

US DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

+ + + + +

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL
SAFETY AND HEALTH

+ + + + +

ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIATION AND
WORKER HEALTH

+ + + + +

103rd MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY
JANUARY 6, 2015

+ + + + +

The meeting convened telephonically at
11:00 a.m. Eastern Standard Time, James M. Melius,
Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT :

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

JAMES M. MELIUS, Chairman
HENRY ANDERSON, Member
JOSIE BEACH, Member
BRADLEY P. CLAWSON, Member
R. WILLIAM FIELD, Member
DAVID KOTELCHUCK, Member
RICHARD LEMEN, Member
JAMES E. LOCKEY, Member
WANDA I. MUNN, Member
DAVID B. RICHARDSON, Member
GENEVIEVE S. ROESSLER, Member
PHILLIP SCHOFIELD, Member
LORETTA R. VALERIO, Member
PAUL L. ZIEMER, Member
TED KATZ, Designated Federal Official

REGISTERED AND/OR PUBLIC COMMENT PARTICIPANTS

ADAMS, NANCY, NIOSH Contractor
AL-NABULSI, ISAF, DOE
BARRIE, TERRIE
HARTSFIELD, DeKEELY, HHS
HINNEFELD, STU, DCAS
KINMAN, JOSH, DCAS
KOTSCH, JEFF, DOL
MAURO, JOHN, SC&A
NETON, JIM, DCAS
OSTROW, STEVE, SC&A
RUTHERFORD, LAVON, DCAS
STIVER, JOHN, SC&A

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	3
Opening remarks & Roll call	
By Mr. Katz.....	4
Welcome	
By Dr. Melius.....	7
SLAPS SEC Petition Residual Period	
By Mr. Rutherford.....	8
Questions	17
Vote	35
SEC Petition Status Update	
By Mr. Rutherford.....	40
Updates from Work Groups and Subcommittees	
By Member Beach.....	44
By Member Clawson.....	48
By Member Kotelchuck.....	50
By Member Munn.....	51
By Member Ziemer.....	53
Plans for March 2015 Board meeting	55

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 (11:00 a.m.)

3 MR. KATZ: I think it's time. It's
4 11:00 and Jim's on. So let me get things rolling
5 here.

6 Just a few general notices. The
7 materials that we're discussing today for this
8 teleconference are all available on the NIOSH
9 website. The agenda as well.

10 As we're speaking about a SEC petition,
11 which we're wrapping up or we hope to wrap up for
12 a St. Louis Airport Storage Site, SLAPS.

13 So those materials are on the NIOSH
14 website under the Board section, under scheduled
15 meetings, today's date. And everyone from the
16 public, you can pull up the presentation and follow
17 along.

18 Board Members, you have a Live Meeting
19 address, if you want it, for that presentation.
20 But you also have the presentation itself.
21 Whatever your preference is.

22 One other thing I just wanted to note.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 For everybody and John, I mean Jim may, Dr. Melius
2 may have more to say, but we had a resignation from
3 the Board since we last met. Mark Griffon has
4 reluctantly, after, you know, struggling with this
5 for quite a number of years, decided to resign.

6 As you all know he's been really
7 stretched thin because he has heavy duties with the
8 Chemical Safety Board. So he's really -- he had
9 to scale back years ago when he joined the Chemical
10 Safety Board to stay with our Board. And he's had
11 to resign.

12 We'll have to make that work. And it's
13 just, I just would say briefly, from the Agency,
14 before we get on the record with anything, but, you
15 know, we're going to miss him. He's been a
16 tremendous contributory, even when he scaled back
17 for the Chemical Safety Board.

18 You know, whenever he could contribute
19 it was always valuable. So we're going to miss
20 him. And we'll do more about that.

21 Thanking him for his service down the
22 road. But he just resigned just before the New

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Year.

2 MEMBER MUNN: This is a major loss for
3 this Board.

4 MR. KATZ: Yes. I mean he's certainly
5 a formative influence for the Board and we're very
6 grateful to have had him as long as we did.

7 MEMBER MUNN: We are.

8 MR. KATZ: So let me, anyway, let me get
9 started with roll call. Let me note we don't have
10 any items that relate to anyone's conflicts of
11 interest so we don't need to go do individual
12 conflicts of interest for this meeting.

13 And I'll just run down the roll,
14 alphabetically. If I haven't already heard your
15 voice please register your attendance and then
16 we'll go from there.

17 (Roll call.)

18 All right, that covers everything for
19 administrative matters. Please, for everyone
20 listening in, mute your phones except when you want
21 to address the group.

22 Press *6 if you don't have a mute button

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to mute your phone, *6 again to take your phone off
2 mute. And, Jim, it's your meeting.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, thank you.
4 Thank you, Ted. I think Henry's trying to thaw out
5 up in the Midwest. You too, Gen, from what I hear.
6 Pretty cold.

7 MEMBER ROESSLER: It's not above zero
8 yet.

9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Well we're a balmy,
10 I don't know, 15 degrees in Albany, so.

11 MEMBER CLAWSON: You know, and I find
12 that interest because in Idaho it's a nice warm 35
13 degrees. Here in the wintertime.

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Well when you're
15 taking your snowmobile to our next meeting in March
16 we'll --

17 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: -- we'll compare
19 notes, so.

20 MEMBER MUNN: Out in Richland in the
21 Banana Belt, you don't even want to hear about our
22 55 degrees yesterday, do you?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Oh.

2 MEMBER MUNN: Go forward.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Well we don't have
4 anybody from Florida on the committee. Board. We
5 have a -- do a one site residual period, it's a SEC
6 petition, and then we'll sort of go through our
7 usual issues.

8 So I think we'll turn it over right now
9 to LaVon Rutherford.

10 MR. RUTHERFORD: All right, can
11 everyone hear me okay?

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

13 MR. RUTHERFORD: Good. All right.
14 This is LaVon Rutherford, I'm going to talk about
15 the St. Louis Airport Storage Site. And if you got
16 Live Meeting up you'll just follow along with me
17 there. If you're going through just with the
18 presentation, I'll let you know when to flip the
19 slide.

