

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

WORKING GROUP MEETING

ADVISORY BOARD ON
RADIATION AND WORKER HEALTH

ROCKY FLATS

The verbatim transcript of the Working
Group Meeting of the Advisory Board on Radiation and
Worker Health held telephonically on November 26,
2007.

STEVEN RAY GREEN AND ASSOCIATES
NATIONALLY CERTIFIED COURT REPORTING
404/733-6070

C O N T E N T S
November 26, 2007

WELCOME AND OPENING COMMENTS DR. CHRISTINE BRANCHE, DFO	6
INTRODUCTION BY CHAIR MR. MARK GRIFFON, ABRWH	9
MEMBERS OF THE CLASS, NEUTRON ISSUES, '52 - '66	9
COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	38

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 MEMBERS

DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL

BRANCHE, Christine, Ph.D.
Principal Associate Director
National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Washington, DC

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

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

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

IDENTIFIED PARTICIPANTS

ALBERG, JEANETTE, SEN. ALLARD
BARKER, KAY, ANWAG
BARRIE, TERRIE, ANWAG
BOLLER, CAROLYN, CONG. UDALL
BROEHM, JASON, CDC WASHINGTON
ELLIOTT, LARRY, NIOSH
HOMOKI-TITUS, LIZ, HHS
HOWELL, EMILY, HHS
KOTSCH, JEFF, DOL
SHARFI, MUTTY, ORAU
ULSH, BRANT, NIOSH

P R O C E E D I N G S

(10:00 a.m.)

1

2

WELCOME AND OPENING COMMENTS

3

DR. BRANCHE: This is a meeting of the, a conference call of the working group of Rocky Flats' site profile and SEC petition. And I'd like, please, for the Board members to identify themselves who are on the call.

4

5

6

7

8

MR. GRIFFON: Mark Griffon, the Chair of the work group.

9

10

MR. GIBSON: Mike Gibson.

11

MS. MUNN: Wanda Munn.

12

DR. BRANCHE: Thank you very much. I'm going to go through a little housekeeping here for just a moment.

13

14

15

Are there any other members of the Board who are on the call?

16

17

(no response)

18

DR. BRANCHE: All right. Would NIOSH staff and ORAU staff please identify yourselves and also mention if you have a conflict when you identify yourself.

19

20

21

22

MR. ELLIOTT: This is Larry Elliott. I have no conflict.

23

1 **DR. ULSH:** Brant Ulsh, no conflict.

2 (30-second power failure)

3 **DR. BRANCHE:** Any other members of Congress
4 or their representatives on the call, please?

5 **COURT REPORTER:** Dr. Branche, this is Shane.
6 We had a power flicker here at the house. I
7 missed about the last 30 seconds. That's
8 where it went off, but I've got you back. Go
9 ahead, thank you.

10 **DR. BRANCHE:** There were three people who
11 identified themselves as petitioners. Did you
12 catch any of their names?

13 **COURT REPORTER:** No, I didn't. If you could
14 have them again, I'd appreciate it.

15 **DR. BRANCHE:** Please forgive us. There was
16 a power flicker. Could we please have the
17 petitioners or their representatives mention
18 their names again, please?

19 **MS. BARRIE:** This is Terrie Barrie, T-E-R-R-
20 I-E, B, as in boy, A-R-R-I-E of ANWAG.

21 **DR. BRANCHE:** Thank you.

22 **MS. BARKER:** This is Kay Barker, B-A-R-K-E-R
23 of ANWAG.

24 **DR. BRANCHE:** Thank you very much. I
25 appreciate that.

1 Are there any other people on the call
2 who would like to identify themselves?

3 **MS. HOMOKI-TITUS:** This is Liz Homoki-Titus
4 with HHS.

5 **DR. BRANCHE:** Thank you, Liz.

6 **DR. WADE:** And Lew Wade with NIOSH.

7 **MS. HOWELL:** This is Emily Howell with HHS.

8 **MR. SHARFI:** Mutty Sharfi with ORAU.

9 **DR. BRANCHE:** Thank you, and I'm Christine
10 Branche, and I'm with the office of the
11 Director of NIOSH.

