#### Dragon, Karen E. (CDC/NIOSH/EID)

From:

john ramspott /

Sent:

Sunday, February 08, 2015 10:15 PM Ziemer, Paul (CDC/NIOSH/DCAS)

To: Cc:

0

Daniel McKeel; Katz, Ted (CDC/NIOSH/OD); melius

\_, Houlihan, Bill (Durbin);

Subject:

NIOSH Docket Office (CDC)

My .... GSI PER "now" remark Feb 5th. Meeting .

Dr. Ziemer:

Here is the Source and justification for my comments at the Feb. 5th. GSI, TBD-6000 Work Group Meeting.

I was sharing it not as a "definition of a PER", as you said, but as "a statement of fact, and justification" of why I firmly believe NIOSH should have already issued a GSI PER. This NIOSH document does not say release a PER "when every single conclusive Site fact is known". It says: "as relevant new information becomes available".

I believe everyone knows the definition of a PER. My primary point of reading NIOSH's document into the record, is because I do not believe the policy or guideline is being followed. The new Appendix BB Rev 1 clearly is relevant new information.

This is NIOSH's published definition and guideline, "Front Page, First Paragraph", (Source below):

1. "NOSH is committed to applying the best available science in dose reconstructions. In keeping with this commitment, completed cases with probabilities of causation less than 50% are reviewed as relevant new information becomes available. The results of these reviews are described in a Program Evaluation Report (PER). The PER details the effect, if any, of the new information on the completed dose reconstruction. If it appears that the new information may result in an increase in dose for a completed dose reconstruction with a probability of causation of less than 50%, NIOSH is committed to working with the Department of Labor to reopen and rework the dose reconstruction, as appropriate. A Program Evaluation Plan (PEP) describes plans for evaluating specific program details or issues".

Program Evaluation Reports (PERs) - Centers for Disease ... "CLICK" www.cdc.gov/.../oc...

United States Centers for Disease Control and Preve...

**Program Evaluation Reports (PERs) and Program Evaluation Plans (PEPs)** ... The results of these reviews are described in a Program Evaluation Report (PER) .

It cannot be more evident that the "new" Appendix BB Rev 1 clearly contains **relevant new information**, and it is available now, and is currently being used for "new" GSI Dose Reconstructions. (Examples have been provided.)

The results have been dramatic.

I also heard Dave Allen tell Dr. Mckeel the drastic jump, in the claim in question, that Dr. McKeel asked him about, during the Feb 5th. WG Meeting, was a result in all of the new material now contained in Appendix BB Rev 1. (Transcript will confirm Dave Allen's remarks).

I took Dave Allen's comment as a very positive remark, considering all of the work that has gone into this "GSI fact finding" by all of us. I believe Dave stated the facts well, and confirmed my point as well.

I personally believe NIOSH's confirmed use of this "new" GSI Appendix BB Rev 1 information, for new GSI claims, yet denying earlier GSI claimants the same right to this new material, is completely unfair and unjust, etc., etc..

The "denied" GSI Claimants deserve to see some of this "commitment" now. They have waited long enough.

As I stated, some of these GSI Claimants have died while waiting, that truly bothers me.

If you feel I have misunderstood any of this, please let me know. I am always open to listening to another opinion. No one corrected me at the Feb 5th. Work Group Meeting, so I took it as being a valid point.

In retrospect, I should have made perfectly clear that this was my understanding of facts.

I totally appreciate the opportunity of being able to participate in the WG Meetings. This is meant as a clarification, not a criticism.

I also appreciate your attempt to schedule the next WG Meeting soon. Hopefully NIOSH will get back with you quickly so you can schedule the next meeting.

I appreciate you asking NIOSH to get back to you as soon as possible.

#### Ted:

Please share this with the court reporter, it may help him with my meeting statement. I really appreciate his efforts at a tough task.

Please distribute this to the entire Board, NIOSH, and SC&A, and others listening in to the meeting.

#### **Dear NIOSH Docket Officer:**

Please accept my recent GSI/ TBD 6000 Work Group information and email plus the attached PDF file: Program Evaluation Reports (PERs) - Centers for Disease ... "CLICK" <a href="https://www.cdc.gov/.../oc...">www.cdc.gov/.../oc...</a>

United States Centers for Disease Control and Preve...

**Program Evaluation Reports (PERs) and Program Evaluation Plans (PEPs)** ... The results of these reviews are described in a Program Evaluation Report (PER) . for consideration for posting on the DCAS website under Docket 140 (GSI).

I also did request that DFO circulate this email and comments to the full Board and the TBD-6000 WG including DCAS, and SC&A members. My email includes my personal comments for the Feb. 5th., 2015 meeting that centered around Appendix BB Rev 1 and the PER-057 topic.

Thank you,

#### John Ramspott

On behalf of General Steel industries claimants.



# Program Evaluation Reports (PERs) and Program Evaluation Plans (PEPs)

NIOSH is committed to applying the best available science in dose reconstructions. In keeping with this commitment, completed cases with probabilities of causation less than 50% are reviewed as relevant new information becomes available. The results of these reviews are described in a Program Evaluation Report (PER). The PER details the effect, if any, of the new information on the completed dose reconstruction. If it appears that the new information may result in an increase in dose for a completed dose reconstruction with a probability of causation of less than 50%, NIOSH is committed to working with the Department of Labor to reopen and rework the dose reconstruction, as appropriate. A Program Evaluation Plan (PEP) describes plans for evaluating specific program details or issues.

# **Program Evaluation Reports**

Do you know the number of the PER you are looking for? If you do, click on the number below to go to the section of the page where the PER is located.

