

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

convenes the

FORTY-FIRST MEETING

ADVISORY BOARD ON  
RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

ABRWH BOARD MEETING

The verbatim transcript of the  
Meeting of the Advisory Board on Radiation and  
Worker Health held telephonically on October 18,  
2006.

C O N T E N T S

October 18, 2006

WELCOME AND OPENING COMMENTS DR. PAUL ZIEMER, CHAIR DR. LEWIS WADE, DFO	7
ASSIGNMENT OF BOARD MEMBER REVIEW TEAMS FOR THE 6 <sup>TH</sup> ROUND OF INDIVIDUAL DOSE RECONSTRUCTION REVIEWS (AND REASSIGNMENT OF SOME 5 <sup>TH</sup> ROUND CASES RESULTING FROM THE RETIREMENT OF DR. DEHART) DR. ZIEMER, CHAIR	10
CONFLICT OF INTEREST UPDATE CONCERNING THE SC&A CONTRACT MR. DAVID STAUDT	24
WORKING GROUP (WG) REPORTS AND SCHEDULING FOR FUTURE WORK GROUP MEETINGS WG CHAIRS	41
BOARD WORKING TIME: DR. ZIEMER, CHAIR	
DISCUSSION OF SITE PROFILE REVIEW TASK FOR SC&A IN FY07	92
NEED FOR NEW WORKING GROUPS (I.E. PROCEDURES REVIEW)	95
DISCUSSION OF WORKING GROUP & SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING THE DECEMBER FACE-TO-FACE MEETING	102
COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	112

**TRANSCRIPT LEGEND**

The following transcript contains quoted material. Such material is reproduced as read or spoken.

In the following transcript: a dash (--) indicates an unintentional or purposeful interruption of a sentence. An ellipsis (. . .) indicates halting speech or an unfinished sentence in dialogue or omission(s) of word(s) when reading written material.

-- (sic) denotes an incorrect usage or pronunciation of a word which is transcribed in its original form as reported.

-- (phonetically) indicates a phonetic spelling of the word if no confirmation of the correct spelling is available.

-- "uh-huh" represents an affirmative response, and "uh-uh" represents a negative response.

-- "\*" denotes a spelling based on phonetics, without reference available.

-- (inaudible)/ (unintelligible) signifies speaker failure, usually failure to use a microphone.

**P A R T I C I P A N T S**

(By Group, in Alphabetical Order)

BOARD MEMBERSCHAIR

ZIEMER, Paul L., Ph.D.  
Professor Emeritus  
School of Health Sciences  
Purdue University  
Lafayette, Indiana

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

WADE, Lewis, Ph.D.  
Senior Science Advisor  
National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
Washington, DC

MEMBERSHIP

1 CLAWSON, Bradley  
2 Senior Operator, Nuclear Fuel Handling  
3 Idaho National Engineering & Environmental Laboratory

GIBSON, Michael H.  
President  
Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical, and Energy Union  
Local 5-4200  
Miamisburg, Ohio

GRIFFON, Mark A.  
President  
Creative Pollution Solutions, Inc.  
Salem, New Hampshire

4 LOCKEY, James, M.D.  
5 Professor, Department of Environmental Health  
College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati

1 MELIUS, James Malcom, M.D., Ph.D.  
2 Director  
3 New York State Laborers' Health and Safety Trust Fund  
4 Albany, New York

MUNN, Wanda I.  
Senior Nuclear Engineer (Retired)  
Richland, Washington

PRESLEY, Robert W.  
Special Projects Engineer  
BWXT Y12 National Security Complex  
Clinton, Tennessee

ROESSLER, Genevieve S., Ph.D.  
Professor Emeritus  
University of Florida  
Elysian, Minnesota

ANNOUNCED PARTICIPANTS

BEHLING, KATHY, SC&A  
ELLIOTT, LARRY, NIOSH  
ESCOBAR, FELICIA, SEN. SALAZAR  
FITZGERALD, JOE, SC&A  
HINNEFELD, STUART, NIOSH  
HOWELL, EMILY, HHS  
MAURO, JOHN, SC&A  
NETON, JIM, NIOSH  
STAUDT, DAVID, CDC  
ULSH, BRANT, NIOSH

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

(10:00 a.m.)

**WELCOME AND OPENING COMMENTS****DR. PAUL ZIEMER, CHAIR**

1 DR. ZIEMER: Okay, Ray is now with us --

2 DR. WADE: I see.

3 DR. ZIEMER: -- and ready to go, so maybe --  
4 maybe we should call the meeting to order.

5 DR. WADE: Mark, are you with us?

6 MR. GRIFFON: Yes, I'm here.

7 DR. ZIEMER: Ah, good, Mark.

8 DR. WADE: Okay. And Ray, are you ready to  
9 begin?

10 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, sir.

11 DR. ZIEMER: So I will call the meeting to  
12 order. This is the conference call meeting of  
13 the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker  
14 Health. This is -- those present are Ziemer,  
15 Lockey, Munn, Roessler, Presley, Gibson,  
16 Clawson, Melius, Griffon and Lew Wade, the  
17 Designated Federal Official. Dr. Poston is  
18 unable to be with us today.

19 We also have a number of staff people here. We  
20 don't need to identify them all at the moment -

1           - or do we? Do we need that for the record,  
2           Dr. Wade?

3           **DR. WADE:** No, I don't know that we do. I  
4           think if anyone is going to participate in the  
5           discussion, they need to --

6           **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, they can --

7           **DR. WADE:** -- clearly identify themselves.

8           **DR. ZIEMER:** -- identify as they participate.  
9           Also there may be members of the public on the  
10          phone lines as well.

11          **DR. WADE:** I would ask if there are any  
12          representatives of members of Congress who  
13          would like to be identified on the call.

14          **MS. ESCOBAR:** This is Felicia Escobar. I work  
15          for Senator Ken Salazar and --

16          **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, thank you.

17          **MS. ESCOBAR:** Uh-huh.

18          **DR. ZIEMER:** And Ray, did you get that?

19          **THE COURT REPORTER:** I believe so, Felicia  
20          Escobar?

21          **MS. ESCOBAR:** Yes.

22          **THE COURT REPORTER:** Okay. Thank you.

23          **MS. ESCOBAR:** Uh-huh.

24          **DR. WADE:** Anyone else who would like to be  
25          identified?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

(No responses)

**DR. ZIEMER:** Very good. Let me then welcome everybody to the conference call. I'll make a few preliminary remarks and then Dr. Wade will also have an opportunity to make some additional remarks.

I hope all of you have a copy of the agenda, and we are blocked off time-wise to go till 1:30. It's not mandatory that we go to 1:30. Our items of -- of deliberation are all items that are more in the form of reports and updates, and therefore we may be able to have a more streamlined meeting, although it's not mandatory that we -- that we make it shorter, either. The designated time frames have been set aside based on estimates and, as you know, we will proceed with the agenda as we complete items, so that the time frame that was disseminated may not necessarily be the final time frame that we end up with. So with the understanding that we have that flexibility to move ahead as we complete items, why we will proceed. I thank every for participating. Lew, you have some additional remarks?

**DR. WADE:** Only to thank everyone for their

1 participation and also, you know, the modus  
2 operandi we've sort of evolved into is that  
3 between Board meetings we schedule -- between  
4 face-to-face Board meetings we schedule a  
5 telephone call. And again, it's really to sort  
6 of wrap up loose ends and deal with issues that  
7 need to be dealt with before we sit down  
8 together again. And you know, at some points  
9 that -- the demands will be greater than  
10 others. As Paul said, I don't know that we'll  
11 use the entire day today, but I do think it's a  
12 good idea to have these calls scheduled and to  
13 deal with issues because, as you'll see today,  
14 there are several issues that really wouldn't -  
15 - would best not wait until we're next together  
16 in December. And that's the purpose of the  
17 call, so I appreciate your discipline, those of  
18 you who were with us in making these calls, and  
19 I appreciate your efforts.

**ASSIGNMENT OF BOARD MEMBER REVIEW TEAMS  
FOR THE 6<sup>TH</sup> ROUND OF INDIVIDUAL DOSE RECONSTRUCTION  
REVIEWS (AND REASSIGNMENT OF SOME 5<sup>TH</sup> ROUND CASES  
RESULTING FROM THE RETIREMENT OF DR. DEHART)**

20 DR. ZIEMER: Well, let's go to the first item  
21 on the agenda, which deals with the dose  
22 reconstruction review process. And I'd like to  
23 look first at round five. And you may recall

1           that round five, we had -- had assigned all the  
2           teams for that. And to the best of my  
3           knowledge, all of those teams have completed  
4           their interactions with the SC&A staff. And  
5           Kathy and Hans, can you confirm that that is  
6           the case?

7           **MS. BEHLING:** Yes, we have one more team to go  
8           through the -- the cases, but everyone else is  
9           complete at this point.

10          **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. And I should point out --  
11          and I don't know if you all have a copy of the  
12          -- the cases and the teams that -- I think a  
13          copy was disseminated within the last couple of  
14          weeks, but the first team on that list was  
15          DeHart and Roessler, and DeHart of course --  
16          his term ended on the Board prior to his  
17          actually doing the reviews. My understanding  
18          is that Dr. Roessler ended up working without  
19          DeHart with the SC&A folks. Gen, is that  
20          correct?

21          **DR. ROESSLER:** That's true, I had to do it on  
22          my own.

23          **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, we thank you for doing that  
24          sort of double duty and appreciate the fact  
25          'cause that put the whole burden on you to

1 handle those particular cases. But anyway, we  
2 thank you for that.

3 So with the exception of whatever single team -  
4 - and you've got that scheduled then, Kathy,  
5 for --

6 **MS. BEHLING:** Yes, I do. It's scheduled for  
7 tomorrow.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, okay. So --

9 **MS. BEHLING:** So we should be finished by  
10 tomorrow.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** So those'll be finished and then I  
12 assume that we will have -- before our next  
13 meeting then we will have the official draft of  
14 the findings and --

15 **MS. BEHLING:** Yes.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- and that will be able to start  
17 the matrix process at our meeting in -- in  
18 December.

19 **MS. BEHLING:** That's correct.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** Very good. Let me ask if anyone  
21 has any questions on round five at this point.

22 (No responses)

23 If not, move to round six and let me ask if --  
24 and Stu Hinnefeld distributed also the list  
25 that we selected for round six. Did everybody

1 get a copy of that? It went out within the  
2 last couple of weeks. Is anyone lacking a copy  
3 of that, the 20 cases for round six?

4 (No responses)

5 Okay. Lew, you have had an opportunity to  
6 check conflicts of interest relative to the  
7 facilities involved with the round six audit  
8 selection, so do you want to share those with  
9 us?

10 **DR. WADE:** Surely. Again what I did was I gave  
11 the list to our attorneys and asked them to  
12 identify potential conflicts of Board members,  
13 and I'll be referring to the selection ID  
14 number when I make this report. And I'll only  
15 be reporting those situations where a conflict  
16 has been raised to my attention.

17 For item 18, selection ID that ends in 18,  
18 Griffon and Presley are conflicted.

19 For item 19, Gibson, Griffon and Poston are  
20 conflicted.

21 For item 22, Griffon.

22 For item 31, Munn.

23 For item 48, Munn.

24 For item 49, Griffon and Presley.

25 For item 96, Griffon and Presley.

1 For item 106, Clawson and Griffon.

2 For item 144, Munn.

3 For item 163, Munn.

4 For item 166, Griffon, Poston, Presley, Ziemer.

5 And for item 171, Gibson, Griffon.

6 So that's the report I have from the attorneys.

7 Again, I think -- you know, as is always the  
8 case, we see members with conflicts, but that

9 speaks to the fact that you are valuable

10 additions to the Board. I think that there is

11 a way to work through that now. Dr. Ziemer.

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Thank you. Now I'm -- as a

13 first effort to get the assignments here, I

14 would like to, if we're able to, use the same

15 teams with the following exception. We had

16 two-person teams except for when we made the

17 last group of assignments we put Dr. Lockey on

18 the team with -- with Mike Gibson and me, so we

19 had a three-person team there. But the other

20 teams were two-person teams and then now we

21 have Roessler as a one-person team. So I'm --

22 I would propose that we move Lockey to the team

23 to replace DeHart, so Lockey and Roessler would

24 work together if we're able to find suitable --

25 suitable cases without conflicts of interest.

1           Would that be agreeable, Gen, and --

2           **DR. ROESSLER:** It's agreeable to me.

3           **DR. LOCKEY:** Yeah, it's fine with me.

4           **DR. ZIEMER:** Now that means we have five teams  
5           of two, and we have 20 cases, which means each  
6           team would have four cases. And I -- I think,  
7           and we've found in the past, the easiest way to  
8           do this is to start out with team one and find  
9           four cases for them and then on to team two and  
10          so on. Then we would take them in order,  
11          unless there's a conflict.

12          So for example, the Roessler/Lockey team -- and  
13          we may have to trade some if this doesn't work  
14          out, but Roessler/Lockey could take cases --  
15          let me just propose this and if -- and we'll  
16          just go down through the list and then see if -  
17          - if it's agreeable -- would take cases 8, 18  
18          and 19 and 20, and --

19          **DR. ROESSLER:** On here it's 22.

20          **DR. WADE:** It's 22, Paul.

21          **DR. ZIEMER:** I'm sorry, 22.

22          **DR. ROESSLER:** Okay.

23          **DR. ZIEMER:** Correct. I just read it wrong.  
24          And there would be no conflict there.

25          Then Presley/Poston would take cases 26, 20 --

1 31, 33 and 48. Now I'm going to skip the  
2 Griffon team for the moment because there's a  
3 bunch of Griffon ones here, and we go to the  
4 Gibson/Ziemer team, and they would take 93, 96,  
5 106 and 1-- get this right, I'm sorry -- 49,  
6 93, 96 and 106. Did I get those right?

