. Roessler, Member
Phillip Schofield, Member
Loretta R. Valerio, Member
Paul L. Ziemer, Member

Registered and/or Public Comment Participants:

Adams, Nancy, NIOSH Contractor
Barrie, Terrie, ANWAG
Barton, Bob, SC&A
Behling, Kathy, SC&A
Buchanan, Ron, SC&A
Calhoun, Grady, DCAS
Gogliotti, Rose, SC&A
Hand, Donna
Hughes, Lara, DCAS
Kotsch, Jeff, DOL
Naylor, Jenny, HHS OGC
Nelson, Chuck, DCAS
Rutherford, Lavon, DCAS
Taulbee, Tim, DCAS

Contents

Centers for Disease Control National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health 138th Meeting Wednesday, February 21, 2021	1
Roll Call/Welcome	4
Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition Status Update - Dr. Chuck Nelson, DCAS	6
Updates from Work Groups and Subcommittee - WG/SC Chairs	8
Plans for the April 2021 Board Meeting	12
Adjourn	22

Proceedings

(10:30 a.m.)

Roll Call/Welcome

Dr. Roberts: It is 10:30 Eastern Time. I want to say good morning to everyone. I do believe our court reporter is on the line. This is the teleconference for the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health. I'm Rashaun Roberts. I'm DFO for this Board.

Before we start the roll call, I do want to cover a few brief items so that the call today runs smoothly. So, first, so that everybody can be heard clearly during the call, please make sure that your phone is muted, unless, of course, you need to speak. If you don't have a mute button, press *6 to mute. If you need to take yourself off mute press *6 again.

There have been a few cases where we've suddenly heard considerable background noise, so please check your phone periodically throughout this call to make sure that you haven't somehow become unmuted. And I can hear a little bit of background noise right now. So, again, if everybody could check their phones and make sure that mute is on, that would be great.

Member Clawson: Hey, Rashaun. You may want to remind them that when they want to talk that they've got to off mute, too.

Dr. Roberts: Yes. Yes. Please do. If you don't have the mute button, press *6 to unmute yourself. But, again, I still hear some background noise. You know, hopefully, everybody can put themselves on mute.

You can find the agenda for this meeting on the NIOSH website. For those who may not have an agenda in front of you right now, know that the agenda is pretty straightforward for today, so you should find it easy enough to follow along even if you don't have it in front of you.

I also wanted to provide a little bit of context for today's agenda. So, if you attended the Board meeting that we had back in December, you might have expected the agenda to contain an item to continue the discussions about Savannah River Site, since the Board voted in that meeting to table those discussions. There's been a bit of a change in plan.

And, again, if people could mute their phones. I'm hearing -- I don't know if it's dishes or something in the background, but make sure that your phone is muted. Okay.

So, anyway, I'll just try to move through this. Rather than revisiting the Savannah River Site discussion at today's meeting, the SRS Work Group thought it would be more productive to have another Work Group meeting to discuss some additional information that was provided, prior to resuming discussions with the full Board.

The SRS Work Group meeting, which will be done jointly with the SEC Issues Work Group, is tentatively scheduled for March 23rd.

I should also note that the Board did receive a letter addressed to it pertaining to Savannah with the expectation on the part of the authors that Savannah would be discussed in this meeting. Given the change in plans, however, the letter will be distributed to the Board prior to the March 23rd meeting. And since the authors requested that the letter be read, we will do that at the March 23rd meeting.

So, with these changes in plan, the primary purpose of today's meeting is to prepare for our April 14th and 15th Board meeting which, of course, will be taking place virtually again.

I'd like to formally welcome everybody to this teleconference. And, again, this is for the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health.

So, since this is an administrative meeting, there

really should not be any conflicts of interest. So we don't need to address that. So let's move right into the roll call.

(Roll call.)

Dr. Roberts: Thanks. And, again, welcome. This should be a relatively brief meeting. First on the agenda we have the SEC petition status update. And I believe Mr. Chuck Nelson is going to provide that. Chuck?

Special Exposure Cohort (SEC) Petition Status
Update - Dr. Chuck Nelson, DCAS

Mr. Nelson: Thanks, Rashaun. I just want to let everybody know that I took over for LaVon Rutherford as the NIOSH SEC team lead a few months ago, so I'll be giving the report today.