20 So I'm on the second slide at the
21 facility is -- going over the facility designation.
22 Again, St. Louis Airport Storage Site. You'll

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hear us call it SLAPS.

2 It's a Department of Energy Site in St.
3 Louis, Missouri. The covered time periods are
4 January 3rd, 1947 through the end of 1973. And the
5 beginning of 1984 through the end of 1998, again,
6 are the covered periods.

7 Slide 3, you'll go through a little site
8 history. In the 1940's the Manhattan Engineering
9 District acquired 21.7 acres north of the St. Louis
10 International Airport.

11 They acquired this land to store
12 residues from processing of the uranium ores. The
13 various ores that were received at Mallinckrodt.

14 Mallinckrodt Chemical Works sent the
15 residues to SLAPS from 1946 through 1953. And
16 continued to store the residues at SLAPS until
17 production at Mallinckrodt stopped in 1966.

18 Most of the stored, or I'll say source
19 material, the heavy concentrations or the heavy
20 residues, were removed from SLAPS from 1966 to 1969
21 period.

22 So Slide 4. The St. Louis Airport

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Authority, they remove the residues. Actually
2 the residues were bought by another company.

3 Those residues were removed. All
4 aboveground structures were removed. They added
5 clean-fill over the remaining, buried or residual
6 contamination, one to three feet. Most of that
7 work was completed in 1969.

8 They did a final survey for turnover for
9 the airport November 3rd, 1971. Or to turnover to
10 the City.

11 The City took over the area in 1973.
12 DOE actually took back ownership of the property
13 in 1984 under the FUSRAP program. And in 1998 DOE
14 transferred the site to the Army Corp of Engineers.

15 Let's go to Slide 5. Back in 2010 we
16 issued an Evaluation Report. We actually
17 evaluated the whole covered period.

18 Initially the site was designated
19 Atomic Weapons Employer. And in our initial
20 portions of our evaluation we uncovered
21 information that supported, not only a change in
22 the actual covered period, but also that it looked

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 like it was actually owned by the AEC. Which would
2 have meant it would have been a DOE site.

3 We issued our Evaluation Report on
4 April 13th, 2010. In our Evaluation Report we
5 recommended adding a Class from January 3rd, 1947
6 through November 2, 1971.

7 Basically, that covered the
8 operational period of when residues were brought
9 out to the site. It also covered the period when
10 the residues were, when the major portions of the
11 residues were removed all the way up till we got
12 a closeout or pretty much a survey that was to turn
13 the area over to the City.

14 We did find a dose reconstruction was
15 feasible for the remaining cover period. That was
16 for a stagnant period, from November 3rd, 1971
17 through December 31st, 1973. And then for the
18 remaining covered period, January 1, 1984 through
19 December 31, 1998.

20 You'll kind of get -- I know one of your
21 thoughts is going to be, why is there this break
22 in period between 1973 up to 1984? Why isn't there

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a residual period there?

2 Well if you remember, the Department of
3 Energy there are no, you know, residue periods for
4 Department of Energy sites. It's just covered
5 periods for when ownership.

6 So Board action was postponed for that
7 remaining period. The 1971 to '73 period and 1984
8 to 1998 period.

9 And we presented that Evaluation Report
10 at the May Board meeting in 2010 in Niagara Falls.
11 And again, the Advisory Board voted to recommend
12 the Class that we had proposed.

13 Slide 6. There are very few claims for
14 this site. We had three claims for the entire
15 covered period.

16 That included the SEC period 1947 to
17 1971, which it covers two of the three claims. And
18 then we had one claim that was outside of that
19 period. We had one claim that had internal
20 dosimetry. That is one of the claims that is in
21 the SEC period.

22 And then we have two claims that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 external dosimetry. And both of those claims are
2 in the SEC period. So the one claim we do have is
3 for -- we do not have monitoring data.

4 Okay, let's go to the next slide, Slide
5 7. Potential exposures. The site was stagnant,
6 pretty much from 1971 to 1973.

7 Again, all the major source material
8 had been removed, one to three feet of clean-fill
9 was placed on top of the surface, all structures
10 were gone.

11 Internal exposure was only from radon
12 emanation through the clean-fill. And external
13 exposures were gamma emissions through clean-fill.

14 The 1984 to 1998 period, activities
15 were mostly environmental monitoring with some
16 site maintenance. You know, erosion control,
17 things like that.

18 The potential internal/external
19 exposure potential was from contaminated debris,
20 residue source material from maintenance
21 activities.

22 Slide 8. Personal area monitoring

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 data. Again, the 1971 to '73 period was a stagnant
2 period when the facility was pretty much locked and
3 no access in that area.

4 You have, as I mentioned, all buildings
5 and source material was removed and one to three
6 feet of clean-fill dirt. So there's no personal
7 or area monitoring data during that period.

8 Slide 9. January 1, 1984 through the
9 1998 period, internal monitoring data urine
10 samples taken from workers involved in
11 characterization and remedial action activities.

12 Urine samples were analyzed for
13 radium-226 as well as thorium-228. Air sampling
14 included breathing-zone, which also have isotopic
15 ratios from SLAPS soils, soils taken at SLAPS in
16 a 1991 analysis.

17 Slide 10. External monitoring data.
18 We have no external monitoring data through the
19 1971 to '73 period, but we do have the verification
20 survey that was completed at the end of removing
21 all the buildings, source material and installing
22 the clean-fill dirt that was the very beginning of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this 1971 to '73 period.

2 And in that survey, no area exceeded 1
3 millirad per hour.

4 Slide 11. Our dose reconstruction
5 approach. Now 1971 to 1973 period, internal
6 exposures would have only been from radon.

7 We don't expect anyone was at the
8 facility at all during this period. But if we did
9 have indications or if the questions were brought
10 up, our internal approach would be only to apply
11 radon exposure for this period using the highest
12 radon concentrations from the site remedial
13 investigation studies that were taken.

14 External dose would be based on the
15 highest dose rate from the 1971 site survey, which
16 was 1 mR per hour.

17 Slide 13. Our 1984 to 1998, '98
18 approach. Again, we believe most of the people
19 were monitored, internal and external.