7 **DR. WADE:** Correct.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah. Then Griffon/Clawson could  
9 take 113, 125, 136 and 144. Now we're going to  
10 run into a problem here I see, so we're going  
11 to have to do a trade in a minute 'cause -- but  
12 let me do Munn/Melius. Let's -- let's skip 163  
13 for a moment and put Munn/Melius on 166, 171  
14 and 181, and then do a trade and bring -- do a  
15 trade -- 163, let's put Roessler and Lockey in  
16 there and -- and put Melius/Munn on 008 at the  
17 top.

18 **DR. ROESSLER:** Okay, so we get the Hanford,  
19 163.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

21 **DR. ROESSLER:** Okay.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Now I -- I think -- I think with  
23 that arrangement -- I think we have -- we've  
24 used all the teams. Right? Five teams of two,  
25 and I think we have no conflicts.





1           **THE COURT REPORTER:** I know it --

2           **DR. WADE:** -- so that causes us concern.

3           **THE COURT REPORTER:** Do you want me to go to  
4 another phone?

5           **DR. WADE:** Have you missed any of our  
6 deliberations?

7           **THE COURT REPORTER:** Excuse me?

8           **DR. WADE:** You have not missed any of our  
9 deliberations?

10          **THE COURT REPORTER:** Oh, no. No.

11          **DR. ZIEMER:** Ray, do you want the Board members  
12 to identify themselves when they --

13          **THE COURT REPORTER:** No.

14          **DR. ZIEMER:** -- speak or can you recognize  
15 voices?

16          **THE COURT REPORTER:** It's not necessary. I'm  
17 fine without that, but I'm wondering if I  
18 should move to another phone so y'all can  
19 communicate with me.

20          **DR. ZIEMER:** Oh, no, that's all right. This is  
21 always -- I think that -- probably -- probably  
22 good to identify, just to double -- make  
23 double-sure.

24          **THE COURT REPORTER:** Usually I'm fine with it.

25          **DR. WADE:** Okay, Ray, and this is Lew Wade.

1 I've sent people to find you, so when they  
2 come, that's why they're looking for you.

3 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Okay.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, Board members, you now have  
5 the proposed teams for round six. Is there any  
6 objection or comments on those teams?

7 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I have no  
8 problems.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Anyone have any concerns about --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, Paul, this is Mark Griffon.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** I don't have any concerns with  
13 the teams and I let the process go, but I do  
14 want to say for the record, I think my  
15 conflicts are wrong again so I've got to talk  
16 to --

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** You need to work that out --

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- them, yeah.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- with the attorneys and then we  
20 can hopefully --

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** I only see one site on here that  
22 I should have been conflicted on, one case, and  
23 I don't understand. I think they're recusing  
24 me -- Oak Ridges again -- and that's not the  
25 case, so --

1           **DR. WADE:** Okay, we'll work that out, Mark.  
2           Thank you.

3           **DR. ZIEMER:** Thanks. Then without objection,  
4           these'll be the assignments for then the next  
5           set of cases. And perhaps -- perhaps Kathy and  
6           Hans can give us some idea of timetable on this  
7           set. Or John.

8           **MS. BEHLING:** Okay, this is Kathy Behling. I  
9           am hoping to have this sixth set done by the  
10          next meeting in December, so hopefully -- I'm  
11          not sure if we're going to get out conference  
12          calls in before the next meeting or somewhere  
13          right after that meeting, but it's going to be  
14          very close to the December meeting.

15          **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah. But we -- we then, for the  
16          December meeting -- as far as looking ahead --  
17          we will have round four matrix to deal with  
18          'cause that's already underway.

19          **MS. BEHLING:** That's correct --

20          **DR. ZIEMER:** And then we'll have the first  
21          round -- the first sort of version of the  
22          matrix and the findings for this set.

23          **MS. BEHLING:** Yeah. Actually the matrix for  
24          the fourth set I have -- I have initiated and  
25          developed that matrix. I believe that's in

1 NIOSH's hands at this point in time. We  
2 haven't gotten any response yet. I understand  
3 they're backlogged and I am -- when we get  
4 through with tomorrow's conference call I will  
5 develop the matrix for the fifth set and I will  
6 -- we will circulate that. And then hopefully  
7 very close, as I said, to the December meeting  
8 we will be near done with the sixth set and  
9 will probably just be having conference calls  
10 about that time. And then after the conference  
11 calls, again, we will publish our report and  
12 generate the matrix for the sixth set. So  
13 there's going to be three sets of matrices that  
14 are going to require issues resolution by the  
15 end of this year.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right. And Mark, just in terms of  
17 the -- the subcommittee now, we'll be hopefully  
18 operating in the new subcommittee mode by the  
19 time of our December meeting. I think the new  
20 -- new document is still going through the  
21 system, but at least -- there will be at least  
22 two matrices to address at that point.

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, that -- that's right.

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** And we might even want to have --

1 I have to coordinate with Stu, as well, 'cause  
2 -- to see where he is with the NIOSH responses  
3 on the fourth, but I was actually hoping  
4 possibly to have a subcommittee meeting prior  
5 to the full Board meeting.

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** You mean --

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** That may not happen, though,  
8 depending on the -- the progress of --

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** You mean separate or --

10 **MR. GRIFFON:** Separate, separate from, yeah.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

12 **DR. WADE:** Stu, are you on the line? Is there  
13 any comment that NIOSH can make at this point?

14 **MR. HINNEFELD:** Yeah, I'm on the line and I  
15 think we can probably make a working group  
16 meeting -- or be prepared for a working group  
17 meeting before the next --

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** It would actually be a  
19 subcommittee now --

20 **MR. HINNEFELD:** Yeah, yeah, but before the ne--

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** Before it was a work-- a work--

22 **MR. HINNEFELD:** -- meeting --

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- session.

24 **MR. HINNEFELD:** Yeah. But we'll have to check  
25 our calendars, Mark. There's --



1 David Staudt. I don't know if David's on the  
2 line today or --

3 **MR. STAUDT:** Yes, Dr. Ziemer, I am.

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, good. So -- and Lew, did  
5 you have -- want to kick this off and then  
6 maybe David can follow up there?

7 **DR. WADE:** Only to turn it over to David and to  
8 -- to make his report, and then look forward to  
9 a discussion about sort of paths forward to --  
10 to satisfy the Board's issues and concerns.

11 **MR. STAUDT:** Dr. Ziemer, the first issue  
12 related -- was related to the firewall  
13 mitigation strategy which you -- you wanted me  
14 to come back and take a look and see if I could  
15 get that incorporated into the contract. And I  
16 took a look at the contract and the conflict of  
17 interest plan is incorporated by reference into  
18 the contract, so I won't be modifying the base  
19 contract. But the conflict of interest plan is  
20 a living document and SC&A is required every  
21 December to review the plan to make sure that  
22 it's up to date and if there are any changes to  
23 be made. Now they've only had to do that once,  
24 and now it's coming up this December again and  
25 I've asked them to include the firewall plan in

1           their -- in any of their comments to me. So  
2           I'm fully anticipating that the plan will be  
3           updated and that we will have a revised plan in  
4           December or January and that will be sent to  
5           the Board and also be put on the web sites. So  
6           I think that issue's pretty much -- I think  
7           that's been resolved.

8           The other issue that comes up has to do with  
9           what I just call conflict -- special conflict  
10          of interest, circumstances or situations that -  
11          - and -- and I know that during the performance  
12          of this contract several of these are going to  
13          come up and some are very minor. But some are  
14          -- are more serious and -- and how are we going  
15          to address those and I think that's what Lew  
16          was alluding to that. I think we need to have  
17          some discussion on how the Board would like to  
18          see this done 'cause there was a concern that  
19          the Board mee-- only meets, you know, every so  
20          often and if these -- if these issues come up,  
21          how was the Board going to be informed.

22          So from my perspective these conflict of  
23          interests can -- can be derived or -- or the  
24          concerns be raised from -- from anyone. And  
25          the main thing is that either Lew -- Dr. Wade

1 or myself be informed. And then it comes down  
2 to how are we going to deal with them.  
3 And I just put an example out there. One of  
4 the more difficult ones dealing with Dr.  
5 (unintelligible) and Anspaugh and their work at  
6 Nevada Test Site and the Pacific Proving  
7 Ground. And in that situation John Mauro came  
8 to us and said that he would like to use these  
9 experts and the reasons why. And -- and I of  
10 course had certain -- I knew that this was  
11 going to cause some difficulties, but we looked  
12 at the situation and Dr. Wade and I decided  
13 that -- that we were going to bound the work  
14 that they were going to do and -- and  
15 everything that they were going to do was going  
16 to be transparent to the working group. And  
17 under those very limited circumstances, when  
18 their work was done, these gentlemen are going  
19 to have to stop performance on the contract.  
20 So I think that some members are -- are -- want  
21 to maybe have a -- they may have an input or  
22 have some -- some notification provided to them  
23 that -- in these circumstances. And I kind of  
24 want to get a feel from the Board exactly what  
25 they're looking for. You know, my goal always

1 is to make sure that this mov-- this work keeps  
2 moving forward and that when these situations  
3 come up there are no delays. So I don't know  
4 if Dr. Wade or you want to kind of make some  
5 comments on that, but I just want to get a feel  
6 from the Board on how they would like to see  
7 this proceed.

8 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, let me --

9 **DR. WADE:** This is Lew. I mean I can provide a  
10 little bit of background and just to sort of  
11 bin the problems and then to -- to have the  
12 Board provide guidance.

13 When it goes to an issue of approving a  
14 variation in the plan -- the conflict of  
15 interest plan, for example -- there are  
16 responsibilities that fall to the government.  
17 There are also responsibilities that I think  
18 the Board wants to hold for themselves in terms  
19 of letting their opinions be known. In order  
20 for the -- for the Board to do that, there  
21 needs to be a complete and accurate disclosure  
22 of information on the part of SC&A. We have to  
23 talk about how that takes place. Then we have  
24 this last issue which is the decision-making  
25 authorities of the Board. The Board can only

1           take a formal action when they're together with  
2           a quorum. But we do have working groups and  
3           we've given certain prerogatives to chairs of  
4           working groups. So the government can exercise  
5           its own prerogatives in terms of its opinion,  
6           but I'm very interested in knowing what the  
7           Board would like the government to -- to await  
8           to hear from the Board on with regard to these  
9           issues.

10          **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, and it may vary in every  
11          case, but we -- we have a specific case here  
12          that maybe can help give us some guidance. For  
13          example, here is the case where I think, from  
14          the government's point of view and putting some  
15          boundaries on it, you have -- and keeping the  
16          transparency, you -- you have indicated that  
17          you believe that it meets the government  
18          criteria for handling COI. At the same time,  
19          there are concerns that the Board, or at least  
20          maybe individuals on the Board have about  
21          individuals involved and their roles, and some  
22          means of providing that input at the front end,  
23          before things are sort of an accomplished fact  
24          and -- and whether or not working groups -- I -  
25          - I don't think we've explicitly authorized

1           working groups to act on behalf of the Board  
2           except in limited ways in terms of discussions  
3           on, you know, what kinds of information they  
4           would like when they're work-- working, say  
5           with NIOSH, and trying to develop matrices and  
6           so on. But certainly final actions are always  
7           things the Board has to do. So perhaps some  
8           general comments from Board members and we can  
9           determine whether we need a more specific  
10          policy or not.

11          **DR. MELIUS:** Yes. This is Jim Melius and I was  
12          the one that raised this issue. And what I was  
13          disturbed about was that there was no  
14          consultation from NIOSH back -- and the  
15          contracting office back to -- to the Advisory  
16          Board about how these two particular  
17          individuals would be used. So -- and we  
18          weren't, you know, sort of fully informed about  
19          their potential conflicts of interest and then  
20          we're -- suddenly been confront with a -- you  
21          know, that they were on board, I -- you know,  
22          as -- as participants. We weren't informed  
23          about what their limitations were and I  
24          personally think that those limitations were  
25          not appropriate and certainly would have liked

1 to had some input into the process of how that  
2 was -- how that was determined and was not  
3 allowed that. And -- and frankly it caused a  
4 fair amount of conflict between John Mauro and  
5 I about -- 'cause, you know, he's telling me he  
6 had the go-ahead to use them in a way that I --  
7 I thought wasn't appropriate and this --  
8 they're -- at least one of them is involved in  
9 the 250-day issue, which is relevant to the  
10 workgroup that I chair.  
11 What I would like to have going forward -- and  
12 I believe we've done this before -- appropriate  
13 -- is that, you know, you doctors -- you know,  
14 one is that the Board members be informed when  
15 this kind of a situation is tak-- taking place  
16 with, you know, our contractor, SC&A and -- and  
17 they be fully informed so that we understand  
18 what -- what's going on. Secondly, that -- you  
19 know, I -- I don't have any problem -- and that  
20 then we be given an opportunity to maybe  
21 express our views to Dr. Ziemer as the Chair of  
22 our Board. Alternative may be that, you know -  
23 - in this particular case, since it -- it takes  
24 in -- involves the Nevada Test Site, Bob  
25 Presley and I were chairs of the -- the working

1 groups that were most -- you know, most  
2 involved in this issue and, you know, Paul --  
3 you know, would -- would consult with us and --  
4 and we'd try to resolve -- I don't think that  
5 would necessarily hold it up and I think this  
6 could have been resolved, you know, fairly  
7 easily and allowed the work to go forward. But  
8 I didn't think it was appropriate that this  
9 went ahea-- you know, essentially that NIOSH  
10 was in a position of making a -- in the  
11 contracting of it, a decision about our  
12 contractor without consulting us. And in  
13 essence, it's our credibility that's on the  
14 line, not NIOSH, and -- and you know, so it's a  
15 tricky situation to -- to deal with.