# **Program Evaluation Report Index**

| <u>01 (#per1</u>                                                                                                            | ) <u>02 (#per2)</u> | <u>03 (#per3)</u>  | <u>04 (#per4)</u>    | <u>05 (#per5)</u>  | <u>06 (#per6)</u>  | <u>07 (#per7)</u>  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <u>08 (#per8</u>                                                                                                            | <u>09 (#perq</u>    | <u>10 (#per10</u>  | ) <u>11 (#per11)</u> | <u>12 (#per12)</u> | 13 (#per13)        | <u>14</u>          |
| <u>(#per14)</u>                                                                                                             | <u>15 (#per15)</u>  | 16 (#per16)        | <b>17 (</b> #per17)  | 18 (#per18)        | 19 (#per19)        | <u>20 (#per20)</u> |
| <u>21 (#per21)</u> <u>22 (#per22)</u> <u>23 (#per23)</u> <u>24 (#per24)</u> <u>25 (#per25)</u> <u>26 (#per26)</u> <u>27</u> |                     |                    |                      |                    |                    |                    |
| (#per27)                                                                                                                    | <u>28 (#per28)</u>  | <u>29 (#per29)</u> | <u>30 (#per30)</u>   | 31 (#per31)        | <u>32 (#per32)</u> | . 33               |
| <u>(#per33)</u>                                                                                                             | <u>34 (#per34)</u>  | 35 (#per35)        | 36 (#per36)          | 37 (#per37)        | 38 (#per38)        | . 39               |
| <u>(#per39)</u>                                                                                                             | 40 (#per40)         | <u>41 (#per41)</u> | <u>42 (#per42)</u>   | 43 (#per43)        | <u>44 (#per44)</u> | 45                 |
| (#per45)                                                                                                                    | <u>47 (#per47)</u>  | <u>48 (#per48)</u> | <u>50 (#per50)</u>   | <u>52 (#per52)</u> | 55 (#per55)        | . <u>56</u>        |
| (#per56)                                                                                                                    | <u>58 (#per58)</u>  |                    |                      |                    |                    |                    |

• OCAS-PER-0001 Rev-00: Misinterpreted Dosimetry Records Resulting in an Underestimate of Missed Dose in Savannah River Site Dose Reconstructions [958 KB (4 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per-001-ro.pdf)
September 8, 2003

**About this Document:** Describes the evaluation of the programmatic effect of the misinterpreted dosimetry records resulting in an underestimate of the missed dose for Savannah River Site dose reconstructions.

**Summary:** While the underestimated missed dose resulted in a non-claimant favorable estimate of missed dose, the overestimated onsite ambient dose offset this underestimate. As a result, no further evaluation is necessary because the offset still resulted in a slight claimant favorable bias in the dose estimate and resulting probability of causation.

• OCAS-PER-0002 Rev-00: Error in Surrogate Organ Assignment Resulting in an Underestimate of X-ray Dose in Savannah River Site Dose Reconstructions [482 KB (4 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per-002-ro.pdf)
December 15, 2003

**About this Document:** Describes the evaluation of the programmatic effect of an error in surrogate organ assignment resulting in a potential underestimate of the X-ray dose for certain Savannah River Site dose reconstructions.

**Summary:** An error in surrogate organ assignment for the liver, gall bladder and spleen (ovaries was assigned instead of lung) resulted in the underestimation of X-ray organ doses in three completed dose reconstructions. The impact on the probability of causation in these three cases has been evaluated and found to be minimal ( $\leq 0.5\%$ ), and the probable compensability status of these claims was unaffected. No revision of any completed dose reconstructions is warranted; however, to preclude future occurrences of this error, revisions of several Technical Basis Documents has been initiated.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0003 Rev-00: Evaluation of the Effect of Adding Ingestion Intakes to Bethlehem Steel Cases [31 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per-003-ro.pdf)
January 28, 2005

**About this Document:** Describes the evaluation of the programmatic effect of the effect of adding ingestion intakes to Bethlehem Steel cases.

**Summary:** As a result of adding ingestion intakes, the probability of causation of none of the previously completed Bethlehem Steel claims would increase to greater than 50%.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0004 Rev-00: Application of Photofluorography at the Pinellas Plant [5] [373 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per-004-ro.pdf) February 15, 2005

**About this Document:** Describes the evaluation of the programmatic effect of the discovery of photofluorographic examinations on dose reconstructions for employees of the Pinellas Plant.

**Summary:** Evidence of photofluorography as discovered in a claimant's medical records from the Pinellas Plant. As a result, photofluorography use at Pinellas Plant is now assumed through 1959. This assumption will not change the likely compensability of any completed dose reconstruction. The relevant ORAU procedure will be modified, and photofluorography use will be assumed in the Pinellas Plant Site Profile.

# Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0005 Rev-00: Misinterpreted Application of the External Dose Factor for Hanford Dose Reconstructions [2] [85 KB (6 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per-005-ro.pdf)
June 9, 2006

**About this Document:** Describes the evaluation of the programmatic effect of the misinterpreted application of the bias factor for Hanford Dose Reconstructions.

**Summary:** An error in interpretation and application of the bias factor information in the Hanford External Dose Reconstruction Technical Basis Document (1) resulted in an underestimate of the external dose for certain Hanford claims. Claims that were potentially affected by this error were identified and those that had not already been submitted to the Department of Labor were returned to the ORAU team for rework. The cases that had been submitted to DOL were reevaluated by removing the bias factor, thus developing a revised external dose. The probability of causation for each of the affected claims was recalculated. This evaluation found that although this error appeared upon discovery to be rather significant, there was no impact on compensation decisions made by the Department of Labor.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0006 Rev-00: External Dosimetry Target Organ for Prostate Cancer 7 [42 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per-006-ro.pdf)
September 15, 2006

**About this Document:** Describes the evaluation of the programmatic effect to change external dosimetry target organ for prostate cancer from testes to bladder.

**Summary:** Changes the external dosimetry target organ for prostate cancer from testes to urinary bladder. This change will result in lower organ doses and consequently, lower probability of causation values. Therefore, this change will not result in an increase in probability value for any completed claims, and no cases need to be re-evaluated.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0007 Rev-00: Evaluation of the Effect of Revision 2 of the Site Profile on Previously Completed Bethlehem Steel Cases [42 KB (7 pages)]

(/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per-007-ro.pdf)

November 9, 2006

**About this Document:** New document to evaluate the effect of revision 2 of the Site Profile on previously completed dose reconstructions from Bethlehem Steel.

**Summary:** The Bethlehem Steel Technical Basis Document was revised on July 27, 2006. The revision changed the estimated quantity of uranium inhaled and ingested as well as external dose to the skin. As a result of revisions to the Bethlehem Steel Technical Basis Document, three claims that were previously determined to have a PC of less than 50% will now have a PC greater than 50%. Eight cases that previously had a PC greater than 50% now have a PC less than 50%. This report, along with detailed information on the specific cases and calculations, has been provided to DOL for determination of further action.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0008 Rev-00: Modification of NIOSH-IREP Lung Cancer Risk Model: Effect of "Combined" Lung Model on Non-compensable Lung Cancer Claims [143 KB (4 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per8-ro.pdf)
April 12, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to report the impact of the NIOSH-IREP lung cancer model on non-compensable cases completed before February 28, 2006.