Today's report should be pretty short. We'll not be presenting any new SEC petition evaluations at the April Board meeting. We do have one new petition currently under evaluation, and that is for Pinellas, which is SEC-00256. We hope to complete the evaluation in the May-June timeframe and would possibly be ready to be presented in the August Board meeting.

I do expect the Work Group Chairs will provide their updates today, as needed, on the current ongoing SEC petitions with the Advisory Board. At this point, I just want to let you know there will be no new Evaluation Reports presented at the April meeting.

Thank you. Are there any questions?

Member Beach: Hi, Rashaun. This is Josie. I just checked in. I didn't realize we started a little earlier.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, great. Thank you and welcome, Josie.

Member Beach: My apologies.

Dr. Roberts: I thought it was a little strange that

you weren't there.

Okay, any questions for Chuck?

Member Clawson: Chuck, are you still over the Hanford site, then?

Mr. Nelson: That's correct, Brad. I'm over Hanford and Sandia still.

Member Clawson: Okay, I just wanted to make sure you hadn't changed that. Appreciate it. Thank you.

Mr. Nelson: No problem. And LaVon is still around, fortunately, and he'll be helping me as needed during this period of transition, which could go on for a while. You know, there's a lot to be known as the SEC team lead. There's a lot going on. Fortunately, I have him to tap into.

Member Clawson: What's his job now?

Mr. Nelson: Would you like to pipe up there, Bomber, and tell them what your new job is?

Mr. Rutherford: Well, everyone takes new roles with Stu and Jim leaving. Grady moved up to Stu's spot. Tim Taulbee went to the ADS position. And I've taken over Grady's old spot as kind of in charge of all of the HPs.

Member Clawson: Well, congratulations. That'll be good.

Dr. Roberts: Any other questions or comments?

Okay. Well, hearing none, at this point -- and again, if you're listening and I do hear background noise. If you're not talking, if you could put your phone on mute, *6; if you don't have a mute button, *6 to take yourself off mute.

But let's go ahead and move into the updates from the Work Groups and Subcommittees. And who would like to start?

Member Clawson: I guess --

Member Beach: Rashaun, since I was last on -- this is Josie, I'll go ahead and start if that's okay.

Dr. Roberts: Sure. I heard somebody else talking. Is that okay?

Member Clawson: That's okay. It's always about Josie, so it's fine.

(Laughter.)

Updates from Work Groups and Subcommittee -
WG/SC Chairs

Dr. Roberts: Okay, Josie.

Member Beach: Okay, Mine is going to be pretty brief. Metals & Controls does have a meeting scheduled. We've changed it a couple of times, but we are now scheduled for March 18th. So, that is coming up.

Procedures met on February 18th. It was a full two years before we had met, since we had met, I should say. The Subcommittee has -- I'm not we're going to give an update on what our meeting entailed, other than we have 41 technical procedures at this time that have been closed out with agreement between NIOSH, SC&A, and the Subcommittee.

SC&A proposed to the Subcommittee a possible method of providing the Board with pertinent information on the review of the technical guidance documents ready for the full Board approval, with an example issues matrix format, one we're all familiar with from our Work Group meetings.

The Subcommittee agreed, and during our upcoming April Board meeting you will see an example of a sampling for expediting close-out of completed technical documents. So, this is something that's going to be presented in April. It will give the Board a chance to ask questions,

comment on how they feel this worked. We're just going to select a few of the simpler ones, to start with, giving you a chance to weigh in and comment and process moving forward to get through those 41 technical documents. So, just a little bit of a heads up. Hopefully, at our April meeting we'll start that.

That's all I have, Rashaun.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, great. Any questions for Josie?

Okay, hearing none, Brad, do you want to go ahead?

Member Clawson: Yeah, I'll go ahead and talk about Savannah River right now. We've got a Work Group scheduled for next month. And we're going to -- the evaluation from SC&A is being pushed through right now, through DOE and everything, to get it cleared up. We'll meet next month to discuss this bootstrap theory and all this other fun stuff. So that's all going to be put on in the next month.

As far as Hanford, correct me, we're still proceeding on. We've taken care of almost everything up there, haven't we, Chuck? We don't have any lingering reports, do we?