12 Dr. (sic) Presley, have you joined the
13 call?

14 (no response)

15 **DR. BRANCHE:** Okay.

16 **MR. GRIFFON:** Christine, can I ask is anyone
17 from the Department of Labor on the call?

18 (no response)

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** I guess that's a no.

20 **DR. BRANCHE:** I guess that's a no.

21 Before I hand it over to the Chair I
22 just want to please ask everyone if you are
23 going to speak, please go ahead and speak into
24 the phone directly so that our recorder can
25 get all of your words. But if you're not

1 speaking if you could please mute your phone,
2 it will help all of us better hear the phone
3 conversation. Thank you very much.

4 Mark.

5 **INTRODUCTION BY CHAIR**

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** I just wanted to, I set up
7 this work group call for our Rocky Flats work
8 group. Obviously, we haven't met in quite a
9 while.

10 **MEMBERS OF THE CLASS, NEUTRON ISSUES, '52 -'66**

11 But the reason for this call, there's really
12 only one agenda item, and it is a follow up on
13 the implementation of the Rocky Flats' class,
14 specifically what workers are considered as
15 members of the class, or should be considered
16 members of the class based on the question of
17 monitored or should have been monitored for
18 neutron exposures from '52 through '66.

19 And I know that the, you know,
20 generally speaking, the implementation of that
21 class is a Department of Labor decision as we
22 know. But we did leave, as a work group we
23 did ask NIOSH in our decision in Denver to
24 please as an action provide a listing of
25 buildings that NIOSH believed to be buildings

1 where workers that were in those buildings
2 during that time period should be considered
3 part of the class. And therefore, that's why
4 I think we just wanted to follow up on this.

5 And it was sort of highlighted by the
6 interest by the petitioners and others
7 watching this process, particularly the four
8 newspaper stories. If folks haven't seen
9 them, I think there's four newspaper stories
10 that have come out in the Rocky Mountain News,
11 November 7th, November 9th, November 10th and
12 November 24th. If you don't have those, we can
13 certainly get copies around. I don't know if
14 everyone has all four of the stories.

15 But the primary subject touched on in
16 these stories was that, was sort of
17 questioning whether the number of buildings
18 indicated by NIOSH was all-inclusive of the
19 way we had written up the SEC class. And, in
20 fact, the article, or one of the articles
21 suggests that there's evidence that workers in
22 some other buildings were exposed to neutron
23 radiation between '52 and '66. So, and this
24 is, I think, derived from the University of
25 Colorado research. Margaret Ruttenber did

1 speak to this a little bit.

2 And just as a reminder, early on in
3 our work group we had a matrix item where we
4 did look at, we knew that the University of
5 Colorado had done the medical surveillance
6 study, and we expressed interest in looking at
7 this data. NIOSH then -- and if I get this
8 wrong, Larry or Brant can correct me -- but my
9 understanding is NIOSH did go to the
10 University of Colorado, review this data, and
11 basically determined that it was, as far as
12 the radiation exposure data itself, it was not
13 anything different than we already had
14 available to us for review, and therefore, it
15 wasn't going to, you know, we didn't pursue it
16 any further, or NIOSH didn't pursue it any
17 further as far as getting copies of it or
18 getting electronic copies of it and making it
19 available to the work group.

20 So that's sort of the background of
21 this, and I guess my reason for the call is
22 just to, I think we all need to better
23 understand maybe, you know, it seems that
24 this, the newspaper articles are raising at
25 least a question in the minds, you know, for

1 some people, as to whether we are or NIOSH and
2 DOL are identifying all people that were
3 monitored or should have been monitored for
4 neutron exposures.

5 And we as the Board, I think, should
6 at least monitor this process so that we make
7 sure we, you know, the class as we suggested
8 be implemented appropriately. So I guess I
9 would just maybe throw it open to ask NIOSH if
10 they can help us shed some light.

11 The other thing we might need to do
12 here -- I'll just throw this out right up
13 front -- is we may need to determine, and this
14 may require a, more of a technical phone call
15 with the University of Colorado and NIOSH to
16 sort of, and maybe with the Board on the line
17 or SC&A on the line to sort out what data
18 we're looking at; what data they're looking at
19 and make sure that we are comparing apples and
20 apples, you know, whether we have the same
21 data or not. I think that may, that's sort of
22 down in the weeds and may require a sort of
23 technical phone call between the University of
24 Colorado and NIOSH with maybe the Board
25 monitoring.