**Summary:** The "combined" lung cancer risk model was introduced on 02/28/06 via the release of NIOSH-IREP Version 5.5, followed by v5.5.1 on 05/16/06. The combined lung

model is programmed with two different lung cancer risk models: the NIOSH-IREP model, plus an alternative risk model created by the National Cancer Institute for use in NIH-IREP, another version of IREP (referred to hereafter as the "NIH" model). For each cancer of the lung, trachea, or bronchus, NIOSH-IREP now calculates separately the probability of causation (PC) produced by each of the two risk models and reports the higher PC at the upper 99th percentile credibility limit as the PC value of record for the claim. NIOSH-IREP v5.5 and v5.5.1 also incorporate a bias correction factor for random errors in dosimetry for "never smokers" exposed to radon. Due to a programming oversight, this correction had been omitted for "never smokers" and was applied only to smokers in earlier versions of NIOSH-IREP. NIOSH-IREP v5.5 corrected this error.

This "combined" lung cancer risk model was endorsed by the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health, and can result in no lower PC value for the same set of claim inputs than had been calculated under previous versions of NIOSH-IREP (versions 5.4 and earlier).

For a more detailed description of the new combined model, including the background of and rationale for the modification, please refer to OCAS-PEP-008, dated 12/07/06.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-009 Rev-00: Target Organs for Lymphoma [17 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per9-ro.pdf)
March 8, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to change target organs for lymphoma.

**Summary:** In February, 2006, OCAS determined that the internal and external dosimetry target organs used for several forms of lymphoma should be changed. The detailed rationale for this decision is described in OCAS-TIB-012. The change resulted from a detailed investigation by OCAS of the etiology of lymphoma.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0010 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: The Effect of Rocky Flats Neutron Dose Reconstruction Project Data [21 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per10-ro.pdf)
April 13, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to report the impact of data received from the Rocky Flats Plant Neutron Dose Reconstruction Project.

**Summary:** Neutron doses at Rocky Flats were re-evaluated as part of the Rocky Flats Neutron Dose Reconstruction Project (NDRP). These records were provided to OCAS as part of the individual dosimetry records. The application of the NDRP data to dose reconstructions is described in ORAUT-OTIB-0050, Rev. 00.

# Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0011 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: K-25 TBD and TIB Revisions [17 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per11-ro.pdf)
September 26, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require a new dose reconstruction as a result of changes to the K-25 dose reconstruction methods.

**Summary:** There were 432 claims completed by NIOSH between 11/24/2004 and 8/31/2006 that resulted in a POC less than 50%. This does not include claims that may have been submitted in that time frame but subsequently returned to NIOSH for any reason. All these claims will be reviewed by NIOSH to determine if external co-worker data was used. NIOSH will request that DOL return those claims completed before 5/21/2005 determined to have been completed using external co-worker data. NIOSH will also request the return of those claims completed with external co-worker data between 5/21/2005 and 8/31/2006 if they are deemed a Construction Trades worker. DOL will be provided with documentation for the remaining claims indicating the claim did not meet these criteria.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0012 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Evaluation of Highly Insoluble Plutonium Compounds [45 KB (6 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per12-ro.pdf)
August 6, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the affect of OTIB-0049, Highly Insoluble Plutonium Compounds.

**Summary:** DOL will be provided a list of the entire population of potentially affected claims (4,865 claims). NIOSH has determined that 1,757 of these claims required a new dose estimate to determine the affect of this change. NIOSH is requesting that DOL return these claims to NIOSH for a new Dose Reconstruction. NIOSH will review the remaining 3,108 claims to determine if any other changes also affect the claim. For each of these claims, NIOSH will either request the claim be returned for a new Dose Reconstruction, or provide DOL with documentation indicating why the changes will not cause the Probability of Causation to increase above 45%.

SC&A Draft: OCAS-PER-012, Subtask 4, Review of Nine Advisory Board Selected Cases Reworked for the Evaluation of Highly Insoluble Plutonium Compounds
 [232 KB (46 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/abrwh/scarpts/sca-ocper12-ro.pdf)
 Contract No. 200-2009-28555
 SCA-TR-PR2012-0012, Revision o
 July 20, 2012

# Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0013 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Evaluation of the Impact of Changes to the Isotopic Ratios in for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant [23 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per13-ro.pdf)
August 13, 2007

**About this Document:** This document provides a list of previously completed claims that are potentially affected by a revision to the Paducah isotopic ratios.

**Summary:** An initial selection of claims was based on the following search criteria:

- 1. Probability of Causation (POC) less than 50%
- 2. Dose Reconstructions completed prior to November 7, 2006.

These criteria were used to produce a list of 734 potentially affected claims. NIOSH will provide this list to DOL and request these claims be returned for a new dose reconstruction. The new dose reconstruction will be completed using all the current methodology which will account for any other changes affecting these claims.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0014 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Construction Trades Workers [74 KB (7 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per14-ro.pdf)
November 27, 2007

**About this Document:** This document determines which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of TIB 52 on the completed dose reconstruction.

**Summary:** A search of the claims was conducted to determine which claims may be those of Construction Trades Workers. Only those claims with a probability of causation (PC) less than 50%, that are currently at the Department of Labor, and whose dose reconstruction was approved prior to August 31, 2007, were included. The search resulted in 977 potentially affected claims being selected. NIOSH will provide DOL with the list of 977 claims, as well as a determination on each claim as to whether a new dose estimate is required. Documentation, that includes a dispositive statement which explains the basis as to why each claim was or was not determined to require a new dose reconstruction, will be provided to DOL and included in each case file.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0015 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Mallinckrodt TBD Revision [5] [16] KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per15-ro.pdf)
July 31, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising the Mallinckrodt TBD.

**Summary:** It is not possible to determine the magnitude of the change to dose without a new dose estimate. Since (as of issuance of this PER) no Mallinckrodt claims have yet been completed with the newest revision to the TBD, NIOSH is requesting that all Mallinckrodt claims with a dose reconstruction performed using Revision 1 of ORAUT-TKBS-0005 that have a Probability of Causation less than 50% be returned for a new estimate. A list of the population of 16 potentially affected claims is attached. A new dose reconstruction will be completed for each of the claims using the latest revision to the Mallinckrodt TBD.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0016 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Implementation of IREP Procedure for Claims near 50% Probability of Causation [132 KB (4 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per16-ro.pdf) September 25, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to evaluate the effect of implementing a new IREP procedure on previously completed claims.

**Summary:** A total of 109 previously non-compensable claims with PC values of 45% or greater were evaluated. The average PC value remained below the 50% compensation threshold for each of the 109 claims. An itemized list of claims was provided to DOL containing the final evaluation result for each of the 109 claims.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

OCAS-PER-017 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Evaluation of Incomplete Internal Dosimetry Records from Idaho, Argonne - East and Argonne - West National Laboratories [21 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per-017-ro.pdf)

September 11, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require revisions as a result of new dosimetry data at INL, ANL-E, and ANL-W.