20 From all indications there were a
21 handful of people that were involved in activities
22 at the site. You know, doing the environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 monitoring, erosion control. There were no major
2 activities going on during that period.

3 So you use internal and external
4 personal monitoring data when available. If no
5 personal internal monitoring data available during
6 the period, we would use a resuspension of
7 contaminated soil. Basically an OTIB-0070
8 approach.

9 We could develop a coworker model if
10 applicable. I say if applicable, if it met the
11 criteria that were, you know, established and for
12 coworkers.

13 If no personal external monitoring data
14 available, we could determine period external
15 exposure based on area monitoring or develop a
16 coworker model.

17 The area monitoring for the facility,
18 as I mentioned earlier, they had TLD monitoring in
19 all areas of the site to monitor external
20 exposures. They also had track-etch for radon,
21 they had air sampling in the area.

22 So there was good air sampling and good

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 external monitoring for the area during that
2 period. So if that's needed.

3 And I think that's it. Questions?

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Anybody have
5 questions for LaVon?

6 MEMBER BEACH: Yes, Jim, this is Josie.
7 I have some questions for the '84 to '98 time
8 period.

9 MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes.

10 MEMBER BEACH: I was reading the site
11 interviews that were listed in the ER review and
12 it talked about, actually there was two of them.
13 They talked about the work they were doing in that
14 time period.

15 Digging mostly like on the sides of the
16 road. One of them indicated they dug from one to
17 ten feet, as much as 20 to 30 feet and the dirt got
18 hotter and hotter.

19 So I guess I'm wondering, during that
20 time period, one of these interviews said there was
21 15, I think, to 20 men working doing that type of
22 work. Mostly on the sides of the road, digging up,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 facing radiation is what he said.

2 Also on the Evaluation Report on Page
3 34 it talks about the '84 to '98 timeframe that you
4 have TLDs up to 1990 but the data hasn't been
5 located after the '90's. So I just wanted you to
6 talk a little bit more about that work and if that's
7 covered under SLAPS or something else?

8 MR. RUTHERFORD: Well the period -- the
9 '84 to '98 period, yes there was some remedial work,
10 erosion control. And they also did some, as you
11 mentioned, the digging in the ditches.

12 And that was mainly because of the
13 run-off that they were looking at. They had
14 indications that the contaminants were spreading
15 out to the ditches and they wanted to determine how,
16 you know, basically the extent of that spread.

17 We still have indication that all
18 individuals that we had, were monitored for that
19 period.

20 Now as you mentioned, we don't have all
21 of the TLD data for, you know, for everyone during
22 that period. That doesn't mean that it doesn't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exist, it means at this time we don't have that
2 data.

3 That data may have been -- if we got a
4 claim for an individual, that may be provided by
5 the Department of Energy. I don't know.

6 But that doesn't hold us back because
7 of the area monitoring data we have. And all the
8 other data that we have.

9 The external dose reconstruction is
10 actually a -- there's plenty of data for that.

11 MEMBER BEACH: Yes. And I guess it's
12 just a little confusing when you try to look at all
13 of it.

14 When you look at the internal, it says
15 you have available personal monitoring information
16 in the baseline risk assessment. And I didn't go
17 look at that, but I guess I'm just curious what kind
18 of internal monitoring you have for those guys that
19 were doing that work.

20 MR. RUTHERFORD: Well for what we have
21 -- if you look in the Site Research Database and
22 you actually go through, we have internal

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 monitoring data for a number of individuals.
2 Including portions of that activity that you
3 mentioned.

4 And I can't say if we have all -- because
5 you said ten or 15 people. Now we had indication
6 -- one of our bioassay log sheets had eight to ten
7 people. And so that could have been that activity
8 we're discussing.

9 But all indications we have right now
10 are individuals that were working during that
11 period and doing remediation, there was bioassay
12 taken.

13 Now again, I think even from an internal
14 approach, if we do not have personal monitoring
15 data for a specific individual, we believe we have
16 enough internal monitoring data. As well as other
17 urine sampling data for individuals involved in
18 those activities that we can do the internal -- that
19 we can reconstruct the internal dose.

20 MEMBER BEACH: Okay, thanks, LaVon.

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: So this is Jim,
22 LaVon. Just to clarify. I think I understood you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to say that you believe that the workers doing the
2 erosion control were among those monitored?

3 MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, I do.

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Oh, okay. Now is
5 there a report or anything equivalent of a, sort
6 of an updated Site Profile that address all these
7 issues?

8 MR. RUTHERFORD: No, there's not. The
9 actual -- you can look at the one dose
10 reconstruction that was completed for the
11 individual that was outside of the SEC period.

12 That dose reconstruction actually
13 covers most of the -- well since the individual did
14 not have external or internal monitoring, you can
15 see the approach that we used.

16 We used the 1971 to 1973 period. We
17 used the highest radon concentration and we also
18 used the 2,000 or 1 mR per hour for 2,000 hours.
19 So we basically gave him 2 rem per year, external
20 dose, for those two years.

21 And the '84 to '98 period we actually
22 used the TLD area monitoring data and came up with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a dose rate based on that TLD area monitoring data
2 and assumed 2,000 hours with that as well. And
3 then we did an OTIB-0070 approach, as I mentioned
4 earlier, using the resuspension of the isotopes
5 used in the soil ratios that were determined in the
6 1991 survey.

7 But we do not have a Site Profile
8 specifically that identifies all this information.

9 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: As I recall, when
10 this site was first discussed in, I guess 2010, at
11 that point we had sort of less information, at least
12 available to tell the Board about, about what
13 activities did go on and sort of less certainty
14 about what the, you know, activities, what people
15 were doing during this time period.

16 And some of that was, you know, you had
17 very few people at the interview because not many
18 people had come forward with claims. And what I'm
19 seeing is there are still very few claims from this
20 site.

21 MR. RUTHERFORD: That's correct.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes. Any other

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Board Members have questions?

2 MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer. I
3 just wanted to ask, LaVon. Have there been any
4 additional claims around the three that you showed?