1 **MS. HOMOKI-TITUS:** Mark, this is Liz Homoki-
2 Titus. Since this is a DOL decision, it's
3 just my recommendation that you might want to
4 try to include them as well.

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, DOL is who I was hoping
6 they were on the call today actually, too.
7 But, yeah, you're right, Liz. So we're really
8 monitoring it from the standpoint of the work
9 group had sort of asked NIOSH to do the best
10 research they could to provide a listing of
11 buildings. And then after that, you're right,
12 it is up to DOL so they should probably be in
13 the loop as well.

14 **MS. MUNN:** Mark, this is Wanda Munn. I
15 haven't seen that most recent article you
16 indicated, the 11/24 one. Those things don't
17 always come through unless someone is tracking
18 the media publications.

19 **MR. GRIFFON:** I will try to get a copy of
20 that to you unless some has it readily
21 available. I have a hard copy but not --

22 **MS. MUNN:** I don't necessarily need it
23 today, but at your convenience if I could have
24 a copy.

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, certainly.

1 **MS. MUNN:** Thank you.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** So I don't know. I guess I
3 would ask maybe if Larry or Brant could give
4 us a sense, did I mischaracterize anything,
5 and maybe we could decide on a reasonable path
6 forward just to make, I mean, I think it's in
7 all of our best interests to make sure we get
8 this listing of buildings and the right people
9 in the class. So I think --

10 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Mark, this is Larry Elliott.
11 Let me speak to a couple things here for you.
12 I'll ask Brant to fill in what I haven't
13 spoken to or reflected upon.

14 First of all, I would clarify that we
15 don't think the Board asked us to provide a
16 list of buildings we thought the Board, it was
17 our job to provide DOL any way possible for
18 them to assist them in determining eligibility
19 for class members. And we pointed to the NDRP
20 and its contents and said that these, the NDRP
21 has a list of buildings, and it also has a
22 list of employees who were monitored or should
23 have been monitored in those buildings. And
24 if you look at the DOL circular, or actually a
25 technical bulletin on this, which is 08-01,

1 dated October 15th, 2007, there are three
2 screening criteria that DOL uses to assist in
3 determining eligibility of a claimant for
4 these two classes. The first is inclusion in
5 the Rocky Flats Neutron Dosimetry
6 Reconstruction Project list. And the second
7 is any previously completed NIOSH dose
8 reconstruction for a named employee which
9 includes neutron exposure or mentions exposure
10 to plutonium. And the third is employment in
11 a building identified as a plutonium building.
12 So we assisted in providing and pointing to
13 the NDRP and the list of buildings that it
14 contained for DOL. We have had conversations
15 with DOL about the claims that were in our
16 hands at the point in time. We gave them a
17 list of claims that had been sent to NIOSH
18 that contained what we thought to be a
19 presumptive cancer. We gave them another list
20 of claims that we had here that were non-
21 presumptive cancer. And that's essentially
22 the standard practice that is employed here in
23 engaging DOL on any of these classes. I'm
24 sorry that they're not on the line today to
25 speak directly to any questions or concerns

1 that you may have here. As DOL started
2 working through these claims, they come across
3 this Building 881. They talked to us about
4 Building 881. We told them that building, as
5 Brant had presented in his presentation, I
6 believe, in June -- he can speak to this --
7 that Building 881 had very miniscule, small
8 amounts of plutonium activity in that
9 building. It was a building where they
10 reconditioned the uranium pits and the
11 cladding. The plutonium cladding had already
12 been removed so they were using an acid bath
13 to wash, to remove any residual plutonium from
14 those pits and clean them up. In that case it
15 had been our opinion that neutron exposures
16 were de minimis there in Building 881. Be
17 that as it may -- and we talked to DOL about
18 that. Be that as it may, DOL pointed out that
19 in a couple or so many of our reconstructed
20 cases that NIOSH had used, I guess, a
21 claimant-favorable approach and given neutron
22 exposure to people who may have worked at
23 Building 881. So that fit the second
24 screening criteria. And so they have added
25 Building 881 to their list with no objection

1 from us. We found that to be, if that's the
2 way they wanted to approach it, we understood
3 that, and we found that to be okay. So I
4 don't know where you want to go with this at
5 this point but --

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I guess --

7 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Do you have anything to add to
8 this, my -- background?