**Summary:** Additional requests were sent in August/September 2006. By April of 2007 a response was received for each of the request. These requests resulted in receiving internal dose data for 83 claims, 62 from INL, 14 from ANL-W, 6 from ANL-E and one with additional records from both INL and ANL-W.

Some of these claims have already been returned to NIOSH for new dose reconstruction for various reasons. The new dose reconstructions will consider the new data received. NIOSH is requesting the remaining claims be returned for a new dose reconstruction. This consists of 68 individual claims. A list of these claims will be forwarded to the Department of Labor. A new dose reconstruction will be completed for each of the claims using the new data.

SC&A Draft: A Review of NIOSH'S "Program Evaluation Report: Evaluation of Incomplete Internal Dosimetry Records from Idaho, Argonne - East and Argonne - West National Laboratories" [436 KB (49 pages)]
 (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/abrwh/scarpts/sca-anlper17-ro.pdf)
 Contract No. 200-2009-28555
 SCA-TR-PR2012-0017, Rev. 0
 (May 15, 2012)

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0018 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Los Alamos National Laboratory TBD Revision [ [18 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per18-ro.pdf)
July 31, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising the LANL TBD.

**Summary:** It is not possible to precisely determine the effect of the change to LAMPF dose estimates on Probability of Causation without a new Dose Estimate. However, it is possible to determine if the LAMPF energy distribution was used in the original dose estimate. It is also possible to determine if an individual was assigned unmonitored neutron dose based on neutron to photon ratios and whether the ratio used will increase or decrease under the new revision to the TBD.

In order to determine the effect of these factors, the individual cases must be re-examined. Since the unmonitored neutron dose has the potential of affecting every claim, all claims completed prior to May 30, 2007 from Los Alamos National Laboratory with a Probability of Causation less than 50% will require a review. NIOSH will request claims be returned in which the LAMPF energy distributions were originally assigned using Revision 0 for a new dose estimate. NIOSH will also request the return of claims in which the original dose estimate utilized a neutron to photon ratio that has now increased. For all other claims, NIOSH will review the claim against any other revisions to other technical documents that may affect the claim. DOL will be provided with a statement for each claim indicating what changes the claim was reviewed against and why the change did not affect the particular dose estimate or the Probability of Causation calculation. For any claims where it is not possible to provide this statement without a new Dose Estimate, NIOSH will request that DOL return the claim for a new Dose Estimate.

NIOSH has determined that 300 claims meet the criteria for further review. The remaining cases with a probability of causation less than 50% (1 claim) were completed using revision 1 of the TBD. NIOSH will provide DOL with the list of 300 claims as well as a determination on each claim as to whether a new Dose Estimate is required.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

 OCAS-PER-0019 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: The Effect of Additional Neutron Dose Data from the Savannah River Site [20 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per19-ro.pdf)
 May 18, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to report the impact of additional neutron dose data received from the Savannah River Site.

**Summary:** Dosimetry records are requested from the Savannah River Site for each claim received from the Department of Labor with Savannah River employment. This data is used in reconstructing the individuals' radiation dose. The Savannah River site notified NIOSH that additional data pertaining to neutron dosimetry was not sent for several claims. The additional data has since been received and added to the original dosimetry data.

Previously completed claims were re-evaluated to determine the affect of this new data on the individual claims. This Program Evaluation Report (PER) was prepared to report the results of that evaluation.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0020 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Blockson TBD Revision [5] [14 KB (1 page)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per20-ro.pdf)
July 31, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising the Blockson TBD.

**Summary:** It is not possible to determine the magnitude of the change to dose without a new dose estimate. Since (as of issuance of this PER) no Blockson Chemical Company claims have yet been completed with the newest revision to the TBD, NIOSH is requesting that all Blockson Chemical Company claims with a Probability of Causation less than 50% be returned for a new estimate. A list of the entire population of the ninety-one potentially affected claims is attached. A new dose reconstruction will be completed for each of the claims using the latest revision to the Blockson TBD.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0021 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Rocky Flats Plant Dose Reconstruction Method Modifications [14 KB (1 page)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per21-ro.pdf)
September 20, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising Rocky Flats Plant TBDs and TIBs.

**Summary:** The Department of Labor indicated they will return all claims to NIOSH that were not determined to be a member of the SEC. Therefore, no evaluation of the modifications to dose reconstruction methodology is necessary. NIOSH will complete a

new dose reconstruction for all claims returned by DOL using the current methodology. It should be noted that some of these claims will be unaffected by these modifications and some dose reconstructions may decrease as a result of removing dose associated with the SEC basis.

The last document to be revised to incorporate changes as a result of the SEC deliberation and designation was the external dose section of the Rocky Flats Technical Basis Document. This document was revised on August 17, 2007. Therefore, the returned claims should consist only of those approved prior to that date. This totals 590 claims, some of which NIOSH previously requested a return based on other PERs.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0022 Rev-00: Chapman Valve TBD Revision [15 KB (1 page)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per22-ro.pdf)
September 20, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising the Chapman Valve TBD.

**Summary:** There were 31 Chapman Valve claims completed with a probability of causation below 50% prior to the revision to the TBD. Twenty one of these were completed using TIB 4. Because that document describes a higher dose estimate than the revision to the Chapman Valve TBD, no further evaluation is necessary for those claims. The remaining 10 Chapman Valve claims were completed using revision 0 of the Technical Basis Document. NIOSH is requesting that these claims be returned for a new dose estimate. A new dose reconstruction will be completed for each of the claims using the latest revision to the Chapman Valve TBD.

# Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0023 Rev-00: Argonne National Lab-West TBD Revision [ [15 KB (1 page)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per23-ro.pdf)
September 20, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising the ANL-W TBD.

**Summary:** There were 22 ANL-W completed with a probability of causation below 50% prior to the change in default frequency. NIOSH will review the records of each claim to determine if an x-ray frequency less than annually was used to complete the dose reconstruction for claims in which no medical records were received from DOE. NIOSH will provide DOL with the list of 22 claims as well as a determination on each claim as to whether a new dose estimate is required.

# Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0024 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: General Steel Industries TBD

Approval [14 KB (1 page)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per24-ro.pdf)

September 25, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of approving a GSI TBD.