5 MR. RUTHERFORD: No. No, none at all.

6 MEMBER ZIEMER: Thank you.

7 MR. RUTHERFORD: Yes, I think what a
8 lot of it is, is not only was there very few people
9 involved in the work out there, that a lot of the
10 remedial work didn't happen until after it was
11 turned over to the Army Corp of Engineers.

12 MEMBER BEACH: LaVon, I just found the
13 spot. This gentleman that you guys interviewed
14 said that there was 15 to 20 people working and he
15 worked for nine to ten months from '97 or '98. But
16 he worked at Weldon Springs and SLAPS from '93 to
17 '99.

18 And I guess the one paragraph that
19 really struck me was, it said that they did the
20 excavating on the sides of the roads, they did
21 radiation sampling and testing using excavators
22 and backhoes. They dug from one to ten to as much

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 as 20 to 30 feet on the side of the road.

2 So I guess I'm just wondering if we have
3 a sense of everything that they actually did at that
4 point. It seems like a lot of digging.

5 MR. RUTHERFORD: Well yes. And as I
6 mentioned, if we have bioassay data for the
7 individuals involved, or for at least of the
8 individuals involved, it doesn't matter how much
9 contamination or digging they did with your
10 reconstructed dose.

11 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. As long as all
12 those workers could be covered, I guess, is what
13 I'm getting at.

14 MR. RUTHERFORD: Well and I didn't go
15 back and try to pull names of each individual and
16 try to compare it to that. I didn't do that.

17 And as you mentioned also, the
18 individual work at Weldon Springs as well. And so
19 there is going to be, you know, obviously you're
20 going to look at not only his exposures digging the
21 ditch, but also at Weldon Spring.

22 And in both situations I wouldn't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 anticipate there was internal monitoring
2 performed.

3 MEMBER MUNN: We've had lots of
4 experience with raffinates and their contents over
5 the period of years that we've looked at these
6 things. And the raffinates certainly were not
7 unknown quantities.

8 It was fairly well identified what was
9 contained. Not always what the exact percentages
10 were, but it isn't as though these folks would have
11 been digging without any supervision or without any
12 knowledge of what was there.

13 Certainly if the object of looking at
14 the trenches was defined, what was in the trenches,
15 then certainly that material was analyzed and the
16 information would have been interpreted with
17 respect to what the job was. Which was to see what
18 was there.

19 Can't imagine that activity would have
20 gone on for months and months without this
21 information being available about level of
22 exposure that was being generated. There has to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be, whether we have specific records for each
2 individual, we have to have a pretty good idea that
3 the exposure there was well observed and was not
4 inadvertent.

5 It must have been known. And certainly
6 administered with respect to its severity.

7 MEMBER CLAWSON: You're making an
8 assumption there. And as we found out, this is
9 Brad, many of the other sites, things that we
10 thought would have been taken care of were not.

11 And what Josie is saying about this,
12 there is a lot of different nuances that can play
13 into this. And we just want to make sure that the
14 people are being covered right.

15 And there's just a question on, you
16 know, what kind of information do we have on this.
17 And LaVon asked that -- that he feels if he thinks
18 they're covered.

19 One of my questions is, is there were
20 very few claims in this, but is that possibly
21 because most the complainants for this would have
22 been Weldon Springs? Because I think I remember

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reading out that they worked at Weldon Springs,
2 then went out there did this, went back to Weldon
3 Springs until the later years.

4 MR. RUTHERFORD: Well, Brad, that very
5 well could be that there are a number of claimants
6 that are tied into Weldon Springs. You know, I'm
7 not sure --

8 MEMBER CLAWSON: Right, I'm not --
9 that's you know, that's what I've been telling
10 myself as why we didn't have -- in just reading the
11 information that we do have and it seems like Weldon
12 Springs actually kind of, well they controlled this
13 to a point and then things started to change. Then
14 I realized that.

15 MR. RUTHERFORD: Looking --

16 MEMBER CLAWSON: You know, we're out
17 there digging holes into this stuff. And I know
18 what we go through today to dig a hole in some of
19 these older sites. It's amazing what we find.

20 MR. RUTHERFORD: I do agree. I do want
21 to remind you thought, this is, you know, this
22 happened 1984 to 1998. So this isn't like the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 '40's and '50's as well.

2 MEMBER MUNN: Hardly.

3 MR. RUTHERFORD: And if you look at the
4 amount of analysis that was done, I mean when
5 they're doing isotopic analysis on the bioassay
6 samples, they are, you know, they did the isotopic
7 analysis to ratios on the soil samples. They had
8 established area monitoring with TLDs, with radon
9 for track-etch, they had air sampling in the areas.

10 It's clear that their radcon program
11 was at a point where any activities that were going
12 on, they were going to look at those activities very
13 closely. So from that perspective and the data we
14 have, I feel pretty good about it.

15 MEMBER CLAWSON: And I understand
16 that.

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And this is Jim. I
18 mean I agree that we don't want to assume too much
19 just because it's a more recent time period. But
20 at the same time, in the absence of information
21 about other activities where at the site, where it
22 would appear that there would be, be unable to do

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 dose reconstruction, I think we have to sort of
2 assume that claims that would come forward would,
3 you know, would be taken care of.

4 And then if NIOSH finds claims that are,
5 you know, involve activities or something that
6 could not be addressed are something unusual that,
7 that could always be reopened if necessary.

8 MR. RUTHERFORD: Right. To add to
9 that, I totally agree with that. If we find
10 information and we found this happened before, we
11 could say now based on the information we have and
12 all the data that we had, believe dose
13 reconstruction is feasible.

14 If new information comes up or is
15 brought in and is provided in a petition to us and
16 we haven't addressed that or we don't feel it was
17 properly addressed or had been looked at by the
18 Board, we would qualify a petition, move it forward
19 and come back to the Board with it.

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. This is Jim
21 again. I would have just felt more comfortable
22 with some sort of report or something that would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sort of document this a little bit better. But,
2 you know, maybe perhaps it's the transcript of this
3 meeting that, you know, will provide enough of that
4 information along with your PowerPoint
5 presentation for that.

6 But I think in the future, at some
7 point, some of these we need to have a little bit
8 more, sort of definitive report to work off of or
9 memo to, in order to take action. Because I think
10 that would be, would have been helpful here.