Mr. Nelson: That's correct, Brad. All the SEC issues were closed out and we are in the middle -- not in the middle, we started co-exposure evaluations. And those are currently underway for Hanford and making good progress.

Member Clawson: Okay. Now, I don't know who is over Pantex anymore, but we had something going on with it and I kind of lost track where we were at with that one. I think it was the implementation of all the changes to the Site Profile. But can anybody talk to that one?

Mr. Rutherford: Yeah. Brad, this is LaVon. And I am not exactly sure of the status on the changes. I thought that the implementation was taking place,

but I will have to check with Mark Rolfes and verify that and have Mark send you an email update.

Member Clawson: Okay, yeah. I just know that there was a -- we had a couple more things to finish up on Pantex. I think it was in you guys' court. So, that will be about it for me, Rashaun.

Mr. Nelson: Brad, this is Chuck Nelson. I do have one update for Pantex. There was 83.13 that didn't qualify and it's under administrative review right now.

Member Clawson: Okay, sounds good. Thank you.

Member Kotelchuck: Hi. I'll go next. This is Dave.

Dr. Roberts: Great. Hi, Dave.

Member Kotelchuck: Okay. Dose Reconstruction Review Subcommittee which is meeting tomorrow, of course, at 10:30. There is -- a number of the people -- a few people, I should say, on the Subcommittee will be recused for some of the three blinds that we're going over. And I suggest that tomorrow we go over the blinds in what we'll call reverse order. That is, B44, B43, and then B42. I think that will give the recused people time to do other things while they're recused. And I will send out the identifiers and things on the CDC internet today just to give you a little more detail so that I don't have to identify the blinds here in this public meeting.

So, however, I want to remind people, whether you're recused or not, we meet at 10:30 Eastern Time. We want to have every single person who is attending the meeting to be there for the roll call to assure that we have a forum [sic]. Then after we determine the forum, we'll go on to the three blinds in the order that I suggested. And I'll detail that a little bit more later this morning. Thank you.

Dr. Roberts: Thank you, Dave. Great. And I did want to add -- well, first of all, are there any

questions for Dave?

Okay. Hearing none, I just wanted to provide a reminder for the new set of blind reviews. If you have not submitted your nominations yet, if you could get those to me as soon as possible, that would be great. Thank you.

Who's next with Work Group or Subcommittee updates?

Member Ziemer: This is Paul Ziemer. I can give you a quick update on TBD-6000. That Work Group hasn't met for a while, but we do have some remaining issues on Superior Steel. We have a Work Group meeting scheduled for April 1st and we'll be trying to close out the rest of the Superior Steel issues. And that should clear our deck for a while on TBD-6000. Thank you.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, great. Are there any questions for Paul?

(No response.)

Dr. Roberts: Okay. I will just add since, Paul, you mentioned Superior Steel, I wanted to just update the group on the package. Basically, Nancy Adams did send a revised Superior Steel SEC determination package to CDC and HHS just this morning. So, the package has not been acted upon, was not acted upon during the previous administration, even though it was submitted for review and decision on December 15th of last year.

Nothing in the package has changed except for a few corrections to titles and references from the Secretary to Acting Secretary. The requested decision date for that package is March 23rd, 2021, but, since it's a determination, there's no statutory 30-day due date.

Okay, any questions?

(No response.)

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Who would like to report next?

Member Anderson: This is Andy. I don't have anything to report. We've had some information to come to us and now it's been postponed until April.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, anybody else?

Member Schofield: Yes, this is Phil. I don't have anything to report, update. Maybe if they get far enough along with Pinellas and we could possibly have a Work Group meeting before the August Board meeting.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Anyone else?

(No response.)

Plans for the April 2021 Board Meeting

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Well, I assume, unless anyone has anything else, that's the end of our Work Group and Subcommittee reports. So let's go ahead and move into the plans for the April 2021 Board meeting. And that will be taking place April 14th and 15th.

I'd like to start. There have been a couple of discussions with SC&A about the format of the Board coordination report that it provides. And I just want to go ahead and turn this over to Bob Barton to kind of discuss an alternative format for that report and get your feedback as to whether or not you think a change in format of that report would be useful to you.