9 **DR. ULSH:** Yes, I do actually. As you know,
10 the Neutron Dose Reconstruction Project
11 included people who were monitored for
12 neutrons or people who were monitored for
13 gamma but not neutrons if they worked in a
14 plutonium building. One of the topics that
15 the Board asked us to report further on it at
16 the May Board meeting included plutonium in
17 Building 881.

18 And I did report on that in my
19 presentation at the June Board meeting and
20 specifically talked about the operation that
21 Larry mentioned where they received weapons
22 back from the field that were being
23 decommissioned. The plutonium was removed in
24 the 700 buildings, and the pits were shipped
25 over to Building 881. It contained what

1 workers termed trivial or nuisance levels of
2 plutonium. Certainly not enough to generate
3 significant neutron fields.

4 Those uranium parts were washed in
5 Building 881 in acid, and the acid was shipped
6 back to Building 771. So there's no evidence
7 that there were significant neutron fields in
8 Building 881. So that's that building.

9 Now as Mark mentioned, the Rocky
10 Mountain News has been reporting that there
11 are 19 other buildings that should be
12 considered neutron buildings. And this past
13 Saturday, the latest article that I have,
14 actually gave a list of those buildings that
15 they assert were neutron buildings. And this
16 morning I verified the descriptions of those
17 buildings, what they actually did.

18 And last week I actually verified with
19 the records people out at Rocky Flats that
20 there were no reportable quantities of uranium
21 -- I'm sorry -- of plutonium in Building 881
22 or any buildings other than listed in the
23 NDRP. Now in the newspaper article this past
24 Saturday, they had a list of buildings, and I
25 got the descriptions.

1 And I'm not going to go through all of
2 them, all of the 19, but they include, for
3 example, Building 111 which is an office,
4 print shop, photography lab; Building 112
5 which is a general cafeteria, Building 750,
6 which is a cafeteria, 333 which is a paint
7 shop. So it goes on and on. I have not
8 spoken to the reporter at the Rocky Mountain
9 News about this so I don't know what criteria
10 she's using to say that these are neutron
11 buildings.

12 **MR. GRIFFON:** And some of this I think can
13 be, I think we need to understand. Let me
14 just say a couple things. One, on 881, we did
15 as a work group ask, that's correct, Brant.
16 And I think one thing that you're not
17 mentioning is that we also, I think -- and
18 correct me if I'm wrong -- you reported or
19 agreed with findings that we said there were
20 also some critical experiments that were done
21 in 881.

22 **DR. ULSH:** That is correct.

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** So it wasn't only the
24 plutonium contamination then --

25 **DR. ULSH:** And those were critical

1 experiments involved a couple of people who
2 were already part of the NDRP. I could
3 identify them by name.

4 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, and we had this
5 discussion of whether it was one or two or
6 whether it could have been more people
7 involved, and we never really resolved that.
8 Or I didn't feel that we resolved it. You
9 might have felt comfortable with that. But
10 that was sort of hanging out there, too, as
11 another thing that went on in that building.

12 **MS. BOLLER:** Mark, I'm sorry to interrupt,
13 but this is Carolyn Boller. I'm going to have
14 to hang up. I've got a doctor's appointment.
15 But it seems to me that 881 is no longer an
16 issue since the Department of Labor has put
17 that on the list --

18 **MR. GRIFFON:** I agree.

19 **MS. BOLLER:** -- so if we can get off of 881.
20 What I would like to know is this list of 19
21 buildings, is I would like somebody, and I'm
22 willing to do this or somebody else, pick up a
23 phone and call Laura Frank at the Rocky
24 Mountain News, somebody from the Board, and
25 find out where she got her information and

1 what she based it on, if she will share that
2 information with you.