**Summary:** There were 4 General Steel Industries claims completed with a probability of causation below 50% prior to the approval of the TBD. These were completed using

ORAUT-OTIB-0004. Since the new document describes a higher dose for some of the dose estimate, it is necessary to revise these dose estimates to determine the effect. NIOSH is requesting that these claims be returned for a new dose estimate. A new dose reconstruction will be completed for each of the claims using the latest revision to the General Steel Industries TBD.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0025 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Huntington Pilot Plant TBD Revision [14 KB (1 page)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per25-ro.pdf)
September 28, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising the Huntington Pilot Plant TBD.

**Summary:** There was one Huntington Pilot Plant claims completed for the above target organs with a probability of causation below 50% prior to 1/16/2004. NIOSH is requesting that this claim be returned for a new dose estimate. A new dose reconstruction will be completed using the latest revision to the Huntington Pilot Plant TBD.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-026 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Pantex TBD Revision - ORAUT-TKBS-0013 [16 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per-026-ro.pdf) October 31, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising the Pantex TBD.

**Summary:** There were 50 Pantex claims meeting the employment dates and target organ criteria above that were completed with a probability of causation below 50% prior to February 1, 2007. NIOSH will review the records of each claim to determine if the dose assigned in the revised TBD is higher than that assigned in the dose reconstruction. NIOSH will provide DOL with the list of 50 claims as well as a determination on each claim as to whether a new Dose Estimate is required. Documentation for each claim not requiring a new dose reconstruction will provide the basis for that determination.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-027 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Clarksville and Medina Site Profile - ORAU TBKS-0039 [15 KB (1 page)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per-027-ro.pdf)
October 30, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of issuing a revision to the Clarksville TBD.

**Summary:** Prior to November 4, 2006, there were 65 Clarksville and Medina claims completed which had a probability of causation below 50%. NIOSH will review these dose reconstructions to determine if the dose assigned in consistent or higher than the issued TBD. NIOSH will provide DOL with the list of 65 claims as well as a determination on each claim as to whether a new Dose Estimate is required. Documentation for each claim not requiring a new dose reconstruction will provide the basis for that determination.

• OCAS-PER-028 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Pinellas TBD Revision 5. [14 KB (1 page)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per-028-ro.pdf)
October 30, 2007

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising the Pinellas Plant TBD.

**Summary:** There were 24 Pinellas Plant dose reconstructions completed with a probability of causation below 50% between August 3, 2006, and November 8, 2006. NIOSH will review these dose reconstructions to determine if missed photon dose was included when appropriate. NIOSH will provide DOL with the list of 24 claims as well as a determination on each claim as to whether a new Dose Estimate is required. Documentation for each claim not requiring a new dose reconstruction will provide the basis for that determination.

Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0029 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Hanford TBD Revisions 5 [30 KB (4 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per29-ro.pdf)
December 18, 2007

**About this Document:** Document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising the Hanford TBD.

**Summary:** There were 1190 Hanford or PNNL claims completed prior to June 22, 2007, with a probability of Causation below 50%. The dose reconstruction methodology of each will be reviewed to determine if a new dose reconstruction is necessary to determine if the revisions increase the dose estimate. NIOSH will review these dose reconstructions to determine if they meet any of the criteria listed in the PER. NIOSH will provide DOL with the list of 1190 claims as well as a determination on each claim as to whether a new dose estimate is required. Documentation for each claim not requiring a new dose reconstruction will provide the basis for that determination.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0030 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Savannah River Site TBD Revisions [31 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per30-ro.pdf)
December 18, 2007

**About this Document:** Document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising the Savannah River Site TBD.

**Summary:** There were 54 Savannah River Site claims completed prior to August 21, 2003, (issue date of revision 1) with a probability of Causation below 50%. The dose reconstruction methodology of each will be reviewed to determine if a new dose reconstruction is necessary to determine if the revisions increase the dose estimate. NIOSH will review these dose reconstructions to determine if they meet any of the criteria listed in this PER. NIOSH will provide DOL with the list of 54 claims as well as a determination on each claim as to whether a new dose estimate is required. Documentation for each claim not requiring a new dose reconstruction will provide the basis for that determination.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0031 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Y-12 TBD Revisions [17 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per31-ro.pdf)

Approved: December 18, 2007

**About this Document:** Document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising the Y-12 Plant TBD.

**Summary:** There were 693 Y-12 claims completed prior to January 12, 2006, with a probability of causation below 50%. The dose reconstruction methodology of each will be reviewed to determine if a new dose reconstruction is necessary to determine if the revisions increase the dose estimate. NIOSH will review these dose reconstructions to determine if they meet the criterion listed in this PER. NIOSH will provide DOL with the list of 693 claims as well as a determination on each claim as to whether a new dose estimate is required. Documentation for each claim not requiring a new dose reconstruction will provide the basis for that determination.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• OCAS-PER-0032 Rev-00: Program Evaluation Report: Nevada Test Site TBD Revisions [17 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/oc-per32-ro.pdf)
December 18, 2007

**About this Document:** Document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the effect of revising the Nevada Test Site TBD.

**Summary:** There were 481 Nevada Test Site claims completed prior to July 30, 2007, (issue date of revision 1) with a probability of Causation below 50% that meet the criteria above. The dose reconstruction methodology of each will be reviewed to determine if a new dose reconstruction is necessary to determine if the revisions increase the dose estimate. NIOSH will review these dose reconstructions to determine if they meet any of the criteria listed in this PER. NIOSH will provide DOL with the list of 481 claims as well as a determination on each claim as to whether a new dose estimate is required. Documentation for each claim not requiring a new dose reconstruction will provide the basis for that determination.

# Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-033 Rev-0: Reduction Pilot Plant TBD Revision 5 [112 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per-33-ro.pdf)
December 9, 2011

**About this Document:** Determines affect of revising the Reduction Pilot Plant TBD on previously completed claims.

**Summary:** Several changes in the Dose Reconstruction methodology occurred in the revision to the TBD. Most changes reflect a decrease in the estimated dose. However, the estimate of internal dose increased from 1956 through 1963 and for 1978 and 1979. The inhalation estimate for operators went from approximately 3.83 pCi/day (1400 pCi/yr) to 44 pCi/day. The original intake was the geometric mean of a lognormal distribution with a geometric standard deviation of 4.3. The new estimate is a single bounding value.

While the internal dose estimate increased, other exposure pathways decreased. Due to the nature of some of the changes, the magnitude of the effect on individual dose estimates will vary from claim to claim.