11 MR. RUTHERFORD: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: But any other
13 questions?

14 DR. MAURO: Dr. Melius, this is John
15 Mauro. Is it appropriate for me to raise a
16 question?

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Board Members, I --

18 DR. MAURO: Oh, I'm sorry if no Board
19 -- I did have a question.

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: If there's -- but I
21 don't have any objection to you.

22 DR. MAURO: Thank you. It will be a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 quick one. I understand -- Bomber, this is John.
2 You mentioned that OTIB-0070 is a fallback position
3 when you don't have data, bioassay data, or you
4 can't build coworker model bioassay data.

5 The only thing I caution is OTIB-0070
6 is mainly indoors and uses the resuspension factor
7 approach. You know, ten to the minus six, ten to
8 the minus five per meter.

9 When you're out doors and you have both
10 contamination of soil, the mass-loading approach
11 is probably a better approach. Where you -- I'm
12 sure you have good information on the mix of
13 radionuclides, you know, picocuries per gram of
14 soil based on, you know, characterization.

15 And then if you assume some dust
16 loading, because while people are digging they're
17 going to be kicking up some dust, and there are ways
18 of assigning dust loading in milligrams per cubic
19 meter. I would think that's a better approach than
20 the resuspension factor approach.

21 MR. RUTHERFORD: John, actually that
22 is exactly what we did in the dose reconstruction.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I said OTIB-0070 because of it being our standard
2 residual approach.

3 If you look at the approach we used, we
4 used the resuspension factor from the baseline risk
5 assessment. And it's based on the ambient dust
6 concentrations in the St. Louis area.

7 And then it's adjusted based on
8 activities. And it's, you know, in milligram per
9 cubic meters.

10 DR. MAURO: Excellent. Thank you.

11 MR. RUTHERFORD: So it's exactly what
12 we did.

13 DR. MAURO: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Any other questions?
15 Comments? If not do I hear a motion or?

16 MR. KATZ: Jim, before we do that.
17 This is Ted. We should just check, we have no
18 indications that the Petitioner is, wanted to
19 participate. But we should just check that box
20 still.

21 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, go ahead. So
22 if the Petitioner is on the line for the --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Petitioner for the original site, you're welcome
2 to comment at this point.

3 Okay, hearing no one I think we will --

4 MR. KATZ: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: -- move ahead. Do
6 we have any proposals for action?

7 MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. I
8 propose that we accept the recommendation made by
9 NIOSH and fail to accept this Special Exposure
10 Cohort for the St. Louis Airport Storage Site as
11 stated in the presentation by Dr. Rutherford.

12 MEMBER ANDERSON: Hello, this is Andy.
13 I didn't make it for the first part, but I did start
14 with the presentation. So I'll second that.

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Andy, we were
16 concerned that you're out there with frostbite or
17 something.

18 MEMBER ANDERSON: No, my computer had
19 frostbite.

20 MEMBER MUNN: Okay.

21 MEMBER ANDERSON: We were having a
22 little IT problem because we're shifting systems

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 right now.

2 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Oh geez.

3 MEMBER MUNN: Well keep them indoors.

4 MEMBER ANDERSON: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: So we have a motion
6 and a second. Any further comments? If not, Ted,
7 can you do the roll call?

8 MR. KATZ: Sure. And let me just note,
9 before I do the roll call, two things. One, Dr.
10 Richardson also joined us around the time Andy did,
11 pretty close after we got started. And then after
12 we do this I need to reclaim the mic to cover another
13 administrative matter that I overlooked.

14 But so let's go with this with the
15 votes. And I'll just do it alphabetically. Dr.
16 Anderson?

17 MEMBER ANDERSON: Yes.

18 MR. KATZ: Ms. Beach?

19 MEMBER BEACH: No.

20 MR. KATZ: Mr. Clawson? Brad, are you
21 on the line still?

22 MEMBER CLAWSON: No.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: Dr. Field?

2 MEMBER FIELD: Yes.

3 MR. KATZ: Dr. Kotelchuck?

4 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Yes.

5 MR. KATZ: Dr. Lemen?

6 MEMBER LEMEN: No.

7 MR. KATZ: Dr. Lockey?

8 MEMBER LOCKEY: Yes.

9 MR. KATZ: Dr. Melius?

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

11 MR. KATZ: Ms. Munn?

12 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

13 MR. KATZ: Dr. Poston I believe is
14 still absent, is that correct?

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

16 MR. KATZ: Dr. Richardson? Are you
17 still with us, Dr. Richardson? Maybe you're on
18 mute. Okay, let me go down. Dr. Roessler?

19 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Hi. Do you hear
20 me?

21 MR. KATZ: Oh yes, there you are.

22 MEMBER RICHARDSON: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KATZ: Okay, thank you. Dr.
2 Roessler? Gen, are you still with us? Maybe
3 you're on mute.

4 MEMBER ROESSLER: This is Gen, am I on
5 now?

6 MR. KATZ: Yes, you are.

7 MEMBER ROESSLER: Okay. Yes.

8 MR. KATZ: Mr. Schofield?

9 MEMBER SCHOFIELD: Yes.

10 MR. KATZ: Ms. Valerio?

11 MEMBER VALERIO: No.

12 MR. KATZ: Dr. Ziemer?

13 MEMBER ZIEMER: Yes.

14 MR. KATZ: Okay, the yeas have it with
15 one, two, three, four noes, 11 yeas. Well ten
16 because we have one absentee vote for Dr. Poston,
17 which we'll have to collect. But in any event the
18 motion passes.

19 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes. I have a
20 letter, do you want me to read into the record or?

21 MR. KATZ: Yes, please do that. And
22 then I'll get to my other administrative --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I believe I
2 circulated this to the Board, the draft. It's
3 pretty straightforward.

4 The Advisory Board on Radiation Worker
5 Health (The Board) has evaluated Special Exposure
6 Cohort Petition 00150 concerning workers of the St.
7 Louis Airport Storage Site, under the statutory
8 requirements established by the Energy Employees
9 Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of
10 2000, EEOICPA, incorporated into 42 CFR Section
11 83.13.