3 A second piece of it, I think that
4 someone needs to talk to Margaret about Jim's
5 studies because allegedly all of these 19
6 buildings came from the Ruttenber studies. So
7 somebody needs to have a follow-up
8 conversation with her to find out what
9 Margaret is willing to share with us and how
10 did they come, did they have something in
11 their study that you all might have missed
12 early on?

13 **MR. ELLIOTT:** It was a standard study,
14 Carolyn. Brant Ulsh has been there. NIOSH,
15 you know, this study was done under a
16 cooperative agreement with NIOSH money. The
17 study was also to look at toxic chemical
18 exposures as well as radioactive material
19 exposures.

20 And we're not quibbling that there is
21 this list of buildings in that study. We're
22 not quibbling that there was toxic exposure in
23 those buildings. We had no quibbles at all
24 with the study itself. And in Brant's review
25 of the information that Dr. Ruttenber had

1 assembled for his study, you know, we were
2 prepared to negotiate with Dr. Ruttenber to
3 get any information that we had not yet seen
4 or been made available to us.

5 And Brant's determination was that we
6 had all of that information already. We were
7 receiving it or had received it, and there was
8 nothing new there to offer in dose
9 reconstruction or in an SEC evaluation.

10 **MS. BOLLER:** And I think, if I understand
11 correctly, 881 was added not only because it
12 met the criteria as well, it was because they
13 had had people who had indicated that they'd
14 had neutron exposure in their claims. So 881
15 was added to take care of those folks. You've
16 got a lot of people, you know, who you don't
17 have records of who moved in and out of some
18 of these buildings. Maybe they weren't
19 permanently assigned there, but they moved in
20 and out, and they may have spent some degree
21 of time. I think those are going to be the
22 problem cases.

23 **DR. ULSH:** Well, the people who worked in
24 Building 881 who had neutron exposure were
25 those who worked overtime periodically in one

1 of the plutonium buildings, and when they did
2 so they were issued a neutron dosimetry, and
3 they were already part of the NDRP class.

4 I agree with you that 881 is already
5 off the table because DOL has made their
6 decision.

7 **MS. BOLLER:** So can you send us, Brant, can
8 you send us that list of 19? I didn't see the
9 article in Saturday's paper, but do you have a
10 one- or two-liner on each of those buildings
11 that you could share with this group?

12 **DR. ULSH:** I have 17 of the 19.

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** I was actually going to ask
14 the same thing. If you can send that around,
15 Brant, to the work group that'd be very useful
16 to see what these buildings are.

17 **DR. ULSH:** It's like a five or six word in
18 some cases description of what the building
19 was, and I can pass that.

20 **MS. BOLLER:** Great. I appreciate you, Mark,
21 setting up this call, and everybody who's on
22 it. I've got to run, so thank you very much.

23 **MR. GRIFFON:** Thank you, Carolyn.

24 **MR. KOTSCH:** Mark, Mark, this is Jeff
25 Kotsch. I'm sorry -- with Labor. I just,

1 I've been on the call for about ten minutes.
2 I got in a little late.

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** Thank you, Jeff.

4 **MR. KOTSCH:** So if there's anything I can
5 help you with belatedly, let me know.

6 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I'm glad you're on the
7 call. I think if we, I was actually going to
8 recommend sort of the same path that was just
9 mentioned, that we do a follow-up sort of
10 technical call with Margaret Rutenber and
11 that might be a point where we would want
12 NIOSH and DOL on there. And basically to
13 understand because these numbers of workers by
14 building, you know, that is in the news story,
15 my understanding is it did come from the
16 Rutenber data, and I think we need to
17 basically understand whether, if there's any,
18 I don't know if there's even a disparity here.

19 In fact, some of these buildings, some
20 of the ones that Brant has mentioned like
21 Building 112, they list 19 people. That's
22 over 14 years. Maybe one person might have
23 been in there and also working in other areas.
24 We don't know exactly why these buildings
25 might have come up for having some people

1 badged for neutrons.