• DCAS-PER-034 Rev-0: Harshaw Chemical Company TBD Revision [15 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per-34-ro.pdf)
December 9, 2011

**About this Document:** Determines affect of revising the Harshaw TBD on previously completed claims.

Approved: December 9, 2011

**Summary:** Several editorial changes and clarifications were included in the revision however these changes do not affect the estimated dose. Some changes may have decreased the dose but the only significant increase in the dose estimate is caused by an increase in the estimated intake rate for type S uranium from 12/1/1949 to 12/31/1953. The values are listed in Table 5-6 of both revisions.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-035 Rev-0: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Technical Basis

Document Revisions (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per35-ro.pdf)

October 31, 2013

**About this Document:** Determines the effect of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Technical Basis Document Revisions on previously completed claims

**Summary:** Fourteen out of 373 claims that were potentially affected by the revisions had a probability of causation (POC) greater than 50%. NIOSH will notify DOL of all the results and request a return of the 14 claims that would now result in a POC greater than 50%.

• DCAS-PER-036 Rev-0: Program Evaluation Report: Blockson TBD Revision [20 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dcas-per-036-ro.pdf)
April 5, 2012

**About this Document:** New document to determine which previously completed claims require evaluation for the affect of revising the Blockson TBD.

**Summary:** Revision 3 of the Blockson Chemical Company Technical Basis Document (DCAS-TKBS-0002) was issued on 12/20/2010. The previous version (revision 2) was issued on 11/21/2007. PER-020, issued on 7/31/2007, evaluated the effect of all changes that were made to the Blockson Chemical Company Technical Basis Document (TBD) prior to that date. This resulted in a request to DOL for the return of all previously completed Blockson claims that had a probability of causation of less than 50%. Once returned, a new dose reconstruction was completed for each using the version of the TBD current at that time. Revision 1 of the TBD was current when PER-020 was issued. However, revision 2 was issued a short time later on 11/21/2007 prior to any claims being completed using revision 1. Therefore, this PER only considered the changes that were made between revision 2 and revision 3. This information is summarized below:

- Revision o all claims completed using revision o were requested returned (PER-020).
- Revision 1 No claims were completed using this revision
- Revision 2 The subject of this PER
- Revision 3 The current version of the TBD

• DCAS-PER-037 Rev-0: Program Evaluation Report: Revision 3 of the Ames Laboratory Technical Basis Document (ORAU-TKBS-0055) [21 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per-37-ro.pdf) July 17, 2012

**About this Document:** Revision 3 of the Ames Laboratory Technical Basis Document (ORAU-TKBS-0055) was issued on 1/3/2012. The previous version (revision 2) was issued on 1/14/2011. Revision 1 was issued 12/18/2009 and Revision 0 PC-1 was issued 8/20/2008. This PER considered the changes that were made between the current revision (revision 3) and all previous versions of the TBD.

**Summary:** For the 16 claims requiring further evaluation, dose was recalculated using all current dose reconstruction methods including the current version of the TBD. Only one claim resulted in a probability of causation greater than 50%. NIOSH will notify DOL of these results and request a return of the one case that would now be greater than 50%.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-038 Rev-0: Program Evaluation Report: Hooker Electrochemical TBD Revisions [2] [177 KB (5 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per-38-ro.pdf)
July 24, 2012

**About this Document:** site specific appendix to Battelle-TBD-6001 (Appendix AA) was issued 6/15/2007. This was superseded by a stand-alone Technical Basis Document (TBD) on 4/4/2011 (DCAS-TKBS-0009 rev. 0). On 6/16/2011, revision 1 was issued to that document to correct an error. The changes made in revision 1 of the TBD caused external doses to operators to decrease during the operational period. No increase in any doses occurred in revision 1. Revision 0 however, did result in some increased dose when compared to Appendix AA. Therefore, Appendix AA is compared to Revision 1 in this PER in order to itemize the increased dose.

**Summary:** As a result of this review, the revisions to the Hooker Electrochemical TBD did not result in the probability of causation of any previously completed claims rising to greater than 50%. A listing of those claims evaluated and their final disposition will be forwarded to the Department of Labor.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-039 Rev-0: Baker Perkins TBD Revision [15 KB (1 page)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per39-ro.pdf)
January 7, 2013

**About this Document:** Several changes in the methods used to reconstruct doses at Baker-Perkins resulted in both inhalation and external doses being higher for some job categories when compared to previous methods. Since only 8 claims have been completed for this site, each with a probability of causation below 50%, all 8 were reevaluated using revision 1 of the TBD.

**Summary:** As a result of this review, the revision to DCAS-TKBS-0005 did not result in the probability of causation of any previously completed claims rising to greater than 50%. A listing of those claims evaluated and their final disposition will be forwarded to the Department of Labor.

• DCAS-PER-040 Rev-0: Mallinckrodt TBD (ORAUT-TKBS-0005) Revision [ [88 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per40-ro.pdf) September 10, 2013

**About this Document:** Considers the effect of Revision 3 on claims that were completed using revision 2 or Revision 2 PC-1.

**Summary:** For the ninety-one claims requiring further evaluation, dose was recalculated using all current dose reconstruction methods, including those in the current version of the TBD. From that recalculated dose, a new probability of causation was determined. The probability of causation remained below 45% for 86 of the 91 claims. For three of the remaining five claims, the probability of causation fell between 45% and 50%. In accordance with NIOSH procedures, IREP was run 30 times with 10,000 iterations for each run. The final probability of causation remained below 50% for all three claims. The final two resulted in a probability of causation greater than 50%. In both cases, this resulted primarily from the inclusion of monitored external dose between 1942 and 1948 that had not previously been included. NIOSH will notify DOL of all these results and request a return of the two claims that would now be greater than 50%.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-041 Rev-o: Revision to ORAUT-OTIB-0006, Dose Reconstruction from Occupational Medical X-ray Procedures [33 KB (4 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per-41-ro.pdf)
July 12, 2012

**About this Document:** New document to determine the effect on previously completed claims due to revision ORAUT-OTIB-0006, Dose Reconstruction from Occupational Medical X-ray Procedures.

**Summary:** The revision to ORAUT-OTIB-0006 did not result in probability of causation of any previously completed claims rising to greater than 50%.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-042 Rev-0: Program Evaluation Report: Linde Ceramics Plant Technical Basis

Document Revision [33 KB (4 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per-42-ro.pdf)

November 16, 2012

**About this Document:** Determines which previously completed claims require evaluation for the affect of revising the Linde Ceramics Plant TBD.