12 National Institute for Occupation
13 Safety and health, NIOSH, has recommended that
14 individual dose reconstructions are feasible for
15 all employees of the Department of Energy, its
16 predecessor agencies and their contractors and
17 subcontractors who work at the St. Louis Airport
18 Storage Site in St. Louis, Missouri, from November
19 3rd, 1971 through December 31st, 1973. And from
20 January 1st, 1984 through December 31st, 1998.

21 NIOSH found that it has access to
22 adequate exposure monitoring and other information

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 necessary to do individual dose reconstructions
2 with sufficient accuracy for members of this group
3 and therefore a Class covering this group should
4 not be added to the SEC. The Board concurs with
5 this determination.

6 Based on these considerations and the
7 discussion, the January 6, 2015 Board meeting, the
8 Board recommends that this Class not be added to
9 the SEC. Close this documentation for the Board
10 meeting where this SEC Class was discussed.

11 Documentation includes copies of the
12 petition, NIOSH review thereof and related
13 materials. If any of these items are unavailable
14 at this time, they will file them shortly. So
15 anyone, spelling, misspelling or grammatical
16 errors, just send Ted or I an email on that.

17 MR. KATZ: Okay. Thank you, Jim. And
18 I was, as I'm reminded by the two Board Members that
19 joined us late, I was remiss in not completing the
20 roll call for everyone who isn't a Board Member,
21 the front end of this, and we need that for the
22 transcript record.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So let me just run through that very
2 quickly and then we'll carry on with the agenda with
3 LaVon's presentation.

4 (Roll call.)

5 And back to you Jim or LaVon for his SEC
6 presentation.

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: I want the pleasure
8 of introducing LaVon again. LaVon, for your very
9 enlightening Special Exposure Cohort Petition
10 Status Update.

11 MR. RUTHERFORD: Okay, this will be
12 much quicker than the last presentation. We
13 anticipate that we will present four Evaluation
14 Reports at the March meeting.

15 We will present Dow Walnut Creek. We
16 anticipate that Evaluation Report will be to the
17 Advisory Board and out mid to late January.

18 We were held up a little bit getting
19 some information that some documents from OSTI that
20 we did receive back in December. So we have
21 reviewed that once and we are, again, anticipating
22 that will be to the Board mid to late January.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Idaho -- INL, it's been a flurry
2 activity. We are going to have that Evaluation
3 Report at the March meeting. And we anticipate
4 that we will get the report to the Advisory Board
5 in early March.

6 I realize that's a little late, however
7 the -- I think there's a -- it's a large site and
8 there's a lot of information there that ultimately
9 I anticipate the Board's going to ask for continued
10 work. And I believe we're going to tell the Board
11 that we may have some additional work that we need
12 to do.

13 But we will present an Evaluation
14 Report for a portion of that period at a minimum.

15 Hanford. Again, this is a specific for
16 some construction workers. We are -- anticipate
17 having a report to the Board mid to late February.

18 And then Grand Junction Operations
19 Office. This is the post 1975 period. We expect
20 to have a report to the Advisory Board in mid to
21 late February as well.

22 And so those are the four reports we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 will be presenting at the March meeting. And
2 that's it.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: So no other
4 petitions in review or?

5 MR. RUTHERFORD: Actually we do have a
6 couple of petitions that Westinghouse Electric
7 Corporation that I had presented or indicated at
8 the Board meeting. It's a residual period.

9 That Evaluation Report will come
10 forward in the July meeting. And we do have a
11 potential 83.14 that we're also working on. And
12 I won't get into any details on that at this time.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Any
14 questions for LaVon?

15 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Jim, I have a
16 question for you.

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

18 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Administratively,
19 aren't we -- isn't the Board supposed to vote on
20 your letter? I have no objection but I thought we
21 normally, when you sent the letter that --

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: No. Usually we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't, I believe.

2 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Ah-ha. You just
3 gave it to us for --

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: For review. And to
5 read it into the record. So it's in the record for
6 --

7 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay. Fine.

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: But we certainly
9 accept, you know --

10 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: I have -- no, I
11 have no corrections or --

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

13 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: -- edits.

14 MR. RUTHERFORD: Oh, I do -- I
15 apologize, Jim or Dr. Melius. I wanted to identify
16 too that Argonne National Lab was, because it was
17 separate facility from INL, that petition did come
18 in.

19 It was the same petitioner, the INL.
20 And we will present that Evaluation Report at the
21 July meeting as well.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Busy

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 schedule coming up. Good. Okay, next item, if
2 there's no more questions for LaVon, next item,
3 updates from Work Groups or Subcommittees. Any --

4 MEMBER BEACH: Yes. Jim, this is
5 Josie. I'd like to give a quick update on the
6 Kansas City Work Group Report?

7 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Go ahead.

8 MEMBER BEACH: Okay. So the
9 Evaluation Report was issued January 7th of 2014.
10 There's been several site visits with NIOSH, SC&A
11 and Board Members present.

12 Those visits were in December of 2013,
13 May 2014 and the latest one was in October of 2014
14 for interviews and data capture.

15 The issues matrix was issued March 12th
16 of 2014. And there was a revised issue matrix that
17 went out June of 2014.

18 There was a technical call held in July
19 of 2014 regarding Kansas City external dose records
20 and neutron dose estimation questions. There's
21 two key issues.

22 The internal exposure to uranium.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NIOSH's approach using TBD-6000 and TBD-0070. The
2 Work Group has agreed that this is scientifically
3 sound and extremely claimant-favorable.

4 The second of the key issues is the
5 thorium-mag or mag-thorium operations. There's
6 more clarification needed from NIOSH regarding the
7 reconstruction approach for the machining of the
8 mag-thorium alloys.

9 We have had, I believe, two Work Group
10 meetings. I didn't grab the dates of those.

11 During data capture other potential
12 radiological source terms were identified that
13 were not fully addressed in the Evaluation Report.
14 Including tritium handling operations.

15 We still need some clarification to
16 determine the potential exposure timeframe
17 involved and the workers who may have been
18 potentially exposed for certain thorium oxide
19 handling activities.