16 **DR. WADE:** This is Lew. One of the issues that  
17 we need to deal with -- and again, I'm  
18 completely sensitive to everything Dr. Melius  
19 says, is -- is where the responsibility would  
20 fall for notifying Board members. When NIOSH  
21 was notified of this by John Mauro, we were  
22 notified in an e-mail that also indicated that  
23 he had copied the chairs of the working groups,  
24 Dr. Presley and -- Mr. Presley and Dr. Melius.  
25 And so we operated on the assumption that that

1 notification was made. We need to crisp this  
2 up because obviously it didn't work --

3 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, well --

4 **DR. WADE:** -- and --

5 **DR. MELIUS:** -- two -- two problems with that.  
6 We did receive an -- an e-mail, copy of the e-  
7 mail, but then there was, you know, essentially  
8 no consultation back from you or Da-- or Dave  
9 Staudt about -- about -- about the issue, and  
10 next thing you know, it was -- was done.  
11 Secondly, I did not think that -- that John's  
12 information was complete and, at least based on  
13 some of the information I -- I obtained later  
14 from -- actually from SC&A web site and so  
15 forth. Now, I -- I -- I -- again, I think John  
16 was making a good-faith effort to -- to provide  
17 information to us, and I think if we had been  
18 consulted, if there had been some way -- you  
19 know, some system in place to get back to us, I  
20 would have asked for additional information  
21 based on John's e-mail and -- and then we could  
22 have, you know, worked to -- to get it resolved  
23 and I think it could have been done in -- in a  
24 timely manner. But -- but I was basically  
25 expecting, you know, to hear back from you and

1           -- and you know, I believe that was the time  
2           you were out of town, Lew, so I mean there was  
3           some, you know, reasons --

4           **DR. WADE:** Right, this is always about making  
5           good process in the future. Now --

6           **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah.

7           **DR. WADE:** -- we study the past to understand  
8           how to do the future better, so -- so again, in  
9           terms of this process, would the Board expect  
10          to be notified of these issues by SC&A or by  
11          the contracting officer once the contracting  
12          officer is notified by SC&A?

13          **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I think it  
14          ought to be by the contracting officer.

15          **MR. STAUDT:** I -- I would be -- this is Dave  
16          Staudt. I would be more than happy to do that.

17          **DR. WADE:** Okay. So once -- then once that  
18          notification is made, is the action then on the  
19          part of Board members to contact Dr. Ziemer  
20          with concerns, or would you like there to be --  
21          I can't schedule a call of Board members, so  
22          there needs to be a step forward. Once a Board  
23          member receives notification, what would Board  
24          members like to see as their range and actions?

25          **DR. MELIUS:** This is Jim Melius again. I would

1 say that we -- we contact Dr. Ziemer.

2 **DR. WADE:** Okay.

3 **DR. MELIUS:** You know, maybe copy you, Lew and  
4 Dave, on, you know, any concerns that we raise,  
5 but that, you know, it's our responsibility to  
6 contact Paul and -- if there -- if there is a  
7 concern about something. That's --

8 **DR. WADE:** And I think that's very workable, so  
9 --

10 **DR. MELIUS:** I -- I --

11 **DR. WADE:** -- just to repeat, if a situation  
12 comes up relative to an exception to the  
13 conflict of interest policy on the part of  
14 SC&A, SC&A's contractually responsible to  
15 notify the contracting officer. The  
16 contracting officer then takes the  
17 responsibility to notify individual Board  
18 members. At that point individual Board  
19 members will contact Dr. Ziemer if they wish to  
20 pursue this further in terms of asking for  
21 information, raising a question, any  
22 interaction they would like they would do so by  
23 contacting Dr. Ziemer, who would then con--  
24 contact the contracting officer.

25 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I agree

1 with that.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, let me ask a question here  
3 first. This is Ziemer again. Now are we  
4 assuming that David will know which workgroups  
5 are the ones that need to be contacted?

6 **DR. MELIUS:** That's why I was -- this is Jim,  
7 sorry to interrupt, but I would say it goes out  
8 to all the Board. That way we're not having to  
9 worry about what -- what workgroup and so  
10 forth.

11 **MR. CLAWSON:** That -- this is Brad Clawson. I  
12 agree with that because there may be other  
13 people on other workgroups that may know things  
14 that the actual workgroup don't about this  
15 individual.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right. So the full Board would  
17 get contacted under this proposal, and then I  
18 think work-- I think particularly in a case  
19 like the one we just talked about, I think  
20 between the workgroup chairs then and the Board  
21 Chair we could make a determination if we felt  
22 the issue rose to the level where we needed the  
23 full Board sort of conference call or whether  
24 we could resolve it informally without --  
25 without going through a -- a Board action

1 process.

2 **DR. WADE:** Right, I would expect that after the  
3 notification of all the Board members, Dr.  
4 Ziemer, you can consult one on one with working  
5 group members and at that point you would have  
6 the option of calling the contracting officer  
7 and say the Board would like you to delay  
8 decision on this --

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Uh-huh.

10 **DR. WADE:** -- till the Board formally meets.

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

12 **DR. WADE:** David doesn't have to follow your  
13 recommendations, but you can make that  
14 recommendation --

15 **DR. ZIEMER:** Understood.

16 **DR. WADE:** -- to him and --

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Understood.

18 **DR. WADE:** -- in all likelihood he would  
19 attempt to follow your recommendation. If he  
20 doesn't hear from you, then he could proceed  
21 with making his judgment. That seems  
22 reasonable to me, it seems workable.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right. And the -- the other part  
24 of this is to -- we need to make sure that the  
25 -- for -- for example, I don't know if all the

1 Board got this -- yeah, David, you -- you  
2 distributed your -- your memo of the 18th to  
3 all the Board members, I believe.

4 **MR. STAUDT:** Yes.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** And -- and that had -- that had  
6 John's e-mail of August 30th attached to it --  
7 or as part of it.

8 **MR. STAUDT:** Correct.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** But --

10 **DR. WADE:** But John's e-mail -- for the record,  
11 John Mauro's e-mail was only sent to the two  
12 working group chairs that he thought had --

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, and what I'm saying is that  
14 -- that -- that's too much delay. So for  
15 example, an e-mail like John's e-mail of August  
16 30th, if received by the contracting officer,  
17 should immediately go out to the Board --

18 **DR. WADE:** Correct.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- at that point, before any  
20 action is taken on the part of the contracting  
21 officer.

22 **DR. WADE:** Correct.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

24 **DR. WADE:** And then the contracting officer  
25 would wait an appropriate time to make a

1 decision, likely make a call to you, Dr.  
2 Ziemer.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah. In other words, he would  
4 say here's a proposal or request from the  
5 contractor on this particular issue. Does the  
6 Board wish to take a position or delay action  
7 or whatever.

8 **DR. WADE:** Correct.

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Are other Board members  
10 comfortable with this approach?

11 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I am.

12 **MS. MUNN:** This is Wanda. It seems workable.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Any -- any that want to voice a  
14 contrary opinion or propose an alternative?

15 **DR. ROESSLER:** Sounds good to me.

16 **DR. MAURO:** Dr. Ziemer, this is John Mauro.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

18 **DR. MAURO:** By way of confirmation then, when I  
19 notify David of such a situation, we take -- we  
20 sit tight until we hear back from the  
21 contracting officer with a green light or not.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, and so --

23 **DR. MAURO:** We don't do any work along those  
24 lines until we hear back.

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, in a case like this, yeah,



1 DR. ZIEMER: Right.

2 DR. MELIUS: -- so -- but my -- my concern is  
3 basically going forward. What's happened has  
4 happened.

5 DR. ZIEMER: Yeah, yeah.

6 DR. WADE: Yeah, my considered opinion -- this  
7 is Lew -- is that everyone was acting in the  
8 best interest of the process. But again, it  
9 was -- we were in a place we had not been  
10 before and it's always good to have plans.

11 DR. ZIEMER: Okay. Well, we'll proceed in that  
12 fashion then and the -- this is kind of an  
13 informal process. We'll see how it works.

14 DR. WADE: All right. With everyone's  
15 permission, I'll write this up and send it just  
16 as a note to the Board so Board members  
17 individually can correct my recollection of  
18 this. And if not, we'll have something to  
19 refer to.

20 DR. ZIEMER: Thank you. Any other comments on  
21 this issue?

22 (No responses)

23 **WORKING GROUP (WG) REPORTS AND SCHEDULING FOR**  
**FUTURE WORK GROUP MEETINGS**

24 Okay, very good. Then let's move ahead to  
25 working group reports. Now we have a sizeable

1 list of working groups now. In fact, if you --  
2 if you go back to a -- some correspondence that  
3 Lew distributed after our last meeting, and  
4 it's an e-mail dated September 26th, is a kind  
5 of a roster of all the workgroups, as well as  
6 the subcommittee. And I think it would be  
7 appropriate if we went through each of those  
8 and at least got a status report on where they  
9 are in terms of either scheduling meetings,  
10 already scheduled between now and the next  
11 Board meeting or planned meetings or any other  
12 things pertaining to where they are on their  
13 particular issues.

14 Let's see --

15 **DR. WADE:** Dr. Ziemer, I could just run down  
16 the list if you would like.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, why don't we -- we can just  
18 do it in order, beginning with the Subcommittee  
19 on Dose Reconstruction.

20 **DR. WADE:** And again as background -- you know,  
21 putting the agenda together for this call, I --  
22 I didn't indicate that we would have in-depth  
23 technical discussions of -- of any of these  
24 issues. I think sort of a summary status  
25 report by the working group chair, and I'm

1 particularly interested in scheduling working  
2 group meetings. There's been a flurry of e-  
3 mails that could cause one to think some  
4 meetings are scheduled or not, and I think it  
5 would be good, at one time at one place, to get  
6 all of that on the record so we could be sure  
7 that the working group and subcommittee's needs  
8 with regard to future meetings are met. And  
9 I'd start with the Subcommittee on Dose  
10 Reconstruction, ably chaired by Mark Griffon.  
11 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, we -- as -- as you just  
12 heard, I think I might need to talk to Stu a  
13 little further and SC&A and -- and the  
14 subcommittee members, but I was hoping to have  
15 a -- a subcommittee meeting prior to the next  
16 Board meeting, only because we can -- it -- we  
17 can have a more focused working session if  
18 they're -- if they're separated from the Board  
19 meetings. I think we -- it allows us to focus  
20 totally on the matrix and go through the matrix  
21 one item at a time. If it's going to be too  
22 close to the Board meeting by the time  
23 everyone's ready, I think we'll probably just  
24 have a meeting the day before the regular Board  
25 meeting and move on matrix -- the fourth matrix

1 and, to the extent we can, the fifth matrix,  
2 but at least the fourth matrix. I think we're  
3 ready to -- to go into -- to finding  
4 resolution, comment resolution process.

5 **DR. ZIEMER:** Right.

6 **MS. MUNN:** This is Wanda. When you were  
7 discussing that earlier I was trying to express  
8 my -- my concurrence that we need to get that  
9 one really moving and moving very quickly and -  
10 - and I was -- there was something wrong with  
11 my microphone apparently. I had to get rid of  
12 it.

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh.

14 **MS. MUNN:** But -- can't -- can't stand to have  
15 you not hear me.

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I think Stu -- Stu has been  
17 putting together responses for NIOSH, so we  
18 want to at least have -- give NIOSH adequate  
19 time to fill that part of the matrix in before  
20 we schedule a meeting.

21 **MS. MUNN:** I would certainly hope so --

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

23 **MS. MUNN:** -- but when you suggested let's go  
24 with the other meeting the day before our other  
25 meeting, we're currently scheduled -- if my

1 calendar tells me correctly -- to start on a  
2 Monday. Am -- am -- is my calendar correct or  
3 am I incorrect?

4 **DR. WADE:** Calendar's correct.

5 **MS. MUNN:** I -- I was scheduling 11th of  
6 December as our first meeting date. And if  
7 that's the case, then -- then it would  
8 certainly be helpful, from my point of view, if  
9 we did that the week after Thanksgiving rather  
10 than -- than --

11 **DR. WADE:** Wanda, the last thing we heard was  
12 "if we did that" and now we're not hearing you.

13 **MS. MUNN:** Oh, you're not? There was a strange  
14 sound, but again, it wasn't me.

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** I can hear you.

16 **MS. MUNN:** Good. My suggestion was that the  
17 week after Thanksgiving would -- if -- if it's  
18 possible at all for Stu to get the materials  
19 together that we need to do, would probably be  
20 much better than waiting until the week before  
21 the meeting since our meeting starts on Monday.

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, and I was assuming that the  
23 Monday was left for subcommittee meeting time  
24 anyway, but maybe it wasn't.

25 **DR. WADE:** No, it might be. We'll have that

1 discussion later --

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

3 **DR. WADE:** -- but --

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** I -- I agree, if we can get it  
5 in, Wanda. The only thing I wouldn't want to  
6 do is like the week before wouldn't make a lot  
7 of sense.

8 **MS. MUNN:** No, it would --

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** If it can be a couple of weeks  
10 before, then let's -- let's try to do that,  
11 yeah.

12 **MS. MUNN:** If we could just do the last -- the  
13 last week in -- in November, that would --

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

15 **MS. MUNN:** -- that would be ideal I think if  
16 Stu could do it.

17 **MR. HINNEFELD:** This is Stu Hinnefeld. How do  
18 you feel about the week before Thanksgiving  
19 rather than the week after?

20 **MS. MUNN:** Well, the week before is fine for me  
21 if it's fine for you. I just --

22 **MR. HINNEFELD:** Well, the week --

23 **MS. MUNN:** -- thought that might be --

24 **MR. HINNEFELD:** -- after is not fine --

25 **MS. MUNN:** -- pushing you too much.

1           **MR. HINNEFELD:** The week after is not fine for  
2 me for -- I'd say personal reasons.

3           **MS. MUNN:** Okay. But we're -- we're going to  
4 have working group meetings in Cincinnati the  
5 preceding week, at least one, on the 9th, and -  
6 - and possibly more, either before or after  
7 that. But if -- from my perspective, if you  
8 can get what you need together by the week of  
9 the 13th, that would be --

10          **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

11          **MS. MUNN:** -- the best of all possible worlds,  
12 if you --

13          **MR. GRIFFON:** We'll have to work on that. I  
14 think, Wanda, a lot of us have the similar  
15 idea, which is -- I was thinking if I can tie  
16 my Rocky Flats workgroup along with the  
17 subcommittee, you know, and travel once instead  
18 of twice --

19          **MS. MUNN:** Right.