2 So I think we want to, but this might
3 be better served to do a technical call.
4 Because also my understanding is that, from
5 talking with Margaret Brucely (ph) was that
6 all this data for the radiation side of their
7 study anyway, they did have, do, as Larry
8 said, some of chemical exposure information.
9 But all the radiation data she said came
10 directly from DOE. So if that's the case, we
11 should have the same data, and I just want to
12 make sure we're working with the same data and
13 interpreting it the same way.

14 **DR. ULSH:** Yeah, the dosimetry data that Dr.
15 Ruttenber used came from two different
16 sources. One was the RHRS database and the
17 other was a database that was maintained by
18 Los Alamos. Both of those sources were
19 migrated into HIS-20 which as you know we
20 have. So we do have the raw data.

21 Now the part that we may not have is
22 what Dr. Ruttenber did with it after he got it
23 in terms of putting it into a format that
24 would be useful for an epidemiological study,
25 and specifically the job exposure matrix that

1 he created dealing with toxics.

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** Right, right, that's kind of
3 what she indicated to me was that the raw data
4 you may all have, but assembling it in a
5 usable fashion was a little bit of their value
6 added.

7 **MR. ELLIOTT:** But there's a difference here,
8 Mark, that we all should recognize. An
9 epidemiologic study analysis file is
10 completely different in its assemblage than
11 what we would look to for dose reconstruction
12 purposes.

13 **MR. GRIFFON:** Agreed. Agreed.

14 **DR. WADE:** This is Lew. We have three paths
15 forward, I think. Let me just sort of put
16 that forward. Brant is going to share with
17 everyone on the call, interested parties, his
18 brief description for the buildings in
19 question, whatever information that he has.

20 Mark, it was suggested by Carolyn that
21 you might want to contact the reporter and see
22 if there were sources that could be made
23 available to you all leading up to a technical
24 call that I think, Mark, you would arrange --

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah.

1 **DR. WADE:** -- with the parties. And then
2 after that call, it would be your choice as to
3 whether you wanted to reconvene the work group
4 or just how you wanted to proceed.

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I think that would be,
6 you know, a technical call. And I did, like I
7 said, briefly talk to Margaret Ruttenber and
8 she seemed agreeable to that. So that way we
9 can see. I just want to make sure that we can
10 look at this and see if we're looking at the
11 data in a similar fashion, and we can, because
12 like I said several of these buildings have a
13 very limited number of people showing
14 monitoring in those time periods. And maybe
15 we can sort some of those out.

16 **DR. WADE:** Your thoroughness is to be
17 applauded I think. So I think those are the
18 paths forward.

19 Brant, you will share the information
20 you have on the buildings.

21 And, Mark, you'll decide what outreach
22 you want to make to the reporter, and then
23 you'll schedule a technical call.

24 **MR. GRIFFON:** That sounds like a reasonable
25 path forward.

1 Any of the other work group members
2 have any questions or comments?

3 **MS. MUNN:** Yeah, Mark, this is Wanda. It
4 puzzles me why this list of supposedly new
5 buildings is appearing now. You know, we can
6 assume that any building on any site anywhere
7 can be pointed to and say there were people
8 who worked there. But when we're looking at
9 things like cafeterias and paint shops,
10 because that's what all of these buildings
11 are, and we're discussing specifically neutron
12 exposure, then it's baffling why individuals
13 might think that those were sources for
14 exposure.

15 And unless there is some criterion
16 established somewhere that I'm unaware of, I
17 can't imagine, it's hard to imagine why that
18 type of building would be incorporated in a
19 potential exposure site. So it's easy to say
20 this is a potential exposure site. Without
21 concrete evidence that this is an exposure
22 site, then that does not appear to be any
23 basis for making that kind, taking that kind
24 of position.

25 So I guess I'm not sure exactly how

1 you anticipate approaching that specific
2 question, but it appears that that's the crux
3 of the matter here. Why would anyone assume
4 that these buildings are appropriately
5 incorporated in what is considered to be a
6 potential source for neutron exposure? Why?

7 **MR. GRIFFON:** Well, I guess that's the
8 question, Wanda. Is, you know, I just have
9 building numbers so it'd be very helpful to
10 see descriptions. Part of this --

11 **MS. MUNN:** Even the descriptions themselves
12 are not really the key. The key is why would
13 anyone assume that this building is a source?