20 We found inventory information, but no
21 actual monitoring. Or excuse me, no actual
22 operational applications yet.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So we're still working on additional
2 inquires and we're continuing to work. We have
3 several petitioner questions that we are working
4 on getting answers to.

5 Our next Work Group meeting is
6 scheduled for the 20th of this month. To date
7 there were 20 matrix issues. We closed three of
8 them.

9 I expect we'll have quite a few closures
10 after our meeting on the 20th. And I plan to maybe
11 work with Ted in March, do a more formal
12 presentation if we feel like we're ready for it,
13 at our March meeting. That's all I have.

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: You think that the
15 March presentation would be to try to reach closure
16 on the SEC?

17 MEMBER BEACH: You know, Jim, I don't
18 want to say yes right now. I'll know more after
19 our meeting on the 20th.

20 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

21 MEMBER BEACH: It just -- yes, there
22 was still -- at the time of this, us putting this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 together, there's still some unfinished items that
2 we need to keep looking for answers to. So.

3 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes. Well and I --
4 you know, whether the Work Groups ready for
5 recommendation or not, I'm not objecting to -- I
6 think it might actually be helpful to have an update
7 just to, you know, bring the Board -- have the Board
8 understand what issues you're addressing and --

9 MEMBER BEACH: Yes. Yes, that's why I
10 was thinking more of an in depth on the 20 issues
11 that we have and what we've closed so far.

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

13 MEMBER BEACH: If the Work Group agrees
14 with that.

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Okay, well
16 let's talk after your --

17 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: -- Work Group
19 meeting. Good. Anybody, any other Work Group or
20 Subcommittee chairs wish to give an update?

21 MEMBER CLAWSON: Jim, this is Brad.
22 I'd like to give just a little update on some of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 my Work Groups there.

2 We have the Work Group meetings for
3 Fernald and Nevada Test Site. All these issues
4 that we're trying to close up now are mainly Site
5 Profile issues and so forth. Because of the SEC
6 that both of these sites have.

7 We've made very good progress on both
8 of the sites. We're getting very near to closing
9 Nevada Test Site completely.

10 Fernald, we still have a couple of
11 outstanding issues. Nothing major but we final
12 closed the K-65 issue and the radon issues through
13 there.

14 We did have a Work Group with Pantex a
15 little bit earlier. We are still waiting on that.

16 And, Stu, correct me if I use the right
17 terminology on this because there was a
18 neutron-photon ratio that we're trying to work out
19 on that.

20 MR. HINNEFELD: This is Stu. The
21 actual question is, how are we going to do neutron
22 dose reconstruction?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Whether it's going to be neutron to
2 photon or what technic are we going to use. And
3 I think we're getting pretty close to having a
4 product to be able to deliver to the Work Group on
5 that.

6 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. And that will
7 basically pretty well finish out Pantex. But the
8 neutron issue kind of bleeds into a couple of the
9 sites there. But we've made very good progress.

10 I would like to tell NIOSH how much I
11 appreciate the work that they've done and the
12 manner that they've done it in. It's been good.
13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good. Thanks,
15 Brad. Anybody else like to update on their Work
16 Groups?

17 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Jim? Jim, Dave
18 Kotelchuck.

19 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay.

20 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Board Members will
21 be happy to hear that the Dose Reconstruction
22 Subcommittee has finished its deliberations on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Sets 10 through 13, which we've been working on for
2 many months.

3 There are still a few outstanding
4 resolution of a few outstanding cases that are in
5 other Subcommittees or other Working Groups. But
6 we're pretty close to finishing.

7 And then that will allow us to move
8 ahead on the report from the Subcommittee. The
9 case report for the Secretary.

10 And while I'm speaking, Jim, I hope that
11 you will be able to appoint a replacement person
12 for Mark Griffon, who we will miss. Both soon and
13 helpfully even before our next meeting on February
14 27th.

15 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Okay,
16 thanks, Dave. Other Work Group updates?

17 MEMBER MUNN: This is Wanda. Just a
18 quick note or two with respect to Procedures.

19 Our total findings values now are at
20 698. To all intents and purposes we've looked at
21 700 different findings over the years.

22 We have less than ten percent of those

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are in the open classifications of which we've
2 physically closed better than 80 percent of them.
3 About ten percent of them are in the process of
4 being worked by other Work Groups or transferred
5 in some way. So we're making progress.

6 As I've told you repeatedly, a great
7 deal of our effort currently is being directed to
8 our PERs. We addressed a full dozen of them at our
9 last meeting.

10 And we're meeting roughly every three
11 months now. And our next session will be in
12 February, Wednesday February 18th. So we're
13 making progress in Procedures.

14 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Good, thank you.
15 Anybody else?

16 If not I have a, well I guess two -- more
17 information for people on the SEC Evaluation Work
18 Group. I believe we will plan a Work Group meeting
19 before the March meeting.

20 And also for Hanford, if LaVon keeps his
21 commitment and gets us a report in February, I think
22 it would probably worthwhile for the Work Group to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have a meeting, at least a conference call, to
2 review that report and get prepared for the March
3 meeting in that area. So I will be working with
4 Ted and setting up those two meetings.

5 In regard to Mark Griffon, in addition
6 to the Dose Reconstruction Subcommittee, which he
7 was a Member, he also chaired three other Work
8 Groups. I believe Savannah River, Rocky Flats and
9 LANL.

10 And so I will be probably be sending out
11 a notice looking for people to, you know, possibly
12 replace him on the groups. But first I want to sort
13 of go figure out -- I want to talk to some of the
14 people on the Work Groups, sort of understand where
15 we are and what kind of assignment would be
16 appropriate.

17 So probably in the next week or two.
18 Hopefully we'll at least get that part of the effort
19 to replace Mark underway.

20 MEMBER MUNN: You realize of course
21 that Mark's irreplaceable. When you say that.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: All right, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 effort. The effort to. I wasn't predicting a
2 completely successfully, a hundred percent
3 replacement, right.

4 MEMBER MUNN: Oh, well, we can do that
5 physically.

6 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes. But yes, no
7 well will all miss him and do that. Any other Work
8 Group updates?