20          **MR. GRIFFON:** -- that would be ideal.

21          **MS. MUNN:** Right.

22          **MR. GRIFFON:** So we need to coordinate these,  
23 as well. But yeah, if we -- let me -- let --  
24 let's do this. Stu, do you -- I mean do you  
25 want to lock into a day or you want to check

1 with your folks first?

2 **MR. HINNEFELD:** Well, we -- we require some  
3 more interaction with ORAU before we --

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

5 **MR. HINNEFELD:** -- we know we're going to be  
6 ready so I'd -- I'd rather not --

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** All right.

8 **MR. HINNEFELD:** Or you can -- you can pick a  
9 day today and I can -- you know, in association  
10 with other meetings when you're going to be in  
11 town, and then we'll just do whatever we can to  
12 get ready.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** I think, Lew, for your purposes  
14 you can indicate they're shooting for the week  
15 of the 13th. Right?

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

17 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, can we take --

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Maybe as the other workgroups  
19 report and we see --

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** We can see where --

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- schedule, we can try to  
22 coordinate those.

23 **DR. WADE:** I think at the close of this I'd  
24 like to have a day -- a specific day for the  
25 subcommittee.

1           **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

2           **DR. WADE:** Let's wait until that decision is  
3 informed by others.

4           **MS. MUNN:** That's a good idea. I would -- I  
5 would propose that -- the 16th, if that looks  
6 as though it's going to be --

7           **DR. WADE:** Check.

8           **MS. MUNN:** -- (unintelligible) for others.

9           **DR. WADE:** We won't end this without the  
10 possibility of trying to lock in a day, but  
11 let's hear some more.

12           Now again, the -- for -- for everyone's  
13 recollection and the record, the subcommittee  
14 is chaired by Mark, with Mike Gibson, Dr.  
15 Poston, Wanda; alternates are Clawson and  
16 Presley.

17           Then we have -- the next on the list that I  
18 sent out was the workgroup on the Nevada Test  
19 Site site profile, chaired by Presley with  
20 Munn, Clawson and Roessler as members. So  
21 Robert, you know, in a nutshell, where are you,  
22 what are you scheduling?

23           **MR. PRESLEY:** Okay, this is Bob Presley. We  
24 have not -- we do not have anything scheduled.  
25 I'm waiting on -- Is Mark Rolluf (sic) there

1           today? Is Mark listening in?

2           **DR. NETON:** Mark is here but not -- I don't  
3 believe he's on the phone right now.

4           **MR. PRESLEY:** Okay. What we're waiting on is  
5 CDC, NIOSH, to go through a proposal and then  
6 come back to us with a date that we can get  
7 together. I have talked -- myself talked to  
8 Mark last week and we've not talked since then  
9 about a date, but I would -- I would hope that  
10 we could probably set our meeting sometime  
11 around this -- either before or after this  
12 November the 13th date so that -- because the -  
13 - some of the people that are on the NTS  
14 working group are also on the Rocky Flats.

15           **DR. NETON:** Bob, this is Jim Neton. I know  
16 that there was some concern about our response  
17 to the Anspaugh write-up --

18           **MR. PRESLEY:** That's correct.

19           **DR. NETON:** -- and yesterday I believe we asked  
20 ORAU, Gene Rollins specifically, to start  
21 working on that. And I think it was -- their -  
22 - their thought was that it might take about  
23 three weeks to -- three to four to accomplish  
24 that analysis. So you know, if that's  
25 something you want to be discussed at the next

1 meeting, it would have to be probably after the  
2 13th. That -- that's up for you guys to  
3 decide.

4 **MR. PRESLEY:** Okay. I will get back with Mark  
5 on that --

6 **DR. NETON:** Okay.

7 **MR. PRESLEY:** -- and see, because there's --  
8 what we had planned on doing is have Anspaugh  
9 there with -- I don't have my notes --

10 **DR. NETON:** Gene Rollins.

11 **MR. PRESLEY:** Lew (sic) Rollins, right, and  
12 SC&A and the working group to go over this.

13 **DR. NETON:** Right. And again, the resuspension  
14 calculations that -- that Anspaugh believes are  
15 in error, to put some bracketing values around  
16 those is going to take three to four weeks for  
17 Rollins to accomplish that. Now it may be that  
18 he can get to a point where he can get a  
19 general sense of how -- the big -- the big  
20 issue is how much difference does it make. I  
21 think everybody agrees there's an error there,  
22 but is it -- is it a significant error; and if  
23 it is, how big. So I think you're right, we  
24 need to get back with Mark and -- and flesh  
25 that out a little better.

1           **MR. PRESLEY:** I will -- I will get back with  
2 Mark tomorrow sometime.

3           **DR. NETON:** Okay, I'll let him know that.

4           **MR. PRESLEY:** Okay. I appreciate that.

5           **DR. WADE:** Thank you all. Next on the list is  
6 the Savannah River Site site profile workgroup  
7 --

8           **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, did we announce who was on  
9 the Nevada Test Site --

10          **DR. WADE:** -- chaired by Mark (sic) Gibson.

11          **DR. ZIEMER:** Excuse me, Lew. Did you indicate  
12 who was on the Nevada Test Site profile team?

13          **DR. WADE:** I will again. I think Presley,  
14 Munn, Clawson and Roessler.

15          **DR. ZIEMER:** Uh-huh.

16          **DR. WADE:** On Savannah River Site it's Gibson,  
17 Clawson, Griffon and Lockey.

18          **MR. GIBSON:** Okay. This is Mike. We have not  
19 had any meetings or phone calls, the working  
20 group, since the last one. I've been in  
21 contact with Joe Fitzgerald with SC&A and Sam  
22 Glover of NIOSH, and they're still exchanging  
23 information, try to come to closure on some of  
24 the open issues. It looks like they're --  
25 they're tightening them up. There's a few

1 things about the fault tree databank  
2 compilation about the other nuclides for the  
3 tank farm, and there's some so-called three by  
4 five-inch data cards that have some dose re--  
5 results on them that they need a little bit  
6 more exchange between the two parties where  
7 it'd probably be beneficial to have another  
8 meeting to try to close out multi open issues.  
9 But hopefully if -- if things go right, maybe  
10 we could plan a meeting that same week of  
11 November 13th for this working group also.

12 **DR. WADE:** Okay.

13 **MR. CLAWSON:** Mike, this is Brad Clawson. What  
14 was -- what was the name of that incident  
15 database that we were trying to get from the  
16 previous contractor for Savannah River? Have  
17 we had any response to that? I believe DuPont  
18 owned it and we were trying to get access to  
19 it.

20 **MR. GIBSON:** That I've not heard yet. I don't  
21 know if they've been made -- that's been made  
22 available to them or not.

23 **DR. NETON:** Yeah, we -- we can't answer that  
24 from this end, either. Sam Glover is our lead  
25 on that and he's not on the call.

1           **MR. CLAWSON:** Okay, that -- that's one thing  
2           that I'd personally like to be made aware of  
3           because I feel this is pretty important in this  
4           one that we've got going on.

5           **MR. GIBSON:** Right, and you're absolutely  
6           right. And what's been brought up, this was  
7           paid for by government money supposedly so, you  
8           know, it should be available to us and the  
9           government and our contractor.

10          **MR. CLAWSON:** That's correct.

11          **DR. WADE:** Okay, let's move on to possibly the  
12          -- one of the most sensitive of issues and  
13          that's the workgroup on the Rocky Flats site  
14          profile and SEC petition chaired by Mark, with  
15          members Gibson, Presley and Munn.

16          **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, since the last meeting  
17          we've had a fair amount of activity by both  
18          NIOSH and SC&A responding to various action  
19          items. And I think at this point one of the  
20          critical items that -- that remains is the data  
21          reliability question. I think a lot of other  
22          ones are -- are close to closure, so -- but --  
23          but I think again we're -- we're -- I'm -- I  
24          was thinking of early November or sounds like  
25          this week of November 13th could be a busy one.

1           **MS. MUNN:** Aren't we already scheduled for the  
2           9th?

3           **MR. GRIFFON:** Did we schedule for the 9th?

4           **MS. MUNN:** We originally did.

5           **MR. GRIFFON:** I don't reca--

6           **MS. MUNN:** At least on my calendar.

7           **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh, I didn't recall that.

8           **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, we had said the 9th. We  
9           picked that --

10          **MR. GRIFFON:** Did we say that in Vegas?

11          **MS. MUNN:** -- at our last meeting, yeah.

12          **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay, I was a little distracted  
13          in Vegas when I left, so --

14          **MS. MUNN:** No wonder why.

15          **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

16          **DR. ZIEMER:** Mike, did you have that on your  
17          calendar?

18          **MR. GIBSON:** No, I did not.

19          **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. Now I  
20          didn't have that on my calendar, either.

21          **MS. MUNN:** Oh, boy, I --

22          **MS. HOWELL:** This is Emily Howell. I had on my  
23          calendar a meeting on the 9th for Dr. Lockey's  
24          --

25          **DR. LOCKEY:** Right.

1           **MS. HOWELL:** -- workgroup for SEC petitions not  
2           qualifying. And Wanda, I think you're in that  
3           group, as well.

4           **MS. MUNN:** Yes, I am.

5           **MR. GRIFFON:** Ah, that's a different meeting.

6           **DR. LOCKEY:** That's the meeting for the 9th.  
7           This is Lockey.

8           **MS. MUNN:** That may be -- that may be what I  
9           had written down and -- and was thinking --  
10          thinking Rocky Flats and --

11          **DR. WADE:** And that's why we're here having  
12          this discussion 'cause there's been a lot of  
13          this sort of miscommunication, but that's fine.  
14          So Mark --

15          **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I -- I have -- I mean I  
16          would like to, again, link it around these  
17          other times, maybe even like the 8th -- 'cause  
18          it looks like we're going to have busy two  
19          weeks and a lot of people are on several  
20          workgroups, so --

21          **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, we are.

22          **MR. GRIFFON:** -- you know, it may be --

23          **MR. PRESLEY:** Mark, this is Bob Presley. The  
24          8th is not good -- the 8th or the 9th is not  
25          good for me.

1           **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

2           **MS. MUNN:** Is the 10th?

3           **MR. PRESLEY:** Friday the 10th? No, because I  
4           can't get up there -- well, unless I can get an  
5           early flight out of here.

6           **MS. MUNN:** You can get an early flight, Bob.

7           **MR. HINNEFELD:** Friday the 10th is a holiday  
8           for federal employees. It's -- Veterans Day is  
9           observed.

10          **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh, okay.

11          **MR. PRESLEY:** That's right, yeah, and I need to  
12          be -- I need to be somewhere around here for  
13          that, too.

14          **MS. MUNN:** So that means if we're going to do  
15          that week and hold to the 9th that we already  
16          have scheduled, we'd have to be looking at  
17          something like election day on the 7th or  
18          something of that sort.

19          **MR. GIBSON:** And we can't miss that.

20          **MS. MUNN:** No -- well --

21          **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

22          **MS. MUNN:** -- you can -- you can vote before  
23          you leave. I do that all the time.

24          **MR. GRIFFON:** I mean my -- my sense from -- I  
25          did talk to Joe Fitzgerald a little bit and

1           they are drafting sort of a review of the  
2           evaluation report as all this stuff -- all  
3           these action items come in and NIOSH's  
4           responses come in. SC&A has been drafting sort  
5           of their review of the evaluation report and  
6           also they've drafted some analysis of the  
7           completeness of the individual dose files or  
8           the dose record and I think that's going to be  
9           a critical one in sort of winding up this  
10          question of data reliability. So he -- Joe  
11          indicated that probably they would need at  
12          least till the end of October, early November.  
13          So I think -- we might be able to do it  
14          earlier. I was just trying to figure out --  
15          you know, I don't -- I don't want people to  
16          have to travel to Cincinnati three times in  
17          three weeks, you know.

18          **MS. MUNN:** No, I think --

19          **MR. GRIFFON:** So --

20          **MS. ESCOBAR:** Mark -- Mark, this is -- this is  
21          Felicia with Senator Salazar and we just --  
22          just wanted to, you know, say that we're still  
23          following this issue and, you know, I think  
24          that the data reliability issue is something  
25          that, you know, from our constituents'

1 perspective it's been a -- you know, it's --  
2 continues to be a really big problem and, you  
3 know, we would hope that you guys would --  
4 understanding that it's difficult with travel  
5 for everybody and that this is a very time-  
6 intensive process, that you would -- you'd take  
7 the -- the appropriate, you know, time to  
8 really, you know, give -- give the parties the  
9 ability to really review and get into the --  
10 you know, the nuts and bolts of the data  
11 reliability issue, and also give, you know, you  
12 all as Advisory Board members the opportunity  
13 to really review what comes back from -- you  
14 know, from NIOSH and others, so that's just one  
15 thing I wanted to -- to make clear, that we're  
16 really hoping that you guys are able to really  
17 get -- get the information you need and have  
18 the time to -- to review it. So just factor  
19 that into your, you know, your --

20 **DR. WADE:** Thank you. Thank you very much for  
21 that.

22 **MS. ESCOBAR:** Yeah.

23 **DR. WADE:** So I guess the instruction that I  
24 would take is that we want to meet as soon as  
25 we can, that meaning when we are fully ready,

1           so -- because again, if we meet, then we might  
2           have to meet again. Is it possible that early  
3           in that week, even November 6th, might be an  
4           opportunity?

5           **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I could  
6           make that day.

7           **DR. ULSH:** This is Brant Ulsh. I have some  
8           questions -- this is the first I've really  
9           heard about SC&A's analysis of the completeness  
10          of individual rad files. If that is going to  
11          come to us at the end of October, we'll need  
12          some time to review that, depending on how big  
13          it is.

14          **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

15          **MR. GRIFFON:** No, I think Joe -- Joe  
16          Fitzgerald, are you on the line?