Mr. Barton: Yes, thank you, Dr. Roberts. This is Bob Barton.

We've been sort of doing some self-editing over here, a little introspection, to see if we can improve our process and our procedures so that we can better serve you as the Board's contractor. And one of the ideas that came up was the Board coordination document, which we produce three times a year ahead of the full Board meetings. And

it really contains a lot of very useful information, but it has also gotten rather bloated over the years. We're sitting at a -- I'm looking at it right now. We're sitting at 53 pages. And a lot of the information is, again, useful, and we need to keep the record of all of the decisions and discussions that have been happening, but a lot of the information isn't useful, necessarily, for each Board meeting.

So, one of the ideas we've been kicking around, and we would like to try as sort of a pilot study to see how it works out, is to create essentially an executive summary that really only brings to the fore the work and the progress that has been done since the previous Board meeting. So, in essence, every four months, what is happening with each site. That way you don't have to go through all, right now, 53 pages to get at the information and see, you know, that there's been no updates since 2016, that sort of thing.

So, that was one of our ideas. And again, we would like to sort of try it, breaking it apart. We'd still do the full Board coordination document, but also provide essentially an executive summary for you all so it's a little more efficient for you to see exactly what has been happening and keep abreast of all the developments for the sites that are essentially currently active, because a lot of the sites, for whatever reason, there's no movement on. We've settled the issues and they really are essentially retired or what have you.

So, that's our idea. And, again, we'd like to sort of test drive it for the upcoming meeting in April. But also, you know, just to sort of open up the floor a little bit to ask what other things are going to be useful for you as Board Members that we can provide, again, to just try to maybe tweak, improve our process. Or if it's fine the way it is, that's great, too.

But we did want to sort of open up the opportunity

to have this discussion, and perhaps maybe give some thought into it, and we can certainly discuss it offline if some ideas come up. But, again, this is our idea at this point and we wanted to see if that's something that the Board would find useful. Again, we'd be breaking the Board coordination document into what it is now, but also provide an executive summary that just highlights what's really active right now so that it's a little more efficient for you all to go through.

Member Beach: Bob?

Mr. Barton: Yes.

Member Beach: This is Josie. When you first said that, I was a bit worried, because we don't want to lose the history. So I'm pleased to hear that you're going to separate it out and the history is still going to be available, because sometimes you go back and you look at that just as a reminder.

So, I'm all for that executive summary, breaking it out, as long as we don't lose the history point, which is what you just said we wouldn't. So, I don't have any suggestions at this time for more information, but I like the idea. I think it's a good one.

Member Ziemer: Bob, this is Paul. I agree with that. I think it's more detailed than most of us need for the sites for which we are not Work Group Chairs. But, particularly, as long as the detailed one is available, I think particularly the Chairs, for their own Work Groups, would like all the detail to be readily available. But, broadly for the Board Members, I think just for the meeting the executive summary would be very useful.

Member Kotelchuck: Dave K. I like the idea of the executive summary also. I'm wondering, are you going -- each time you put out an executive summary, three times a year, are you going to also update the larger summary, the one that you've been handing out for the years? If so, that would be

wonderful. It's a lot of added work for you. Are you going to try to update the main report each time?

Mr. Barton: Yes, Dr. Kotelchuck. That's essentially what we're proposing. And to be honest, I'm not sure that it would be that onerous. I mean, it is a little bit of extra work, but, again, we would essentially just be distilling down what -- we would update the Board's coordination document in its fullest, and then, essentially, a one-, two-, or three-pager that highlights what work, again, has been done in the previous, essentially, four months.

Member Kotelchuck: That sounds fine. I mean, that's wonderful. You're doing more work to make things clearer for us and I appreciate it. I think I might be open, just as one Board Member, to saying that you publish your main document once a year and then the executive summary goes along with it. And then at the end of the year you update from the three executive summaries that you've already done, and at the beginning of each year we have a master list, if that would save you some work.

On the other hand, I guess I shouldn't worry that we're giving you more work. If you update the main report as well as give us an executive summary, if you don't think that's onerous, if that isn't onerous for you, that would certainly be better.