9 MEMBER ZIEMER: This is Ziemer. Let
10 me note a couple quick comments on the TBD-6000 Work
11 Group.

12 I think all of the Board Members have
13 been just apprised of the information that has been
14 developed over the last number of months and their
15 various email exchanges between the staff and the
16 Work Group and the Co-Petitioner.

17 In any event, I just wanted to remind
18 the group that we have a form, SC&A, their, what
19 I would call their operative review of the Appendix
20 BB, which is General Steel Industries, Appendix BB
21 Rev 1.

22 We have the December Evaluation Report

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that they made of the NIOSH document. And we are
2 awaiting comments back from NIOSH on that.

3 And hope to schedule a Work Group
4 meeting very soon so we can resolved these issues
5 and try to put the Appendix BB matters to bed so
6 that the PER can proceed. So I am very hopeful we
7 can schedule that Work Group meeting very soon and
8 try to resolve these issues.

9 I know that the competition is very
10 anxious to get this resolved as well and I'm hopeful
11 that we can do that. We're just awaiting this last
12 group of comments from NIOSH.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, thanks, Paul.
14 Anybody else? Okay so I think that takes us
15 directly into plans for the March meeting.

16 And I think given, I think what you
17 heard from LaVon, I think we can assume that our
18 March meeting will be at least a day and a half and
19 most likely a two day meeting to get through all
20 of this information and the work. So I think you
21 should plan accordingly.

22 So I'm guessing more likely a two day

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meeting. But that helps with your planning. Ted,
2 do you have anything else to add on that or?

3 MR. KATZ: Yes. Just that in addition
4 to all this other work, we also need a morning
5 session, again, for you annual ethics training.
6 So yes, I completely agree. I think that is a two
7 day meeting.

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. And we always
9 find a distant place for ethics updates.

10 MEMBER LEMEN: Okay. This is Dick
11 again.

12 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes.

13 MEMBER LEMEN: Can you please give us
14 the exact dates and locations?

15 MR. KATZ: Yes. It's March 25th and
16 26th, I believe. If I'm remembering correctly.

17 MEMBER MUNN: That's correct.

18 MEMBER BEACH: That's what I have.

19 MR. KATZ: 25 and 26th of March, Dick.

20 MEMBER LEMEN: And where?

21 MR. KATZ: This is in Richland or that
22 area. Richland, Pasco area.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER LEMEN: Okay.

2 MEMBER MUNN: That's in the State of
3 Washington dear.

4 MR. KATZ: Yes.

5 MEMBER LEMEN: Really? I didn't know
6 that. I'm happy you told me, Wanda. I'm
7 enlightened.

8 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: So we'll be coming
9 out to visit Wanda and Josie.

10 MEMBER MUNN: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: We'll do that at that
12 time. And then I'm also expecting, I don't want
13 to put Jim Neton on the spot, but I think we'll also
14 have some -- spend some time spending about the
15 coworker model issue also.

16 DR. NETON: Yes. This is Jim, I agree.

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Yes. On the agenda.
18 So it will be, you know, as I said, like two days.
19 But two interesting and full days of activity for
20 us.

21 MEMBER MUNN: And this is Wanda. I'm
22 mentioning the fact that there's a great deal of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 excitement locally in the Hanford area with respect
2 to the new designation of the Manhattan Project
3 sites of which of course we are one.

4 And this means that a great deal of
5 activity is going to be seen historically. With
6 respects to the events that occurred here locally.

7 Offline I'd like to ask the Board
8 Members whether anyone is interested in seeing some
9 of what maybe going on, with respect to the
10 definition of a new park area and what we have been
11 looking at as the Hanford site for the last 50
12 years. And if so, the B Reactor now is more
13 available for tours than it has been in the past.

14 And we could probably arrange that if
15 Members of the Board are interested in doing that.
16 So I'll inquire about that offline.

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. Very good,
18 that sounds like a good idea, Wanda. Thanks. Any
19 other, I don't believe we have any correspondence
20 that needs to be addressed.

21 MR. KATZ: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And so I think we can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 adjourn our meeting. I guess we have to ask a
2 motion to adjourn.

3 MEMBER CLAWSON: Jim, this is just
4 Brad. Not to speak for Dr. Kotelchuck, but
5 shouldn't we be getting some more blind reviews
6 getting pushed forth, SC&A, so that we don't have
7 a lag in that?

8 MR. KATZ: We have -- they're working
9 on blind reviews, Brad.

10 MEMBER CLAWSON: Are they?

11 MR. KATZ: Yes.

12 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay.

13 MR. KATZ: Yes.

14 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay, I just wondered
15 what --

16 MR. STIVER: This is John Stiver. I
17 think one thing I'm a little bit concerned about
18 that we're going to be finishing up this Set 21 and
19 the blinds by the end of February.

20 And so we tend -- we like to, if
21 possible, giving the time that it takes to get a
22 new set authorized and selected and all that, maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 go ahead and start that process to get the ball
2 rolling so that we don't have a big gap, you know,
3 in activity for that period the beginning of March.

4 MEMBER KOTELCHUCK: Okay.

5 MEMBER CLAWSON: Okay. I just want to
6 make, I know it takes a long time to get that done,
7 I just wanted to kind of get the ball rolling. But
8 I'll leave that up to the powers that be and we'll
9 go from there.

10 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay. So do I hear
11 a motion to adjourn?

12 MEMBER CLAWSON: Yes, let's adjourn.

13 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, Brad. Do I
14 hear a second?

15 MEMBER BEACH: I'll second it. This
16 is Josie.

17 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: All in favor?

18 (Chorus of ayes.)

19 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: And that leaves Dr.
20 Lemen, right?

21 MEMBER BEACH: Yes.

22 MEMBER LEMEN: I agree.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Okay, anyway.

2 Enjoy the winter, we'll see you in March.

3 MEMBER LEMEN: Bye-bye.

4 CHAIRMAN MELIUS: Bye.

5 MR. KATZ: Thank you everybody.

6

7 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter

8 went off the record at 12:05 p.m.)

9

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701