17          **MR. FITZGERALD:** Yes, I am.

18          **MR. GRIFFON:** I think that's ready to go soon.  
19          Right, Joe?

20          **MR. FITZGERALD:** Yeah, I mean --

21          **MR. GRIFFON:** At least as a preliminary report,  
22          it is.

23          **MR. FITZGERALD:** Yeah, we think we can have  
24          this thing teed up for the -- for NIOSH and the  
25          Board, if not today, by early tomorrow. So

1 we're -- it's been in development now for a  
2 week or so -- a couple of weeks.

3 **MS. MUNN:** Great. That's good to hear, Joe.  
4 Thank you.

5 And I hope that someone other than I is willing  
6 to reassure the Congressional members who are -  
7 - are focused on the data reliability issue  
8 that we are spending an -- a significant amount  
9 of time and effort looking at this thing. I  
10 hope we can reassure them that they need not be  
11 concerned that it's going to be glossed over or  
12 shortchanged in any way. We --

13 **MS. ESCOBAR:** Well, I -- and I appreciate that.  
14 This is Felicia again, you know, but we just  
15 can't stress that enough and I -- and I know  
16 that if it's as taxing on your time, so you  
17 know, thank you for -- for really digging into  
18 the issues. We really appreciate it.

19 **DR. WADE:** Right, and -- and I think -- this is  
20 Lew Wade -- that the working group and the  
21 Board's record will speak for itself on this,  
22 so -- what about the 6th? I hate to --

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, we could tentatively do the  
24 6th, but I think Brant, if you get this report  
25 tomorrow, I think it's like -- like Joe -- Joe

1 mentioned it to me on the phone as being sort  
2 of a preliminary review of -- of about 12  
3 cases, Joe, is that what --

4 **MR. FITZGERALD:** Yeah, we've done 12 cases and  
5 this comes from, you know, the review that -- I  
6 think stems from the review that you've done on  
7 HIS-20 versus CEDR and --

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

9 **MR. FITZGERALD:** -- trying to go back to some  
10 of the original claimant data, just to sort of  
11 bring it around full circle as far as data  
12 reliability. So I think you will have what you  
13 would need to look at and consider, and I think  
14 it -- certainly in -- in time, with a few weeks  
15 perhaps, that we could have a discussion in  
16 November.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I did mention this is an  
18 ongoing activity. In the Vegas meeting my  
19 notes say that SC&A was reviewing these at that  
20 point, and I guess their -- their draft  
21 report's final now. Or -- or it's a -- they --  
22 they've completed a draft, anyway.

23 **DR. WADE:** Okay, so the 6th is a Monday before  
24 election day.

25 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, let's go for it.

1           **DR. WADE:** I'm sorry, Wanda?

2           **MS. MUNN:** I suggest we go for it.

3           **MR. GRIFFON:** I think we should shoot for it,  
4           yeah.

5           **MS. MUNN:** I hate to put this off if there is -  
6           - if there is any -- since Joe's going to have  
7           the material ready for us to really look at and  
8           if Brant and if (unintelligible) available on  
9           the 6th, then that's -- we -- we've really  
10          spent a lot of time and --

11          **MR. GRIFFON:** I think that's a good week, too,  
12          because then it gives us several weeks before  
13          the Board meeting --

14          **MS. MUNN:** Right.

15          **DR. WADE:** Right.

16          **MR. GRIFFON:** -- where -- where some additional  
17          work, if it needs to be done, can be done.

18          **MS. MUNN:** Any loose ends --

19          **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

20          **MS. MUNN:** -- can be addressed.

21          **DR. WADE:** Okay, very good. And I'm going to  
22          be so bold as to suggest maybe 10:00 a.m. to  
23          give some people a chance to fly in that  
24          morning. Does that work for you, Mark?

25          **MR. GRIFFON:** That's great.

1           **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I can make  
2           that.

3           **DR. WADE:** Okay, so 10:00 a.m. on Monday the  
4           6th we are tentatively scheduled to meet in  
5           Cincinnati, at a hotel to be named, to deal  
6           with the Rocky Flats site profile and SEC  
7           workgroup.

8           **MR. PRESLEY:** Okay, can we try to get -- if  
9           nothing breaks or bends, try to get that hotel  
10          out there at the airport?

11          **DR. WADE:** Yeah, we will get one at the  
12          airport, certainly.

13          **MR. PRESLEY:** Thank you.

14          **DR. WADE:** Thank you. Again now, workgroup on  
15          Chapman Valve SEC, that's chaired by Dr. Poston  
16          -- he's not with us -- Griffon, Clawson,  
17          Roessler and Gibson. John Mauro, I know you  
18          spoke to Dr. Poston yesterday. Can you help us  
19          in this regard?

20          **DR. MAURO:** Yes. In fact, Dr. Poston asked if  
21          I wouldn't mind just briefing you folks on the  
22          conversation we had. Bottom line is, Dr.  
23          Poston would like to hold a conference call  
24          working group meeting on Chapman Valve toward  
25          the end of this month or early next month, the

1 date he will set soon as he's -- gets --  
2 opportunity to set an appropriate date with the  
3 rest of the members of the working group. And  
4 I had indicated to Dr. Poston that by that time  
5 we should have some -- we won't have our  
6 report, but we should have enough material that  
7 I think we can get to the heart of a lot of the  
8 important issues that we're concerned about  
9 related to Chapman Valve.

10 We did recently receive a revised version of  
11 the Chapman Valve site profile, I think  
12 yesterday it came in. I did read it. We are -  
13 - so I think we will be in a good position to  
14 have a very productive working group meeting  
15 toward the end of this month or early November,  
16 to be set by -- by the working group.

17 **DR. WADE:** Okay, so my summary is a telephone  
18 call is being proposed by the working group  
19 chair, end of November, early December.

20 **DR. MAURO:** Yes.

21 **DR. WADE:** Okay. And other members, you're  
22 going to wait to hear from the working group  
23 chair to schedule a specific time, but I see  
24 that as the plan.

25 **DR. LOCKEY:** Did I hear end of November or

1           early December? I thought it was end of  
2           October or early November.

3           **DR. MAURO:** I'm sorry, end of October.

4           **DR. LOCKEY:** Yeah.

5           **DR. MAURO:** This would be our first conference  
6           call. We really just began work, but we've  
7           done enough that I think we could have some  
8           productive discussion -- certainly more to  
9           come.

10          **DR. WADE:** Okay, so I misspoke, end of October,  
11          early November.

12          **DR. NETON:** This is Jim. Could we expect to  
13          see some sort of a draft report or --

14          **DR. MAURO:** What I'd like to deliver to you is  
15          a series of tables and graphs, perhaps some  
16          text. I don't think it'll be something that  
17          I'd like to call a draft report, but I think it  
18          will be talking points.

19          **DR. NETON:** That's fine, just some-- something  
20          to look at and to digest before -- before the  
21          call.

22          **DR. MAURO:** Yes.

23          **MR. GRIFFON:** Jim, this is Mark Griffon.

24          **DR. NETON:** Yeah.

25          **MR. GRIFFON:** Good to hear your voice again, by

1 the way.

2 **DR. NETON:** Thanks.

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** I don't know -- LaVon indicated  
4 in his e-mail that there was another TBD  
5 forthcoming or --

6 **DR. NETON:** It's been issued. I think that the  
7 working group members and John Mauro have been  
8 --

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I -- I have -- no, I have  
10 the -- the new site profile --

11 **DR. NETON:** That's it.

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- but you said something else  
13 that was forth-- that was coming.

14 **DR. NETON:** Not to my knowledge.

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** I'm looking for the e-mail right  
16 now.

17 **DR. NETON:** (Unintelligible) worded not quite  
18 right, but --

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh, okay.

20 **DR. NETON:** -- we've revised -- Revision 1 of  
21 the Chapman Valve site profile where some  
22 things, you know, have been bolstered up based  
23 on comments that were made in the evaluation  
24 report. We've redone the internal dosimetry  
25 analysis a little bit, as John Mauro has

1 already observed. But there's nothing else  
2 coming up. We -- we're working on draft dose  
3 reconstructions.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Oh, okay, I see -- I guess the  
5 second paragraph threw me off. He says the  
6 Tech. Basis Document and sample dose  
7 reconstructions --

8 **DR. NETON:** Ah.

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- once complete, will be posted  
10 on the O drive. So it is -- the TBD is the --

11 **DR. NETON:** Right --

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- revised site profile.

13 **DR. NETON:** -- the TBD -- I don't know if it's  
14 on the O drive yet, but it should be shortly.  
15 It's -- I signed it yesterday, I believe, so --

16 **MR. HINNEFELD:** It's on our web site.

17 **DR. NETON:** It's on our web site already, so  
18 you can get it there. We just decided to open  
19 up another -- you know, on the X drive, open up  
20 another folder there, so anything --

21 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

22 **DR. NETON:** -- like that John puts out or  
23 whatever, we can get it available to everybody.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

25 **DR. WADE:** Okay. Moving on to the workgroup on

1           SEC issues, paren, including the 250-day issue,  
2           that's chaired by Dr. Melius with members  
3           Ziemer, Roessler and Griffon.

4           **DR. MELIUS:** Yes, this is Jim Melius. I would  
5           -- we need to schedule a working group meeting.  
6           I think that's somewhat dependent on the timing  
7           of a report from SC&A, and last I talked to  
8           Arjun, that was expected sometime, you know,  
9           second or third week in November and -- just  
10          trying to pin that down 'cause I -- again, I'm  
11          not sure this -- we -- it's worth meeting until  
12          we have that -- that report in -- in hand and  
13          give us a chance to discuss it and so forth.  
14          That's -- that report does not require, I don't  
15          believe, sort of NIOSH review at this point in  
16          time since it's more of a conceptual, you know,  
17          background on a number of issues. So once we  
18          have that, we should be able to move forward.  
19          I don't know, John, if you have any -- John  
20          Mauro, if you have any sense of where Arjun is  
21          with that.

22          **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Yes, I -- I'm -- I'm on the  
23          call, Jim.

24          **DR. MELIUS:** Oh, good, Arjun. Okay.

25          **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Yeah, we've -- we're working

1           intensively on this. We -- we have a number of  
2           the documents and we're developing a conceptual  
3           approach, and an outline of the report will be  
4           ready this Friday for internal review, or early  
5           next week. And we should have a rough draft  
6           report by mid-November, as originally  
7           scheduled. You've -- you've already got the  
8           criticality piece. Now if you would -- I don't  
9           know how you want it. If you want us to kind  
10          of give you like memoranda on the pieces, or do  
11          you want to see a draft report, because there  
12          are a number of issues that we're covering --  
13          **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, Arjun, is rough draft --  
14          that's just an internal document at that point.  
15          That's not a draft report that you're going to  
16          issue at that point.  
17          **DR. MAKHIJANI:** That's right.  
18          **DR. ZIEMER:** Rough is just kind of the early  
19          version?  
20          **DR. MAKHIJANI:** Yes, the -- the -- Dr. Ziemer,  
21          the plan is that that draft would be reviewed  
22          internally before -- before going to you, and  
23          that in the first week of December you would  
24          get the draft report, as we call it, for Board  
25          consideration. Now I'd be working with Dr.

1 Melius before that, as I have been, and keeping  
2 him posted -- and decide if we're going to have  
3 a meeting, and so I'll -- I'll -- I'll keep him  
4 posted as to its progress.

5 That's why I was suggesting maybe that I could  
6 send memoranda for consideration at that mid-  
7 November meeting and I'll know what's in the  
8 draft report internally so -- so we'll be able  
9 to talk about it then.

10 **DR. MELIUS:** Okay.

11 **DR. MAURO:** This is John Mauro. Dr. Melius,  
12 one of the steps that was taken a little  
13 earlier on was we prepared a list of documents  
14 that are in the controlled document list as  
15 part of the NTPR DTRA program. I sent that  
16 list on to Larry Elliott, who then forwarded it  
17 on to Dr. Paul Blake, who runs the -- the DTRA  
18 program. What -- I guess this is the question  
19 posed to the working group, do you know whether  
20 or not any progress has been made in obtaining  
21 those documents or if there's any problems with  
22 obtaining those documents?

23 **DR. MELIUS:** I think that's a question for  
24 NIOSH. We would have no knowledge -- this is  
25 the first time I've heard of this, so --

1           **MR. ELLIOTT:** John, this is Larry Elliott. Let  
2 me respond to that. I have been in  
3 communication with Paul Blake at Defense Threat  
4 Reduction Agency. You know, I sent the letter,  
5 as you mentioned, requesting the four items  
6 that you are interested in. He sent me an e-  
7 mail yesterday indicating that we would talk  
8 today about the status of those. He had no  
9 problem in providing the first three items, but  
10 the number four item was presenting some  
11 difficulty. He needed to -- as I understand  
12 it, he needed to cover some bases with their  
13 legal folks. And so I'll report -- I'll give  
14 you another update as soon as I have a  
15 conversation with Dr. Blake.  
16 We have put aside I believe a folder or are  
17 preparing a folder on the O drive with any of  
18 the related information from your request to  
19 them that we already have in our holdings here,  
20 so just to facilitate the access and make sure  
21 we don't duplicate reproduction of information.  
22           **DR. WADE:** If -- this is Lew. If I might just  
23 interject very quickly, I -- I was concerned by  
24 Dr. Melius's comment that he was not aware of  
25 this. I assume, John, that this is something

1 we would discuss with the working group. NIOSH  
2 is not notifying the working group.

3 **DR. MELIUS:** Excuse me, and just to clarify, I  
4 knew that there was the re-- a request for  
5 documents. I didn't -- had no knowledge of  
6 sort of the -- the status of how it was being  
7 forwarded and so forth, that's --

8 **DR. WADE:** Okay, being sensitive to  
9 communication --

10 **DR. MELIUS:** No, no, I appreciate that, so  
11 (unintelligible) necessarily expected me to  
12 know that, but --

13 **MR. ELLIOTT:** My apologies --

14 **DR. MELIUS:** -- (unintelligible) asked me to  
15 like answer the question.