Member Ziemer: Well, this is Ziemer again. Keep in mind that there's not really action on every Work Group every time we meet. Sometimes it's just a sentence that's added that says there's been no activity since the last meeting or the last report, or something like that.

Member Kotelchuck: Yes. So maybe it's a small task to change the main report each time, is what you're saying?

Member Ziemer: Well, it seems to me at most you're just talking about a few sentences for many of them even if they've met.

Mr. Barton: This is Bob. I think that's correct. I mean, it would not be too taxing to just simply produce the full document every time. It really isn't.

Member Kotelchuck: Okay, fine.

Mr. Barton: It would be a step in the process in getting towards that executive summary. Again, we're just trying to look for ways to make it more efficient and effective for you all.

Member Kotelchuck: Thank you. I appreciate it.

Dr. Roberts: Any other comments? Or is there a different point of view that other people might have?

(No response.)

Dr. Roberts: Okay, so it sounds like, Bob, you're going to kind of pilot this for the April meeting, see how it plays. And, you know, if any adjustments need to be made from there, we can make them. But it sounds like most people feel that this would be a useful change, the addition of an executive summary.

Mr. Barton: Sounds great.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Excellent. All right, I do want to -- there is a draft agenda that I kind of sketched out for April 14th and 15th. And I'll just run past what I've got at this time, and if there are any changes that we need to make we can go ahead and discuss them.

So, the session on Wednesday, April 14th would start at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time. Of course, we would start out with the opening done by me. The NIOSH program update has about 15 minutes, as do the DOL program update and DOE program updates. So that's kind of the standard way that we open up the meeting.

Then I have an update, and this is kind of something we're going to need to play by ear, for

the Savannah River Site, running from 2:00 p.m. to 3:45. But that means it could be adjusted depending on what happens in terms of the Work Group meeting on March 23rd. But I do have a placeholder, Brad, for the Savannah River Site. Does that sound okay?

Member Clawson: Yeah. I just don't want to leave it to the end. I'd rather start with it.

Dr. Roberts: Yes. Yes, and that's kind of what I had in mind in putting it up so early in the agenda.

Then we have a break for about 15 minutes. And then an update on completed dose reconstruction procedure reviews from 4:00 to 5:15, Josie. And we had talked about you presenting the matrix and kind of talking through the easier technical document during that timeframe.

Member Beach: Yeah, and I'm not sure if I'll do the presenting or if Kathy will. We haven't worked that out yet, but that sounds reasonable.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, currently I have both of you down for it, so we can work that out later.

And then we have a public comment session running from 5:15 to 6:15 that day. So that would close out the first day.

The second day, the 15th, would start at the same time, one o'clock. We would be starting with the SEC petition status update. We have Chuck Nelson down for that agenda item, and 15 minutes is allocated for that.

Chuck, it doesn't sound like you would be covering much during that update?

Mr. Nelson: No, it would just be a standard update. I'll follow, basically, the guidelines that Bomber has used in the past, or I should say LaVon has used in the past, and it shouldn't take that long.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. So, 15 minutes would probably

be sufficient for me to open, take attendance, and your update. So we would probably be okay time-wise.

Next on the agenda I have an hour and 45 minutes allocated to Metals & Control, Josie and LaVon.

Member Beach: You said an hour and how long?

Dr. Roberts: It's an hour and 45 minutes right now.

Member Beach: Okay. And that's adjustable depending on what happens in our meeting?

Dr. Roberts: Yes.

Member Beach: Okay.

Dr. Roberts: Exactly, exactly. So we can definitely shorten the time or try to find a way to lengthen it, if necessary.

Okay, great. Then I have a break for about 15 minutes immediately following M&C. A Board work session that goes from 3:15 to 4:15, which is about the standard hour that we typically do in those sessions. Then an hour, Dave Kotelchuck, that is allocated to an update on the Subcommittee on Dose Reconstruction Review.

Member Kotelchuck: Okay. Although, I'm not sure that we need a lengthy report on it. I'm always happy to talk about where we are, but I think that might be just a short report. I don't think we have an issue to present to the Board, unless other folks think there are. Or we can talk about it tomorrow. So I think we really don't need an hour.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, so we may adjust that to 30 minutes or something like that.