**Summary:** The selection criteria resulted in 78 claims requiring further evaluation. For those claims, the dose was recalculated using all current dose reconstruction methods including the current version of the TBD. From that recalculated dose, a new probability of causation was determined. The probability of causation remained below 45% for 74 of the 78 claims. None of the cases resulted in a probability of causation between 45% and 50%. The four remaining cases had a probability of causation greater than 50%.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-043 Rev-o: Program Evaluation Report: Internal Dosimetry Organ, External Dosimetry Organ, and IREP Model Selection by ICD-9 Code Revision (June 7, 2013) [32 KB (5 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per43-ro.pdf)
June 7, 2013 **About this Document:** Determines the effect on previously completed claims due to revisions to ORAUT-OTIB-0005: Internal Dosimetry Organ, External Dosimetry Organ, and IREP Model Selection by ICD-9 Code

**Summary:** Thirty-six claims were re-evaluated to determine the effect of revisions to OTIB-5. Two claims resulted in a new probability of causation greater than 50%, both as a result of changing the internal dose target organ from gallbladder to liver for code 155.1. None of the remaining thirty four claims exceeded a probability of causation of 45%. NIOSH will provide the Department of Labor with the list of the thirty-six claims evaluated under this PER. NIOSH will also request from the Department of Labor that the two claims now greater than 50% be returned to NIOSH for a new dose reconstruction.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-044 Rev-0: Program Evaluation Report: Metallurgical Laboratory [ [42 KB (1 page)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per44-ro.pdf)
May 16, 2013

**About this Document:** New document to determine the effect on previously completed claims due to changes to Metallurgical Laboratory dose reconstructions.

**Summary:** With only one claim potentially affected by previous changes, the dose was recalculated for that claim using all currently approved methods. As a result of this recalculation, the probability of causation remained below 50%.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-045 Rev-0: Program Evaluation Report: Aliquippa Forge TBD Revision [15 KB (1 page)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per45-ro.pdf)
May 13, 2013

**About this Document:** Evaluates all claims with employment in the residual period and a probability of causation less than 50% to determine the affect of the Aliquippa Forge TBD Revision 1.

**Summary:** Twenty six claims with a probability of causation less than 50% were previously completed. Five of those had no employment in the residual period and were eliminated from further review. The dose was estimated for the remaining twenty one claims using the Revision 1 of the TBD. All twenty one remaining claims resulted in a probability of causation below 45%.

#### Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-047 Rev-0: NIOSH/DCAS Program Evaluation Report: Grand Junction Operations Office [47 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per47-ro.pdf)

March 26, 2014

**About this Document:** Determines the effect on previously completed claims due to changes to Grand Junction Operations Office dose reconstructions.

**Summary:** Potentially effected Grand Junction Operations Office claims were reviewed based upon additional information discovered while evaluating an SEC petition. NIOSH will notify DOL of all results and request a return of the one claim that would now result in a probability of causation greater than 50%.

• DCAS-PER-048 Rev-0: Wah Chang [29 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per45-ro.pdf)
September 27, 2013

**About this Document:** Reviews claims that may have been affected by: changes in the dates of the operational and residual period, a Special Exposure Cohort designation, and a revision of ORAUT-OTIB-0070: Dose Reconstruction During Residual Radioactivity Periods at Atomic Weapons Employer Facilities (/niosh/ocas/tibsnum.html#tib70) which was used in some previous dose reconstructions.

**Summary:** The dose for affected claims was recalculated using all currently approved methods and information and resulted in a probability of causation below 45%.

Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-050 Rev-0: Bliss and Laughlin Appendix 5 [27 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per50-ro.pdf)
March 13, 2014

**About this Document:** Determines the effect on previously completed claims due to the approval of the Bliss and Laughlin Appendix.

**Summary:** Claims were reviewed with a probability of causation less than 50% and dose reconstructions completed prior to 9/11/12, the date the appendix was approved. Dose for the each of these claims was recalculated using all current dose reconstruction methods. The probability of causation remained below 45% for all claims.

Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-052 Rev-0: Westinghouse Nuclear Fuels Division [35 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per52-ro.pdf)
March 25, 2014

**About this Document:** Determines the effect on previously completed claims due to new information found for the Westinghouse Nuclear Fuels Division site.

**Summary:** Additional air samples were discovered. As a result of analyzing the additional samples, the calculated intakes increased significantly. NIOSH will request the return of the claims that would now result in a probability of causation greater than 50%. NIOSH will provide the Department of Labor with the list of all the claims evaluated under this PER.

Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-054, Rev. 0: Carborundum Company [13 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per54-ro.pdf)
September 12, 2014

**About this Document:** Determines the effect on previously completed claims due to issuing revision 1 of Battelle-TBD-6000

**Summary:** One case resulted in a new POC greater than 50%. NIOSH will provide the Department of Labor with the list of all the claims evaluated under this PER. Further, NIOSH will request the return of the case that would now result in a probability of causation greater than 50%.

## Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-055, Rev. 0: TBD-6000 Revision [ [87 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per55-ro.pdf)
September 12, 2014

**About this Document:** Determines the effect on previously completed claims due to changes in methods and covered employment period.

**Summary:** NIOSH will request the return of two claims that would now result in a probability of causation greater than 50%.

Select a Different PER (#pers)

• DCAS-PER-056, Rev. 0: BWXT Virginia [13 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per56-ro.pdf)
September 12, 2014

**About this Document:** Determines the effect on previously completed claims due to changes in methods used in BWXT claims.

**Summary:** No claim had a probability of causation of greater than or equal to 50% as a result of this reanalysis. One claim, however, had probability of causation between 45% and 50%. For that claim, the IREP program was run 30 times at 10,000 iterations in accordance with NIOSH procedures. The probability of causation remained below 50%. NIOSH provided the Department of Labor with the list of all the claims evaluated under this PER. Since all claims were below 50%, NIOSH did not request the return of any of the claims.

# Select a Different PER (#pers)

DCAS-PER-058: Dow Chemical Co.--Madison Site [20 KB 2 pages)]
 (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/pers/dc-per58-ro.pdf)
 November 21, 2014

**About this Document:** Determines the effect on previously completed claims due to a revision to the Dow Chemical Appendix.

**Summary:** None of the claims resulted in a POC greater than 50%. NIOSH will provide the Department of Labor with the list of all the claims evaluated under this PER.

Select a Different PER (#pers)

# Program Evaluation Plans

Do you know the number of the PEP you are looking for? If you do, click on the number below to go to the section of the page where the PEP is located.