16 **MR. ELLIOTT:** My apologies, but you know, I  
17 knew we were going to have a conversation about  
18 this today --

19 **DR. MELIUS:** No, I --

20 **MR. ELLIOTT:** -- rather than trying to belabor  
21 everybody with an e-mail yesterday, not knowing  
22 anything more than I already know --

23 **DR. WADE:** Okay.

24 **DR. MELIUS:** It's perfectly okay, Larry,  
25 believe me.

1           **DR. WADE:** Good. So what's the take-away  
2 message from this, Dr. Melius, in terms of the  
3 working group and likely getting together?

4           **DR. MELIUS:** Then I -- I think we just need to  
5 be able to work out a date, middle of November,  
6 and somewhat -- I think we need to sort of  
7 figure out where everybody else is in terms of  
8 scheduling 'cause there's a fair amount of  
9 overlap between some of the other -- with some  
10 of the other groups.

11          **DR. WADE:** So I'll bin this as a possibility  
12 during the week of the 13th, and we'll just see  
13 how it works out?

14          **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah.

15          **DR. WADE:** Okay. Now to one that I think will  
16 be simple, the workgroup to review SEC  
17 petitions that did not qualify, chaired by Dr.  
18 Lockey with members Roessler, Melius, Clawson  
19 and Munn. Dr. Lockey?

20          **DR. LOCKEY:** That's -- I think -- as far as I  
21 know, that's scheduled for November 9th in --  
22 at NIOSH in Cincinnati.

23          **DR. ROESSLER:** At NIOSH or at the airport?

24          **MR. ELLIOTT:** No, we'll be doing it here in the  
25 offices at NIOSH.

1           **MS. MUNN:** We have to have access to all those  
2 files.

3           **DR. LOCKEY:** Right. What time would that  
4 start?

5           **MR. ELLIOTT:** What time do you want it to  
6 start?

7           **DR. LOCKEY:** People have to fly in. Is it best  
8 to start around 10:00 o'clock?

9           **DR. WADE:** 10:00 o'clock on the morning of the  
10 9th of November at NIOSH's offices in  
11 Cincinnati the workgroup will convene.

12           **DR. LOCKEY:** Well, what I'm asking is -- is --  
13 if people cannot fly in that morning, we could  
14 start earlier, but --

15           **DR. MELIUS:** This is Jim Melius. I'd be flying  
16 in the night before.

17           **DR. LOCKEY:** Okay.

18           **MR. CLAWSON:** This is Clawson, I'd be flying in  
19 the night -- night before.

20           **DR. LOCKEY:** Okay.

21           **DR. WADE:** Wanda?

22           **MS. MUNN:** I will definitely be flying in the  
23 night before.

24           **DR. WADE:** Let's pick a gentlemanly and lady  
25 time to start in the morning.

1           **DR. LOCKEY:** Why don't we start at 9:00 then.

2           **MS. MUNN:** 9:00 will be fine with me.

3           **DR. WADE:** 9:00 a.m.

4           **DR. LOCKEY:** Okay.

5           **DR. WADE:** Okay, well, that's good. We've got  
6 a meeting scheduled for 9:00 o'clock on the  
7 9th. Who can't remember that?

8           **MS. MUNN:** Me.

9           **DR. WADE:** The workgroup on Hanford site  
10 profile Dr. Melius chairs, Clawson, Ziemer,  
11 Poston.

12           **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, where we stand with that,  
13 I've been pursuing -- this is one of these site  
14 profiles that's a little complicated by the  
15 fact that there are several updates underway of  
16 -- of different parts of it and so forth. So  
17 what I'm thinking -- we have a review from --  
18 we have a review and essentially a response  
19 from -- from NIOSH, and I'm thinking the best  
20 way to move forward is going to be a conference  
21 call initially, just given some of the  
22 scheduling issues, to try to get everybody  
23 updated and then figure out a work schedule,  
24 what -- what would make sense to focus on now,  
25 what -- what issues have been -- are

1           essentially being dealt with with the site  
2           profile updates and what the schedules are for  
3           that.

4           **DR. WADE:** Okay. Do you want to try and set  
5           that now, Dr. Melius?

6           **DR. MELIUS:** I think it's easier to do that --  
7           a conference call's easier to set up, I think.

8           **DR. WADE:** Okay, so you'll initiate an action  
9           with your Board members and NIOSH and SC&A to  
10          set up a conference call to sort of set the  
11          path forward for the Hanford site profile  
12          workgroup.

13          **DR. MELIUS:** And John Poston isn't on the call,  
14          so we can't -- I don't think we should try to  
15          do something today, given his schedule.

16          **DR. WADE:** Okay, that's good. We'll -- we'll  
17          await --

18          **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah.

19          **DR. WADE:** -- hearing from you. And then last  
20          but certainly not least, the workgroup on  
21          conflict of interest policy for the Board,  
22          chaired by Lockey with Melius, Ziemer and  
23          Presley.

24          **DR. LOCKEY:** I haven't -- I was thinking that  
25          perhaps that could be done later on in the

1 year. I don't -- I'd ask the other members of  
2 the subcommittee whether this is something that  
3 has to be done right away or, with everything  
4 else going on, we can delay this a little bit.

5 **DR. MELIUS:** This is Jim Melius. I don't see a  
6 need to -- to rush on this one and --

7 **DR. WADE:** Possibly when the Board is together  
8 in December this workgroup could have coffee or  
9 something and -- and chart a path forward.

10 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I agree  
11 with that.

12 **DR. LOCKEY:** Excellent.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Sounds good.

14 **DR. LOCKEY:** Okay.

15 **DR. WADE:** Okay, that brings us back to, you  
16 know, the big week, which is 11/13, that week.  
17 Right now I have four candidates for that week:  
18 The subcommittee, Savannah River Site, the 250-  
19 day SEC issue and Nevada Test Site. At least  
20 that's my notes of all the meetings that are  
21 possibly in play that week. We do have two  
22 meetings scheduled the week before. But do we  
23 want to try and figure out a way to get all of  
24 that done during the week of 11/13?

25 **MS. HOWELL:** I'm sorry, Lew, what meetings do

1                   you have scheduled the week before?

2           **DR. WADE:** I have Dr. Poston's meeting on the  
3           petitions that didn't qualify.

4           **DR. ZIEMER:** No, (unintelligible).

5           **DR. WADE:** Then I have the Sava-- excuse me,  
6           the Rocky Flats meeting scheduled for the 6th.

7           **MS. HOWELL:** Oh, I'm sorry, are we talking  
8           about November 11 to 13th? I thought you were  
9           talking about the Chicago meeting.

10          **DR. WADE:** No, I'm sorry. I'm talking about  
11          the week of November 13th.

12          **MS. HOWELL:** Okay, thank you.

13          **DR. WADE:** As a candidate for four meetings.

14          **MS. HOWELL:** Okay.

15          **DR. WADE:** And you know, I don't know if -- if  
16          someone wants to speak first, I guess you would  
17          give deference to the subcommittee. Mark, do  
18          you want to try and pick a day, and then we'll  
19          try and organize around that?

20          **MR. GRIFFON:** Well, yeah, Wanda offered  
21          November 16th earlier. I think that's fine  
22          with me.

23          **DR. WADE:** Okay, so at least in terms of a  
24          proposal, the subcommittee on the 16th. Then I  
25          would ask subcommittee members who have other

1           responsibilities potentially during that week  
2           to speak and maybe we can sort of make the --  
3           those other meetings butt up against the  
4           subcommittee meeting.

5           **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. The NTS  
6           working group, Wanda would be there on the 17th  
7           -- or on the 16th. If we could get SC&A and  
8           NIOSH to agree to either the 15th or the 17th,  
9           that would be all right with me -- preferably  
10          the 15th.

11          **MS. MUNN:** I'd prefer the 15th.

12          **DR. WADE:** Do I hear from NIOSH or SC&A?  
13          There's a proposal for the Nevada Test Site  
14          site profile group to meet the 15th of  
15          November.

16          **DR. NETON:** We can -- we can certainly try to  
17          meet that. Again, it's going to depend on the  
18          analyses that Gene Rollins is working on, but  
19          we'll -- if we can't -- we could tentatively  
20          schedule that. If it's not going to happen,  
21          we'll get back to you.

22          **DR. WADE:** Okay.

23          **MR. PRESLEY:** I think that would be good to go  
24          ahead and schedule it, give them something to  
25          work to.

1           **DR. NETON:** Yeah.

2           **MR. PRESLEY:** If we make it, we make it. If  
3 not, then I understand.

4           **DR. WADE:** Okay. Now I have left for potential  
5 scheduling the Savannah River Site and the 250-  
6 day SEC issue.

7           **DR. MELIUS:** This is Jim Melius. What about  
8 the 15th for -- thinking certainly of Wanda --  
9 not Wanda, excuse me, Gen Roessler, who's on  
10 the Nevada Test Site profile one and it  
11 overlaps -- and since this also deals with  
12 Nevada Test Site and there may -- there's some  
13 sort of cross-interest -- whether the 15th  
14 would work for the SEC issue.

15           **DR. ROESSLER:** But we have the Nevada Test Site  
16 on the 15th.

17           **DR. MELIUS:** The 15th?

18           **DR. ROESSLER:** How about the 17th?

19           **DR. WADE:** Say it again, Gen?

20           **DR. ROESSLER:** How about the 17th -- or the  
21 16th, if there's no --

22           **MR. GRIFFON:** I mean do you --

23           **DR. ROESSLER:** -- conflict in --

24           **MR. GRIFFON:** Do you expect all these to be  
25 all-day meetings?

1           **MS. MUNN:** You never can tell.

2           **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I know, it's difficult.

3           **DR. ROESSLER:** Well, with Wanda -- let's see,  
4           Wanda, you have a conflict on the 16th.

5           **MS. MUNN:** On when?

6           **DR. ROESSLER:** Let's see, we're talking about  
7           the 250-day?

8           **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah, that's Mark --

9           **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, I'm not on that one --

10          **DR. ROESSLER:** You're not on that one.

11          **MS. MUNN:** -- so there's --

12          **DR. MELIUS:** We can do the 16th.

13          **DR. ROESSLER:** The 16th sounds good.

14          **DR. WADE:** Okay.

15          **MR. GRIFFON:** The 16th is the day of the  
16          subcommittee.

17          **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, and you have Mark --

18          **DR. ROESSLER:** Oh, yeah.

19          **MS. MUNN:** -- (unintelligible) day on that one.  
20          You'd probably do better with the 17th.

21          **DR. WADE:** Or the 14th.

22          **MS. MUNN:** Or the 14th.

23          **DR. ROESSLER:** 14th, how's that?

24          **DR. MELIUS:** I can't do the 14th.

25          **DR. WADE:** 17th?

1           **DR. MELIUS:** I can do the morning of the 17th.

2           **DR. ZIEMER:** I can do morning of the 17th.

3           **DR. ROESSLER:** I can do the 17th.

4           **MR. GRIFFON:** I can.

5           **DR. WADE:** Okay, so the morning of the 17th for  
6           250-day, and that leaves -- with a hopeful  
7           voice -- the Savannah River Site site profile  
8           group. Do we want to try and --

9           **MR. GIBSON:** Yeah, this is Mike. If -- is Joe  
10          -- are you still on --

11          **MR. FITZGERALD:** Yeah, I'm on the phone.

12          **MR. GIBSON:** Do you think that you guys may be  
13          able -- you and NIOSH may be in a position one  
14          day that week to -- to have a meeting?

15          **MR. FITZGERALD:** You know, certainly talking to  
16          Sam about this, too, and I think you  
17          characterized it very well that we have  
18          identified the issues and the information that  
19          we need to -- you know, more or less to close  
20          specific issues out. At this point, issues  
21          like the databank access and some of the other  
22          items are ones where I guess we'll know better  
23          once we find out whether that information can  
24          be had and reviewed. If we don't get the  
25          information and we don't have a chance to have

1           that review, then I'm not sure, you know, that  
2           time'll be profitable. So I -- to some extent  
3           I guess we're going to need to see how that  
4           goes.

5           **DR. ZIEMER:** You want to schedule that and then  
6           -- block it off and then -- it's easier to  
7           cancel later if you need to.

8           **DR. WADE:** We could put a hold on the 14th.

9           **MS. MUNN:** That'd be helpful for Brad 'cause  
10          he's on the Nevada Test Site workgroup on the  
11          15th.

12          **MR. CLAWSON:** This is Brad, and that's one of  
13          the things I'm questioning of -- where I'm  
14          sitting at right now, I've -- I've got like a  
15          day in between some of those. If it would be  
16          all right with Lew or whatever, that would also  
17          give me the opportunity to be able to go in and  
18          look into this O drive and stuff like that that  
19          I haven't had ability to be able to do, and  
20          then do the following meeting the next day  
21          instead of just trying to hold me over and kind  
22          of be there.

23          **DR. WADE:** That'd be fine, Brad, we would -- we  
24          would consider that as time well spent.

25          **DR. LOCKEY:** This is Jim Lockey. I'm all right

1 the 14th in the afternoon, but in the morning  
2 up to 11:00 o'clock, I'm not.

3 **DR. WADE:** What if we were to tentatively,  
4 Mike, talk about the afternoon of the 14th?

5 **MR. GIBSON:** Okay.

6 **DR. WADE:** And then you could make the call a  
7 week or two from now as to whether that's a  
8 reality.

9 **MR. GIBSON:** Okay, I can do that.

10 **DR. WADE:** Good.

11 **DR. LOCKEY:** Okay.

12 **MR. GIBSON:** And who should I -- who can I  
13 contact about the status of this databank that  
14 we're trying to get access to?

15 **DR. WADE:** Jim Neton or someone, can you help?

16 **DR. NETON:** Sam Glover would be your best point  
17 of contact. He's our official person as --

18 **DR. WADE:** Can you say the name again, Jim?

19 **DR. NETON:** Sam Glover.

20 **DR. WADE:** Okay. Could you have Sam contact  
21 Mike?