14 **MR. GRIFFON:** Because people were monitored
15 for neutron exposures that were in that
16 building apparently. That's the question.

17 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Or they worked in that
18 building, they were assigned to that building
19 like the paint shop --

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** But they might have went to
21 other places --

22 **MR. ELLIOTT:** -- they went out on a, they
23 were to go over and paint in some other
24 building where plutonium was processed, and
25 they were badged for that activity.

1 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, that seems like a
2 logical explanation, Larry, so that's what we
3 have to see. If there's a logical explanation
4 for all these, then we have a response. I
5 mean, I think part of -- and we have to just
6 make sure that criteria, the three-step
7 criteria you mentioned, is going to accomplish
8 the goal that we wanted in our original SEC
9 class.

10 So I think some of these may, you
11 know, you look at them and you say that very
12 few people in 14 years were monitored in that
13 building, it's likely that the building wasn't
14 a source necessarily. And maybe they can be
15 readily explained by the description of the
16 buildings, you know, the activities.

17 **MS. MUNN:** Well, it would be helpful to have
18 them, and I suppose any judgment prior to that
19 is really preliminary.

20 **MS. ALBERG:** Mark, this is Jeanette with
21 Senator Allard's office, and the third
22 criteria as I wrote it down was employment in
23 a PU building or a building with PU exposures.
24 Now any of those 19 buildings, is that the
25 argument that these 19 buildings had possible

1 PU exposures? And does then Labor then have
2 to basically change that qualification?

3 **MR. GRIFFON:** Well, I guess that's the
4 question is, see, the way these numbers were
5 derived my understanding is that it was just
6 the people assigned to those buildings were
7 monitored for neutron exposures at some point.
8 And it's not clear that they got the neutron
9 exposures working in those buildings
10 necessarily.

11 As Larry just indicated they could
12 have been assigned to that building and sent
13 out to work in other plutonium areas or
14 buildings where neutron exposures could have
15 occurred. So that's what we want to sort of
16 run down. Is this really a lot of additional
17 buildings or is this really the same set of
18 facts just with this question of where people,
19 you know, were assigned work versus where they
20 were exposed.

21 **MR. ELLIOTT:** That third criterion of
22 employment in a building identified as a
23 plutonium building, I did not mention that
24 there were nine specific buildings identified
25 for DOL as being plutonium processing

1 buildings --

2 **MR. GRIFFON:** Larry, could you --

3 **MR. ELLIOTT:** -- nine are listed in this
4 technical bulletin.

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** Could you send that technical
6 bulletin to all of us? I'm sure it's
7 available somehow, but I'm not. Could you
8 forward --

9 **MR. ELLIOTT:** I think I've already done
10 that, but I will resend it.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** I'd appreciate it. Yeah,
12 that'd be helpful.

13 **MS. ALBERG:** Larry, if you could send it to
14 the Congressional delegation that would be
15 nice, too. Thank you.

16 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Will do.

17 **MR. BROEHM:** Larry, this is Jason. If you
18 would send it to me, I'll get it to everyone.

19 **MR. ELLIOTT:** Okay.

20 **MR. GRIFFON:** So I think that as Lew stated,
21 I think that's our best path forward for now.
22 And I just wanted to do a call today so we
23 could at least maybe give an update on the
24 full Board meeting tomorrow, the full Board
25 meeting phone call as to what we're doing with

1 this. I know it's certainly a concern to some
2 people, and we want to address it as quickly
3 as we can. And that's the purpose of this
4 call.

5 So Brant's going to forward the
6 building description. Larry's going to
7 forward the criteria that he outlined. I will
8 contact Laura Franks and then from there I'll,
9 considering now setting up a technical phone
10 call which would be NIOSH with Margaret
11 Ruttenber most likely along with DOL. I think
12 that was a good suggestion.

13 And if everyone's agreeable, I'll stay
14 on the call just to monitor for the work
15 group. But just to have this, I think that's
16 where I want to get into the details of what
17 database is everybody looking at, where are
18 these numbers coming from, and then reconvene
19 the work group if needed after that.

20 **DR. WADE:** Sounds like a plan, Mark.