# Program Evaluation Plan Index

 $\underline{08\,(\#\text{pep8})} \quad \underline{09\,(\#\text{pep9})} \quad \underline{12\,(\#\text{pep12})} \quad \underline{13\,(\#\text{pep13})} \quad \underline{14\,(\#\text{pep14})} \quad \underline{17\,(\#\text{pep17})}$ 

• OCAS-PEP-008 Rev-00: Modification of NIOSH-IREP Lung Cancer Risk Model: Impact of "Combined" Lung Model on Non-Compensable Lung Cancer Claims [132 KB (5 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/peps/oc-pep8-ro.pdf)

December 7, 2006

**About this Document:** New document to evaluate the modification of the NIOSH-IREP lung cancer model on previously competed cases.

Select a Different PEP (#peps)

• OCAS-PEP-009 Rev-00: Evaluation of the Change in Target Organs for Dose Reconstruction Involving Lymphoma [5] [62 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/peps/oc-pepg-ro.pdf)
December 8, 2006

**About this Document:** This document provides a plan to evaluate the change in target organ selection for previously completed dose reconstruction involving lymphomas.

Select a Different PEP (#peps)

• OCAS-PEP-012 Rev-00: Evaluation of Highly Insoluble Plutonium Compounds [101 KB (6 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/peps/oc-pep12-ro.pdf)
March 29, 2007

**About this Document:** In the first version of the Rocky Flats Plant (RFP) Internal TBD (Jan 2004), it was noted that highly insoluble forms of plutonium were generated during the Rocky Flats fires. In response to the need to assess claims with potential exposure to this material, ORAUT-OTIB-0049 was developed. ORAUT-OTIB-0049 delineates the methods for assessing potential exposure to highly insoluble forms of plutonium, not only from the RFP fires, but at other sites in the complex that may have worked with this material.

Select a Different PEP (#peps)

• OCAS-PEP-0013 Rev-00: Evaluation of the Impact of Changes to the Isotopic Ratios in for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant [20 KB (2 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/peps/oc-pep-013-ro.pdf)
March 21, 2007

About this Document: October 25, 2006, Revision 01 of ORAUT-TKBS-0019-5, Occupational Internal Dose was issued as part of the biennial review process. During the biennial revision of this TBD section, the information provided in existing document was evaluated to ensure that the published isotopic ratios for transuranic (TRU) radionuclides meet the criteria of providing either an accurate or maximum dose estimate. The results of the evaluation indicated that the current ratios did not meet that goal. Information provided in existing references (particularly PACE and the University of Utah, 2000; BJC, 2000), as well as that found in a new reference was assessed with the result that new TRU isotopic ratios were developed and are included in the TBD as Tables 5-2 and 5-2a in the revised document.

On November 7, 2006 Revision 01 of ORAUT-TKBS-0019-4, Occupational Environmental Dose was issued. A revaluation of the source data for ORAUT-TKBS-0019-5 led to a revision to the TRU isotopic ratios (relative to uranium) for estimating dose from these radionuclides. In addition, the authors have been able to categorize these ratios according to specific processes and periods as described below in conjunction with ORAUT-TKBS-0019-5.

• OCAS-PEP-0014 Rev-00: Evaluation of the Impact of OTIB-0052, Construction Trade Workers [90 KB (5 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/peps/oc-pep14-ro.pdf)

March 29, 2007

**About this Document:** In 2004, it was noted that some Construction Trades Workers (CTW) at various sites were unmonitored during the early years of the complex. It was believed that these workers may have been exposed to external radiation and/or internal contamination above ambient and environmental levels without adequate monitoring. To address this issue, ORAUT-OTIB-0052 (Technical Information Bulletin: Parameters to Consider When Processing Claims for Construction Trade Workers) was developed to provide guidance on assessing CTWs with inadequate monitoring (either internal or external).

## Select a Different PEP (#peps)

• OCAS-PEP-0017 Rev-00: Evaluation of Incomplete Internal Dosimetry Records from Idaho, Argonne - East and Argonne - West National Laboratories [17 KB (3 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/peps/oc-pep-017-ro.pdf)
March 21, 2007

About this Document: In April/May 2006, while reviewing dose reconstructions (DR) for an Idaho National Laboratory (INL) case and an Argonne National Laboratory - East (ANL-E) case, a particular notation ("no recordable dose") in the INL dosimetry response, as well as a similar notation ("no internal dose") in the ANL-E dosimetry response, was questioned. Both the INL and ANL-E points of contact (POC) were contacted and asked if this notation meant that the energy employee (EE) was not monitored. The INL POC responded that this notation meant that this particular EE may have been monitored but no internal dose was assigned. The ANL-E POC provided information that the EE had internal dose records for most years of his employment. [Although Argonne National Laboratory - West (ANL-W) requests are sent thru the Chicago Operations Office, the dosimetry records are provided by INL.]

In May/June 2006, it was determined that INL/ANL-W/ANL-E did not consistently include internal dose data in all of their individual dosimetry responses and that additional requests were needed for submitted cases with a POC less than 50%. For a particular EE, INL/ANL-W/ANL-E either provided all or none of the EE's internal dosimetry records. A good indicator that there may be internal dosimetry data is that the OCAS-INT-004 (check-box form) may have a hand-written note next to the internal dosimetry status section that says - "no internal dose" or "no recordable dose."

Select a Different PEP (#peps)

# Comments on Program Evaluation Reports and Plans

**How to Submit Comments** Comments on Ames Laboratory documents can be submitted to the NIOSH Docket Officer electronically by e-mail at <a href="mailto:nioshdocket@cdc.gov">nioshdocket@cdc.gov</a> or printed comments can be mailed to:

NIOSH Docket Office, Robert A. Taft Laboratories, MS-C34, 1090 Tusculum Avenue, Cincinnati, OH 45226.

#### **Comments Received**

• Program Evaluation Reports

 Draft: A Review of NIOSH's Program Evaluation Report OCAS-PER-014, Construction Trades Workers [228 KB (21 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/abrwh/scarpts/sca-per14-ro.pdf)
 Contract No. 200-2009-28555 SCA-TR--PR2012-0014, Rev. 0

March 2012

Draft: A Preliminary Review of NIOSH's Evaluation Report OCAS-PER-009, Target Organs for Lymphoma [809 KB (44 pages)] (/niosh/ocas/pdfs/abrwh/scarpts/sca-ocper9-r3.pdf)
Contract No. 200-2004-03805
Task Order No. 3
SCA-TR-TASK3-0008
June 2008

Page last reviewed: September 26, 2014 Page last updated: November 25, 2014

Content source: National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health Division of Compensation Analysis and Support

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 1600 Clifton Road Atlanta, GA 30329-4027, USA 800-CDC-INFO (800-232-4636) TTY: (888) 232-6348 - Contact CDC -INFO