22 **DR. NETON:** Sure, I'll do that.

23 **DR. WADE:** Okay. So for the week of --

24 **MR. GIBSON:** Excuse me, Lew?

25 **DR. WADE:** Yes, ma'am -- sir.

1           **MR. GIBSON:** Once I get this information from  
2           Sam, is it appropriate for me as a Board member  
3           to whoever has this data to make a request or  
4           should I go through Dr. Ziemer or what's the  
5           protocol for that?

6           **DR. WADE:** You know, Dr. Ziemer, do you have a  
7           preference?

8           **DR. ZIEMER:** I -- I think the working group can  
9           request the information that they need as part  
10          of their deliberations on behalf of the Board.  
11          But actually is it -- is this something that --  
12          that -- who identified the database to start  
13          with?

14          **MR. FITZGERALD:** Well, Dr. Ziemer --

15          **DR. ZIEMER:** Is this something NIOSH is trying  
16          to get anyway?

17          **MR. FITZGERALD:** No, this is -- this is  
18          something that in the site profile review SC&A  
19          identified as a source of information that  
20          would, you know, add to that which the site  
21          profile references, and we indicated that was  
22          information that would also shed light on these  
23          episodic releases at Savannah River. I think  
24          in our discussions it was agreed that there'd  
25          be an attempt to gain access to it with the --

1           you know, certainly the -- one issue being the  
2           fact that apparently DOE does not maintain that  
3           database anymore and now I guess it's being  
4           held by a contractor -- former contractor and I  
5           think Sam was going to determine whether or not  
6           this access could be arranged. And you know,  
7           certainly it was a issue of the government  
8           having paid for it in the first place, so there  
9           should be no, you know, encumbered access to  
10          it.

11         **DR. ZIEMER:** I guess --

12         **MR. FITZGERALD:** I think that --

13         **THE COURT REPORTER:** Excuse me --

14         **DR. ZIEMER:** -- (unintelligible) we actually  
15         may need to know or maybe -- maybe counsel can  
16         help us on this, who -- who should the request  
17         come from. It sounds like it either has to  
18         come officially from NIOSH or from the Board,  
19         and I can certainly make the request. Mike,  
20         I'd want you to draft the letter and I would  
21         sign it, but -- or can we do it by phone call?

22         **MR. ELLIOTT:** The request needs to come from  
23         NIOSH, Dr. Ziemer, and we're pursuing it, so --

24         **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, that's --

25         **MR. ELLIOTT:** -- (unintelligible) know exactly

1           where --

2           **DR. ZIEMER:** -- what I thought because it'd be  
3           like the DOE records.

4           **MR. ELLIOTT:** Yeah, we have to press this under  
5           the Memorandum of Understanding --

6           **DR. ZIEMER:** Right, right, that's --

7           **MR. ELLIOTT:** -- that we have with DOE --

8           **DR. ZIEMER:** -- that makes sense to me.

9           **THE COURT REPORTER:** Dr. Ziemer, this is Ray.  
10          I'm not sure who the speaker was right before  
11          you. Was that Joe Fitzgerald?

12          **MR. FITZGERALD:** That was me. I'm sorry, Ray.  
13          Joe Fitzgerald.

14          **THE COURT REPORTER:** Okay. Thanks.

15          **MR. ELLIOTT:** I'm sorry. We'll push on this  
16          and see where it's at.

17          **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay.

18          **MR. GIBSON:** And Larry, this is Mike. In a --  
19          you know, if you find any resistance -- I don't  
20          know, personally I think a letter from the  
21          Board to maybe some of the members of Congress  
22          would just -- you know --

23          **MR. ELLIOTT:** Well, I don't know that we're  
24          meeting any resistance. We certainly have the  
25          Memorandum of Understanding that's served us

1 well up to this point, and so you know, I just  
2 don't know exactly the status. This is the  
3 first I've heard of this, so I'll -- I'll find  
4 out where things stand.

5 **MR. GIBSON:** Okay.

6 **DR. WADE:** Thank you. Okay, so -- this is Lew.  
7 If I could just do a quick summary of what I  
8 think we've decided upon, the subcommittee is  
9 intending to meet face-to-face in Cincinnati on  
10 the 16th of November; the workgroup on the  
11 Nevada Test Site site profile scheduling to  
12 meet face-to-face in Cincinnati on the 15th of  
13 November; the workgroup on the Savannah River  
14 Site site profile tentatively scheduled to meet  
15 face-to-face in Cincinnati on the 14th at 1:00  
16 p.m. -- 14th of November; the workgroup on the  
17 Rocky Flats site profile and SEC petition  
18 scheduled to meet face-to-face in Cincinnati on  
19 the 6th of November at 10:00 a.m.; the  
20 workgroup on Chapman Valve SEC is tentatively  
21 scheduling a call for the end of October,  
22 beginning of November, e-mail to be sent out by  
23 Dr. Poston, the workgroup chair; the workgroup  
24 on SEC issues, including the 250-day issue,  
25 scheduled to meet face-to-face in Cincinnati on

1 the 17th of November.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Do we have a time on that one yet?

3 **DR. WADE:** We do not.

4 **DR. ROESSLER:** I was wondering on that one,  
5 since that's a Friday and since I'm hoping that  
6 that would be at the airport and we could start  
7 early.

8 **DR. WADE:** Okay.

9 **DR. MELIUS:** Is it -- Jim, yeah, I think -- Jim  
10 Melius. Starting early's fine with me 'cause I  
11 need to get out of there in the afternoon.

12 **DR. WADE:** You want to say 8:00 a.m., or 7:30?

13 **DR. ROESSLER:** Sure.

14 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah.

15 **DR. WADE:** Jim, your call.

16 **DR. MELIUS:** 8:00 -- 8:00 a.m.

17 **DR. WADE:** 8:00 a.m.?

18 **DR. MELIUS:** Yeah.

19 **DR. ROESSLER:** Thank you, Jim.

20 **DR. WADE:** Okay. The workgroup on the review  
21 of SEC petitions that did not qualify, a face-  
22 to-face meeting at NIOSH facilities in  
23 Cincinnati on the 9th of November starting at  
24 9:00 a.m. The workgroup on Hanford site  
25 profile, a conference call to be scheduled to

1 put together a path forward. Dr. Melius will  
2 send out details. And the workgroup on  
3 conflict of interest policy for the Board, at a  
4 time to be scheduled.

5 So I think that's important that we've gone  
6 through that. Again, I can't thank you all  
7 enough for your work.

8 **MR. PRESLEY:** Hey, Lew, this is Bob Presley.

9 **DR. WADE:** Sir?

10 **MR. PRESLEY:** We did not set a time for the NTS  
11 in Cincinnati on the 15th.

12 **DR. WADE:** And you're about to do that.

13 **MR. PRESLEY:** I would like to do that at 10:00  
14 o'clock in the morning, if that's all right  
15 with everybody.

16 **DR. ROESSLER:** And would that also be at the  
17 airport?

18 **MR. PRESLEY:** I would hope so.

19 **DR. WADE:** Yes, it will be.

20 **DR. ROESSLER:** All right.

21 **DR. WADE:** And then Mark, the subcommittee, do  
22 you want to put a time on the 16th?

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, 10:00 a.m.

24 **MR. PRESLEY:** What subcommittee is that, Mark?

25 **DR. WADE:** That is the only subcommittee, the

1 Subcommittee on Dose Reconstruction.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Dose Reconstruction.

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right.

4 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Dr. Wade, this is Ray. I  
5 got everything on those dates except the  
6 Hanford -- what was the date on that, or is  
7 that to be announced?

8 **DR. WADE:** The Hanford -- the workgroup on the  
9 Hanford site profile, a conference call to be  
10 announced and shared by Dr. Melius.

11 **THE COURT REPORTER:** Okay. Thank you.

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** And we didn't -- we're still  
13 holding off on the Chapman Valve -- right? --  
14 end of October, early November is what --

15 **DR. WADE:** Right, a call end of October, early  
16 November, Dr. Poston will notify.

17 **MR. GRIFFON:** All right.

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. I think that completes this  
19 topic.

**DISCUSSION OF SITE PROFILE REVIEW TASK**

20 **FOR SC&A IN FY07**

21 Let's go on to the next one, which is --  
22 there's several parts to it. The first part is  
23 discussion of site profile review tasks for  
24 SC&A in February -- in Fiscal Year '07. You  
25 may recall at our last Board meeting we -- we

1 set up a priority list of candidate site  
2 profiles for the contractor to review. Those -  
3 - actually Lew -- or LaShawn sent us out a copy  
4 of that -- I guess, Lew, you did -- a week or  
5 so ago with the list on it as a reminder. The  
6 -- the two profiles that we gave SC&A a go-  
7 ahead on were LLNL and K-25, that's Lawrence  
8 Livermore and Oak Ridge K-25. The others, in  
9 order of priority, the next three were Pantex,  
10 Portsmouth and Argonne West. My understanding  
11 is that the contractor has the resources now to  
12 proceed on a third -- third one. We authorized  
13 the first two and we want to determine whether  
14 the Board wishes them to proceed with Pantex or  
15 whether or not the priorities have changed.

16 And Lew, do you have any additional --

17 **DR. WADE:** No, I would --

18 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- comments or (unintelligible) --

19 **DR. WADE:** -- like to just clarify --

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- (unintelligible) work --

21 **DR. WADE:** -- one thing because this is not my  
22 field. The first one on the list is what, John  
23 Mauro?

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** I have Lawrence Livermore --

25 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah.

1           **DR. ZIEMER:** -- is on my list.

2           **DR. WADE:** John, what's on your list?

3           **DR. MAURO:** Oh, I'm -- the -- the hierarchy,  
4           based on the -- the scoring or the voting  
5           weight that was given --

6           **DR. WADE:** Uh-huh.

7           **DR. MAURO:** -- at the -- number one was -- on  
8           the scoring was Lawrence Livermore. Number two  
9           --

10          **DR. WADE:** Okay, that's fine, I just wanted to  
11          make sure I didn't confuse Lawrence Livermore  
12          and Los Alamos, so --

13          **DR. ZIEMER:** Lawrence Livermore and then K-25.

14          **DR. WADE:** Okay, so we gave John the go-ahead  
15          on two.

16          **DR. MAURO:** Right.

17          **DR. WADE:** When I talked to John recently,  
18          along with David Staudt, John tells us that  
19          he's in a position to begin work on the third.  
20          We don't want to delay the contractor and their  
21          work, so I thought we might take this  
22          opportunity to give John the go-ahead on a  
23          third. The third on our voting was Pantex.

24          **DR. ZIEMER:** And so, Board members, the  
25          question is do you wish to have -- authorize

1 the contractor to proceed with Pantex, or has  
2 our priorities changed?

3 **MS. MUNN:** This is Wanda. I still feel that  
4 Pantex is different enough from the other sites  
5 that we've looked at so far that it's logical  
6 to keep it in its current position. I'd like  
7 to see them move forward on that.

8 **MR. CLAWSON:** This is Brad. I see no problem  
9 with proceeding with Pantex. I think it --  
10 it's valuable that we get into that one fairly  
11 soon.

12 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I agree.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Are there any Board members who  
14 feel we should change?

15 (No responses)

16 If not, can I take it without objection that  
17 we'll authorize the contractor to proceed with  
18 the review of the Pantex site profile?

19 (No responses)

20 There appears to be no objection.

21 **DR. WADE:** Thank you.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** So authorized.

23 **DR. WADE:** Thank you.

24 **NEED FOR NEW WORKING GROUPS**

25 **(I.E. PROCEDURES REVIEW)**

**DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Need for new working

1 groups. You know that we -- we did authorize  
2 the contractor to proceed with reviewing some  
3 new procedures. As they progress in that and  
4 the findings are developed, we will need a  
5 working group to review that -- those, so --  
6 and John Mauro, can you tell us where we are on  
7 that task?

8 **DR. MAURO:** Yeah, on the new set of procedures  
9 -- if you recall, where we stand is you folks  
10 have identified 15 --

11 **DR. ZIEMER:** Uh-huh.

12 **DR. MAURO:** -- for us to begin with. We have -  
13 - our contract calls for 30, so you -- we -- we  
14 have started work on allocation of the first  
15 15. In fact the most important one, dealing  
16 with construction -- OTIB-52 -- work has begun.  
17 Arjun is -- is leading that up. However the  
18 others, work has not proceeded very far and --  
19 and we are again -- we are expecting at some  
20 point in the process it wouldn't be a bad idea  
21 if we have some direction by -- by December for  
22 the other 15 so we could have the full cadre of  
23 30 identified.

24 By the way, as an aside, if you recall, you  
25 also identified that there were seven that --

1 procedures that have already been effectively  
2 reviewed as part of the site profile process,  
3 so in effect our plan is to deliver a report  
4 that covers a total of 37 procedures in the  
5 deliverable that will come out of this proc--  
6 product -- project. We -- we have certainly  
7 adequate work right now to move forward with  
8 the 15. There's no urgency right now for the -  
9 - the Board to identify the next set of 15.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

11 **DR. WADE:** Is there -- is there a -- would it -  
12 - would it suit you, John, to have a workgroup  
13 identified today, or might that wait until  
14 December?

15 **DR. MAURO:** I think it would be good today.  
16 I'll tell you why. We are moving forward right  
17 now with one of the most important OTIBs, 52,  
18 dealing with construction. And that's going to  
19 turn out to be a little bit more of an involved  
20 review than let's say the others where  
21 collaboration and keeping the working group  
22 apprised of developments -- for example, we're  
23 hoping to bring aboard some specialists in  
24 construction working through Knut, who had  
25 expressed a great deal of interest in that and

1           -- and it wouldn't be a bad idea to move  
2 forward with those activities in collaboration  
3 with a working group. So I guess -- if I had  
4 my 'druthers, it would be very desirable to  
5 have a working group there as we start to move  
6 into the -- specifically this one particular  
7 procedure.