Member Kotelchuck: Right, or even less. I mean, our reviews -- let's put it this way, we'll have our meeting tomorrow and I can speak to other folks.

Dr. Roberts: Okay.

Member Kotelchuck: We'll talk then.

Dr. Roberts: Okay, that sounds good. Yeah, it sounds like a lot of this is kind of pending the Work Group discussion.

The same is true -- I do have TBD-6000 down for an update, Paul, running for an hour for 5:15 to 6:15. And, again, that may be too much time or not enough time depending on what happens.

Member Ziemer: Yeah, I would say right now 30 minutes would be more than adequate. Again, we might need to adjust that depending on what occurs at the Work Group. But, in my mind at the moment, I think it will be fairly straightforward and we'll not have a lot of issues to deal with.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Great.

Member Ziemer: We can be flexible, but I don't see us needing an hour at the moment.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. All right, well, I'll make a note of that and we'll see what happens in these Subcommittees and Work Groups and then we can adjust the times accordingly.

So, that's really all I have in terms of agenda items. Is there anything that's been missed that should be on the agenda?

(No response.)

Dr. Roberts: Okay, great. Well, I don't hear anything now. And, again, we'll remain flexible with the specific times for presentation on the agenda.

Member Anderson: Are you going to send out your draft?

Dr. Roberts: Yes, that will be sent out to the Board as we get closer to the meeting. Okay, great. Any other questions?

Okay, hearing none, I wondered if -- I probably

should have done this back in the December Board meeting, but I wanted to see if we could go back. We do have some dates already determined for Board meetings up through I think it's August of this year.

And I'm wondering if we can identify some dates for October and October teleconference and a December meeting. It's unclear at this point whether or not the December meeting would occur face-to-face, but we can at least try to just establish some dates right now.

So, for October, and again, this is just a teleconference, the dates that I have that we could do it would be October 19th or the 20th, the 26th or the 28th. I don't know if you have your calendars in front of you, but is one of those dates better than the others?

Member Lockey: This is Jim Lockey. The 20th is good for me, anyway.

Member Richardson: The earlier the better for me. The 26th is out.

Member Beach: The 20th works good for me.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Are there any Members that can't make the 20th?

Member Ziemer: This is Paul Ziemer. I can do either of those dates.

Dr. Roberts: Okay.

Member Schofield: This is Phil. Any of those dates work. I don't really have a life.

(Laughter.)

Dr. Roberts: Okay, so it sounds like the 20th is a strong possibility. So I'll tentatively put that down for a teleconference.

Let's move into December. Typically, we schedule

the two-day meeting for early in the month. So I have December 1st and 2nd, or December 7th and 8th, or the 8th and 9th of December.

Member Beach: I vote for the 1st and 2nd or 8th and 9th, either of those.

Member Lockey: Josie, I can't do the 1st, but the 8th and 9th are good.

Member Beach: Awesome.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Do any Members have a conflict with the 8th and 9th?

Member Anderson: Just not the 10th.

Dr. Roberts: Just not the 5th, you said?

Member Anderson: The 10th.

Dr. Roberts: Oh, the 10th. Okay. But 8th and 9th works?

Member Anderson: Yes.

Member Beach: Rashaun, are we going to try and do a face-to-face or a teleconference?

Dr. Roberts: Yeah, that's a question that I can't shed any light on at this point, because I haven't heard about travel policy being -- you know, the kind of pause on travel being lifted or anything of that sort as of now.

Member Beach: Okay.

Dr. Roberts: So it could be either.

Member Beach: Okay.

Dr. Roberts: Okay. Any other issues with the 8th and 9th? If not, I'll tentatively mark that.

Member Anderson: Is it going to be face-to-face?

Member Ziemer: I assume we probably won't know

for several months on the travel policy. I think we just go ahead and plan it at this time, right? Either way, it's going to be 8th and 9th, right?

Adjourn

Dr. Roberts: Right, exactly. Because we can't say whether it will be in person or not. Okay, all right, well, I believe that is the last of the agenda. So if everybody is okay, we'll go ahead and adjourn the meeting. And as Dave K. mentioned, we do have a Subcommittee on Dose Reconstruction Review meeting tomorrow starting at 10:30 Eastern. Okay. Thank you. Have a good day.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:15 a.m.)