21 **MS. BARRIE:** Mark, this is Terrie Barrie
22 with ANWAG. And I just want to raise a couple
23 of issues. You keep talking about that
24 plutonium building, the ones that are the
25 source for neutron radiation. Isn't it

1 correct that highly enriched uranium also
2 (unintelligible) neutrons?

3 And the second item I want to raise to
4 you is I checked the 19 buildings that was in
5 the, as Laura Franks reported being omitted.
6 And I found or I couldn't find nine of those
7 buildings listed on the site profile. And one
8 of them is --

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** I think, Terrie, I'll let
10 NIOSH respond to this, too, but I think that
11 the presence in a plutonium building was one
12 of their criteria, not meant to be all
13 inclusive. So you are correct. There are
14 other sources of, other potential sources of
15 neutron exposures, but that was one of their
16 criteria.

17 Larry or Brant, you can respond to
18 that.

19 **DR. ULSH:** I'll speak to it, Mark.

20 Terrie, in terms of the sources of
21 significant neutrons at Rocky Flats, primarily
22 you're talking about anywhere where there was
23 a significant quantity of plutonium, so the
24 700 buildings primarily but not only. Also
25 there was a neutron generating source in

1 Building 991. And both of those I just
2 mentioned are already included in the NDRP and
3 included in the class.

4 Now in terms of enriched uranium that
5 was in Building 881, enriched uranium
6 operation. So it's kind of academic at this
7 point because they've already added that.
8 However, just to answer your question there
9 was enriched uranium metal there. Though it
10 is certainly true that some chemical forms of
11 uranium can generate neutrons, for instance
12 uranium hexafluoride, but those are not the
13 forms that were present at Rocky Flats.
14 Enriched uranium metal doesn't put out many
15 neutrons at all. In fact, you would be very
16 concerned if it did from a criticality
17 standpoint. So, no, the major sources of
18 neutrons at Rocky were the plutonium and that
19 neutron generator in Building 991.

20 Oh, and then you also asked about the
21 site profile. You are correct. I also looked
22 at the site profile just this morning again.
23 And the purpose of the site profile is
24 primarily to list the major buildings and that
25 is a somewhat subjective criteria. So

1 obviously you would want to talk about
2 Building 881, Building 771. Some of the
3 smaller buildings were not discussed in the
4 site profile. You're correct about that.

5 The place that I got my descriptions
6 this morning is -- and I'll also send this out
7 to the web address -- the historical American
8 engineering record, and that's got a more
9 complete description than the site profile
10 does.

11 **MR. GRIFFON:** Actually, and I remember that
12 link being discussed during the work group
13 meetings. Previously we looked at some of
14 those links. You shared those with us for
15 some of the other buildings.

16 So I think that's if that's okay with
17 the work group, I think that will be our path
18 forward.

19 **MS. MUNN:** This is Wanda. Mark, when you
20 make your call to the media folks, is it
21 possible for me to join you on that call? I'd
22 certainly like to hear personally what's going
23 on. Just let me know when you're going to
24 make it.

25 **MR. GRIFFON:** Yeah, I don't see a problem

1 with that, Wanda. Yeah, I can do a three-way
2 call with you.

3 **MS. MUNN:** I don't know when or whether I'll
4 be available, but if --

5 **MR. GRIFFON:** Okay, I'll try to get you on
6 the call.

7 Okay so --

8 **DR. WADE:** I think we're done then.

9 **MR. GRIFFON:** I think we're done. I
10 appreciate everyone's time and I'll give a
11 brief report tomorrow to the full Board on
12 what we're doing. And I'll try to make this,
13 these two calls, contacting Laura Franks and
14 the technical call, and do it quickly in the
15 near future so we can answer some of these
16 questions.

17 **MS. MUNN:** That's great.

18 Lew and Christine, may I speak with
19 you for a few minutes after everybody's off
20 the line?

21 **DR. WADE:** Surely.

22 **MR. GRIFFON:** Thank you, everyone.

23

24 (Whereupon, the working group meeting
25 concluded at 10:40 a.m.)

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 Nov. 26, 2007; 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 20th day of February, 2008.

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