8           **DR. WADE:** Okay, fine. And just for the  
9 record, the reason we sort of face this -- this  
10 mini-vacuum is that in the past the  
11 subcommittee, as it was previously constituted,  
12 dealt with procedures, and as it is being  
13 reconstituted deals only with dose  
14 reconstruction.

15           **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

16           **DR. WADE:** So Paul, it's your pleasure.

17           **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah. Well, it sounds like it'd  
18 be useful to go ahead and have the committee  
19 work -- or the workgroup in place so that when  
20 needed they'd be -- be ready to go into  
21 operation. I think I'd like to first give  
22 folks the opportunity, if they're interested in  
23 this particular workgroup, to -- to volunteer.  
24 So who would like to be part of this workgroup  
25 on procedures review, recognizing that there's

1 no immediate work on it. Work would probably  
2 begin after our next meeting and into next year  
3 sometime.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Paul, I'm -- I'm interested. I'd  
5 rather not chair. I've got a lot of --

6 **DR. ZIEMER:** Mark Griffon.

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- prongs in the fire.

8 **DR. ZIEMER:** Sure.

9 **MS. MUNN:** This is Wanda --

10 **MR. GIBSON:** This is Mike, I volunteer for that  
11 -- that, but I'd rather not chair it, either --

12 **DR. ZIEMER:** Gibson, who else?

13 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah. This is Wanda, I'm not wild  
14 about chairing it, either.

15 **DR. WADE:** But you didn't say you wouldn't.

16 **MS. MUNN:** No, I didn't say I wouldn't.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** Who else indicated an interest?  
18 All right, Griffon, Gibson and Munn.

19 (No responses)

20 Okay. Well, I guess the Chair is going to put  
21 himself on that then, that'll give us four.

22 **DR. WADE:** Okay.

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** I mean there's one other thing is  
24 -- that what John just said -- I mean there may  
25 be a good reason for breaking off that one

1 procedure on construction workers to just have  
2 a separate construction worker workgroup, you  
3 know, looking at --

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, and in fact --

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** You know, if there's  
6 (unintelligible) --

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- this -- this workgroup --

8 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- (unintelligible) almost like a  
9 site profile.

10 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- this workgroup may end up  
11 concentrating that -- on that as their initial  
12 task 'cause that's probably going to be one of  
13 the things. If we need a separate workgroup,  
14 we will, but --

15 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay.

16 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- at least this one is there to -  
17 -

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- start that. Anyone else  
20 interested in this?

21 **MR. PRESLEY:** This is Bob Presley. I would be  
22 interested in working on that, but not chairing  
23 it, also.

24 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Let me -- I'm going to put  
25 you down as an alternate, Robert, so we have

1 four --

2 **MR. PRESLEY:** That'd be fine.

3 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- plus an alternate, and I will  
4 serve as chairman pro tem.

5 **MS. MUNN:** Good.

6 **DR. WADE:** Do you feel you have the experience,  
7 Paul, to do that?

8 **MS. MUNN:** He probably (unintelligible) --

9 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, I'll work on it. Okay, that  
10 gives us at least a group to go forward.

11 **DR. WADE:** Okay, thank you very much. I do  
12 appreciate that.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** And it may be -- Poston isn't on  
14 the line, and it may be that Poston will agree  
15 to -- to participate in that. I'll move out if  
16 he's -- would be interested.

17 **DR. WADE:** And remember that in -- in the  
18 letter we received from -- our friends, this  
19 issue of the Board addressing the construction  
20 workers was raised, so I think this action  
21 would be found consistent with that.

22 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, right. Okay, that takes  
23 care of that workgroup.

24 **DR. MELIUS:** This is Jim Melius. I need to  
25 sign off and go to another meeting, so --

1           **DR. WADE:** Thank you, Jim.

2           **DR. MELIUS:** -- thank everybody.

**DISCUSSION OF WORKING GROUP & SUBCOMMITTEE**

3           **MEETING DURING THE DECEMBER FACE-TO-FACE MEETING**

4           **DR. ZIEMER:** I think we're basically done.  
5           We're -- we're really -- need to determine  
6           which of these groups are going to meet before  
7           our meeting in December, also. That is on the  
8           morning of our December meeting.

9           **DR. WADE:** I mean historically we always  
10          reserve the morning of the first day for the  
11          subcommittee. We could continue to do that.  
12          It could be a time for other workgroups, but  
13          there's such an overlap between workgroups and  
14          subcommittee it's hard to imagine that more  
15          than a couple could meet. I just didn't know -  
16          -

17          **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah, what -- what I think I'm  
18          going to suggest, Lew, in that regard is that  
19          the various workgroups that are going to be  
20          meeting in the next month or so, if any of them  
21          need follow-up meetings in -- at the front end  
22          of our meeting in -- in December, perhaps they  
23          could let you know and we can try to schedule  
24          them. It may be that they'd have -- some of  
25          them would have to be sequential rather than

1 simultaneous because of overlap of membership.

2 **DR. WADE:** Fine. Mark, do you want me to hold  
3 the morning of the first day for subcommittee  
4 meeting possibly?

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** Possibly, yeah. Yeah, but I can  
6 also see it, if desired, to meet with the Rocky  
7 Flats --

8 **DR. WADE:** Okay.

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** -- it might be...

10 **DR. WADE:** So the subcommittee will have no --  
11 no preference to that morning at this point.  
12 Right now I'll say we'll start the Board  
13 meeting 1:00 o'clock on the first day --

14 **DR. ZIEMER:** And we may --

15 **DR. WADE:** -- and we'll use the morning as  
16 appropriate.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- at least one workgroup planned  
18 to meet, though.

19 **DR. WADE:** Okay.

20 **DR. ZIEMER:** Whichever is most urgent,  
21 probably.

22 **DR. WADE:** Okay.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay. Are there any other items  
24 of business that need to come before us today?

25 **MR. GIBSON:** Paul, this is Mike. I've got a

1 question.

2 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

3 **MR. GIBSON:** If memory serves me right,  
4 Battelle's contract has -- period has ended.  
5 Do they have a deliverable for NIOSH and is  
6 that available to the Board?

7 **DR. ZIEMER:** Battelle's -- the dose  
8 reconstructions that they were doing?

9 **MR. GIBSON:** Yes.

10 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Mike, this is Larry Elliott. Let  
11 me answer your question if I can. Battelle has  
12 been awarded a contract mod for a no-cost  
13 extension. I believe it goes through May of  
14 2007, and that will consume the remainder of  
15 funds that they have not expended to this date,  
16 as well as we have specified exactly what we  
17 want them to accomplish with the remaining  
18 funds and the time frame that has been extended  
19 to them. So we're making those contract  
20 modifications happen at -- now, at this time.

21 **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay?

22 **MR. PRESLEY:** Hey, Paul, this is Bob Presley.

23 **DR. ZIEMER:** Yeah.

24 **MR. PRESLEY:** Back about four or five years ago  
25 the Board asked NIOSH if there was any way that

1           periodically, quarterly, whatever, we could get  
2           a summary of what we had been paid out in the  
3           way of wages and also what we have been paid  
4           out in the way of reimbursement. I would like  
5           to know if that can be talked about at the next  
6           Board. I think that that's something that  
7           needs to come up and we need to readdress,  
8           because --

9           **DR. ZIEMER:** You're asking for individual mem--  
10          information that individual members could have  
11          on what they've been paid?

12          **MR. PRESLEY:** That's correct. I want a paper  
13          trail.

14          **DR. ZIEMER:** Now I get, every two weeks, from  
15          this federal pay thing --

16          **MS. MUNN:** Mil pay thing.

17          **DR. ZIEMER:** What is it called?

18          **MS. MUNN:** I think it's mil pay, if I remember  
19          correctly.

20          **DR. ZIEMER:** Which gives the earnings for that  
21          period and the earnings to date for the year.  
22          Are you not getting something like that?

23          **MR. PRESLEY:** I've not been able to get on that  
24          web site. The other thing is, we don't know --  
25          all you do is you just get a -- an amount that

1 shows up in your checking account ever so often  
2 after a -- after a -- a meeting or something.  
3 I would like to see some type of a -- of a --  
4 of an expense report or something like this for  
5 what we've been paid for and what we've turned  
6 in.

7 **DR. WADE:** I will see that it's on the agenda  
8 to discuss, Robert.

9 **MR. PRESLEY:** Lew, I appreciate that very much.

10 **DR. LOCKEY:** Lew, I agree with that because for  
11 tax purposes, it's going to be a problem at the  
12 end of the year figuring out expenses versus  
13 everything else.

14 **DR. WADE:** I will just have somebody come -- I  
15 know there are lots of issues that each of you  
16 have and I -- I'll have somebody come and face  
17 you and -- and hear the concerns and tell you  
18 the way it should be and you can tell them the  
19 way it is.

20 **MR. PRESLEY:** Okay, Lew, I would appreciate  
21 that very much.

22 **MS. MUNN:** As long as --

23 **DR. WADE:** It would be my pleasure.

24 **MS. MUNN:** As long as we're discussing pay  
25 issues, there has -- has there been any success

1 at all in getting the State of Georgia to agree  
2 to stop withholding state withholding tax for  
3 those of us who don't live or even travel  
4 through Georgia?

5 **DR. WADE:** It is being worked on. I cannot  
6 report success at this point, but I can report  
7 diligent effort. And hopefully by December  
8 I'll have something to -- more positively to  
9 tell you.

10 **MS. MUNN:** If there's something that we should  
11 be doing as individuals, I'd certainly like to  
12 know what that is.

13 **MR. CLAWSON:** Hey, Wanda, this is Brad. If you  
14 get onto that -- that site, you can actually  
15 change your --

16 **MS. MUNN:** I have done that three times.

17 **MR. CLAWSON:** Have you? Me, too, so --

18 **MS. MUNN:** With no success.

19 **DR. LOCKEY:** What is -- what is that site?

20 **MS. MUNN:** It is [mypay.dsas.mil/mypay](http://mypay.dsas.mil/mypay) -- that's  
21 m-y-p-a-y.asex.

22 **DR. LOCKEY:** asex?

23 **MS. MUNN:** Uh-huh.

24 (Multiple members spoke simultaneously.)

25 **DR. WADE:** (Unintelligible) to everyone as

1 well, would you mind?

2 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, I could --

3 **MR. PRESLEY:** Hey, Wanda --

4 **MS. MUNN:** Yes.

5 **MR. PRESLEY:** -- you might want to check in.

6 They have even been turning in my per diem and  
7 my travel and everything as income.

8 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, well, I know -- I know the  
9 State of Georgia has a couple of thousand  
10 dollars of my monies that they've been  
11 withholding and I'd -- I'd like it to go to the  
12 feds, if it's going to be withheld.

13 **DR. ZIEMER:** Well, we -- we need someone there  
14 at the meeting that can try to address these  
15 issues probably.

16 **DR. WADE:** Right, I'll try and get someone.

17 **DR. ZIEMER:** And maybe someone who can explain  
18 why our Board's per diem -- or our Board's  
19 consulting rate is different than the DTRA  
20 Board, or at least I'm told it is. Do you know  
21 --

22 **DR. ROESSLER:** I've heard that, too.

23 **MR. PRESLEY:** It is.

24 **MS. MUNN:** Oh, it's not just the DTRA board.  
25 We're the cheapest date in town, guys.

1           **DR. ZIEMER:** Well --

2           **MS. MUNN:** That's through the waste board and  
3 several other boards.

4           **MR. PRESLEY:** I think it's high time that we  
5 have somebody come talk to us about these  
6 things.

7           **DR. WADE:** We'll try and get someone.

8           **DR. LOCKEY:** I agree.

9           **DR. ZIEMER:** Okay, any -- anything else for the  
10 good of the order?

11          **MR. CLAWSON:** This is Brad. I just wanted to  
12 make sure -- so we're planning for December to  
13 meet as a full Board in Chicago?

14          **DR. ZIEMER:** Correct.

15          **MR. CLAWSON:** Okay. I just -- I just got the -  
16 - the one from Lew there and I wanted to make  
17 sure that we're -- the dates were correct and  
18 that's where we were going to go.

19          **DR. WADE:** That's correct.

20          **MR. PRESLEY:** Do we know yet what hotel we're  
21 going to be in, or what part of town?

22          **DR. WADE:** I do not. I will let you know as  
23 soon as I find out.

24          **DR. ZIEMER:** If you're able to get something  
25 near O'Hare, it might be good. I don't know if

1 members will really want to be downtown, but --

2 **DR. WADE:** No, we won't go downtown, I'll try

3 to --

4 **DR. ZIEMER:** -- I certainly don't.

5 **MR. PRESLEY:** Wonderful.

6 **DR. WADE:** I'll try near O'Hare.

7 **MR. PRESLEY:** That's good.

8 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Lew, this is Larry Elliott. It -

9 - this is in res-- this meeting is being held  
10 in Illinois for the Blockson Chemical SEC  
11 petition --

12 **MS. MUNN:** Right.

13 **MR. ELLIOTT:** -- deliberation, and that's in  
14 Joliet, and I -- I assume you're all aware that  
15 Joliet's about 60 miles southwest of Chicago.

16 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah.

17 **MR. ELLIOTT:** So I just offer that for your  
18 consideration.

19 **DR. ZIEMER:** If you got to O'Hare, the drive to  
20 Joliet is faster than the drive downtown.

21 **MR. ELLIOTT:** It probably is. But just so you  
22 know, as typically and traditionally, we will  
23 notify claimants in the -- in the area. But to  
24 hold it in Chicago, we may see a --

25 **DR. ZIEMER:** But there are some good conference



1

**CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER****STATE OF GEORGIA****COUNTY OF FULTON**

I, Steven Ray Green, Certified Merit Court Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported the above and foregoing on the day of October 18, 2006; and it is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony captioned herein.

I further certify that I am neither kin nor counsel to any of the parties herein, nor have any interest in the cause named herein.

WITNESS my hand and official seal this the 4th day of November, 2006.

---

**STEVEN RAY GREEN, CCR****CERTIFIED MERIT COURT REPORTER****CERTIFICATE NUMBER: A-2102**