



NIOSH Dose Reconstruction Project Meeting On PORTS Site Profile

Date:

March 24, 2004

Meeting with:

Building Trades Unions; Plumbers and Pipefitters Local

Attendees:

Cam Detty	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) Local #575
William Tipton	IBEW Local # 575
Bob Elliott	Metal Workers Local # 1514
Mark Johnson	Carpenters Local # 437
Glen Mollett	Laborers Local # 83
Gary Coleman	Laborers Local # 83
Steve Cordle	Plasterers and Cement Masons
Don Stiltner	Sheet Metal Workers Local # 24
Mac Mellert	SOADC Bricklayers Local # 39
Steve Burton	Tri-State Building Trades
Stephen Pigg	HFIAW
Russ Montgomery	Ironworkers Local # 769
Ron	Operating Engineers Local # 18
Larry Frank	Plumbers and Pipefitters Local # 577
Ron Hadsell	Concerned individual with J&H Erectors

NIOSH and ORAU Team Representatives:

James Neton – NIOSH/OCAS

William Murray – ORAU

Mark Notich – PORTS Site Profile Team Leader

Vern McDougal – ATL, International

Proceedings

The meeting began at 9:45 AM with introductory remarks from Vernon McDougall and introduction of James Neton, William Murray, and Mark Notich. Copies of the presentation slides and Section 2, Site Description, of the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PORTS) Site Profile were passed out to all attendees. Mr. McDougall asked all the union attendees to give their names and affiliations and to sign the sign-in sheet that was being circulated.

James Neton gave a brief overview of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Program Compensation Act (EEOIPCA), which cancers are automatically compensated, which cancers are not automatically compensated and the claims subsequently sent to NIOSH for dose



NIOSH Dose Reconstruction Project Meeting On PORTS Site Profile

reconstruction, and how and why a dose reconstruction is done. James Neton explained that NIOSH's Office of Compensation Analysis Support (OCAS) has received 343 claims from Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant employees that require dose reconstructions. James Neton said the process consists of a person submitting a claim; the Department of Labor determining if the person's cancer is a Special Exemption Cohort, if it is then the person is automatically compensated. If the cancer is not a Special Exemption cohort, then the claim is referred to NIOSH for a dose reconstruction. If the dose reconstruction shows that the cancer has a greater than 50% possibility of being cause by their employment at a DOE site, then a recommendation is made to DOL to pay the compensation.

William Murray went through the slide show presentation which explained the EEO/PCA program and the Technical Basis Document development and dose reconstruction process. He provided the web address for ORAU COC and OCAS so that the public can contact these organizations with comments or to get information on claims. He explained how uncertainties in documents are approached. He explained how the dose reconstruction is being claimant favorable by assuming the largest possible dose for an individual based on exposure records, environmental data, and other factors.

During the discussion on development of the occupational medical exposure Technical Basis Document, Mr. Murray explained that only doses from employer required x-rays are included in the dose reconstruction calculations. An attendee commented that construction workers never had site x-rays taken either before, during, or after working at Portsmouth. Another attendee commented that a lot of people from the Portsmouth area with Q clearances were sent to other sites and were at those sites for longer than 250 days. Another attendee commented about working DOE Greenfield sites and questioned how this counts against the time requirement for the Special Exposure Cohort. James Neton responded that OCAS is only concerned with radiation exposures and that working at Greenfield (or non-radiation) sites is covered under the DOE compensation program. Another attendee commented to the all the attendees that the State of Ohio recently passed a law that eliminated about 2/3 of the asbestos cases from eligibility for compensation.

Mr. Murray explained the concept of "missed dose" for zero readings or lost badges and how this is claimant favorable.

Mr. Murray completed the slide show and opened the floor for questions.

Discussion Session

Question: Has NIOSH always been in Cincinnati

James Neton: NIOSH has had an office in Cincinnati since the 1970's.

Question: How many cases does NIOSH process per month or per year?



NIOSH Dose Reconstruction Project Meeting On PORTS Site Profile

James Neton: 2000 claims have been processed to date by OCAS. It took 14 months to complete the first 1000 but only 14 weeks for the second 1000.

Question: How do we handle secondary cancers?

James Neton: Only primary cancers are compensated, but if the primary cancer is unknown, then secondary cancers are looked at.

Question: Why is a union member being scheduled for a NIOSH hearing in Cleveland?

James Neton: It sounds like a Department of Labor (DOL) hearing concerning a claim that was denied but he was not sure.

A discussion ensued concerning the incubation (or latency) period for cancers.

Comment: expressing concern that PORTS does not have enough dosimeter badges for people and that union members worked on the site unbadged.

Question: What is the latency period for a cancer and if the dose reconstructors had a chart or graph to follow to determine if latency is an issue.

James Neton: Dose reconstructors have a graph to help determine if the latency period has been exceeded.

Question: how long does the process take; how long does it take NIOSH to process a claim?

James Neton: The goal is to process 200 claims per week.

Question: Does NIOSH deals with inhaled/ingested contaminants

James Neton: On this program, NIOSH addresses internal and external exposure to radioactive materials and the internal exposure can come from inhalation and/or ingestion.

Comment: there is still a language barrier between union members and scientists. Most of the attendees were not able to completely follow the slide show presentation. It was agreed to use language in the slide show that non-scientists could understand and follow.

Question: Is the CPWR or the Portsmouth Resource Center the best place to get information on this project as it relates to Portsmouth.

Vern McDougall: Answered the question with a brief discussion on the CPWR and said that the Portsmouth Resource Center was indeed the best place.



NIOSH Dose Reconstruction Project Meeting On PORTS Site Profile

Suggestion: To have an evening meeting so that all the union membership could have a chance to attend and ask questions. James Neton agreed with this idea and said he would contact the Department of Labor to get a representative to attend. An attendee also suggested that representatives from the building trades attend the PACE meeting on April 16. It was agreed that this was a good idea.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 AM.

Attachments:

Sign-in sheet

Presentation by James Neton, overview of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Program Compensation Act (EEOIPCA),

Summary of the Portsmouth Site Profile